EXPLORING THE LINK BETWEEN OBJECT RELATIONS, NARCISSISM, CYBER BULLYING, AND CYBER VICTIMIZATION AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

SEVGİ MESTCİ

Master's Thesis

Graduate School

İzmir University of Economics

İzmir

2021

EXPLORING THE LINK BETWEEN OBJECT RELATIONS, NARCISSISM, CYBER BULLYING, AND CYBER VICTIMIZATION AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

SEVGİ MESTCİ

A Thesis Submitted to

The Graduate School of Izmir University of Economics

Master's Program in Clinical Psychology

İzmir

2021

ABSTRACT

EXPLORING THE LINK BETWEEN OBJECT RELATIONS, NARCISSISM, CYBER BULLYING, AND CYBER VICTIMIZATION AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Mestci, Sevgi

Master's Program in Clinical Psychology

Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Aylin Koçak Şen

August, 2021

The present study aimed to investigate the role of object relations, and narcissism, on cyber bullying, and cyber victimization. The sample consisted of 393 university students (272 females, 121 males) aged between 18 and 25 (M = 22.13, SD = 1.81). Online form of Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory BORRTI (Bell, 1995; Uluç et al., 2015), Pathological Narcissism Inventory PNI (Pincus et al., 2009; Şen and Barışkın, 2019), and The Second Revision of the Revised Cyber Bullying Inventory RCBI-II (Topçu and Erdur-Baker, 2018) were used. The data collected online via social media means. Stepwise linear regression was used to analyze the stated relations. The results of the stepwise regression analyses showed that both

cyber bullying and cyber victimization were predicted by object relations, insecure attachment, narcissistic vulnerability. Additional analysis showed that parental status, daily internet usage, previous bullying status, and previous victimization status were also significant predictors of cyber bullying and victimization. Findings were discussed in the light of literature.

Keywords: Cyber bullying, cyber victimization, object relations, reality testing, grandiose narcissism, narcissistic vulnerability

ÖZET

ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN NESNE İLİŞKİLERİ, NARSİSİZM, SİBER ZORBALIK VE SİBER MAĞDURİYET DÜZEYLERİ ARASINDAKİ İLİŞKİLERİN İNCELENMESİ

Mestci, Sevgi

Klinik Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Aylin Koçak Şen

Ağustos, 2021

Bu çalışmada nesne ilişkileri ve narsisizmin, siber zorbalık ve siber kurban olma üzerindeki rolünün incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemi yaşları 18-25 aralığında olan 393 (M = 22.13, SD = 1.81) (272 kadın, 121 erkek) üniversite öğrencisinden oluşmaktadır. Araştırmada Bell Nesne İlişkileri ve Gerçeği Değerlendirme Testi BNİGD (Bell, 1995; Uluç et al., 2015), Patolojik Narsisizm Envanteri PNE ve Revize Edilmiş Siber Zorbalık Envanteri-II (Topçu ve Erdur-Barker, 2018) kullanılmıştır. Ölçeklerinin online formları kullanılmış datalar online olarak sosyal medya aracılığı ile toplanmıştır. Analizlerde aşamalı regresyon kullanılmıştır. Analizlerde nesne ilişkileri, kırılgan narsisizm ve güvensiz bağlanma hem siber zorbalığın hem de siber kurban olmanın yordayıcıları olarak bulunmuştur. Ek analiz olarak bazı sosyodemografik değişkenler analizlere dahil edilmiş, aile durumu, günlük internet kullanımı, önceki zorbalık ve mağduriyet deneyimlerinin de

siber zorbalık ve siber mağdur olma üzerinde anlamlı yordayıcı etkisi olduğu bulunmuştur. Bulgular literatür ışığında tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Siber zorbalık, siber mağduriyet, nesne ilişkileri, gerçeği değerlendirme, büyüklenmeci narsisizm, kırılgan narsisizm

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

x

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1:   INTRODUCTION

1.1.   Cyber Bullying

Olweus (1993) defined the concept of bullying as

> *"a student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and overtime, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students".*

Bullying is also defined as it types such as physical (with overt behaviors like assault), verbal (like gossiping) and relational bullying (like not allowing someone to join to the social group or conversation, or social isolation).

Internet usages make people's life easier to reach information and contact with a person across the world. On the other hand, it is an area that control is hard. According to Beran, and Li (2005) teens and young adults use internet as sharing data, getting fun, doing research, talking, and socializing. With the help of internet, people easily initiate some behaviors which they may not choose to do in face-to-face relationship (Ybarra, and Mitchell, 2004). In this context, cyber bullying occurs as a new concept of bullying. Cyber bullying is intentionally hurting others by using information and communication tools such as cell phones or internet, e-mail, instant messaging, chat room, or website (Topçu, 2008). Cyber bullying is taken place in the literature by different names such as electronic bullying (Kowalski, and Limber, 2007; Olweus, 2012), online bullying (Freis, and Gurung, 2013), internet harassment (Kiriakidis, and Kavoura, 2010), online harassment (Ybarra, and Mitchell, 2004), and internet bullying (Williams, and Guerra, 2007).

Smith et al. (2005) describe cyber bullying as an aggressive and intentional act toward victims who cannot easily protect and defend themselves via using electronic forms of contact repeatedly over time. Ybarra, and Mitchell (2004) describe cyber bullying as online harassment, which is an intentional, overt aggression like negative comments toward someone using via internet. Willard (2007) added the description using different forms of social aggression by using digital technology.

Smith et al. (2005) stated cyber bullying platforms as e-mail, websites, forums, chat rooms, instant messaging platforms as MSN, Yahoo, ICQ, SMS, MMS and social media sites. Cyber bullying behaviors are stated as dropping someone from chat

rooms, shooting people's embarrassing photos secretly, sharing them on the internet without permission, sending humiliating, insulting, abusive, aggressive messages, and spreading rumors. These messages may also include serious death threats, and insults.

During these years, cyber bullying is a frequent and increasing problems this is also related to the increasing accessibility of the internet and electronic devices (Olweus, 2012). Studies in the foreign countries show that cyber bullying is a common problem. For example, Kowalski, and Limber (2007) found that 4% of the students are cyber bullies, 11% of them cyber victims and 7% of them are bully-victims. The bullying rates changes in different studies like 9% (Williams, and Guerra, 2007) to 15% (Ybarra, and Mitchell, 2004).

It is seen that especially the spreading the embarrassing picture or the video on a website or something once is common for both perpetrator and targeted group (Olweus, 2012). Even it is not called bullying because it happened once, Olweus (2012) stated that there are large group of people who experience that incidence.

According to Strom, and Strom (2004), social media, chat rooms, some web sites, and blogs give people the advantages of hiding themselves and their identity lead and enable them to select victims, insult, sending negative messages and so on.

In the current study when it is called *cyber bullying*, it includes cyber bullying incidences both for *bullies and victims*. When it is called *bullying*, it is meant face-to-face bullying, that is *traditional bullying*.

1.1.1 Impacts of Cyber Bullying

Üneri (2012) states that cyber bullying is a serious trauma for students and their affects continue all life-long. People who are exposed to cyber bullying as cyber victims may show sleeping problems, afraid of being alone and going outside of the home, may have suicidal thoughts (Wong-Lo, and Bullock, 2011; Kestel, and Akbıyık, 2016), academic problems (Beran, and Li, 2007), depression and anxiety (Erdur-Baker, and Tanrıkulu, 2010; Johnson, 2011; Kowalski, and Limber, 2013), aggression (Kestel, and Akbıyık, 2016), low self-esteem, and negative self-concept (Zezulka, and Seigfried-Spellar, 2016), psychosomatic problems like headaches (Olweus, 2012; Koh, 2013), frustration and sad feelings (Hinduja, and Patchin, 2006).

It is known that cyber bullied students also had been bullied in traditional way (Olweus, 2012), so the specific effect of the cyber bullying is hard to be examined. If the victim is both traditionally and electronically bullied then the effect of cyber bullying may be negligible (Olweus, 2012).

Research shows that bully-victims who are both the cyber bullies and the cyber victims, have the higher rates of anxiety, depression and school problems (Ybarra et al., 2006). Even though, cyber bullying is not occurred in the school settings, it has a great impact on learning, attention, and school problems (Bhat, 2008). Additionally, Arıcak (2009) stated that non-bully and non-victim group show less psychiatric symptoms than bully, victim and bully-victim groups.

To talk about the consequences of cyber bullying on cyber bullies as perpetrator, there are studies show that cyber bullies engage in more in problematic behaviors as illegal actions (Schenk, Fremouw, and Keelan, 2013), property damage (Ybarra, and Mitchell, 2004), substance use and delinquency (Hinduja, and Patchin, 2007), suicidal behaviors (Bonanno, and Hymel, 2013), depression and anxiety problems (Campbell et al., 2013).

As it is shown in the studies cyber bullying events effect both bullies and victims seriously. Most of the concepts are found related to both perpetrator and the victim of the cyber bullying as depression, anxiety, somatization, hostility and self-concept (Ildırım, Çalıcı, and Erdoğan, 2017). Therefore, understanding the possible antecedents of it cyber bullying is important in order to prevent and treat its damages.

1.1.2 *Prevalence of Cyber Bullying*

Prevalence of cyber bullying change according to how we made description of cyber bullying, how we evaluate cyber bullying, country, gender, and age (Tokunaga, 2010). Even though the prevalence rates are lower than the traditional bullying, it causes significant damages on both victims and the perpetrators (Hinduja, and Patchin, 2006; Ybarra, and Mitchell, 2004). Different studies show different ranges, and the rates change between 4.1% and 62% (Kowalski, and Limber, 2007; Li, 2006).

Brochado, Soares, and Fraga (2016) evaluated the different studies and stated that Canada is in the first place that cyber bullying (as perpetrators) is seen most with the prevalence rate of 23.8% (changes 1.9% to 65%). According to same study, highest victimization rates were seen in China with a rate of 23% (changes 11.2% to 56.9%) and the lowest rates are seen in Australia with a rate of 5% and in Germany with 6.3%.

There are contradictory results about gender on cyber bullying. Some of the studies show that males show higher cyber bullying than females (Arıcak et al., 2008) on the other hand some other studies show that women show more victimization compared to men (Hinduja, and Patchin, 2008). Contradictory, there are some studies show that females show higher bullying behaviors (Wolak et al., 2007) and males show higher victimization (Fanti, Demetriou, and Hawa, 2012). Additionally, Ayas, and Pişkin (2011) found that male secondary school students are both engage in bullying events and victimization than girls.

According to age studies, there are different studies show different results, Raskauskas, and Stoltz (2007) stated that ages between 13 and 18 are the riskiest years for cyber bullying. Kowalski, and Limber (2007) worked with secondary school students and found 18% of prevalence in victimization and 11% in perpetration. Juvonen, and Gross (2008) showed that among 12-17 aged students 72% of them victimized of cyber bullying at least once in previous year. Wright et al. (2009) found that 29.8% of the high school students reported that they were victimized and 14.9% of them reported that they were cyber bullied by someone else. Interestingly, Rai, Smith, and Svirydzenka (2017) conducted a research with 52 14 to 15 years old and 50 18 to 25 year olds. Results showed that emerging adults cyber bullied more than adolescents. There are limited number of studies handled with university students. MacDonald, and Roberts-Pittman (2010) found that 21.9% of the students victimized by cyber bullies and 8.6% of them were cyber bullies.

Cyber bullying and traditional bullying were seen to be similar because it is found that cyber bullying creates only 1% new cyber victims. Other victims stated that they've already victimized in traditional (face to face) format (Wolke, Lee, and Guy, 2017). As it is seen, cyber bullying and cyber victimization are newly concepts which may be seen in different countries, among different ages and gender. In

Turkey, there are studies show different ranges of cyber bullying and cyber victimization.

1.1.2.1 *Cyber Bullying in Turkey*

Erdur-Baker, and Kavşut (2007) found that 28% of the high school student are bullies, and 30% of the students are cyber-victims. Taylan et al. (2017) found the rates as 7% to 28% in Turkey. Topçu (2008) states the bullying rates as 48%. Erdur-Baker, and Kavşut (2007) stated that male students significantly reported more cyber bullying and victimization than female students. In the media, there are many news about cyber bullying for example a girl attending a state university in Turkey committed suicide in 2020 and the news stated that one of the reasons of her suicide was being cyber bullied in the social media because of her appearance (Karar Gazetesi, 2020). Aslan, and Önay Aydoğan (2017) evaluated the case of Potinss which is a communication platform for the high school students. It is an application created by two high school students. It was found that students in this platform mostly use insulting, swearing, and threating the others. According to age, the prevalence is changeable also in Turkey. In primary school, the prevalence is 11% to -18% (Ayas, and Horzum, 2012), in secondary school, it is 10% to 23% (Peker, 2015), and in high school, it is 10% to 17% (Özdemir, and Akar, 2011) and in another study it is stated as 56% (Kocaşahan, 2012). As it is seen, prevalence rates of cyber bullying changes 10 to 48% in the studies in Tukey.

1.1.2.2 *Cyber Bullying among University Students*

In the university sample, some research stated the prevalence as 12.8% (Kocaşahan, 2012), Kowalski et al. (2012) showed that in their research 30% of the participants faced with cyber bullying in college so cyber bullying is not only a problem for adolescents. They added that college students engage in cyber bullying both in school and employment areas. In Turkey, Arıcak (2009) found that 19.7% of the students engaged in cyber bullying and 54.4% of the students reported victimization of cyber bullying. Studies show that cyber bullying is not only peculiar for children and teenagers both also a problem for adults. However, there are still limited research in university students. That is why the current study focuses on the university sample.

These rates are similar in other countries. Finn (2004) stated 10 to 15% cyber bullying in universities in USA. Faucher et al. (2014) showed that 24.1% of university students reported cyber bullying among Canadian Universities. Martínez-Monteagudo et al. (2020) found that among 1282 Spanish university students, 7% of them reported cyber bullying and 7.7% reported cyber victimization. As a result, cyber bullying and cyber victimization rates are higher among university students than it's thought. So, this is an important concept should be handled.

1.1.3   Predictors of Cyber Bullying and Cyber Victimization

It is seen in the literature that gender is an important predictor of cyber bullying (Li, 2007). Researchers show that females tend to be more cyber victims than males (Kowalski, and Limber, 2007; Dilmaç, 2009; Calvete et al., 2010). Slonje, and Smith (2008) stated that females were mostly cyber bullied via e-mails. On the other hand, there are some contradictory findings such as in some studies gender was not found as a significant predictor of cyber bullying (both in being victim or perpetrator) among university students (Kowalski et al., 2012) and some other studies stated that males who use internet frequently, were more likely to be the victims in their study (e.g., Akbulut, Şahin, and Erişti, 2010). Therefore, in this study, the role of gender will be examined to clarify the unique paths for females and males.

In addition to gender, the frequency of internet and cell phone usage and joining the internet sites, chat rooms, and social media were found to be related to being cyber bully and cyber victim (Ybarra, 2004; Hinduja, and Patchin, 2008; Erdur-Baker, and Kavşut, 2007; Ekşi, 2012). Ybarra, and Mitchell (2004) showed that frequent use of communication tools was an important predictor of cyber bullying. Additionally, in a relatively recent study, it was found that neglect of parents was related to both internet addiction and cyber bullying (Beyazıt et al., 2019). There are also studies which show that there is no significant relationship between using computer and cyber victimization (Beran, and Li, 2005). Topçu (2008) stated that people who want to engage in cyber bullying and bully someone need to use internet communication tools more frequently. Especially, social media cites were stated as the platforms used for cyber bullying (Horzum, 2010). Kurutaş (2017) found that people who used internet for social media were cyber bullied more than people who use internet for other things. Additionally, results of that study showed people who used internet for social media, fun and game, showed more cyber bullying than others. Thus, the role

of daily internet usage daily internet usage will be tested in the present study to see the difference related to their daily internet usage time.

In addition to gender and daily internet usage, there are some other demographics mentioned in the literature that changes the trajectories of cyber bullying and cyber victimization. For example, parental status, previous experience, previous victimizaiton experience, socioeconomic status, parental education level, and parental working status yielded different patterns on cyber bullying and cyber vicitmization. More specifically, it has been found that individuals who have intact families showed less bullying and vicitmization compared to individuals whose parents are apart (Bevilacqua et al., 2017). Moreover, some studies show that individuals who had been bullied or victimized reported more bullying and vicitmization in their later lives (Olweus, 2012; Ybarra, and Mitchell, 2004). Additionally, low-income individuals reported more victimization (Syts, 2004). Furthermore, in terms of the parental variables, having high-educated parents and parents who do not work out side of the home were found as having a buffering affect on cyber bullying and cyber victimizaition (Burnukara, 2009; Sengupta, and Chaudhuri, 2011). Therefore, in this study, the role of these socidemographic on our study variables will also be examined. About the personality characteristics bullies as an additional predictor, Steffgen et al. (2011) stated that cyber bullies feel less empathy for the victims than traditional bullies. Additionally, peopel who have lower empathy, may also have positive attitudes towards perpetrator role (Almeida et al., 2012). Ildırım, Çalıcı, and Erdoğan (2017) showed that cyber bullying is positively related to anxiety, somatization, hostility, impulsivity, and internet addiction. Çelik et al. (2012) found that emotion instability is medium effect predictor for being a cyber bully. Moreover, it is found that emotional dyregulation of anger is also related to being the perpetrator of cyber bullying (Johnson, 2015). Gradinger (2014) stated that there are some motives like anger, authority, and free time for entertainment of the perpetrators in cyber bullying events. Some studies show that both cyber bullying and traditional bullying are related to the need of gaining high status and having dominant position on others (Salmivall, 2020; Wegge et al., 2014). As already known, bullies have more need of having status and dominance. Another study shows that, cyber bullying (as a perpetrator) is related to psyhoticism and hostiliy (Arıcak, 2009). Semerci (2017) found that extraversion is related to being cyber

bullies and addtionally, he found that opennes was the strongest predictor of both cyber bullying and victimization in a negative way. Likewise, the result of a meta-analysis shows that htere is a strong association between aggression and moral disengagement with cyber bullying perpetration (Kowalski et al., 2014).

Another antecedent of cyber bullying may the object relations with the caregiver. Specifically, it is known that there is a relationship between maternal attachment and externalizing behaviors such as getting into fight (Fagot, and Kavanagh, 1990; Allen et al., 2007; Roelofs et al., 2006) and attachment difficulties are related to antisocial traits (Fite, Greening, and Stoppelbien, 2008). Buelga, Martinez-Ferrer, and Cava (2017) found that poor emotional bonds and the occurrence of family conflict increase the risk of being a perpetrator. Varghese, and Pistole (2017) stated that perpetrators are found to have more attachment anxiety than others. Moreover, Beran (2009) stated that parental rejection was found to be related with traditional peer victimization. Balan, Dobrean, and Balazsi (2018) found that mother, father and peer attachments are indirectly related with traditional victimization. Additionally, it is known that poor attachment qualities lead negative representations of other or the self, and this creates a tendency to engage negative social interactions (Eng et al., 2001). Williams, and Guerra (2007) showed that social support protect adolescents from cyber bullying and victimization. Social support includes parental attitudes, support, warmth. The other important ingredient of parenting is attachment. Şirvanlı Özen, and Aktan (2010) found that there is a negative relationship between secure attachment and being both victimization and perpetrator of bullying in male adolescents. Unfortunately, these researchers are related with traditional bullying. There is still limited research on cyber victimization. In one study, parental attachment was measured as three dimensions of it such as communication, trust and alienation from parents, and it is found that alienation was found to be related to cyber bullying (Yusuf et al., 2018) which shows the relationship between cyber bullying and alienation sub dimension of object relations. Even though attachment is measured and evaluated with its different forms in the studies, there are limited studies which focused on the relationship between object relations and cyber bullying and victimization in the literature (e.g., Yusuf et al., 2018). The other dimension of object relations is social incompetence, Marín-López et al. (2020) showed that high level of social and emotional competencies was negatively related

with cyber bullying. Likewise, egocentricity is another dimension of object relations, studies show that, cyber bullies are related with manipulative behaviors which can be explained by egocentricity (Madan, 2014). Moreover, reality testing can be an antecedent of cyber bullying. Bell (1995) suggested additionally to object relations and reality testing was also an important fundamental in people's healthy ego developments. Because it is known that the problematic relationships in the object relations of the person may affect and create distortions about the external reality (St. Clair, and Wigren, 2004). Unfortunately, there are no studies focus on relationship cyber bullying and victimization and reality testing and its sub dimensions.

The other antecedent is narcissistic personality which is linked to cyber bullying perpetration (Ang et al., 2009; Ang, Tan, and Mansor, 2011; Fanti, Demetriou, and Hawa, 2012). Smaller (2013) stated that there is a possible narcissistic vulnerability background of the bullying event for both bullies and victims. Özözen Danacı, Kavaklı, and Tıkız (2018) thought that narcissistic people may choose cyber bullying as an aggressive way to take revenge and they found that there is a positive relationship between cyber bullying and narcissism. However, there are limited research on cyber bullying and narcissistic personality.

To talk about the personality characteristics and some predictors of cyber victims; Juvonen, and Gross (2008), found that cyber victims were found to have social anxiety than other people and cyber victimization is found to be negatively related with social intelligence (Hunt, Peters, and Rapee, 2012). Çelik et al. (2012) reported that being low in openness to experience characteristics is a predictor for cyber victimization. Research show that victims tend to have higher levels of neuroticism than others (Bollmer, Harris, and Milich, 2006; Turner, and Ireland, 2010). There is a strong association between stress and suicidal ideation with cyber victimization (Kowalski et al., 2014). Cyber victims are found to have more sensitiveness and more empathy than others (Almeida et al., 2012). People who are exposed to cyber bullying are found to be interpersonally more sensitive (Arıcak, 2009). Interpersonally sensitiveness is also related to neuroticism (Luty et al., 2002). Additionally, narcissistic people are found to perceive themselves as victims in other people's interpersonal transgressions in contrast to non-narcissistic group (McCullough et al., 2003).

Some other characteristics like age, some of personality characteristics like self-esteem are also predictors of both cyber bullying and victimization (Dilmaç, 2009). To talk about age, it is known that victims of the cyber bullying are mostly younger than the bullies (Hinduja, and Patchin, 2008; Slonje, and Smith, (2008) and this creates the power imbalance among them. Sroufe, and Rutter (1984) stated that environment protects adolescents to develop and engage in unwanted behavior patterns. And the most fundamental and effective environment is families and parents, and the relationship with the parents.

To sum up, there are many antecedents of cyber bullying and cyber victimization such as, gender, internet usage, some personality characteristics like empathy, aggression level, need for dominance, attachment, object relations, reality testing and narcissism. However, there is a gap in the literature about evaluation the relationship between cyber bullying and cyber victimization and object relations and narcissism together. The predictor object relations will be mentioned, and its dimensions will be described below.

1.2. Object Relations

Object relations is an important view in the psychodynamic approach. Object relations is conceptualized in psychoanalytic theory as dynamic psychological structures that include developmentally organized intrapsychic and emotionally significant experiences, internalized self, and object representations (Greenberg, 1983). Object relations mainly mentions the relationship between the self and the others called the object (Bacal, and Newman, 1990). The representations form the skeleton of interpersonal expectations in adulthood, and these are effective on person's feelings, attitudes, and behaviors in interpersonal relationships (Hazan, and Shaver, 1987; Bartholomew, and Horowitz, 1991).

The first object concept was formed in Freud's works. Freud (1915) in his Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality book, mentioned object as an external thing to satisfy or fail to gratify the sexual drives or aggressive drives of the baby's psyche. In his theory, he believed that sexual and aggressive drives are innate and inherited. Freud stated that baby is object-directed in her first year of life. When baby starts to grow up, she starts to engage in autoerotic comforting behaviors like sucking her

thumb, then it turns to her body to gratify these needs in the anal and genital phases (Schalin, 1995).

Another psychoanalyst is Klein who developed her theory on babies' primitive defense mechanisms, she suggested that object relations occur at the beginning of a baby's life. The baby idealizes the first years of her life and the pre-birth environments, and the baby starts searching similar type of the secure environments to get the secure sense. Baby cannot perceive the external world as a whole, so the first object which baby relates is the breast of the mother (Klein, 1946). However, the breast cannot be nurturing like in the mother's womb, even though the mother does her best as baby expect, so, the baby may feel disappointed and frustrated (Klein, 2011). Klein suggested that the baby born with the sexual and aggressive drives that love and hate are projected to mom's breast. However, she added that baby internalizes the good objects rather than gratifying these drives to protect itself from the projected in inherent aggressiveness. Breast becomes the object that baby projects all instinctual desires and fantasies (Klein, 1932). When baby realizes that the breast is not infinite and endless and this infiniteness does not belong to her, the feeling of envy starts. Envy hinders to form a stable good object internalization. In the first four months of life, baby does splitting. The internalized mother is splitted into two as good breast and bad breast. Good breast is the serving and nurturing object, bad breast is the one aggressive and destructive instincts are projected to it. However, envy is a temporary concept. After that with the help of mother, infant begins to integrate the bad and good objects. Periodic regain of the good object help baby to protect persecution and to form stable strong self (Klein, 1932). According to Klein (1932), the relationship between the infant and the mother is the fundamental template for future relationships.

As a contradictory to Freud's theory, Fairbairn (1944) rejected the assumptions of ego seeks pleasure and need of object for gratification. He claimed that there is an object seeking libido, so baby needs human interaction (Fairbairn, 1944). Fairbairn believed that baby internalizes these patterns, and in the future, it seeks this kind of relationships. Even though there is no gratification it does not weaken the relationship between them. When the baby internalizes object, this distorts the reality because the baby starts to see external world as internalized relationships.

Furthermore, Donald Winnicott is one of the names of the object relations school. He focused on the relationship between the mother and the baby. He gave great importance to the environment and believed that there should be a perfect environment during the early development (Winnicott, 2008). Healthy ego development of the baby is related to the mother's developing ego and supporting maternal care. With the help of these, the baby needs to be detached from the mother in a healthy way. Infant's journey to development includes the absolute dependence, then relative dependence to independence. Infant journey goes as pleasure principle to reality principle and autoerotism to object relations (Winnicott, 1960). In the first years of life, baby needs mother should be a good enough mother. Mother needs to devote herself to the baby and baby's needs. According to Winnicott (2014) good enough mother and holding environment are the most important products of the medical prevention of psychological health. Additionally, a holding environment do not mean being mechanically perfect, it should contain humanistic quality. It means that a good enough mother understands the needs and wants the baby, gets oriented with the baby, and knows where to stop. A baby can perceive the object and others, then it realizes that these objects are not me and starts to distinguish the self and the object. At that point mother should give a space to the baby to develop, mother cannot adopt a perfect mothering anymore. If a mother is good enough, a baby can only proceed these steps and develops a self-concept (Winnicott, 2014). Winnicott (2008), described psychopathology formation as when mother cannot manage baby's needs, when the respond of the mother is insufficient, mother cannot provide a good-enough environment which is necessary to healthy sense of self development of the baby. If there is a loss or neglect, the baby could not feel omnipotence and it may cause problems (Mitchell, and Black, 1995).

As a summary, even though there are differentiations between the theoreticians, the main point is the early relationship between the caregiver and the baby. Early formation and differentiation phases are important in the pre-oedipal development in the investigation of the self-object and other objects (Meissner, 1979). Object relations theory in common suggested that healthy development includes the integration and formation of the dissolved self and relationship representations to the increased functionality and integrated self and other representations (Summers, 1994; Uluç et al., 2015). Individual develops internal objects, these internal objects are the

abstract representations of other individuals, and elaborations of internal mental representations of external world, events, and experiences (Bowlby, 1973). These internal structures and internalizations affect the current interpersonal processes and the internal representation of the self (Buelow, McClain, and McIntosh, 1996). Meissner (1979) stated that relationship and experiences with the object, the quality of it are important on intrapsychic developments. Mental representations of the others, objects, and external world (e.g., experiences with mother form as a cognitive structure) serve forming and structuring the internal world and the self. These representations are subjective and predicts relationship with others (Bowlby, 1973; Huprich et al., 2007) Therefore, the internal world of the person influences the external experience and expectations from the external world (Hazan, and Shaver, 1987). The problems in the object relations of the person may affect and distort the external reality and this may cause psychopathology (St. Clair, and Wigren, 2004). That is why reality testing also an important concept for the object relations (Bell, 1995). One of the evaluation methods of the quality of the object relations is to focus on the person's current relationships and to evaluate how she perceives herself in these relationships (Uluç et al., 2015). Estell et al. (2009) stated that students who were peer- and self-perceived as popular were found to be more likely to engage in aggressive behaviors than their peers. Reijntjes et al. (2013) found that bullies perceive bullying as rewarding. In this study highly engaging in bullying was found to be related to high perceived popularity. Thus, the perception and reality testing of the bullies also wondered in the current study.

Even though object relations is very important concept for the clinicians to define psychopathology and to understand the patients deeply, it is a difficult concept to evaluate with scales. In the literature, it is seen that some projective techniques like early object relations early memories (Bruhn, 1992), TAT, dreams, and Rorschach are the most preferred measures (Stricker, and Healey, 1990). However, recently, as a more objective measure, Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Test (BORRTI) is started to be used to measure object relations including object relations (alienation, insecure attachment, egocentricity, and social incompetence) and reality testing (reality distortion, uncertainty of perception and hallucinations and delusions) sub measures (Bell, 1995). Given that BORRTI is used in different research areas like addiction (Snyder, 1999), personality disorders (Middleton, 2004), depression

(Huprich, 2003), eating disorders (Erbaş, 2015), couple relationships and marital adjustment (Genç, 2020) until this time, and it is an objective measure of object relation, object relations concept will be measured with BORRTI in this study. Quality of object relations determined by sub scales. Bell (1995) described alienation as insecurity in interpersonal relationships, difficulties in developing intimacy, insecure attachment as problematic interpersonal relationships, high sensitivity to rejection, need for acceptance by others. Egocentricity was defined as insecurity to others, defining others by only in relation to the self, and manipulation of others. Social incompetence, as shyness and distress in relationships, difficulties in relating with opposite sex and to form relationship (Uluç et al., 2015). The sub scales of reality testing, firstly, reality distortion is defined as difficulties in differentiation internal fantasies and external reality, grandiose, depressive beliefs and/or paranoid beliefs such as being controlled or watched. Uncertainty of perception includes doubts about the accuracy of person's own perception about internal and external reality. Being curious about person's own and other's emotions and behaviors. Having low social judgments having doubts about interpreting events. Lastly, hallucination and delusions are described as having a severe break with reality, experiences of hearing voices or seeing visions (Bell, 1995). First of all definitions of bullying and cyber bullying will be mentioned according to psychoanalytic theories, then the relationship between the dimensions of object relations and bullying, cyber bullying and victimization will be shown in below.

1.2.1 *Psychoanalytic Description of Bullying*

There are limited studies which focus cyber bullying and victimization from psychoanalytic perspective so, the first of all traditional bullying will be mentioned from a psychoanalytic perspective, then the research which were conducted in this subject will be shown in the sections. Roques (2020) defined traditional bullying from a psychoanalytic perspective. She stated that most of the time the bully and the victim know each other, and even they are friends. In this context, the basis of the power of the bully, which is the authority on the victim, continues apparently. Bully makes the victim believe that there is an asymmetry between them and increase the victim's pain. The usage of the memories also increases the pain of the victim. With the help of verbal and mental communication, there become a deviant connection between bully and the victim. Bully gives incoherent messages to the victim and

victim becomes to feel doubted about the reality of her emotional life and even the reality. With the help of incoherent messages bully finds a place in the victim's mind. According to Roques (2020), especially during adolescence period, the adolescent experiences and falls under the influence of some emotions and drives. The adolescent becomes self-alienated. The alienation is projected to the others. If there is no secure object, others may proclaim as bad and evil. This is projected to external world, and this conflict may diminish the conflict inside of an adolescent.

Bullying is mentioned with dominance, and it is likened to the violence in the marriage because the psychological operation such as shame, guilt, and humiliation and affection of the victims are similar. Dorey (1981) a French psychiatrist worked on psychoanalyses stated that desire of dominance is in the focus of the interpersonal relationships. This is because of the attack for the desired object. Bullies make negative representations in the victims and make them internalize it, thus victims' dignity and repetition devalualized. This means that victims start to think and feel that they deserved it. This is similar to the Ferenczi (1949)'s view of sexual abuse cases. In these cases, victims identify themselves with the violator so that the penalizing fantasies occur. Violator no more becomes a differentiated external object. At this point self and the object, self and non-self, external and psychic reality become complicated. This factor also has an effect on the continuation of the bullying. It is seen that victims have also an effect on the bullying concepts. So, the internalization process and object relations of both bully and victim are wondered in the bullying situations.

Psychoanalysts focused on the emotional attuites and attachment of the mother on the characters of the children and make emphasis on that point (Connolly, and O'Moore, 2003). Family environment and relations are important on bullying concepts (Navarro et al., 2012). When family environment is mentioned, the main concept is attachment that is the intimate relationship between the child and the caregivers (Bowlby, 1973). Therefore, firstly object relations and bullying will be mentioned.

1.2.2 *Object Relations and Bullying*

In the literature, there are more studies that show the relationship between the concepts of object relations and traditional bullying than cyber bullying and

victimization. For this reason, first of all, the relationship between object relations and traditional bullying will be mentioned. There are studies, such as according to Gómez-Ortiz, Romera, and Ortega-Ruiz (2016) victimization of traditional bullying is found to be related to parental psychological aggression discipline which included physical punishments and psychological aggression. Crothers, and Kolbert (2008) found that children who show bullying behaviors are found to have low levels of interaction, communication and affection with their families and had raised by a strict discipline violence and punishment include in it. Research shows that when there is an insecure relationship with parents, there may be non-democratic parenting style (Roelofs, Meesters, and Muris, 2008). Neal, and Frick-Horbury (2001) shows that parents who have democratic parenting styles can form more intimate, warm, and secure relations to their children. Mahasneh et al. (2013) stated that parenting styles and attachment is related. There is a positive relationship between authoritarian parenting with insecure ambivalent attachment. And there is a significant relationship between neglectful parenting and avoidant attachment style. So, it can be said that parenting styles are related to both attachment and object relations in the same way. Olweus (1980) found that cold and rejecting relationship which mentioned as silent violence of the mother, and violent family environment were found to be related with the bullying perpetration of the child.

Different type of parenting overprotectiveness of the mother was found to be related with victimization in boys. On the other hand, for the girls, victimization was found to be associated with conflict relationship and perceived maternal rejection. Additionally, limited, insufficient identification with parental figures found to be related to victimization in the same study (Finnegan, Hodges, and Perry, 1998). There are some studies which show that attachment to the parents is related with both the bullying perpetration and victimization (Hong, and Espelage, 2012; Connolly, and O' Moore, 2003). Connolly, and O'Moore (2003), found that among 228 students aged 6-16 who are bullies showed higher emotional inhibition and did negative attribution to themselves than other. Additionally, these children showed ambivalent attachment styles with their parents. Kokkinos (2013) conducted a research among 10-12 aged students. It is found that avoidant attachment style is positively related to bullying behaviors of the children. Nikiforou et al. (2013) showed that low quality of attachment to the parents predicted both being a bully and

a victim. The scale included dimensions as communication, trust and alienation sub scales. Result showed that both being a bully and a victim were found to be related to father alienation. Beside the mothers, fathers have also an effect on bullying behaviors of the children. And they have found that the effect of the fathers is important in being a victim. On the other hand, communication with the mother is found to be negatively related with being a bully. Farnicka, and Grzegorzewska (2016) indicated that attachment to the mother is related to aggressive behaviors on the internet. In the study alienation with mothers and trust to the mother were found to be related with both aggressor means the bully and victim. A recent study shows that bullying is related with parental bonding which includes overprotection, encouragement to autonomy, care, neglect (Plexousakis et al., 2019). They found that mother's overprotection is a risk factor for a child to be the victim. On the other hand, the lack of maternal care is found as a risk factor for becoming a perpetrator of bullying because mother's behavior gives limited emotional response to the child. Over control and neglect of the parents both create psychological vulnerability in the child. As it is seen there are many studies which focus on the association attachment and parental relationship and traditional bullying and victimization, however there are limited number of studies which focus on object relations and cyber bullying and victimization. In the next section, the relationship between cyber bullying, cyber victimization and object relations will be mentioned.

1.2.3   *Object Relations and Cyber Bullying and Cyber Victimization*

Unfortunately, there are a few numbers of research on cyber bullying in terms of the general concept of object relations. Therefore, in the following paragraphs, the studies related to the relationship between attachment security and cyber bullying and cyber victimization will be explained. Canestrari et al. (2021), in their study they worked with 328 people aged between 18 and 29 years in Italy. They aimed to evaluate the parental attachment on cyber bullying and victimization. It is found that the cyber victimization was negatively associated with secure attachment with father. In a study conducted with 476 students aged between 13 and 19 years in England, the researchers evaluated the effect of cyber victimization on mental distress and tested the moderating role of attachment. It was found that cyber victimization and secure attachment predicted the mental distress approximately 12%. It was stated that secure attachment is a factor that protects children from both victimization and mental

distress (Worsley, McIntyre, and Corcoran, 2019). Varghese, and Pistole (2017) showed that in cyber victimization and cyber bullying, maternal attachment anxiety explained 8% of the variance in cyber victimization, and 10% variance explained by attachment anxiety in cyber bullying. Both the cyber bullies and victims were the ones who had more anxious attachment styles. Ševčíková et al. (2015), showed that parental attachment was negatively associated with peer rejection and online aggression in cyber victims. Additionally, cyber victims who had good attachment with their parents showed more seeking social support behaviors than people who are traditionally victimized. Bingöl (2018) conducted research with 223 high school students. In the study the indirect relationship between early memories of warmth and cyber bullying is evaluated. However, there was not significant relationship of high level of positive feelings and experiences, early memories of warmth in the childhood with cyber bullying and victimization. The researcher explained the results as the population type, because population in the study had higher levels of warmth childhood and very low level of cyber bullying and victimization. To sum up, there are studies which show the relationship between insecure attachment and cyber bullying and victimization. However, there are limited studies about other sub concepts of object relations.

Firstly, there is no study on social incompetence dimension of object relations and cyber bullying and cyber victimization but, Gómez-Ortiz, Romera Felix, and García-Fernández (2016) conducted research among 505 adolescents aged 12 to 16 and found that cyber bullies showed lower levels of perceived social competence, while cyber victims showed higher levels of social competence. Researchers explained the results as the cyber victims are the ones who are socially competent, who engage in prosocial behaviors therefore they became the target of the bullies. This relation is mentioned by not the characteristic with the cyber victims but the social roles of them because of their characteristic. Similarly, Zych et al. (2018) showed that cyber bullies scored lower in social competencies. Pabian, and Vandebosch (2014) found that social intelligence scores of bullies were the lowest ones than other people. So, social incompetence may be an important predictor of cyber bullying and victimization in the present study.

About the alienation dimension of object relations, there is limited studies in the literature. Yusuf et al. (2018) worked on the link between parental attachment and

cyber bulling among children aged 9 to 16. They focused on communication, trust, and alienation in attachment with parents. 10% of the variance in cyber bullying was explained by parental attachment. Especially alienation from parents was the only factor which predicted cyber bullying experiences. In a study Çelik et al. (2021) stated that people low in social interaction may have sensitive personalities (Hojat, 1982) and may feel loneliness (Batıgün, and Hasta, 2010), therefore they may engage in bullying. So, lonelineless and alienation may be associated with cyber bullying and victimization.

About the egocentricity, there is no study about egocentricity and cyber bullying and cyber victimization. However, studies show that, cyber bullies are related with manipulative behaviors (Madan, 2014) which can be explained by egocentricity. It is shown that cyber bullying is related to perceived popularity (Reijntjes et al., 2013). But popularity is also associated with some negative characteristics like manipulativeness, aggressiveness and dominance (Cillessen, and Rose, 2005). These characteristics may be seen as the dimensions of egocentricity. Because in egocentric people see others only in relation to themselves, manipulate others for own aims, people are exploitive, coercive, demanding and controlling in relationships (Bell, 1995). As indicated, both cyber bullying and victimization is predicted by attachment with parents. However, the relationship between them is not considered by the object relations point of view by considering all sub dimensions. Therefore, in the present study, object relations and its sub concepts will be considered.

About the reality testing part, there is no study exactly focus on reality testing dimension of object relations and cyber bullying and victimization, however, there are studies show psychopathic trait was found to be related to cyber bullying (Baroncelli et al., 2020). Özden, and İçellioğlu (2014) also found that psychoticism was associated with both being a victim and the bully. These studies can be considered as the hallucination and delusion dimension of object relations and reality testing, because it is known that reality testing is distorted and hallucinations may be seen in the psychoticism (Waters et al., 2017).

The other dimensions of the reality testing is uncertainty of perception and reality distortion. There is no study that show association between reality distortion and uncertainty of perception and cyber bullying and victimization but, studies show that

people who engage in bullying finds bullying as rewarding, and perceive themselves as popular (Reijntjes et al., 2013). Walrave, and Heirman (2011) showed that people who engage in cyber bullying were prone to minimize the impact of their behaviors on others. To sum up, it is seen that there is a differentiation of perception and reality testing of cyber bullies and victims but there are no studies focus on reality testing of cyber bullying and victimization. Thus, in this study object relations and reality testing's sub concepts are handled in the present study.

1.3. *Narcissism*

Narcissism's name comes from the story of Narcissus who saw his reflection in the water, fall in love, and watched himself all the time (Bulfinch, 1913). As story would have it, one day he tried to hug the view and fell down to the water and drowned (Dorland, 1986). Although narcissism is mostly known by this mythological story, it includes extreme hatred for the true self of the person, and they also absorb others' thoughts about their selves (Lasch, 1978). When it is called narcissistic, it refers to people who wait for others' approval for their self-esteem and self-worth (McWilliams, 2020). All people have some vulnerabilities and frailness about how worthy they are, and people all want to feel good about it (Ozan et al., 2008; McWilliams). Our self-esteem is fed and enhanced by the approves of others who we care (MacDonald, Saltzman, and Leary, 2003; McWilliams, 2020). On the contrary, when it is not approved, this wounds people's self-esteem (Ozan et al., 2008). Narcissistic people are faced with loneliness since infancy (McWilliams, 2020). When the needs of infants are not met, baby cannot be soothed so, s/he learns to satisfy her/his needs by her/his own (Ozan et al., 2008). Narcissistic people are thought to be inherently more sensitive to unspoken emotion messages of other narcissistic people so subjective experiences are pervaded by shame and fear of embarrassment (McWilliams, 2020). Some people worrying about feeding their own self-esteem and narcissistic supplies become the most important issue, so the person becomes very busy on herself (Emmons, 1987; McWilliams, 2020). Therefore, the term narcissistic personality or pathological narcissism are derived from this unbalanced situation (McWilliams, 2020).

Freud (1957) stated that the baby gives priority to herself before others and make investments to herself. According to him, baby thinks that mother is an extent of the baby itself. This is called primary narcissism. Then the baby starts to discover the

external world, ideal-self starts to develop and the baby starts to diverge primary narcissism. Secondary narcissism was viewed as the process of withdrawing the libido from external objects and directing it back to the self as a result of the disappointments in early relationships (Freud, 1957). Relational theoreticians also viewed narcissism as compensatory of disappointments in early relationships rather than stocking in infantile grandiosity (McWilliams, 2020).

Kohut (1968) who contributed with narcissistic personality disorder to literature, perceived narcissism as a developmental pause in a healthy development and defined narcissistic personality disorder as the fundamental imperfectness in the self. These defects are shown with over defensive and compensatory behaviors. Kohut (1977) defined these people as having and maintaining difficulties in relationships, apathetic to others' feelings, looking for caring, and having deep worthlessness and rejected feelings under their grandiosity. He saw narcissism in a continuity from pathological to normal narcissism. On the other hand, Kernberg (1975) made a strict distinction between normal and pathological narcissism as well. According to Kernberg's definition, narcissistic people are busy with their selves, grandiose fantasy, looking for power, beauty, perfection, lack of empathy, exploitativeness, feeling deep emptiness, and chronic jealousy. These people are vulnerable, and they are very sensitive to criticism and unsuccess. Additionally, Kernberg (1975) found the grandiose characteristic as pathological. Normal narcissism is defined as the characteristics may found in every human being and may contribute positively to humans' mental health (Foster, 2007), healthy and normal narcissism help people to have self-esteem with compatible with real life, and help people enjoy their success and not being devastated by negative criticism to their self (Kernberg, 1975).

Moderate level of narcissism is seen healthy about self-worth and positive self-concept (Ang et al., 2009; Fanti, and Henrich, 2015). High levels of narcissism also contain a tendency to feel vulnerable easily and threatened when challenged or criticized by others (Baumeister et al., 2000).

As mentioned before there are two types of narcissism which are normal and pathological one (Karaaziz, and Erdem Atak, 2013). The temporary and situational nature of the mild level of pathological narcissism is defined as narcissistic characteristics/features. On the other hand, long-term persistent and intense

characterological features indicate narcissistic personality disorder (Ronningstam, 2005). In DSM V narcissistic personality characteristic are taken as the characteristics of narcissistic personality disorder and only the grandiose over type of narcissism is included (Miller, and Camplbell, 2010). This may be the reason that in many of the studies most of the evaluation methods of narcissism measure only grandiose type of narcissism. However, narcissistic personality characteristics is not categorical as a construct, it is dimensional. Therefore, there may be different dimensions, degree, and appearances of narcissistic personality characteristics (Pincus, and Lukowitsky, 2010). In this regard, in the current study, narcissism was defined as the *characteristics of narcissistic personality.*

Narcissism was seen as in a continuum and it has two facets as mentioned before. Some researchers categorized the narcissism into two namely grandiose and vulnerable narcissism (Gabbard, 1989; Dickinson, and Pincus, 2003). Some others defined it as exhibitionist and shy narcissism (Akhtar, 2000), overt and covert narcissism (Masterson, 1993), and thick-skinned and thin-skinned narcissism (Rosenfeld, 1987). Grandiose narcissism is the most prototypical way of narcissism which is explained by omnipotent object presentation (Masterson, 1993) and grandiosity is a manifestation of exhibitionism, self-importance and need of attention and admiration from others. Grandiose narcissistic people are seen as they have high self-esteem, they believe in themselves, and they are arrogant. If they face with a failure, they feel bottom out, distressed, and humiliated (Levy, 2012). Kernberg (1970) explained grandiose narcissism as people have strong innate aggressive drive or may have an inherently determined lack of tolerance for anxiety related to aggressive impulses.

On the other hand, in vulnerable narcissism, grandiose feeling is unconscious, the observed feelings are vulnerability, hypersensitivity to criticism, lack of self-confidence, anxiousness, sensitiveness, introversion and pessimism (Wink, 1991), feeling of shame, emptiness, and insufficiency (Dickinson, and Pincus, 2003). Narcissistic vulnerability is related to social withdrawal, emotional dysregulation, and self enhancement failures (Miller et al., 2011). These people have inadequate self-perception caused by the admiration of idealized others and they are dependent on others (Cain et al., 2008). It is known that vulnerable narcissistic people seem shy

and anxious, but they have grandiose feelings under that appearance (Gabbard, 1989).

Even though there are two different types of narcissism, both type of it includes the main features of narcissism like grandiose fantasies, entitlement, self-indulgence (Okada, 2010), inner inadequacy, shame, weakness, and a sense and/or fear of inferiority (Cooper, 1984). Jordan et al. (2003), showed that people with high level of narcissism reported higher level of self-esteem however, it was found that these people had low unconscious self-regard. It is considered as grandiose narcissism related to vulnerability and these are pathological (Jauk et al., 2017). Dickinson and Pincus (2003) stated that people who have grandiose and/or vulnerable narcissistic characteristics may behave repressive and intrusive in their relationships. It is stated that according to threatened egotism theory, aggression is the way of defending self-view against a situation or person who tries to undermine, criticize, or discredit the self (Aberson et al., 2000; Baumeister et al., 2000). Narcissistic people believe that there is an attack to self thus, they engage in more aggressive behaviors against people (Fossati et al., 2010). Mayeux, and Cillessen (2008) stated that self-perceived popularity was associated with aggression. Estell et al. (2009) stated that students who were peer-perceived and self-perceived as popular were found to be more likely to engage in aggressive behaviors than their peers. On the other hand, students who perceive themselves as disliked were also more likely than their peers to engage in aggressive behaviors. Therefore, it was thought that the association between aggressiveness and perceived popular peers may be linked to being seen as a bully.

1.3.1 Narcissism and Bullying

Narcissism's role was firstly evaluated on traditional bullying. Cyber bullying studies recently started to be conducted so, the relationship between narcissism and traditional bullying will be briefly mentioned.

Amichai-Hamburger (2002) stated that personality is an important predictor in determining internet behavior of people. Narcissism is associated with behavioral problems to daily life experienced in school such as bullying (Fanti, and Frangou, 2018). The relationship of narcissism with aggression and externalizing behaviors has been already known (Fanti, and Kimonis, 2013). However, the research examining the association of them with bullying has been newly emerged. From the

developmental framework, bullying can be taken as an aggressive behavior used by children and adolescents to intentionally hurts others (Pepler et al., 2006). Locke (2009) found that narcissism is related to aggression. In this study, the results of regression analysis showed that people with high narcissism and low self-esteem showed more anti-social and maladaptive behaviors. Fanti, and Henrich (2015) also found similar results in their study, specifically they reported that higher level of narcissism and lower self-esteem predicted bullying. A study conducted with university students in Turkey showed that the concept of power which is related to narcissism is a predictor of psychical and verbal aggression (Öngen, 2010). Fanti, and Kimonis (2012) found that these adolescents who had higher scores on narcissism showed more bullying. In the literature, there are studies which show the relationship between antisocial personality traits like narcissism and bullying (Ang et al., 2009; Stellwagen, and Kerig, 2013; Reijntjes et al., 2016). About the victimization of bullying, Fanti, and Kimonis (2012) found that narcissistic youth show higher level of victimization. Additionally, McCullough et al. (2003), stated that narcissistic adolescents tend to see themselves as victims of interpersonal conflicts and others' transgression and feel themselves hurt in a way. Thomaes at al. (2015) focused on narcissism and bullying. It was found that especially, boys who are high in narcissism reported more bullying. Narcissism was linked with indirect bullying stronger than direct traditional bullying. This may lead to think that cyber bullying can be related to narcissism because it is known that in many studies most of the time cyber bullying done in an anonymous way (Slonje, Smith, and Frisen, 2013).

1.3.2 *Narcissism and Cyber Bullying and Cyber Victimization*

Roques (2020) suggested two important variables in defining bullying process. One is external means objective (attacks, prejudices) and the other is internal means objective. These variables change according to self's inner world's fantasy, drives and the level of object relations (about the internalization/projection of the good/bad object in terms of Klein's theory). Both the bully and the victim share a narcissistic vulnerability. Victim from a masochistic way, on the other hand perpetrator from a sadistic way express vulnerability. Whatever the role of the person in the bullying event, bullying does not occur coincidentally. Person's psychic, environmental, and parental vulnerabilities are important in the bullying process. according to her

clinical observation She stated that, the bullying is observed when there is a domestic violence and deprivation which are the basis of oppression or omnipotence, depressive or grandiose emotions. It shows that there is a problem of attachment that is expressed as hypersensitivity towards others and sympathetically reveals the vulnerability and distress of the adolescents.

In the literature there are studies show that cyber bullying is related to the control behaviors and needs among others, gaining prestige among others (Kowalski et al., 2008). In a study being popular is associated with positive traits such as being attractive, outgoing and beautiful but it is also related to negative traits such as being aggressive, dominant, and manipulative (Cillessen, and Rose, 2005). Wegge at al. (2016) found that being a cyber bully is related to social status, perceived popularity, and need for dominance. Banks (1997) stated that the reasons behind the bullying behaviors were power and control.

For cyber bullying and victimization, it is known that internet use is one of the antecedents and risk factors (Ayas, and Horzum, 2011). Batıgün, and Hasta (2010) found that people who are more addictively use internet, use more inhibitory style in interpersonal relationships than others reported higher levels of loneliness. Excessive internet users spend more time on the internet, and they are less extraverted, they become nervous and feel lonelier in interpersonal relationships (Hardie, and Tee, 2007). Twenge, and Campbell (2003) stated that internet is a place that narcissists present themselves as they want. On the other hand, internet sites, social media also promote these people narcissism. Ang et al. (2009) did a research on the association between narcissism and cyber bullying. The researchers conducted the study with 9-13 aged children and reported a positive correlation between narcissism and cyber bullying. In their study, normative belief about aggression was partially mediated the relationship between narcissistic exploitativeness and cyber bullying. Fanti, Demetriou, and Hawa (2012) found a correlation between narcissism and both cyber bullying and victimization, but narcissism was not found to be as a predictor of cyber bullying. Similar to that, in a study which is conducted by Goodboy, and Martin (2015) it was aimed to find out the relationship between cyber bullying and dark triad such as machiavellianism, psychopathy, and narcissism. The researchers found a significant correlation between narcissism and cyber bullying. However, in the regression analysis narcissism was not a predictor of cyber bullying.

Studies that use vulnerable narcissism can be shown as, for example, in a meta-analysis of 131 empirical studies handled with youths, Kowalski et al. (2014) found a poor positive relationship between narcissism and cyber bullying and narcissism is found to be a risk factor for cyber bullying. Fan et al. (2019) conducted a research among 11-18 aged Chinese adolescents and found that covert/ vulnerable narcissism was a positive predictor of cyber bullying and victimization, but overt narcissism was not a significant predictor of cyber bullying and victimization.

Moreover, Zerach (2016) found that pathological narcissism grandiosity and vulnerability were positively associated with cyber victimization, on the other hand, these were not related to cyber bullying offending. In their study, they worked with both heterosexuals and homosexuals and found that narcissism vulnerability was positively associated with both cyber bullying and victimization in homosexual men and grandiose narcissism was positively associated with cyber victimization and bullying in homosexual women but not in heterosexual participants. Sexual orientation was found to be moderator. To sum up, narcissism's both dimensions are related to cyber bullying and cyber victimization, and narcissism is an important predictor of cyber bullying and victimization (Zerah, 2016; Kowalski et al., 2014). However, none of these studies examined the link between object relations, narcissistic vulnerability and cyber bullying and cyber victimization among university students.

1.4. Aim of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the role of object relations, reality testing (i.e., alienation, insecure attachment, egocentrism, social incompetence, reality distortion, uncertainty of perceptions, hallucinations and delusions), and narcissism (i.e., grandiose narcissism and narcissistic vulnerability) on cyber bullying and cyber victimization among Turkish university students. Even though there are some studies investigating the relationship between object relations and cyber bullying and cyber victimization (Varghese, and Pistole, 2017), not directly between reality testing and cyber bullying but between perceptions problems and bullying (Reijntjes et al., 2013), distortions in perceptions such as psychoticism and cyber bullying (Özden, and İçellioğlu, 2014), narcissism and object relations (Hibbard, 1992) and narcissism and cyber bullying and cyber victimization (Ang et al., 2009), there is no studies

examining the relationship among all these variables in one model. Hypotheses of the study were as follows:

Hypothesis 1: It was hypothesized that object relations would positively predict cyber bullying.

- it was hypothesized that all sub scales of object relations, specifically, alienation, insecure attachment, social incompetence and egocentricity would positively predict cyber bullying.

- it was hypothesized that reality testing would positively predict cyber bullying.

- it was hypothesized that all sub scales of reality testing, specifically, reality distortion, uncertainty of perceptions, and hallucinations/delusions would positively predict cyber bullying.

- it was hypothesized that narcissism, specifically, grandiose narcissism would positively predict cyber bullying.

- it was hypothesized that vulnerable narcissism would positively predict cyber bullying.

- it was hypothesized that object relations would positively predict cyber victimization.

- it was hypothesized that all sub scales of object relations, specifically, alienation, insecure attachment, social incompetence and egocentricity would positively predict cyber victimization.

- it was hypothesized that reality testing would positively predict cyber victimization.

- it was hypothesized that all sub scales of reality testing, specifically, reality distortion, uncertainty of perceptions, and hallucinations/delusions would positively predict cyber victimization.

- it was hypothesized that narcissism, specifically, grandiose narcissism would positively predict cyber victimization.

- Lastly, it was hypothesized that vulnerable narcissism would positively predict cyber victimization.

Secondary hypotheses of the present study:

- In the thirtheeth hypothesis, it was hypothesized that cyebr bullying, cyber victimization, grandiose narcissism, narcissistic vulnerability, object

27

relations, and reality testing levels of university students would differ by age, grade, parental status, working status of mother and father, primary caregiver, previous bullying and victimization experience, SES, and daily internet usage.

CHAPTER 2:   METHOD

2.1.   Participants

Participants were 393 (*M* = 22.13, *SD* = 1.81; 69.2% of them were female) non-clinically diagnosed university students aged between 18 to 25. The demographic characteristics of the participants was presented in Table 1.

Tablo 1. Demographic Characteristic of the Participants

Demographic Characteristic	Groups	*N*	%
Gender	Female	272	69.2
	Male	121	30.8
Grade	Undergraduate	331	84.2
	Graduate	62	15.8
People living with	Romantic Partner	21	5.3
	Family Members	300	76.3
	Friends	25	6.4
	Alone	38	9.7
	Others	9	2.3
Socioeconomic Status	Low	57	14.5
	Middle	218	55.5
	High	118	30.0
Education Level of Mothers	Elementary	105	26.7
	Secondary	49	12.5
	High School	132	33.6
	University	107	27.2
Education Level of Fathers	Elementary	102	26.0
	Secondary	36	9.2
	High School	121	30.8
	University	134	34.1
Number of Siblings	Only Child	76	19.3
	One Sibling	198	50.4
	Two Siblings	64	16.3

Table 1. (Continued) Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

	Three Siblings	55	14.0
Birth Order	First	204	51.9
	Second	132	33.6
	Third and more	57	14.5
Parental Status	Mother-Father Together	324	82.4
	Mother-Father Divorced	69	17.6
Working Status of Mother	Working	128	32.6
	Not Working	265	67.4
Working Status of Father	Working	274	69.7
	Not Working	119	30.3
Primary Caregiver	Mother	309	78.6
	Other	84	21.4
Daily Internet Usage	0-3 hours	77	19.6
	4-5 hours	133	33.8
	6-7 hours	101	25.7
	8 hours and more	82	20.9
Previous Bullying Experience	Yes	74	18.8
	No	319	81.2
Previous Victimization Experience	Yes	198	50.4
	No	195	49.6

As seen in Table 1, while 84.2% ($N = 331$) of the participants had an undergraduate degree, 15.8% ($N = 62$) of them had a graduate degree. Moreover, 5.3% ($N = 21$) of them were living with romantic partner, 76.3% ($N = 300$) of them with their family members, 6.4% ($N = 25$) of them with their friends, 9.7% ($N = 38$) of them were living alone, and 2.3% ($N = 9$) of them reported as other. Furthermore, in terms of their socioeconomic status, 55.5% ($N = 218$) reported that they were in middle socioeconomic status, 14.5% ($N = 57$) of them reported low socioeconomic status, and 30% ($N = 118$) of them reported high socioeconomic status. In addition, 26.7% of mothers had elementary school degree, 12.5% had secondary school degree,

33.6% had high school degree, and 27.2% had university degree. Additionally, 26% of the fathers had elementary school degree, 9.2% had secondary school degree, 30.8% had high school degree, and 34.1% had university degree. In terms of number of siblings of the participants, 19. 3% were the only child, 50. 4% had one sibling, 16.3% had two siblings, and 14% of them had three or more siblings. In addition to that, 51.9% of the participants were the first child, 33.6% were the second, and 14.5% of them were the third (or more than that) child of the family. Furthermore, 82.4% of the participants reported that their parents were together and 17.6% of them reported that their parents were divorced. In terms of working status, 32.6% of the participants stated that their mothers were working, 69.7% of them reported that their fathers were working. Moreover, in terms of the primary caregivers of the participants, 78.6% of the participants reported that their mothers raised them, 21.4% of them reported that their primary caregivers were not their mothers. For daily internet usage, 19.6% of the participants reported that they spent 0-3 hours, 33.8% of them 4-5 hours, 25.7% of them 6-7 hours, and 20.9% of them stated that they spent more than 8 hours. In addition, 18.8% of the participants engaged bullying activities as a perpetrator before and 50.4% of the participants were victimized before.

2.2. Materials

In this study, demographic information form, Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI), Pathological Narcissism Inventory (PNI) and Revised Cyber Bullying Inventory- II (RCBI-II) were used.

2.2.1 Demographic Information Form

In the demographic form, participants were asked a total of 23 questions consisting of their gender, grade, people living with, socioeconomic status, education level of their mothers and fathers, working status of mothers and fathers, number of siblings, birth order, number of siblings, parental status, working status of mother and father, primary caregiver, daily internet usage, and previous bullying and victimization experiences. These questions were thought as these may be the demographic variables predicting being a cyber bully and/or cyber victim.

2.2.2 Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI)

Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI) was developed by Bell (1995) and adapted into Turkish by Uluç et al. (2015). The aim of the scale is to

31

evaluate the quality of object relations and reality testing capacity of a person and the early object relations in the ego functions and communication (Bell, 1995). It is measured by evaluating the person's quality of relationships in daily life and how she/he sees herself in the relationships with others (Uluç et al., 2015). This self-report scale was initially developed as BORI and it had 45 items. It had 4 sub scales as egocentrism, insecure attachment, social incompetence and alienation. Then it was revised and reality testing part added which includes 3 sub scales as reality distortion, uncertainty of perception, and hallucinations and delusions. As a result of these revisions, BORRTI has been started to use with 90 items and total 7 sub scales. Items were answered as true or false. According to Bell (1995), these sub scales may be used as separately or as two scales (i.e., object relations and reality testing).

In the object relations sub scale, there are 4 sub tests. Alienation sub test includes 22 items (i.e. "I have at least one stable and satisfying relationship"). Higher score indicates mistrust in interpersonal relationships. These people may have difficulties to relate and form deep, trusting relationship with others. (Bell, 1995). Insecure attachment sub test includes 15 items (i.e. "I may withdraw and not speak to anyone for weeks at a time"). Higher scores indicate that the person may be sensitive to rejection and they may be easily hurt. They may be desperately yearned close relationship. They may have lower tolerance to loneliness, break ups, and loss. They will be alert to follow any signals for abandonment. They may feel deep anxiety, fear, guilt and jealousy and these creates a sadomasochist relationship (Uluç, et al., 2015). Egocentricity sub test includes 12 items (ie. "I have no influence on anyone around me"). Higher scores mean that these people feel insecure in their relationships and recognize others only in the basis of the relationship with themselves, they cannot recognize others' emotions and they are prone to manipulate others with their own wishes and aims. They protect themselves and impose upon others in the relationships. They may show manipulative, demanding, oppressive and controlling (Uluç, et al., 2015). Social incompetence sub test has 6 items (i.e. "I feel shy about meeting or talkin with members of the opposite sex"). Higher scores mean that they feel nervous and shy in interpersonal relationships. They feel socially insufficient and anxious that may lead them to avoidance (Uluç, et al., 2015).

In the reality testing sub scale, there are 3 sub tests. First one is realty distortion which has 21 items (i.e. "I believe that people have little or no ability to control their

sorrows"). Higher score means they may have difficulties perceiving inner and external reality. They may have fears of being victimized and punished (Bell, 1995). Second one is uncertainty of perception sub test which has 16 items (i.e. "Even if my perceptions are inaccurate, I am quickly aware of it and can correct myself easily"). Higher scores indicate that they may have difficulties differentiating their own thoughts and emotions with others. They may have lower social judgement and they may hesitate how to think and evaluate the situations. The last one is hallucinations and delusions sub test which includes 14 items (i.e. "I experience hallucinations"). Higher scores indicate hallucinated life and paranoid delusional situations. This means that the ego functionality is mainly distorted and dysfunctions especially in reality testing (Bell, 1995).

The Cronbach's alpha scores for alienation, insecure attachment, egocentricity, social incompetence, reality distortion, uncertainty of perception, and hallucinations and delusions were .90, .82, .78, .79, .87, .82, and .85, in respectively (Bell, 1995). In the Turkish adaptation study (Uluç et al., 2015), Cronbach's alpha scores for alienation, insecure attachment, egocentrism, social incompetence, reality distortion, uncertainty of perception, and hallucinations and delusions. were .80, .74, .70, .73, .77, .54, and .70, respectively.

In the present study both the sub scales and total scores of the two main factors were considered. Internal consistencies of the sub scales were shown in Table 2.

Tablo 2. Internal Consistency Coefficients of BORRTI Sub Scales

Sub Scales	Number of Items	α
Alienation	22	0.79
Insecure Attachment	15	0.70
Egocentrism	12	0.65
Social Incompetence	6	0.62
Reality Distortion	21	0.72
Uncertainty of Perception	16	0.50
Hallucinations Delusions	14	0.66
Object Relations	37	0.82
Reality Testing	28	0.75

2.2.3 Pathological Narcissism Inventory

The scale was developed by Pincus et al. (2009) and translated into Turkish by Şen, and Barışkın (2019). This self-report scale measures both sub scales of narcissism named grandiosity and vulnerability. The scale has 52 items and 7 sub scales of two main sub scales (i.e., entitlement rage, exploitativeness, grandiose fantasy, self-sacrificing self-enhancement, contingent self-esteem, hiding the self, and devaluing) answered as in 6-point Likert type scale (0: It never describes me, 5: It totally describes me). There are two main sub scales as grandiose narcissism (i.e., entitlement rage, exploitativeness, grandiose fantasy, self-sacrificing self-enhancement) and narcissistic vulnerability (i.e., contingent self-esteem, hiding the self, devaluating). Higher scores in the grandiosity sub scale indicate positive correlations with authoritarian, intrusiveness and interpersonal relationship problems. On the other hand, higher scores in vulnerability sub scale indicates distance, avoidance, exploitation problems in interpersonal relationships (Pincus et al., 2009). Cronbach alpha scores of the sub scales were found to be between .78 and .93, and for the total score the Cronbach's Alpha score was .95 (Pincus et al., 2009).

In the Turkish adaptation study, the 7th factor of the Turkish form included 2 items (2nd and 13th items). The factor load was under .30 and they were evaluated as weak. Given that when these items were excluded the Cronbach's alpha score became .93, the scale was used with 6 factors in the Turkish adaptation form (Şen, 2019). In the Turkish form, factors are the same but the sub scales of them get new names. Grandiose narcissism factor includes grandiose self (5 items; I.e. "I can make anyone believe anything I want them to") and grandiose dreams (7 items; I.e. "I often fantasize about being recognized for my accomplishments"). Vulnerable narcissism factor includes expectations for seeking attention/being noticed (18 items; I.e. "When people don't notice me, I start to feel bad about myself"), self-sacrifice (4 items; I.e. "I try to show what a good person I am through my sacrifices"), need for self-approval (4 items; I.e. "I like to have friends who rely on me because it makes me feel important"), and vulnerable self (11 items; I.e. "I hate asking for help"). The evaluation is done by using either the total score of sub scales or the total score of the

scale. The total score is found to be indicated the vulnerable narcissistic qualities (Şen, 2019).

Expletory factor analysis shows that item 38 has lower load than .30. therefore, the item 2, 13 and 38 were excluded from the sub factor however, it is still be used measuring total score (Şen, 2019). Cronbach alpha scores for internal consistency for the 6 sub scales expectation for seeking attention, grandiose self, vulnerable self, need for self-approval, grandiose dreams, self-sacrifice in respectively were .92, .74, .85, .58, .82, and .74.

In this study Cronbach alpha scores for internal consistency for the 6 sub scales found as .94 for 18-item expectation for seeking attention, .74 for 5-item grandiose self, 0.87 for 11-itemed vulnerable self, .72 for 4-itemed need for self-approval, .79 for 7-itemed grandiose dreams, and lastly, .66 for 4-itemed self-sacrifice was found.

2.2.4   *Revised Cyber Bullying Inventory- II (RCBI-II)*

The Cyber Bullying Inventory (CBI) was developed by Erdur-Baker, and Kavşut (2007) to evaluate cyber bullying and cyber victimization. The CBI had 16 items for cyber bullying and 18 items for cyber victimization. In 2010, in the first revision (RCBI), Topçu, and Erdur-Baker (2018) used a total of 28 items (14 for cyber bullying and 14 for cyber victimization). In 2018, in the second revision (RCBI-II), Topçu, and Erdur-Baker (2018) transformed some items and finalized the scale. The RCBI-II scale composed of two parallel forms each of which consist of 10 questions which are aimed to identify the frequency of the bullying in the cyber format. One of them was used to identify level of bullying (the section called "I bullies") and the other one was used to evaluate level of victimization (the section called "I was bullied"). The responses were taken with a 4-point Likert type scale (1: Never, 2: once, 3: twice, 4: more than three times). The lowest score is 10 and the highest score for the scale is 40 for both forms. Higher scores indicate more frequent cyber bullying and cyber victimization experiences (Topçu, and Erdur-Baker, 2018).

The internal consistency was found .79 for cyber bullying and .84 for cyber victimization (Topçu, and Erdur-Baker, 2018). For the present study, internal consistency coefficient of the 10-item cyber bullying form of RCBI-II was .71 and

internal consistency coefficient of 10-item cyber victimization form of RCBI-II was found as .80.

2.3. *Procedure*

The target population of the study was university students who were registered to an undergraduate or graduate programs in Turkey. Survey was prepared which contained Demographic information form, Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory, Pathological Narcissism Inventory, and Revised Cyber Bullying Inventory. Then the ethical approval was taken from the Ethics Committee of Izmir University of Economics.

The surveys prepared via an online survey website by using google forms. The data was collected via online surveys. Online questionnaire was shared in the social media (i.e., Facebook, Whatsapp), student groups and e-mail groups. First of all, participants filled the informed consent form. If they accepted to participate, they continued to answer the other forms. Participants were informed that the participation was voluntary, they had right to leave the study whenever they want. There were not any identifying questions, the survey was anonyms and confidential. The survey took approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. There were some positive outcomes of collecting the data online. For example, participants were not allowed to skip a question, every item should be answered to continue and finish the survey. On the other hand, there were some limitations as well. For example, people could not ask any questions to the researcher directly, if they were not sure about an item. The other thing was that it was hard to motivate people to fill out the survey in online forms because there was not a chance to speak with them and convince them.

2.4. *Data Analysis*

Aim of the study was to investigate the role of object relations, narcissism on cyber bullying and cyber victimization among university students in Turkey. In the first step the data collected through an online survey. The collected data transferred into SPSS version 22 package program. The data collected online so there were no missing items. In the study, the data was collected from totally 472 participants. Given that exclusion criteria of the study were being younger than 18 years or older than 25 years old, not being a university student, and having a psychiatric diagnose. Therefore, 8 people who did not meet the age criterion and 53 people who had a

psychiatric diagnose were excluded from the study. Moreover, 18 participants were found to be outlier in the normality analysis of the study so the total of 79 participants excluded from the data. Therefore, the final analyzes were carried out with 393 participants.

In the research process, to evaluate the group differences of demographic variables on main study variables, demographic variables which had two categories like gender, class, parental status, working status of mother and father, primary caregiver who raised them, previous bullying and victimization experiences were evaluated by using *t*-test. Demographic variables which had three or more categories as socio-economic status (SES) and daily internet usage time were analyzed by one way ANOVA.

The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used in exploring the relationship between study variables namely object relations, narcissism, cyber bullying, and cyber victimization levels of university students. Lastly, the role of object relations, narcissism and sociodemographic variables in predicting the cyber bullying and cyber victimization levels of university students was evaluated by the Stepwise Regression Analysis method.

Since stepwise regression analysis is a multiple regression technique, first of all the basic assumptions of the analysis were tested. The sample size should be computed as $N \geq 50 + 8m$ (Green, 1991; Tabachnick, and Fidell, 2013). "m" demonstrate the number of independent variables in the research. According to power analysis, in the current study, there are nearly 25 predictive variables (with demographic varaibles). Therefore, the sample should be more than 250 participants ($N = 393$). Additionally, during the analysis process, before the final analysis, scoring of the measurements were prepared, reverse items were recoded, the sub scale and total scores of scales were calculated. In addition, reliability analyzes of all scales for sub scales and total score were evaluated and results were shown in the data collection tools section. Histogram graphs were examined for the normality assumption of the variables. Normality assumptions of the data obtained from 393 participants and these assumptions were evaluated by calculating both Kolmogorov-Smirnov, and Shapiro-Wilk goodness of fit scores and skewness-kurtosis coefficients. Data showed that the skewness and kurtosis coefficients values ranged between –2.0 to + 2.0. It was

identified that variables did not show deviation from normal (Field, 2009). These values were calculated for each scale and sub scales and the results were reported in the results section.

Correlations scores were calculated to evaluate the multicollinearity and singularity between the variables. Coefficients were calculated and it was seen that significant correlations coefficients ranged between 0.10 and 0.66, therefore, there was no multicollinearity which had assumptions as coefficients should be lower than 0.90 (Kline, 2011; Tabachnick, and Fidell, 2001). In order to determine whether there is autocorrelation between the variables, the Durbin Watson coefficients were calculated and it was seen that there was no autocorrelation in the data set. Durbin Watson scores changes in between 1.77 to 1.87. The Durbin, and Watson (1951) stated that Durbin Watson coefficient should be between 1 and 3, thus the result was acceptable. There was no violation of assumptions. Normality assumptions was provided in the analysis which will be used for the aim of the study. Thus, parametric test methods were used.

CHAPTER 3: RESULTS

In this chapter, the findings obtained from the statistical analyzes carried out within the framework of the main purpose and hypothesis of the study were included. The presentation flow of the findings designed as the descriptive statistics for the main study variables discussed in the study, the analysis of the main study variables according to demographic variables, the correlation between the study variables, and finally, the stepwise regression analysis examining the role of object relations and narcissism of university students on their cyber bullying and cyber victimization levels.

3.1. Descriptive Statistics

3.1.1 Descriptive Statistics of the Scales and Normality Assumptions of the Study Variables

The mean and skewness and kurtosis scores of narcissism, object relations, cyber bullying and cyber victimization variables were shown in Table 3.

Tablo 3. Descriptive Statistics for the Study Variables

Variables	*N*	*M*	*SD*	Skewness	Kurtosis
1. Narcissistic Vulnerability (NV)	393	89.75	36.50	.101	-.361
2. Grandiose Narcissism (GN)	393	28.59	7.49	.004	-.161
3. Alienation (ALN)	393	6.17	4.10	.682	-.296
4. Insecure Attachment (IA)	393	5.80	3.07	.246	-.551
5. Egocentrism (EGC)	393	3.76	2.38	.467	-.311
6. Social Incompetence (SI)	393	1.73	1.74	.794	-.387
7. Reality Distortion (RD)	393	3.81	2.95	1.082	.831
8.Uncertainty of Perception (UP)	393	5.22	2.29	.406	-.263
9.Hallucinations and Delusions (HD)	393	1.80	1.92	1.447	1.994
10. Object Relations (OR)	393	11.67	6.10	.511	-.337
11. Reality Testing (RT)	393	8.60	4.43	.766	.172
12. Cyber Bullying (CB)	393	12.38	3.09	1.662	1.650
13. Cyber Victimization (CV)	393	14.56	4.55	.941	.137

Note. p<.05*, p<.001**

As can be seen in the Table 3, the skewness-kurtosis coefficients which were used as statistical technique to test the normality assumptions, took values between –2.0 and + 2.0 for each of the variables in the study. Although there were different value ranges regarding whether the mean scores obtained from the tests according to Kurtosis and Skewness values showed a normal distribution, it can be said that the values taken in the range of ±2.0 were among the acceptable norms in providing the assumption of normality (George, and Mallery, 2010).

3.1.2 Findings Regarding the Analysis of The Study Variables According to Socio Demographic Characteristic

In this section, the findings which examine whether the levels of study variables significantly differed according to the sociodemographic variables was shown and discussed within the scope of the research.

3.1.2.1 Findings on Examining the Cyber Bullying, Cyber Victimization, Grandiose Narcissism, Narcissistic Vulnerability and Object Relations and Reality Testing Levels of University Students by Gender

t-test analysis was conducted for independent samples to determine whether the mean scores of the participants' cyber bullying, cyber victimization, narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism, object relations and reality testing show a significant difference in terms of gender. The results were shown in Table 4.

Tablo 4. *t*-Test Results for the Study Variables According to Gender

		N	M	SD	df	t	p
Cyber Bullying	Female	272	12.07	2.90	391	-3.001	.003*
	Male	121	13.08	3.39			
Cyber Victimization	Female	272	14.38	4.44	391	-1.178	.240
	Male	121	14.98	4.76			
Narcissistic Vulnerability	Female	272	91.05	36.96	391	1.078	.282
	Male	121	86.82	35.43			
Grandiose Narcissism	Female	272	28.01	7.40	391	-2.265	.024*
	Male	121	29.87	7.54			
Object Relations	Female	272	11.33	6.18	391	-1.703	.090
	Male	121	12.44	5.87			
Reality Testing	Female	272	8.48	4.36	391	-.814	.416
	Male	121	8.88	4.59			

Note. p<.05*, p<.001**

When the Table 4 was examined, it was seen that cyber bullying levels of the participants in the research group showed a statistically significant difference according to gender ($t_{(391)}$= -3.001, *p< .05*). When the mean scores were evaluated to see the source of the significant difference, it was seen that the cyber bullying levels of males (*M* = 13.08, *SD* = 3. 39) were higher than females (*M*= 12.07, *SD* = 2.90). On the other hand, there was no statistically significant difference between the cyber victimization levels of the participants according to the gender variable ($t_{(391)}$ = -1.178, *p> .05*).

Table 4 was examined, it was also seen that grandiose narcissism levels of the participants in the research group showed a statistically significant difference according to gender ($t_{(391)}$= -2.265, *p< .05*). When the mean scores were evaluated to see the source of the significant difference, it was seen that the grandiose narcissism levels of males (*M* = 29.87, *SD* = 7.54) were higher than females (*M*= 28.01, *SD* = 7.40). On the other hand, there was no statistically significant difference between the narcissistic vulnerability, object relations, reality testing levels of the participants according to the gender variable (*p> .05*).

3.1.2.2 Findings on Examining the Cyber Bullying, Cyber Victimization, Grandiose Narcissism, Narcissistic Vulnerability and Object Relations and Reality Testing Levels of University Students by Grade Level

Independent Sample *t*-test analysis was conducted to determine whether the means scores of the participants' cyber bullying, cyber victimization, narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism, object relations and reality testing of the participants in the study show a significant difference in terms of class level. The results were shown in Table 5.

Tablo 5. *t*-Test Results for the Analysis of Variables Considered in the Study According to Class Level

		N	M	SD	df	t	p
Cyber Bullying	Undergraduate	331	12.41	3.10	391	0.496	.621
	Graduate	62	12.20	3.05			
Cyber Victimization	Undergraduate	331	14.59	4.58	391	0.254	.800
	Graduate	62	14.43	4.42			
Narcissistic Vulnerability	Undergraduate	331	90.04	35.54	391	0.332	.741
	Graduate	62	88.17	41.57			
Grandiose Narcissism	Undergraduate	331	28.76	7.47	391	1.055	.294
	Graduate	62	27.66	7.56			
Object Relations	Undergraduate	331	11.86	6.16	391	1.459	.148
	Graduate	62	10.69	5.70			
Reality Testing	Undergraduate	331	8.87	4.51	391	3.183	.002*
	Graduate	62	7.19	3.65			

Note. p<.05*, p<.001**

According to the Table 5, the participants' cyber bullying ($t_{(391)} = 0.496$, $p> .05$) and cyber victimization levels ($t_{(391)} = 0.496$, $p> .05$) did not show a statistically significant difference according to the class level variable.

When the Table 5 was examined, it was also seen that the participants' narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism and object relations levels did not show a statistically significant difference according to the class level variable (p>.05). However, reality testing levels of the participants in the research group showed a statistically significant difference according to gender ($t_{(391)}$= 3.183, p< .05). When the mean scores were evaluated to see the source of the significant difference, it was seen that the reality testing levels of undergraduate students ($M = 8.87$, $SD = 4.51$) were higher than graduate students ($M = 7.19$, $SD = 3.65$).

3.1.2.3 Findings on Examining the Cyber Bullying, Cyber Victimization, Grandiose Narcissism, Narcissistic Vulnerability and Object Relations and Reality Testing Levels of University Students According to Parental Status

t-test analysis was conducted for independent samples in order to determine whether the mean scores of the participants' cyber bullying, cyber victimization, narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism, object relations and reality testing showed a significant difference in terms of parental status. The results were shown in Table 6.

Tablo 6. *t*-Test Results for the Analysis of Variables Considered in the Study According to Parental Status

		N	M	SD	df	t	p
Cyber Bullying	Together	324	12.19	2.90	391	-2.733	.007*
	Divorced	69	13.30	3.76			
Cyber Victimization	Together	324	14.21	4.37	391	-3.038	.003*
	Divorced	69	16.20	5.03			
Narcissistic Vulnerability	Together	324	89.63	35.63	391	-0.123	.902
	Divorced	69	90.28	40.65			
Grandiose Narcissism	Together	324	28.60	7.28	391	0.076	.940
	Divorced	69	28.52	8.44			
Object Relations	Together	324	11.77	5.88	391	0.610	.543
	Divorced	69	11.21	7.08			
Reality Testing	Together	324	8.64	4.42	391	0.348	.729
	Divorced	69	8.43	4.50			

Note. p<.05*, p<.001**

When the Table 6 was examined, it was seen that cyber bullying levels of the participants showed a statistically significant difference according to parental status ($t_{(391)}$ = -2.733, $p < .05$). When the mean scores were evaluated to see the source of the significant differences, it was seen that the cyber bullying levels of students whose parents were divorced (*M* =13.30, *SD* = 3.76) showed statistically significant higher levels of cyber bullying compared to students whose parents were together *(M = 12.19, SD = 2.90)*.

Similarly, cyber victimization levels of the participants in the research group showed statistically significant difference according to parental status ($t_{(391)}$ = -3.038, $p < .05$). When the mean scores were evaluated to see the source of the significant differences, it was seen that the cyber victimization levels of students whose parents were divorced *(M = 16.20, SD = 5.03)* showed statistically higher levels of cyber victimization than students whose parents were together *(M = 14.21, SD = 4.37)*. Accordingly, it can be said that individuals with a broken family structure were more

likely to engage in bullying both being a bully and exposed to bullying as a victim than participants with family integrity.

According to the Table 6, the participants' narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism object relations and reality testing levels did not show a statistically significant difference according to the family integrity variable ($p>.05$).

3.1.2.4 Findings on Examining the Cyber Bullying, Cyber Victimization, Grandiose Narcissism, Narcissistic Vulnerability and Object Relations and Reality Testing Levels of University Students According to Working Status of Mother

t-test analysis was conducted for independent samples in order to determine whether the mean scores of the participants' cyber bullying, cyber victimization, narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism, object relations and reality testing show a significant difference in terms of working status of mother. The results were shown in Table 7.

Tablo 7. *t*-Test Results for the Analysis of Variables Considered in the Study According to Working Status of Mother

		N	M	SD	df	t	p
Cyber Bullying	Working	128	12.75	3.51	391	1.654	.099
	Not Working	165	12.20	2.86			
Cyber Victimization	Working	128	15.30	4.79	391	2.175	.031*
	Not Working	165	14.21	4.39			
Narcissistic Vulnerability	Working	128	91,71	38,12	391	0.725	.469
	Not Working	165	88,80	35,73			
Grandiose Narcissism	Working	128	28,52	7,08	391	-0.126	.899
	Not Working	165	28,62	7,69			
Object Relations	Working	128	11,61	6,54	391	0.028	.897
	Not Working	165	11,70	5,89			
Reality Testing	Working	128	8,64	4,61	391	0.130	.896
	Not Working	165	8,58	4,35			

Note. p<.05*, p<.001**

As it was seen in the Table 7, cyber bullying levels of the participants did not show a statistically significant difference according to working status of mother ($t_{(391)}$ = 1.654, *p> .05*); on the other hand, cyber victimization levels of the participants in the research group showed a statistically significant difference according to working status of mother ($t_{(391)}$ = 2.175, *p< .05*). When the mean scores were evaluated to see the source of the significant differences, it was seen that the cyber victimization levels of students whose mothers were working (*M* = 15.30, *SD* = 4.79) showed statistically significant higher compared to students whose parents were not working (*M* = 14.21, *SD* = 4.39).

According to the Table 7, the participants' narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism, object relations and reality testing levels did not show a statistically significant difference according to working status of mother (p>.05).

3.1.2.5 Findings on Examining the Cyber Bullying, Cyber Victimization, Grandiose Narcissism, Narcissistic Vulnerability and Object Relations and Reality Testing Levels of University Students According to Working Status of Father

t-test analysis was conducted for independent samples in order to determine whether the mean scores of the participants' cyber bullying, cyber victimization, narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism, object relations and reality testing showed a significant difference in terms of working status of father. The results were shown in Table 8.

Tablo 8. *t*-Test Results for the Analysis of Variables Considered in the Study According to Working Status of Father

		N	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
Cyber Bullying	Working	274	12.42	3.04	391	0.382	.703
	Not Working	119	12.29	3.21			
Cyber Victimization	Working	274	14.48	4.36	391	-0.515	.607
	Not Working	119	14.75	4.96			
Narcissistic Vulnerability	Working	274	90.12	36.56	391	0.305	.760
	Not Working	119	88.89	36.52			
Grandiose Narcissism	Working	274	28.65	7.30	391	0.245	.807
	Not Working	119	28.44	7.92			
Object Relations	Working	274	12.14	6.18	391	2.283	.018*
	Not Working	119	10.59	5.80			
Reality Testing	Working	274	8.84	4.49	391	1.675	.095
	Not Working	119	8.05	4.25			

Note. p<.05*, p<.001**

From the Table 8 it was revealed that the participants' cyber bullying ($t_{(391)}$ = 0.382, $p>$ .05) and cyber victimization levels ($t_{(391)}$= -0.515, $p>$ .05) did not show a statistically significant difference according to working status of father.

According to the Table 8, the participants' narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism and reality testing levels did not show a statistically significant difference according to working status of father (p>.05). However, object relations levels of the

participants in the research group showed a statistically significant difference according to working status of father ($t_{(391)} = 2.283$, $p < .05$). When the mean scores were evaluated to see the source of the significant differences, it was seen that the object relations levels of students whose fathers were working ($M = 12.14$, $SD = 6.18$) showed statistically significant higher compared to students whose parents were not working ($M = 10.59$, $SD = 5.80$).

3.1.2.6 Findings on Examining the Cyber Bullying, Cyber Victimization, Grandiose Narcissism, Narcissistic Vulnerability and Object Relations and Reality Testing Levels of University Students According to Primary Caregiver

Within the scope of the research, participants were asked who raised them as a primary caregiver in childhood. The answers of the participants were taken as in two categories as mother and others (school, babysitter, grandmother etc.). In order to determine whether the mean scores obtained from the scores of the participants' cyber bullying, cyber victimization, narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism, object relations and reality testing of the participants in the research group show a significant difference in terms of primary caregiver, independent T-test was performed. The results were shown in Table 9.

Tablo 9. *t*-Test Results for the Analysis of Variables Considered in the Study According to Primary Caregiver

		N	M	SD	df	t	p
Cyber Bullying	Mother	309	12.25	2.98	391	-1.525	.130
	Other	84	12.88	3.44			
Cyber Victimization	Mother	309	14.44	4.67	391	-1.063	.289
	Other	84	15.00	4.06			
Narcissistic Vulnerability	Mother	309	91.12	36.09	391	1.395	.165
	Other	84	84.70	37.76			
Grandiose Narcissism	Mother	309	28.32	7.21	391	-1.227	.222
	Other	84	29.55	8.40			
Object Relations	Mother	309	11.70	5.82	391	0.141	.888
	Other	84	11.58	7.08			
Reality Testing	Mother	309	8.65	4.50	391	0.403	.688
	Other	84	8.44	4.16			

Note. $p<.05^*$, $p<.001^{**}$

When the Table 9 was evaluated, it was seen that the participants' cyber bullying ($t_{(391)}= -1.525, p> .05$) and cyber victimization levels ($t_{(391)}= -1.063, p> .05$) did not show a statistically significant difference according to primary caregiver. According to the Table 9, the participants' narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism, object relations and reality testing levels did not show a statistically significant difference according to primary caregiver ($p>.05$).

3.1.2.7 Findings on Examining the Cyber Bullying, Cyber Victimization, Grandiose Narcissism, Narcissistic Vulnerability and Object Relations and Reality Testing Levels of University Students According to Their Previous Bullying Experience

Participants were asked whether they bullied someone before (as a perpetrator) and expected to answer as "yes" or "no". In order to determine whether the mean scores of the participants' cyber bullying, cyber victimization, narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism, object relations and reality testing scales of the participants in

the research group showed a significant in terms of previous bullying experience, independent *t*-test was performed. The results were shown in Table 10.

Tablo 10. *t*-Test Results for Examination of Variables Considered in the Study According to Previous Bullying Experience

		N	M	SD	df	t	p
Cyber Bullying	No	319	12.01	2.83	391	-5.132	.000**
	Yes	74	14.00	3.60			
Cyber Victimization	No	319	14.11	4.34	391	-4.197	.000**
	Yes	74	16.52	5.29			
Narcissistic Vulnerability	No	319	87.86	37.19	391	-2.332	.021*
	Yes	74	97.89	32.36			
Grandiose Narcissism	No	319	28.56	7.35	391	-0.151	.880
	Yes	74	28.71	8.09			
Object Relations	No	319	11.31	6.06	391	-2.480	.015*
	Yes	74	13.25	6.08			
Reality Testing	No	319	8.36	4.25	391	-2.199	.028
	Yes	74	9.62	5.01			

Note. p<.05*, p<.001**

When Table 10 was examined, it was found that the cyber bullying levels of the participants in the research group showed statistically significant difference according to their previous bullying experiences ($t_{(391)}= -5.132, p< .001$). It was observed that the cyber bullying levels of the participants (*M* = 14.00, *SD* = 3.60) were significantly higher than those who did not previously bully someone (*M* = 12.01, *SD* = 2.83).

Similarly, it was found that the cyber victimization levels of the participants in the research group showed statistically significant difference according to their previous bullying experience ($t_{(391)} = -4.197, p< .001$). When the mean scores for the analysis of the sources of significant difference were examined, it was observed that the participants who had previous bullying experience (*M* = 16.52, *SD* = 5.29) had significantly higher level of cyber victimization than those who did not have bullying

experience (M = 14.11, SD = 4.34). Accordingly, it can be said that participants who bullied someone before were more likely to be both cyber bully and cyber victim than individual who did not bullied someone before.

When Table 10 was examined, it was also found that the narcissistic vulnerability levels of the participants in the research group showed statistically significant difference according to their previous bullying experiences ($t_{(391)}$= - 2.332, $p< .05$). It was observed that the narcissistic vulnerability levels of the participants (M = 97.89, SD = 32.36) were significantly higher than those who did not previously bully someone (M = 87.86, SD = *37.19*). But, the participants' grandiose narcissism, levels did not show a statistically significant difference according to their previous bullying experiences.

Similarly, it was found that the object relations levels of the participants in the research group showed statistically significant difference according to their previous bullying experiences ($t_{(391)}$= - 2.480, $p< .05$). It was observed that the object relations levels of the participants (M = 13.25, SD = 6.08) were significantly higher than those who did not previously bully someone (M = 11.31, SD = *6.06*). But, the participants' reality testing, levels did not show a statistically significant difference according to their previous bullying experiences.

3.1.2.8 Findings on Examining the Cyber Bullying, Cyber Victimization, Grandiose Narcissism, Narcissistic Vulnerability and Object Relations and Reality Testing Levels of University Students According to Their Previous Victimization of Bullying Experience

Participants were asked whether they were bullied someone before (as a victim) and expected to answer as "yes" or "no". In order to determine whether the mean scores of the participants' cyber bullying, cyber victimization, narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism, object relations and reality testing scales of the participants in the research group showed a significant in terms of previous victimization of bullying experience, independent *t*-test was performed. The results were shown in Table 11.

Tablo 11. *t*-Test Results for Examination of Variables Considered in the Study According to Previous Victimization Experience

		N	M	SD	df	t	p
Cyber Bullying	No	195	11.87	2.46	391	-3.313	.001**
	Yes	198	12.89	3.54			
Cyber Victimization	No	195	13.23	3.31	391	-6.007	.000**
	Yes	198	15.87	3.54			
Narcissistic Vulnerability	No	195	82.38	36.13	391	-4.044	.000**
	Yes	198	97.00	35.48			
Grandiose Narcissism	No	195	30.18	7.39	391	4.292	.000**
	Yes	198	27.01	7.26			
Object Relations	No	195	10.06	5.45	391	-5.368	.000**
	Yes	198	13.26	6.31			
Reality Testing	No	195	7.73	3.72	391	-3.919	.000**
	Yes	198	9.45	4.89			

Note. p<.05*, p<.001**

When Table 11 was examined, it was found that the cyber bullying levels of the participants in the research group showed statistically significant difference according to their previous victimization experience $t_{(391)} = -3.313, p < .001$). It was observed that the participants who had victimized before *(M = 12.89, SD = 3.54)* had significantly higher level of cyber bullying than the participants who had not victimized of bullying before *(M = 11.87, SD = 2.46)*.

Similarly, it was found that the cyber victimization levels of the participants in the research group showed statistically significant difference according to their previous victimization $(t_{(391)} = -6.007, p < .001$). When the mean differences were examined, it was observed that the participants who were victimized before *(M = 15.87, SD = 3.54)* had significantly higher level of cyber victimization than the participants who had not been victimized before *(M = 13.23, SD = 3.31)*. Accordingly, it can be said that individuals, who had been victimized before in their life are more likely to both being a cyber bully or cyber victim than individuals who have not been victimized.

3.1.2.9 Findings on Examining the Cyber Bullying, Cyber Victimization, Grandiose Narcissism, Narcissistic Vulnerability and Object Relations and Reality Testing Levels of University Students according to the socio-economic status (SES)

One way ANOVA was conducted for independent samples to determine whether scores of the participants' cyber bullying, cyber victimization, narcissistic vulnerability, grandiose narcissism, object relations and reality testing levels of university students differ significantly according to SES. Results were shown in the Table 12.

Tablo 12. One- Way ANOVA Analysis Results Regarding the Analysis of the Variables Considered in the Study According to the Income Level of the Family

		SS	df	MS	F	p	*Significant Difference*
Cyber Bullying	Between Groups	6.091	2	3.045			
	Within Groups	3753.120	390	9.623	0.316	.729	---
	Total	3759.211	392				
Cyber Victimization	Between Groups	54.526	2	27.263			
	Within Groups	8067.937	390	20.687	1.318	.269	---
	Total	8122.463	392				
Narcissistic Vulnerability	Between Groups	6495.859	2	3247.929			
	Within Groups	515999.200	390	1323.075	2.455	.087	---
	Total	522495.059	392				
Grandiose Narcissism	Between Groups	157.339	2	78.669			
	Within Groups	21843.705	390	56.009	1.405	.247	---
	Total	22001.043	392				
Object Relations	Between Groups	271.788	2	135.894			
	Within Groups	14346.171	390	36.785	3.694	.026*	1-3
	Total	14617.959	392				
Reality Testing	Between Groups	170.034	2	85.017			
	Within Groups	7531.834	390	19.312	4.402	.013*	1-2, 1-3, 2-3
	Total	7701.868	392				

Note. $*p < .05$. $**p < .001$

Numbering for significant difference source is 1: Low SES, 2: Middle SES, 3: High SES.

According to the Table 12, there was not a statistically significant difference between the levels of cyber bullying ($F_{(2,390)} = 0.316$, $p > .05$) and cyber victimization ($F_{(2,390)} = 1.318$, $p > .05$), narcissistic vulnerability ($F_{(2,390)} = 2.455$, $p > .05$) and grandiose narcissism $(F_{(2,390)} = 1.405$, $p > .05)$ according to SES.

There was a significant difference object relations ($F_{(2,390)} = 3.694$, $p < .05$). Post Hoc tests were performed in order to determine the source of the difference, LSD test showed that the participants who were in low SES ($M = 12.96$, $SD = 6.41$) had higher object relations levels than high SES ($M = 10.51$, $SD = 6.14$).

There was a significant difference reality testing ($F_{(2,390)} = 4.402$, $p < .05$). Post Hoc tests were performed in order to determine the source of the difference, LSD test showed that the participants who were in low SES ($M = 9.07$, $SD = 4.53$) had higher reality testing levels than people in medium SES ($M = 9.02$, $SD = 4.65$). Again, participants who were in low SES ($M = 9.07$, $SD = 4.53$) had higher reality testing levels than people in high SES ($M = 7.60$, $SD = 3.77$). People in high SES ($M = 9.02$, $SD = 4.65$) had lower reality testing scores than people in medium SES ($M = 7.60$, $SD = 3.77$).

3.1.2.10 Findings on Examining the Cyber Bullying, Cyber Victimization, Grandiose Narcissism, Narcissistic Vulnerability and Object Relations and Reality Testing Levels of University Students According to Daily Internet Usage

One way ANOVA for independent sample was conducted to determine whether cyber bullying, cyber victimization, grandiose narcissism, narcissistic vulnerability, object relations and reality testing differ significantly according to daily internet usage. Results were shown in Table 13.

Tablo 13. One Way ANOVA Results of the Examination of Variables Considered in the Study According to Daily Internet Usage

		SS	df	MS	F	p	Significant Difference
Cyber Bullying	Between Groups	178,238	3	59,413			
	Within Groups	3580,973	389	9,206	6.454	.000 **	1-3, 1-4, 2-4,
	Total	3759,211	392				
Cyber Victimization	Between Groups	205,408	3	68,469			
	Within Groups	7917,055	389	20,352	3.364	.019	1-3, 1-4, 2-4, 2-3
	Total	8122,463	392				
Narcissistic Vulnerability	Between Groups	6520,021	3	2173,340			
	Within Groups	515975,037	389	1326,414	1.639	.180	---
	Total	522495,059	392				
Grandiose Narcissism	Between Groups	557,762	3	185,921			
	Within Groups	21443,281	389	55,124	3.373	.019 *	1-2, 1-3, 1-4
	Total	22001,043	392				
Object Relations	Between Groups	588,911	3	196,304			
	Within Groups	14029,049	389	36,064	5.443	.001 **	1-4, 2-4
	Total	14617,959	392				
Reality Testing	Between Groups	353,323	3	117,774			
	Within Groups	7348,545	389	18,891	6.234	.000 **	1-4, 2-4
	Total	7701,868	392				

Note. $p< .05$ *. $p< .001$**
Numbering for sources of significant is as 1: Daily 0-3 hours, 2: Daily 4-5 hours, 3: Daily 6-7 hours and 4: Daily 8 hours and more.

When Table 13 was evaluated, it was found that the cyber bullying levels of the university students showed statistically significant difference according to the daily internet usage $(F_{(3,389)} = 6.454, p<.001)$. Post Hoc tests were performed in order to determine the source of the difference, LSD test showed that the participants who used internet for 0-3 hours a day ($M = 11.50$, $SD = 2.83$) had lower levels of cyber bullying compared to the participants who used internet for 6-7 hours a day ($M = 12.71$, $SD = 2.96$) and again, participants who used internet for 0-3 hours a day ($M = 11.50$, $SD = 2.83$) had lower levels of cyber bullying than participant who use 8 and more hours in a day (X= 13.42, $SD = 3.81$). Within the study, it was also found that the participants who use internet for 8 and more hours ($M = 13.42$, $SD = 3.81$) had significantly higher cyber bullying scores than the participants who use internet for 4-5 hours daily (M = 12.00, $SD = 2.64$).

Similarly, it was found that cyber victimization levels of the participants showed statistically significant difference according to daily internet usage $(F_{(3,389)} = 3.364, p<.05)$. Post Hoc tests were performed in order to determine the source of the difference, LSD test showed that the participants who used internet for 0-3 hours daily ($M = 13.55$, $SD = 4.62$) compared to the participants who used the internet for 6-7 hours a day ($M = 15.30$, $SD = 4.74$) and compared to participants who used internet 8 hours and more ($M = 15.31$, $SD = 4.86$), participants who used internet for 0-3 hours daily ($M = 13.55$, $SD = 4.62$) showed lower cyber victimization. Additionally, participants who used internet for 4-5 hours ($M = 14.12$, $SD = 4.03$) showed significantly lower levels of cyber victimization than participant who used internet for 6-7 hours ($M = 15.30$, $SD = 4.74$) and 8 and more hours user ($M = 15.31$, $SD = 4.86$).

There was not a statistically significant difference between the levels narcissism $(F_{(2,390)} = 0.316, p>.05)$ according to daily internet usage. Table showed that, there was grandiose narcissism levels of the participants showed statistically significant difference according to daily internet usage $(F_{(3,389)} = 3.373, p<.05)$. Post Hoc tests were performed in order to determine the source of the difference, LSD test showed that the participants who used internet for 0-3 hours daily ($M = 30.83$, $SD = 7.42$) compared to the participants who used the internet for 4-5 hours a day ($M = 28.53$, $SD = 7.24$), compared to the participants who used the internet for 6-7 hours a

day ($M = 28.00$, $SD = 7.71$) and compared to participants who used internet 8 hours and more $(M = 27.30$, $SD = 7.34)$ showed higher grandiose narcissism.

When Table 16 was evaluated, it was found that the object relations levels of the university students showed statistically significant difference according to the daily internet usage ($F_{(3,389)}= 5.443$, $p<.001$). Post Hoc tests were performed in order to determine the source of the difference, LSD test showed that the participants who used internet for 0-3 hours a day ($M = 10.55$, $SD = 6.20$) had lower levels of object relations compared to the participants who used internet for 8 hours and more in a day ($M = 13.68$, $SD = 6.33$). Within the study, it was also found that the participants who use internet for 8 and more hours ($M = 13.68$, $SD = 6.33$) had significantly higher object relations scores than the participants who use internet for 4-5 hours daily $(M = 10.67$, $SD = 6.03)$.

Similarly, it was found that the reality testing levels of the university students showed statistically significant difference according to the daily internet usage ($F_{(3,389)}= 6.234$, $p<.001$). Post Hoc tests were performed in order to determine the source of the difference, LSD test showed that the participants who used internet for 8 hours and more ($M = 10.06$, $SD = 4.70$) had higher levels of reality testing compared to the participants who used internet for 0-3 hours in a day ($M = 7.98$, $SD = 3.97$) and 4-5 hours in a day ($M = 7.65$, $SD = 4.04$).

3.2.   *Correlation Analysis*

In order to determine the relationships between narcissism, object relations, and cyber bullying and cyber victimization level, which were considered within the frame of the main purpose of the research, the Pearson Product Moments Correlation Coefficients were calculated and the results of the correlation analysis were given in the Table 14.

Tablo 14. Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Variables Considered in the Study

	N	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Narcisstic Vulnerability	393	---											
2. Grandiose Narcissism	393	-.51**	---										
3. Alienation	393	.55**	-.35**	---									
4. Insecure Attachment	393	.64**	-.40**	.73**	---								
5. Egocentricism	393	.50**	-.22**	.66**	.64**	---							
6. Social Incompetence	393	.44**	-.29**	.76**	.57**	.32**	---						
7. Reality Distortion	393	.37**	-.23**	.54**	.55**	.65**	.27**	---					
8. Uncertainty of perception	393	.41**	-.25**	.50**	.50**	.41**	.37**	.53**	---				
9. Hallucination/ Delusion	393	.22**	-.19**	.40**	.43**	.50**	.20**	.85**	.47**	---			
10. Object relations	393	.63**	-.37**	.92**	.88**	.82**	.68**	.63**	.53**	.49**	---		
11. Reality testing	393	.45**	-.29**	.59**	.60**	.62**	.36**	.89**	.82**	.83**	.67**	---	
12. Cyber bullying	393	.29**	-.11**	.24**	.34**	.29**	.14**	.24**	.17**	.17**	.33**	.23**	---
13. Cyber Victimization	393	.25**	-.12*	.15**	.27**	.23**	.06	.21**	.14**	.17**	.23**	.21**	.64**

Note. p<.05*, p<.001**

59

In the Table 14, it was summarized the relationships among the variables discussed in the study. It was observed that Narcissistic Vulnerability and Grandiose Narcissism, which are the sub scales of the narcissism scale, show negative significant relationship with each other. On the other hand, the main sub scales of the Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory were positively and highly correlated with each other.

When the relationships between the cyber bullying levels and the scores of sub scales of narcissism inventory of the university students who formed the participants were examined, it was found that there was significant positive relationship between narcissistic vulnerability and cyber bullying ($r= .294, p< .001$). Accordingly, when the participants' cyber bullying levels increase, their narcissistic vulnerability levels will also increase, or as the participants' narcissistic vulnerability levels decrease, their cyber bullying levels will also decrease. On the other hand, there was a significantly negative relationship between the main sub scales of pathological narcissism inventory; grandiose narcissism and cyber bullying ($r= -.107, p< .05$). Thus, it can be interpreted as when the cyber bullying levels of the participants increase, the grandiose narcissism levels will decrease or when the cyber bullying levels decreases, grandiose narcissism levels will increase.

Similar results were obtained for the cyber victimization. As seen in the Table 14, it was found that there was a significant positive relationship between cyber victimization levels of the participants and narcissistic vulnerability ($r= .245, p< .001$). It can be interpreted as when the cyber victimization levels increase, narcissistic vulnerability of the participants also increase or, when the narcissistic vulnerability levels of the participants decrease, cyber victimization levels will be decreased. On the other hand, there was a significantly negative relationship between the sub scale of pathological narcissism inventory; grandiose narcissism and cyber victimization level ($r= -.115, p< .05$). It can be said that as the levels of cyber victimization of the participants increase, grandiose narcissism will decrease or when the level of cyber victimization decreases, levels of grandiose narcissism of the participants' increase.

One of the main objectives of the study was to evaluate the relationship between cyber bullying and the scores that participants obtained from the sub scales of the object relations scale. When the results were examined, it was found that there were significantly positive relationships between cyber bullying and alienation ($r=$ .235, $p<$.001), insecure attachment ($r=$ .335, $p<$ .001), egocentrism ($r=$ .293, $p<$ .001), social incompetence ($r=$ .139, $p<$ .001), reality distortion ($r=$ .235, $p<$ .001), uncertainty of perception ($r=$ .170, $p<$ .001), and hallucinations and delusions ($r=$ .173, $p<$ .001). In other words, when the participants' scores of sub scale of object relations increase, cyber bullying will also increase, or, when the cyber bullying levels decrease, scores of sub scales of the object relations and reality testing inventory will decrease. During the research process, the main sub scales of the Bell object relations and reality testing inventory namely object relations ($r=$ .327, $p<$ .001) and reality testing ($r=$ .234, $p<$ .001) were found to be positively correlated with cyber bullying. In other words, it can be said that as the object relations and reality testing scores of the participants increase, their cyber bullying levels will also increase, or as their cyber bullying levels decrease, their object relations and reality testing scores will also decrease.

When the Table 14 was examined, similar results were found for cyber victimization that there were significantly positive relationships between cyber victimization and alienation ($r=$ .146, $p<$ .001), insecure attachment ($r=$ .272, $p<$ .001), egocentrism ($r=$ .234, $p<$ .001), reality distortion ($r=$ .214, $p<$ .001), uncertainty of perception ($r=$ .142, $p<$ .001), and hallucinations and delusions ($r=$ .168, $p<$ .001). It can be interpreted as, when sub scales the object relations scale scores increase, cyber victimization will be increased or when the cyber victimization decrease, the main sub scales of object relations and reality testing scale (BORRTI) will decrease. However, there was no statistically significant relationship between the level of cyber victimization and the social incompetence sub scale ($r=$ .059, $p>$ .05). In addition, the main sub scales of the Bell object relations and reality testing inventory named object relations ($r=$ .226, $p<$ .001) and Reality Testing ($r=$ .213, $p<$ .001) were found to be positively correlated with cyber victimization. In other word, when the participants' score of object relations and reality testing increases, their level of cyber victimization increases or the when the cyber victimization level of them decreases, their object relations and reality testing scores decrease as well.

Finally, the relationship between the cyber bullying and cyber victimization was evaluated. It was seen that there was a positive and significant relationship between cyber bullying levels and cyber victimization levels ($r = .639, p < .001$) of the university students. It can be interpreted that, when the cyber bullying levels of the participants increase, the level of cyber victimization will also increase.

3.3. Regression Analysis

3.3.1 Findings on the Variables That Predict Cyber Bullying and Cyber Victimization Levels of University Students

The stepwise multiple regression analysis technique was used to determine the level of prediction of the participants' cyber bullying and cyber victimization levels by object relations, narcissism and sociodemographic variables considered within the scope of the research. As there were two different dependent variables within the scope of the research, the results were presented under two main headings as cyber bullying and cyber victimization.

3.3.1.1 Findings on the Role of Object Relations, Narcissism and Sociodemographic Variables in Predicting Cyber Bullying Levels of the Participants

In this section, the process of predicting cyber bullying levels of the participants was reported. Within the scope of the research, regression analyzes were tested in two different processes. As the object relations and reality testing inventory can give two different scoring as total score of main sub scales as Object Relations and Reality testing and seven sub scales as Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentrism, Social Incompetence, Reality Distortion, Uncertainty of Perception and Hallucinations – Delusions. It was tested in two different processes on the basis of main sub scales and 7 sub scales. In addition, a secondary aim was tested as examining the variables predicting cyber bullying when demographic variables were included in the regression analysis process.

Within the scope of the research, firstly, the narcissism and object relations scale of the participants' cyber bullying levels were included into regression analysis as predictors of two main sub scales, Object Relations and Reality Testing. The results were presented in Table 15.

Tablo 15. Multiple REgression Analysis Results Regarding the Prediction of Cyber Bullying Level by Narcissism and Object Relations and Reality Testing (BORRTI) Main Sub Scales

Model	Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std Error	β	t
1	(Constant)	.327	.107	.105	2.92994		
	OR					.327	6.849**
2	(Constant)	.346	.120	.115	2.91139		
	OR					.236	3.841**
	NV					.144	2.347*

OR: Object Relations, NV: Narcissistic Vulnerability

$p<.05^*$, $p<.01^{**}$

When Table 15 was examined, it was seen that the first model was the Object Relations variable, which was among the main sub scales of the object relations inventory (BORRTI). Object relations was the most important predictor of the participants' cyber bullying levels. Based on this equation called Model 1, it was seen that Object Relations explained 10% of the variance in the cyber bullying levels of the participants. When the regression coefficient was examined, it was understood that there were positive relations between the Object Relations and cyber bullying levels of the participants. The greater the participant's score on object relations, the greater the score of participants on cyber bullying.

In addition to the Object Relations variables, Narcissitic Vulnerability predicts the cyber bullying levels of the participants as well. Narcissistic vulnerability was one of the sub scales of the pathological narcissism inventory. Narcissistic Vulnerability and Object Relations together explained 12% of the cyber bullying. There was a positive relationship between Narcissitic Vulnerability and cyber bullying, which contributes 2% by entering the equation in the Model 2.

Since the object relations and narcissism explain only the 12% variance in cyber bullying, the sociodemographic variables which were found to be significant added to the regression models as addtional analyses. Finally, beside the narcissism and

total scores of object relations and reality testing of BORRTI as well as gender, parental status, daily internet usage, previous bullying and victimization experiences that made significant differences on the level of cyber bullying during the research process conditions were also included in the analysis. The results were presented in Table 16.

Tablo 16. Multiple Regression Analysis Results on Predicting Cyber Bullying Level by Narcissism, Object Relations Main Sub Scales and Sociodemographic Variables

Model	Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error	β	t
1	(Constant)	.327	107	.105	2.92994		
	OR					.327	6.849**
2	(Constant)	.390	.152	.148	2.85887		
	OR					.301	6.397**
	PBE					.214	4.548**
3	(Constant)	.414	.171	.165	2.83008		
	OR					.275	5.801**
	PBE					.203	4.343**
	DIU					.141	2.996*
4	(Constant)	.435	.189	.181	2.80324		
	OR					.281	5.983**
	PBE					.195	4.221**
	DIU					.138	2.949*
	PS					.134	2.913*
5	(Constant)	.448	.201	.190	2.78664		
	OR					.191	3.184*
	PBE					.191	4.148*
	DIU					.145	3.114*
	PS					.130	2.840*
	NV					.140	2.374*
6	(Constant)	.459	.211	.198	2.77246		
	OR					.173	2.865*
	PBE					.177	3.827*
	DIU					.141	3.044*
	PS					.125	2.763*
	NV					.159	2.682*
	Gender					.103	2.229*

Note. OR: Object Relations, PBE: Previous Bullying Experience, DIU: Daily Internet Usage, PS: Parental Status, NV: Narcissistic Vulnerability

When the Table 16 was examined, result showed that the most important predictor of the participants' cyber bullying levels, was the Object Relations variable, which was the one of the main sub scale of BORTTI. Based on this equation, it indicated that approximately 10% of the variance in cyber bullying was explained with Object Relations. When the regression coefficient is examined, it was seen that there were positive relations between the Object Relations and cyber bullying levels of the participants. The greater scores on Object Relation, the greater the score of participants on cyber bullying.

In addition to Object Relations variable, in Model 2, another important variable that joined to the model and increase 15% of the cyber bullying which was the previous bullying experiences which contributed 4% by entering the equation. There was a positive relationship between previous bullying experience and level of cyber bullying. Accordingly, it can be said that the cyber bullying levels of the participants who said yes to previous bullying experience were higher.

In Table 26, it was indicated that in Model 3, in addition to the variables in the first two models, the variable of daily internet usage, which contributed 2% to the explanation of variance in the level of cyber bullying of the participants, joined to the model. In this situation, these three variables included in the equation together explained the 17% of the cyber bullying. When the regression coefficient of the daily internet usage was examined, it was seen that it was positively related to cyber bullying. Daily internet usage was a categorical variable, but it also included a ranking within itself. In this case, it can be said that when the cyber bullying levels of the university students in the study, daily internet usage increases.

In the model 4, it was seen that in addition to the other models, parental status alone explains the cyber bullying 1% and with the other variables these explained the cyber bullying 18% together. Parental status was also a categorical variable parent being together marked as 1, and parent divorced marked as 2. the positive relationship in the regression coefficient can be interpreted as the level of cyber bullying will be increased as the family integrity of the participants was broken.

From the Table 16 it was indicated that in Model 5 sub scale of the narcissism scale; Narcissistic Vulnerability was added to the model and it contributed 1% to the explanation of the variance in the cyber bullying level of participants. When the beta coefficient of Narcissistic Vulnerability was examined, it was seen that it was a positive relationship with cyber bullying variable.

When the Model 6 equation model was examined, in addition to the models gender was added and it explain 0.8% alone, and with other variables 19.8% of the variance were explained in cyber bullying. Gender was a categorical variable, "females" was coded as 1, and "male" was coded as 2. The positive relationship in the regression coefficient indicates that the cyber bullying levels of male participants were higher than females.

Secondly in the research, seven sub scales of object relations and reality testing inventory (BORRTI) and sub scales of narcissism were given as the predictors of cyber bullying levels of the participants in the study. Results were given in Table 17.

Tablo 17. Multiple Regression Analysis Results Regarding the Prediction of Cyber Bullying by Narcissism and Object Relations Sub Scales

Model	Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error	β	t
1	(Constant)	.335	.112	.110	2.92181		
	IA					.335	7.025**
2	(Constant)	.351	.123	.118	2.90753		
	IA					.249	4.041**
	NV					.135	2.202*

Note. IA: Insecure Attachment, NV: Narcissistic Vulnerability

$p<.05^*, p<.01^{**}$

When Table 17 was examined, it was seen that the first model was the Insecure Attachment variable which is among the sub scales of object relations was the most important predictor of cyber bullying. Based on this equation Model 1, Insecure Attachment explained 11% of the variance in cyber bullying alone. When the regression coefficient is examined, it was seen that there was a positive relationship

between the participants' Insecure Attachment and cyber bullying levels. It can be interpreted as when the Insecure Attachment levels increase, cyber bullying will also increase of the participants.

In addition the the Insecure Attachment variable, which predicts the cyber bullying levels, another important variable was Narsisistic Vulnerability. Narcissistic Vulnerability and Insecure Attachment together explained 12% of the level of cyber bullying. There was a positive relationship between Narsisistic Vulnerability and cyber bullying, which contributes 1% by entering the equation in Model 2. This indicates that greater scores the Narsissitic Vulnerability, higher levels of cyber bullying.

Since the object relations and narcissism explain only the 12% variance in cyber victimizaiton, the sociodemographic variables which were found to be significant added to the regression models as additional analyses. Thirdly, within the scope of the research, in addition the seven sub scales of the object relation (BORRTI) scale and narcissism, gender, parental status, daily internet usage, previous bullying and victimizaiton experiences which showed significant differences on the level of cyber bullying, were also included in the analysis. The results were shown in Table 18.

Tablo 18. Multiple Regression Analysis Results on Predicting Cyber Bullying Level by Narcissism, Object Relations Sub Scales and Socio Demographic Variables

Model	Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std Error	β	t
1	(Constant)	.335	,112	,110	2,92181		
	IA					,335	7,025**
2	(Constant)	.394	,155	,151	2,85334		
	IA					,306	6,526**
	PBE					,210	4,471**
3	(Constant)	.421	,177	,171	2,81986		
	IA					,284	6,060**
	PBE					,198	4,248**
	DIU					,150	3,212**
4	(Constant)	.440	,193	,185	2,79542		
	IA					,287	6,178**
	PBE					,191	4,133**
	DIU					,147	3,181*
	PS					,128	2,798*
5	(Constant)	.453	,206	,195	2,77777		
	IA					,292	6,301**
	PBE					,175	3,779**
	DIU					,140	3,042*
	PS					,124	2,739*
	Gender					,112	2,438*
6	(Constant)	.466	,217	,205	2,76061		
	IA					,202	3,405**
	PBE					,171	3,705**
	DIU					,144	3,132**
	PS					,122	2,703*
	Gender					,119	2,609*
	NV					,141	2,414*

Note. IA: Insecure Attachment, PBE: Previous Bullying Experience DIU: Daily Internet Usage, PS: Parental Status, NV: Narcissistic Vulnerability

When Table 18 was examined, it was seen that the first model, the most important predictor of the participants' cyber bullying levels, was the Insecure Attachment variable, which was among the sub scales of BORTTI. Based on this equation called Model 1, Insecure Attachment explained the 11% of the variance in cyber bullying. When the regression coefficient was examined, it was seen that there were positive relationships between the participants' Insecure Attachment and cyber bullying levels. This indicates that as the Insecure Attachment levels of the participants increase, their cyber bullying levels will also increase.

In addition to the Insecure Attachment variable, which predicts the cyber bullying levels of the participants, another important variable that enter to the model was previous cyber bullying experiences. Cyber bullying together with Insecure Attachment explained 15% of the cyber bullying levels. There was a positive relationship between the previous experience of bullying and the level of cyber bullying which contributed 4% to the equation by itself called the model 2. This relationship was related to the fact that bullying was asked if they bullied someone before and the answers were coded as "no:0" and "yes:1" as a categorical variable. Accordingly, it can be said that the cyber bullying levels of the participants who said yes to bullying before were higher.

In Table 18, it was seen that in Model 3, in addition to the variables in the first two models, daily internet usage was entered which contributed 2% to the explanation of the variance in the level of cyber bullying of the participants. In this case, these three variables included in the equation and explained 17% of cyber bullying levels. When the regression coefficient of the variable of daily internet usage was examined, it was seen that these were positively related to cyber bullying. The daily internet usage was a categorical variable, it also includes a ranking within itself. In this case, it can be said that the cyber bullying levels of the university students increase as the daily internet usage increase.

When the equation called Model 4 was examined, in addition to the equation in Model 3,2 and 1, Parental Status contributed 1% to explain the cyber bullying levels of university students. And variables together explained 18% cyber bullying.

70

Parental status was also a categorical variable, parents together was coded as 1 and parents divorced was coded 2. there was positive relationship in the regression. It can be interpreted as the level of cyber bullying will increase as the family integrity of the participants were broken.

Again, when Table 18 was examined, it was seen that in Model 5 in addition to first four models, the variable gender contributed 1% to the explanation of cyber bullying. In this case, the Model 5 explained 19% of the participants' cyber bullying levels. The gender variable was a categorical variable and coded as female: 1 and male: 2. so the positive relationship in the regression coefficient indicates that the bullying levels of male participants were higher than females.

Lastly, Model 6 also showed in addition to other variables, which predicted the cyber bullying levels of the participants, another important variable that enter to the model is Narcissistic Vulnerability, one of the sub scales of the pathological narcissism inventory. It explained the 20% of the cyber bullying level together with other variables. There was a positive relationship between Narcissistic Vulnerability, which contributed 1% by entering the model called model 6. This indicates that the higher scores of Narcissistic Vulnerability greater levels of cyber bullying.

3.3.1.2 Findings on the Role of Object Relations, Narcissism and Sociodemographic Variables in Predicting Cyber Victimization Levels of the Participants

In this section, the process of predicting the cyber victimization levels of the participants was reported. Within the scope of the study, since the object relations and reality testing scale can give scores as both total scores of two sub scales, Object Relations and Reality Testing, and also scores of seven sub scales which are Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentrism, Social Incompetence, Reality Distortion and Hallucination-Delusion were tested in two different processes on the basis of main scales and sub scales in regression. In addition, a secondary aim was tested as examining the variables predicting cyber victimization in cases where demographic variables were included in the regression analysis process.

For this reason, four different regression analyzes were conducted to predict the cyber victimization levels of the participants. First, it was conducted as predictors of

narcissism and two main sub scales of the Object Relations and Reality Testing. The result was presented in Table 19.

Tablo 19. Multiple Regression Analysis Results Regarding the Prediction of Cyber Victimization Level by BORRTI's and PNI's main Sub Scales

Model	Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error	β	t
1	(Constant)	.245	.060	.058	4.41862		
	NV					.245	5.002**
2	(Constant)	.271	.073	.069	4.39275		
	NV					.188	3.446**
	OR					.129	2.370*

Note. NV: Narcissistic Vulnerability, OR: Object Relations

$p<.05*$, $p<.01**$

When Table 19 was examined, it was seen that the first model was the Narcissistic Vulnerability variable which was one of the sub scales of Pathological Narcissism Inventory, which was the most important predictor of the participants' cyber victimization levels. Based on this equation called Model 1, Narcissistic Vulnerability explained 6% of the variance. When the regression coefficient was examined, it was seen that there was a positive relationship between Narcissistic Vulnerability and cyber victimization.

In addition to the Narcissistic Vulnerability variable, which predicted the cyber victimization levels of the participants, another important variable that entered to the model was Object Relations, one of the main sub scales of the Object Relations and Reality Testing (BORRTI). Together with Object Relations and Narcissistic Vulnerability, it explained 7% of the cyber victimization level. There was a positive relationship between Object Relations and cyber victimization, which contributed 2% by entering the equation in Model 2. This indicated that the greater scores on Object Relation, the greater the score of participants on cyber victimization.

Secondly, within the scope of the research, in addition to the main sub scales of PNI (Grandiose Narcissism and Narcissistic Vulnerability) and BORTTI (Object

Relations and Reality Testing) of the participants' levels of cyber victimization, some socio demographic variables which made significant differences on bullying victimization, like parental status, working status of mothers, previous bullying and victimization were also included in the analysis. The results were presented in Table 20.

Tablo 20. Multiple Regression Analysis Results on Predicting Cyber Victimization Level by Narcissism, Object Relations and Reality Testing Main Sub Scales and Sociodemomgraphic Variables

Model	Variable	R	R²	Adjusted R²	Std. Error	β	t
1	(Constant)	.291	.084	.082	4.36102		
	PVE					.291	6,007**
2	(Constant)	.348	.121	.116	4.27886		
	PVE					.229	5, 192**
	NV					.202	4,020**
3	(Constant)	.376	.142	.135	4.23338		
	PVE					.214	4,972**
	NV					.209	4,094**
	PS					.151	3,070*
4	(Constant)	.398	.159	.150	4.19658		
	PVE					.189	4, 362**
	NV					.199	3, 932**
	PS					.146	2, 997*
	PBE					.132	2, 802*

Note. PVE: Previous Victimization Experience, NV: Narcissistic Vulnerability, PS: Parental Status, PBE: Previous Bullying Experience,
$p<.05*, p<.01**$

When Table 20 was examined, it was observed that the first model showed that the most important predictor of the cyber victimization was previous victimization experience. Based on Model 1, it was seen that previous victimization experience of bullying explained 8% of the variance in cyber victimization levels of the participants. There was a positive relationship between previous victimization

experience of bullying and cyber victimization. This was related to the categorical coding of the variable; being bullied was coded as 1 "yes" and 0 "no" as a categorical variable.

In Table 20, Model 2 showed that Narcissistic Vulnerability explained 4% of the variance in the cyber bullying levels of the participants alone, and together the variables explained 12% in total. When the regression coefficient was examined, it was seen that there was a positive relationship between Narcissistic Vulnerability and cyber victimization levels of the participants. This indicated that the higher Narcissistic Vulnerability levels of the participants, greater level of cyber victimization.

It was seen that in Model 3, in addition to the variables in the first two models, parental situation variable entered the model, which contributed 2% to the explanation of the variance in the level of cyber victimization of the participants. In this case, these three variables together explained the 14% of the participants' cyber victimization levels. When the regression coefficient of the parental status variable was examined, it was seen that it was positively related to cyber victimization. Parental status was a categorical variable, parents being together coded as 1 and parents divorced coded as 2. The regression coefficient was positive.

In Model 4, in addition to the variables in the first three models, previous bullying experience entered the equation and explained 1% of the variance. In this case, these four variables included in the equation together explained 15% of the variance. When the regression coefficients were examined, there was a positive relationship between previous bullying experience and cyber victimization. This was related to the fact that previous bullying experience was coded as 1: yes and 0: no as categorical variable.

Thirdly, the level of prediction of cyber victimization by the sub scales of BORRTI and PNI was examined and presented in the Table 21. However, in the process, the social incompetence sub scales of object relations was excluded from the analysis due to the assumption of multiple regression, that the dependent variable and independent variables should be related to each other. Because there was no significant relation between cyber victimization and social incompetence.

Tablo 21. Multiple Regression Analysis Results on Predicting Cyber Victimizzation Level by Narcissism and Object Relations Sub Scales

Model	Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std Error	β	t
1	(Constant)	.272	.074	.072	4.38597		
	IA					.272	5.589**

IA: Insecure Attachment

p<.05*, *p*<.01**

When Table 21 was examined, it was seen that the only predictor of participants' cyber victimization levels was the insecure attachment variable, which was among the Object Relations' sub scales. Based on this equation in Model 1, insecure attachment alone explained 7% of the variance in the cyber victimization levels of the participants. When the regression coefficient was examined, it was seen that there was a positive relationship between the participants' insecure attachment and cyber victimization levels. This indicated that the greater insecure attachment levels of the participants, higher level of cyber victimization.

Lastly, within the scope of the research, in addition to the six sub scales of BORTTI (without Social Incompetence) and sub scales of PNI additionally some socio demographic variables (parental status, previous bullying and victimization experiences) included to the analysis which made significant differences on cyber victimization levels. The results were presented in Table 22.

Tablo 22. Multiple Regression Analysis Results on Predicting Cyber Victimization Level by Narcissism, Object Relations Sub Scales and Sociodemographic Variables

Model	Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error	β	t
1	(Constant)	.291	.084	.082	4.36102		
	PVE					.291	6.007**
2	(Constant)	.349	.122	.117	4.27720		
	PVE					.229	4.498**
	IA					.202	4.059**
3	(Constant)	.380	.144	.138	4.22718		
	PVE					.212	4.337**
	IA					.209	4.237**
	PS					.151	3.207**
4	(Constant)	.401	.161	.152	4.19155		
	PVE					.189	3.793**
	IA					.199	4.054**
	PS					.146	3.128*
	PBE					.132	2.764*

PVE: Previous Victimization Experience, IA: Insecure Attachment, PS: Parental Status, PBE: Previous Bullying Experience, NV: Narcissistic Vulnerability
$p<.05^*$, $p<.01^{**}$

When Table 22 was examined, it was observed that the first model, the most important predictor of the cyber victimization levels of the participants was previous victimization experience. Based on this equality in Model 1, it was seen that previous victimization experience explained 8% of the variance in the cyber victimization levels of the participants. There was a positive relationship between previous victimization of bullying and the level of cyber victimization. This was related to the fact that previous victimization experience was coded as 1: yes and 0: no as categorical variable. Accordingly, it can be said that the participants who said yes to being victimized by bullying before, had higher levels of cyber victimization.

In Model 2, it was seen that additionally to previous victimization experience, insecure attachment entered to the prediction model which was among the sub scales

of Object Relations. Based on this equality in Model 2, insecure attachment explained 4% of the variance in the level of cyber victimization of the participants and variables together explained 12%. When the regression coefficient was examined, it was seen that there was a positive relationship between the participants' insecure attachment and cyber victimization levels.

In Model 3, additional to the first to models, parental status entered to the Model which contributed 2% of the explanation of the variance in the level cyber victimization of the participants. In this case, these three variables included in the equation together explained 14% of the cyber victimization levels. When regression coefficient of parental status was examined, it was seen that it was positively related to cyber victimization. Parental status was a categorical variable which coded as 1: parents together and 2: parent divorced. Thus, positive relationship in the regression coefficient can be interpreted as the level of cyber victimizations will increase as the family integrity of the participants broken.

Lastly, Model 4 showed that, in addition to the variables in the previous models, it was seen that previous bullying experience entered to the model which contributed 2% to the explanation of the variance in the level of cyber victimization. In this case, four variables in the model together explained 16% of the participants' cyber victimization levels. When the regression coefficient was examined, there was a positive relationship between previous bullying experiences and level of cyber victimization. This was related to the fact that previous bullying was coded as 1: yes and 0: no as categorical variable.

CHAPTER 4:   DISCUSSION

The aim of the current study was to investigate the role of object relations, reality testing, and narcissism on cyber bullying and cyber victimization among Turkish university students. As both cyber bullying and cyber victimization were analyzed according to the variables, discussions will be done in two main parts. Additionally, as the object relations and reality testing scale give both total scores of the main scales and also their sub scale scores, analysis were also discussed in two different ways.

In the first section, the relationship between object relations and cyber bullying will be discussed then the relationship between sub scales of object relations and cyber bullying will be discussed. Moreover, the relationship between reality testing and cyber bullying and then the relationship between sub scales of reality testing and cyber bullying will be discussed. Lastly, the relationship between narcissism and cyber bullying will be discussed.

In the second section, the relationship between object relations and cyber victimization will be discussed then the relationship between sub scales of object relations and cyber victimization will be discussed. Moreover, the relationship between reality testing and cyber victimization and then the relationship between sub scales of reality testing and cyber victimization will be discussed. Then, the relationship between narcissism and cyber victimization will be discussed. Additionally, the significant descriptive variables which were tested in the model were discussed according to cyber bullying and cyber victimization. Lastly, the limitations, future suggestions, and possible implications of the study were discussed.

4.1.   *Discussion of the Results of Cyber Bullying*

4.1.1   *The Relationship Between Object Relations and Cyber Bullying*

As the object relations and reality testing scales give two different scorings, first of all the main scales as object relation and reality testing were evaluated in the analysis. Multiple regression analyses stepwise technique was carried out. The first hypothesis of the study was that object relations would positively predict cyber bullying. As a result of the analysis, it was found that object relations was a predictor

of cyber bullying. Therefore, the first hypothesis was accepted. According to the results, object relations was the strongest predictor of cyber bullying. In the literature, there is no study focusing on the role of object relations on the cyber bullying. However, it is known that parental care is important factor in developing social bonds and in managing risky situations, conflicts in interpersonal relationships (Bandura, 1997). Object relations theory focused on the relationship with primary caregivers who are child's main objects. The theory focuses on how are the objects, how the child experience and internalize these objects. Additionally, it is important how these internalized objects effect the child's unconscious and effect interpersonal relationship during adulthood (McWilliams, 2020). Kernberg (1991) referred to the contradiction of people seen in the interpersonal relationship the compensation of the early pathologic relationship with parents on the other hand, the irresistible lure of the repetition of unmet aggressive and vengeful needs, all these were re-enacted in the interpersonal relationships. Kokkinos (2013) suggested that early and continued relationship with parent and the child become internalized and might feature in bullying. Therefore, even though there is no direct research on the relationship between object relations and cyber bullying the literature on object relations supports our assumptions. It can be concluded that in there are problems in object relations, people also live problems in interpersonal relationships and they may engage in cyber bullying.

4.1.2 *The Relationship Between Sub Scales of Object Relations and Cyber Bullying*

In the second hypothesis, it was hypothesized that sub scales of object relations, specifically, alienation, egocentricity, insecure attachment, and social incompetence would positively predict cyber bullying. In the model, it was found that insecure attachment was the strongest predictor of cyber bullying. The findings are consistent with the literature suggesting that having an insecure attachment style was a risk factor for being a cyber bully (Canestrati et al., 2021; Varghese, and Pistole, 2017; Yusuf et al., 2018). It is known that cold and rejecting relationship with mother was found to be related with not only cyber bullying but also traditional bullying perpetration (Olweus, 1980; Ševčíková et al., 2015). Moreover, it is well-known that in the relationship between parent and the child, child builds internal representational working models, these internalized beliefs and expectations about themselves and

79

external world affect the interaction between the child and the others (Bowlby, 1973). Moreover, these internalizations are effective in perception, interpretation, and emotion regulation in relationships (Zimmermann, 1999). It can be easily guessed that children whose parents control them strictly, may prefer to gain sense of control by acting out, and they may engage in cyber bullying behaviors. People who exposed to rejecting messages, might be very sensitive to hurtful messages, which may lead them to cyber bullying in personal relationships (van der Watt, 2014). It can be inferred from the literature; insecure attachment is an important factor both prevent and may create risk for being a cyber bully.

Although it was hypothesized in the second hypothesis, that sub scales of object relations, specifically, alienation, egocentricity, insecure attachment, and social incompetence will positively predict cyber bullying, none of the sub scales of object relation namely alienation, egocentrism, and social incompetence did not significantly predict cyber bullying. These nonsignificant results of the current study contradict with the previous research. Yusuf et al. (2018) found that alienation as a concept of parental attachment, was a significant predictor of cyber bullying experience. Moreover, Nikiforou, Georgiou, and Stavrinides (2013) found that cyber bullying was significantly predicted by father alienation. However, we could not find a significant association between alienation and cyber bullying this may be because of Turkish culture, in the Turkish culture adolescence live with their parents until they get married, and their families do not give up their protection and support their children for many years. These close relationships may prevent alienation. This is consistent with the population of the study, in the current study, 76.3% of the participants stated that they were living with their family member. This may affect their alienation levels. It is just a speculation that to talk about it in deeply, there are more studies needed in the future.

Moreover, it is also known that not only alienation but also egocentricity sub scales were significant predictors of pathological personality (Pad, Huprich, and Porcerelli, 2019). In the current study, it was hypothesized that egocentricity would positively predict cyber bullying, but the hypothesis was rejected. The results showed that egocentricity was not a significant predictor of cyber bullying. In the BORRTI inventory, high egocentricity levels are related to insecurity to others and highly egocentric people perceive existence of others only in the basis of their relationship

with them and they tend to manipulate others for their own purposes (Uluç et al., 2015). It is also stated that cyber bullies use more ego centric reasoning in the literature (Leduc et al., 2018). Thomas (2012) stated that cyber bullies may engage online bullying behaviors in order to establish dominance and manipulate others online communication and indicate that they are important. However, we could not find a significant association between egocentricity and cyber bullying this may be because of other variables such as there may be some other factors that affect cyber bullying like self-esteem (Kowalski et al., 2014) and moral disengagement (Robson, and Witerberg, 2013). They may not be egocentric but they may have low self-esteem, may have difficulties in defending their selves thus, engage in cyber bullying. On the other hand, they may be not egocentric but they may have higher levels of moral disengagement, thus they choose cyber bullying to show their dominance to others. It is suggested that future studies should also consider some important variables in cyber bullying such as self-esteem and moral disengagement. Additionally, it may also explain by the characteristic of the scale, because even the definition of the egocentricity is similar with insecure attachment that includes insecurity toward others, both sub scales share same items in the scale. Insecure attachment may also contain egocentricity in some ways. Thus, it is suggested that for the attachment security different measurements may be applied. Given that this is just a speculation future research is needed to discuss the relationship between egocentricity and cyber bullying.

Furthermore, for social incompetence, it was hypothesized that it would be a positive predictor of cyber bullying as well. However, the results showed that social incompetence was not a predictor of cyber bullying. The results were contradictory with the literature which showed that low level of social and emotional competencies were predictors of cyber bullying (Zych et al., 2018). Moreover, Marín-López et al. (2020) stated that high level of social and emotional competencies was negatively related to cyber bullying. Given that we could not find a significant relationship between social incompetence and cyber bullying and the literature indicates a consistent positive relation, that may be explained by the characteristic of the scale. The social incompetence sub scale has 6 items and in the current study, the internal consistency of it was the lowest one. Therefore, it can be concluded that it did not capture the social incompetence subconstruct well.

4.1.3   The Relationship Between Reality Testing and Cyber Bullying

In the third hypothesis, it was hypnotized that reality testing would positively predict cyber bullying. In the current study, it was found that reality testing was not a significant predictor of cyber bullying. In the literature, Bell (1995) stated that both object relations and reality testing was important fundamentals in people's healthy ego developments. It is known that the problems in the object relations of the person may affect and distort the external reality thus it causes problems and psychopathology (St. Clair, and Wigren, 2004). Even though there are not specific studies on reality testing and cyber bullying in the literature there are studies on bullying showed that perception of bullies may differ than others. For example, Reijntjes et al. (2013) found that bullies found bullying as rewarding. In their study, the researchers showed that highly engaging in bullying was found to be related to high perceived popularity. It means that, they see themselves as popular while engaging in bullying. Moreover, Walrave, and Heirman (2011) found that cyber bullies tend to minimize the impact of their behaviors on others. Therefore, the nonsignificant results of this study were surprising. This can be explained by the inventory. It had direct questions about person's doubt about the accuracy of their perception regarding internal and external reality, severe breaks with reality and difficulty in distinguishing reality from inner fantasy (Bell, 1995). Therefore, people might behave in a desirable way or exaggerating positive traits while answering the scale. Given that this is just a speculation future research is needed to talk about the consistent relationship between reality testing and cyber bullying.

4.1.4   The Relationship Between Sub Scales of Reality Testing and Cyber Bullying

In the fourth hypothesis, it was hypnotized that the sub scales of reality testing specifically, reality distortion, uncertainty of perception and hallucinations and delusions would positively predict cyber bullying. First of all, for reality distortion, it was hypothesized that it would positively predict cyber bullying. The result of the analysis showed that reality distortion was not a significant predictor of cyber bullying. Bell (1995) stated that the reality testing is an important factor on health ego development. In this respect, reality distortion can also be considered on the basis of ego strength and the quality of the defense mechanisms used. Even though there was no study exactly focus on the relationship between reality distortion and

cyber bullying, in the literature there were studies which showed that problematic internet use and cyber bullying was related to immature ego defense mechanisms (Waqas et al., 2016). In this way, the results of the study contradict with the literature. This may be explained by the characteristic of the scales, because the reality distortion was defined as having delusions of controlling, and following by others. It included items related to psychopathic characteristic. Even though there are studies that show relationships of reality distortion in normal population (Mills, and Aldag, 1999; Erbaş, 2015), mostly reality distortion was worked with psychopathologies (Middleton, 2004). To sum up, it is suggested to look for the relationship between cyber bullying and reality distortion also with different measurements.

Secondly, as in the fourth hypothesis it was hypnotized that uncertainty of perception would be a positive predictor of cyber bullying. In the current study, it was found that uncertainty of perception was not a significant predictor of cyber bullying. Even though there was not a specific study that shows the relationship between cyber bullying and uncertainty of perception, there are studies that show people who engage in bullying behaviors see bullying as rewarding (Reijntjes et al., 2013) and also these people tend to minimize the impact of their bullying behaviors done in online (Walrave, and Heirman, 2011). As it is seen, our results contradict with the literature and this can be explained by reality testing is an implicit process and it may be hard to be evaluate with self-reports measure, Stricker, and Healy, (1990) believed that these implicit processes should be evaluated with performance tests. It can be suggested that for the future research performance tests can be used as measurements of reality testing, to talk about the relationship between uncertainty of perceptions there need to be new studies in the future.

Moreover, in the fourth hypothesis it was hypothesized that hallucinations and delusions would be the positive predictor of cyber bullying. In the current study, hallucinations and delusions was not found a significant predictor of cyber bullying. Although there is not many research in the literature examining the relation between cyber bullying and hallucinations and delusions, it can be assumed from the research examining the relationship between psychopathic traits and online behaviors that there should be a positive relationship between hallucinations and cyber bullying. For example, Kırcaburun et al. (2018) found that dissociative experiences were not a

predictor of cyber bullying but associated with problematic social media usage. Psychopathic traits were found to be related to cyber bullying (Baroncelli et al., 2020) and psychoticism was associated with bullying (Özden, and İçellioğlu, 2014). Therefore, according to the literature, our nonsignificant findings are not consistent with the previous literature. This may be because of there may be other variables that affect people's hallucinations and decisions. On the other hand, there were very clear questions such as hearing voices, people may be hesitated to say the truth in order not be seen as not normal.

4.1.5   The Relationship Between Narcissism and Cyber Bullying

The fifth hypothesis was grandiose narcissism would positively predict cyber bullying. The results of the study showed that grandiose narcissism was not a significant predictor of cyber bullying. Although we did expect a relation, this finding of the study is consisted with the literature. There are studies that show grandiose narcissism was not a significant predictor of cyber bullying (Fanti, Demetriou, and Hawa, 2012; Goodboy, and Martin, 2015; Jonason, and Webster, 2010). However, there are also contradictory results that show positive associations between overt (grandiose) narcissism and cyber bullying (Ang et al., 2009). It is because that internet is a place for narcissists to present themselves as they wish (Twenge, and Campbell, 2003). In the present study, narcissism inventory had two subscales as grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, but the increases in the total score of the scale indicated the increase in the vulnerable narcissism (Şen, and Barışkın, 2019). It means that total score of the scale measures just vulnerable narcissism. Therefore, the nonsignificant result for the grandiose narcissism can be because of the incapability of the questions measuring the grandiose narcissism. Again, it is a speculative evaluation so the narcissism construct should be measured with a revised measure which captures each dimension clearly.

4.1.6   The Relationship Between Vulnerable Narcissism and Cyber Bullying

Sixthly, it was hypothesized that vulnerable narcissism would positively predict cyber bullying. As a result of the regression analysis, it was found that vulnerable narcissism was a predictor of cyber bullying. This finding is consistent with the literature. According to Roques (2020), Freud stated that trauma actives the self's previous attacks exposed during early periods which were shown as narcissistic

vulnerabilities. If there are problematic early relationship and therefore narcissistic vulnerabilities this maintain the bullying perpetrating. Fragile and sensitive personalities have difficulties in interpersonal relationships (Hojat, 1982), and may feel lonely so they may engage in cyber bullying (Çelik et al., 2021). Moreover, Fan et al. (2019) found that covert narcissism was a significant predictor of cyber bullying. Ang et al. (2009) found that covert (vulnerable) narcissism positively predicted the cyber bullying. Okada (2010) stated that covert narcissist people are very sensitive to how they are seen by others, their sayings and evaluations. And these people tend to show their aggressive behaviors in a covert way. Thus, they may select cyber areas to show their aggression to others, as cyber bullies. Indeed, it is known that anonymity is an important factor that increase cyber bullying (Nakano et al., 2016).

4.2. *Discussion of the Results on Cyber Victimization*

4.2.1 *The Relationship Between Object Relations and Cyber Victimization*

The seventh hypothesis was that object relation would positively predict cyber victimization. As a result, it was found that object relation positively predicted cyber victimization. Even though there are not similar studies in the literature, it is known that bullies make negative representations in the victims and make them internalize it. Thus, victims' dignity and repetition devalualized (Roques, 2020). In a study it was shown that limited and insufficient identification with caregivers found to be related to victimization (Finnegan, Hodges, and Perry, 1998). It means that if there is problematic object relations between the person and her/his caregiver, and there is no secure object, the person will see the external world as dangerous and insecure, and internalize the negative acts toward them such as bullying event and maintain bullying and become victimized. Moreover, Worsley, McIntyre, and Corcoran, (2019) showed that intimate and good relationships with mother was a factor that protects children from cyber victimization. Ševčíková et al. (2015) found that cyber victims who had good attachment with their parent were the one who seek more social support and help. Therefore, these findings showed that a good, stable caregiver as an object and a secure and good relationship with it, is a both protective factor and a preventive factor of being a cyber victim.

4.2.2   The Relationship Between Sub Scales of Object Relations and Cyber Victimization

In the eighth hypothesis, it was hypothesized that sub scales of object relations, specifically, alienation, egocentricity, insecure attachment, and social incompetence would positively predict cyber victimization. In the result, it was found that insecure attachment significantly predicted cyber bullying. The finding is consistent with the literature suggesting that insecure attachment styles was a risk factor for cyber victimization (Nikiforou et al., 2013; Brunstein Klomek et al., 2016; Canestrari et al., 2021). Varghese, and Pistole (2017) showed that maternal attachment anxiety explains 8% variance in cyber victimization. People who have secure attachment styles are less prone to live social difficulties, they have more qualified emotional dysregulation (Bowlby, 1973; Cassidy, 1994). Additionally, insecure attachment mostly occurs in the family situations where there is no intimate, loving, caring relationship, but controlling, non-democratic, punitive and dominant discipline (Roelofs, Meesters, and Muris, 2008; Arafat et al., 2020). It is also known that if there is a conflict in the home especially between parents this was associated with cyber victimization (Chen et al., 2018). The child may be familiar with the dominance, controlling, destructive relationships from her/his parents and continue being a victim in interpersonal relationships.

In the eighth hypothesis, it was also hypothesized that alienation would predict cyber victimization. However, it the present study the analysis showed that alienation was not a significant predictor of cyber victimization. The results were contradictory with the previous research in the literature that cyber victimization was associated with father alienation (Nikiforou et al., 2013). Even though there is no other study about alienation and cyber victimization, there are studies that also show, social alienation was linked to victimization in school (Rudolph et al., 2014). The results of the present study may be explained as people high in alienation are expected to be alienated from the group, friends, and social population. And this may protect them from being cyber bullied. Additionally, the contradictory results may also be explained as the characteristic of the scale. It is thought that there are many overlapping features of both dimensions of object relations alienation and insecure attachment. Alienation sub scale refers to lack of trust, distance in interpersonal relationship besides, insecure attachment; need for intimacy but very sensitivity to

rejection, abandonment and loneliness. In attachment theory; avoidant attachment style is defined as not seeking closeness and not showing emotions in relationships, these people perceive the world as dangerous and others as untrustable and they tend to avoid stressful situations. As it is seen alienation was similar with insecure attachment. Given that this is just a speculation future research is need to talk about the consistent relationship between alienation and cyber victimization.

In the eighth hypothesis, egocentricity was hypothesized to be a significantly positive predictor of cyber victimization. The results showed that egocentricity was not a significant predictor of cyber bullying. There was not any research on egocentricity and cyber victimization. Egocentricity was defined as insecurity to others intentions, controlling others for own demands, omnipotence (Bell, 1995). This is not so common for Turkish culture, because in Turkish culture self-sacrificing, being altruistic, kind, helpful, prosocial are really important. However, it is known that adolescence who show prosocial behaviors become the target of bullying (Romera et al., 2016). It means that there are limited studies to talk about the relationship between egocentricity and cyber victimization, in the future studies more studies are needed.

Furthermore, in the eighth hypothesis, it was hypostasized that social incompetence would positively predict cyber victimization. However, social incompetence did not include the analysis because it was not associated with cyber victimization. There are contradictory studies about social incompetence and cyber victimization. It was found an association between social anxiety, social competence difficulties with cyber victimization (Navarro et al., 2012) and on the other hand, Romera et al. (2016) found that cyber victims had higher socially competence levels than cyber bullies. In the present study, there was no association between social incompetence and cyber bullying and this may be caused by the inventory. In BORRTI, social incompetence sub scale has 6 item and in the current study, its internal consistency was the lowest one. That may be why it was not associated with cyber victimization. Given that this is just a speculation future research is need to talk about the consistent relationship between social incompetence and cyber victimization.

4.2.3   The Relationship Between Reality Testing and Cyber Victimization

The nineth hypothesis was that reality testing would positively predict cyber victimization. Analysis showed that, reality testing did not positively predict cyber victimization. Despite there are not any studies about reality testing of cyber victims, contradictory to current study's results; there are studies that show people who victimized in childhood lived some perceptual impairments such as reality distortion, uncertainty of perception, hallucinations and delusions and psychoticism and also dissociation (Sacco, and Farber, 1999). This may be explained with the difference between the victimization of cyber bullying and other victimizations. The results were all related with sexual, physical victimization, abuse, and maltreatment (Sacco, and Farber, 1999; Davies, 1996). In addition to that, a study showed that both cyber bullying and traditional bullying associated with negative outcomes for victims but when the traditional bullying was controlled cyber bullying was not a significant predictor of mental health problems anymore (Hase et al., 2015). The reason of these findings may be related with other factors that affect the problems in reality testing in other type of victimization. However, in cyber bullying mostly the perpetrator was not known because of the anonymity. In the physical victimization, Roques (2020) stated that victims see their perpetrators and most of the time they are friends of victims. In the bullying event, the friends bully gives incoherent messages and this creates a doubt in the victim's emotion life and in reality testing. So, anonymity of the cyber bully may affect the results on the reality testing of cyber victims. The current study's result may be related to measurements, to talk about the relationship between reality testing and cyber victimization deeply, new studies are needed.

4.2.4   The Relationship Between Sub Scales of Reality Testing and Cyber Victimization

In the tenth hypothesis, it was hypothesized that the sub scales of reality testing specifically, reality distortion, uncertainty of perception and hallucinations and delusions would positively predict cyber victimization. First of all, for reality distortion, it was hypnotized that it would be positively predict cyber victimization. The results of the study showed that reality distortion was not a predictor of cyber victimization. In the literature, Dorey (1981) stated that bullies make negative representations in the victims and make them internalize it, thus victims' dignity and repetition devalualized. This means that victims start to think and feel that they

deserved it. This is similar to the Ferenczi (1949)'s view of sexual abuse cases. In these cases, victims identify themselves with the violator so that the penalizing fantasies occur. Violator no more becomes a differentiated external object. At this point self and the object, self and non-self, external and psychic reality become complicated. This is related to the definition of reality distortion. In the scale higher points indicate that having delusions such as following, controlling or will be punishing by someone. Therefore, the nonsignificant results of this study were surprising. This can be explained by the inventory. As it had direct questions about person's doubt about the accuracy of their perception regarding internal and external reality, severe breaks with reality and difficulty in distinguishing reality from inner fantasy (Bell, 1995), people might want to be seen in a desirable way or exaggerating positive traits while answering the scale. Given that this is just a speculation future research is needed to talk about the consistent relationship between reality testing and cyber victimization.

Secondly, in as in the tenth hypothesis, it was hypnotized that uncertainty of perception would be a positive predictor of cyber victimization. In the current study, it was found that uncertainty of perception was not a predictor of cyber victimization. Although we did expect a relation, this finding of the study is consisted with the previous research in literature. Even though there was no study specifically on cyber victimization and uncertainty of perception, there are studies showed traditional victims perceive the bullying they lived more harsh and crueler than the cyber victims were stated their bullying victimization (Campbell et al., 2012). In the traditional bullying victim's perception were more distorted. This finding supports our results. Campbell et al. (2012) also added that even though cyber victims did not perceive the bullying as harsh as traditional victims, cyber victims stated higher psychological problems. There may be some other variables that affect their uncertainty of perception. Maybe the role of audience and bystanders are needed to be evaluated. To talk about it in deeply, more studies are needed. These cognitive elements related to being cyber victimization is an area of future research.

Moreover, in the tenth hypothesis it was hypothesized that hallucinations and delusions would be a positive predictor of cyber victimization. In the current study, it was found that hallucinations and delusions was not a significant predictor cyber victimization. Even though there was no specific study which focus on the

relationship between hallucinations and delusions and cyber victimization, there are studies that show the relationship between psychoticism and victimization of bullying (Özden, and İçellioğlu, 2014). As it is known that hallucination and delusions are the main symptoms of psychoticism. The results of the current study are contradictory with the previous studies. This difference may occur because of the different measurement usage. To talk about deeply, future studies are need on cyber victimization and hallucinations and delusions.

4.2.5 The Relationship Between Narcissism and Cyber Victimization

The eleventh hypothesis was grandiose narcissism would positively predict cyber victimization. However, grandiose narcissism was not found as a significant predictor of cyber victimization. Although we did expect a relation, the results were coherent with the findings in the literature. For example, some studies show that even though grandiose narcissism was associated with cyber victimization, it was not a predictor of cyber victimization (Fan et al., 2019). Moreover, Goodboy, and Martin (2015) stated that grandiose narcissism was not a significant predictor of cyber victimization in their study. Additionally, Zerach (2016) also showed that grandiose narcissism was associated with cyber victimization in homosexual participants but not in heterosexual participants. Therefore, these findings showed that it is not the grandiose, exploitativeness of narcissism especially in cyber victimization. In some of the measurements narcissism only taken with grandiose narcissism so the different two dimensional narcissism scales can be used in the future studies to talk about the relationship between narcissism and cyber victimization.

4.2.6 The Relationship Between Vulnerable Narcissism and Cyber Victimization

In the twelfth hypothesis, it was hypothesized that vulnerable narcissism would positively predict cyber victimization. As a result of the regression, it was found that vulnerable narcissism was a predictor of cyber victimization. The results were similar with the literature (e.g., Zerach, 2016; Fan et al., 2019). It was known that narcissism was associated with externalizing behaviors, aggression (Fanti, and Kimonis, 2013), and behavior problems such as bullying (Fanti, and Frangou, 2018). Moreover, Roques (2020) stated that both the bully and the victim share a narcissistic vulnerability, victim from a masochistic way. It is known that vulnerable narcissistic people seem shy and anxious under their grandiose appearances (Gabbard, 1989).

Result may be explained by that narcissistic vulnerability was found to be related to social withdrawal, emotional dysregulation (Miller et al., 2011), lack of confidence, neuroticism, social avoidance (Fan et al., 2019), they may be easily targeted of cyber bullying. It means that they cannot defend themselves and feel failed. They may also be hypersensitive to criticism (Wink, 1991) and these reactions reinforce cyber bullying.

There is an important finding that object relations were predictor of both cyber bullying and cyber victimization. There may be different variables that affect object relations and cyber bullying and victimization such as parenting styles. It is known that parenting such as helicopter parenting which is defined as overprotective, intrusive, not giving chance to the children to do something on their own, is related to low self-esteem and introversion problems (Odenweller, Booth-Butterfield, and Weber, 2014; Yaşin, and Özcan, 2020). So, they can not handle bullying events and they eventually be the victim of the cyber bullies. On the other hand, some studies revealed that cyber bullies may have parents such as controlling, intrusive, punishing, and authoritarian. It is thought that learning theory is an important factor (Lucas, 2018). That is, children who observe agressive behaviors at home will eventually act according to that and they may show more agressive behaviors (i.e., bullying) in their relationships with their peers. Thus, bullies who have problematic object relations may have problematic parent-child relationships and these bullies learn to show similar behaviors to others and engage in externalizing problems such as bullying.

Similar surprising results were found on narcissistic vulnerability as well. Narcissistic vulnerability was a predictor of both cyber bullying and victimization. It is known that people high in narcissistic vulnerability, are sensitive to other's evaluations and they engage in aggressive behaviors to express themselves (Okada, 2010). Thus, cyberbullying gives them a great platform to show their aggression in a covert way. On the other hand, for the cyber victims who are also high in narcissistic vulnerability, it is thought that some personality characteristics such as neuroticism, low self-esteem and confidence, vulnerability, avoidant styles of interpersonal relationships are the factors that affect them being victims (Fan et al., 2019). The other thing that is significant in the development of narcissism is parental coldness (Kohut, 1977; Otway, and Vignoles, 2006). If the child is rejected, she may become

frustrated and engage in bullying to show her hostility or on the other hand, because of the emotional rejection she may become more distressed and become withdrawn which make her become the target of bullying. So, emotional regulation or defense mechanisms may have an effect on this relationship. Therefore, future studies should also consider other mechanisms that may have an effect on being bully or victim. Additionally, it is not known if the participants were both cyber bullies and victims. There is a term as bully-victim, which may cause these results of the present study, in the future studies bully-victims should also be considered.

4.3.   *Sociodemographic Variables*

4.3.1   *Sociodemographic Variables and Cyber Bullying*

Given that object relations and vulnerable narcissism explained just 12% of the variance. Therefore, we intended to examine the possible roles of sociodemographic variables in the current study. Because of that some of these variables were found to be significant, the results of them will be evaluated in this section in a detailed way.

In this section, various sociodemographic variables which were found to be significantly related to cyber bullying were added to the analysis. As shown previously, gender, parental status, daily internet usage, previous bullying and victimization experiences were found to be associated with cyber bullying.

Firstly, previous bullying experience predicted cyber bullying. This is an important predictor; it is supported some result in the literature. For example, Beran, and Li (2005) found that 15% of the traditional bullies become cyber bullies in cyber areas, and it was suggested that parents and educators need to consider adolescents' proneness to cyber bullying and be careful about this situation and monitor those children and adolescents.   There are similar studies show that cyber bullying overlaps with traditional bullying (Olenik-Shemesh et al., 2012; Tarablus, Heiman, and Olenik-Shemesh, 2015). This may be explained as the motives of some of the cyber bullies. It can be said that victimized people may engage in cyber bullying as bullies to take revenge. It is known that aggressive people tend to be more revengeful to overcome frustration with force (Bergman et al., 2007). König, Gollwitzer, and Steffgen (2010) showed that there is a common trait of cyber bullies such as being vengeful and being prone to victimize their own perpetrator who bullied them

traditionally. That may be why previous bullying experience predict cyber bullying levels of university students.

Secondly, it was found that daily internet usage predicted cyber bullying significantly. This finding was supported by many research (e.g., Ybarra, 2004; Hinduja, and Patchin, 2008; Erdur-Baker, and Kavşut, 2007; Ekşi, 2012). Studies show that cyber bullying was positively correlated with increase of technology usage (Topçu et al., 2008). Papatraianou, Levine, and West (2014) worked on the protecting factors and risks of cyber bullying according to the social ecological theory. It was found that the accessing cyber areas was a risk factor for cyber bullying. Moreover, in a study, it was stated that the increase in the daily internet usage was the most important variable that predict cyber bullying (Barlett et al., 2019). One possible explanation may be that the internet makes it easier for the people to access many areas and to join social media, chat, applications, games, and videos. Therefore, it can be said that the pervasive use of internet may increase the risks of internet.

Thirdly, parental status was the other significant predictor of cyber bullying. There are studies which support these findings in the literature (Le et al., 2017). Additionally, Shams et al. (2017) shows that children who witnessed their parents' violent and broken relationship were more prone to be cyber bullying perpetrators in the future. Therefore, it can be inferred that witnessing the violence and conflicts may be an important factor while explaining the cyber bullying. Moreover, in the study conducted by Öngider (2006), it is stated that adolescents with divorced parents have difficulty in controlling their impulses and they tend to engage in negative behaviors. Therefore, with the help of the literature given above, it can be said that the parental status of the participants is an important factor on cyber bullying. In the future studies other variables about family and parenting can be considered in the studies.

Lastly, gender was predictor of cyber bullying. The results were coherent with the literature, studies have found that males were more likely to be perpetrator in cyber bullying (Wang, Ianotti, and Nansel, 2009). One of the explanations can be done by aggression. Aggression is an important characteristic of cyber bullying and it is known that males are prone to show more aggression (Eagly, and Crowley, 1986).

Another reason may be that males were found to be more bully, victim and bull-victim (Erdur-Baker, and Kavşut, 2007), additionally, males also experienced of cyber victimization in some areas like online gaming (Kowalski et al., 2012). It can be also explained by the activation in the internet. It is known that males are more active and professional in using internet (Schumacher, and Morahan-Martin, 2001). According to reports of TUIK (2020), internet usage is higher in males in Turkey.

4.3.2 *Sociodemographic Variables and Cyber Victimization*

In this section, various sociodemographic variables which were found to be significantly related to cyber victimization was added to the analysis. As shown previously, parental status, previous bullying and previous victimization were found to be associated with cyber victimization.

In the analysis, it was found that previous victimization experience was the strongest predictor of cyber victimization. The result was related with the literature (Li, 2007), also Olweus (2012) argued that cyber bullying can be an overrated phenomenon that overlap with traditional bullying so much. Li (2007) stated that most of the bullying and victimization incidences done in school areas transferred to cyber areas. It may be related to traditionally victimized children may be seen as socially vulnerable and become also target in the online platforms.

Secondly, parental status was a significant predictor of cyber victimization. This finding is relevant as in the literature it was stated that having divorced or separated parents were associated with cyber victimization (Chen et al., 2018). Single-parent students were also prone to be cyber bullied more than others (Bevilacqua et al., 2017). On the other hand, if the person exposed to violence between the parent before or during separation, these exposures were also related with cyber victimization (Sanzone-Goodrich, 2013). People who were used to conflicts and because of the conflicts if they were victimized in the family, they may be maintain to be a victim also in cyber areas. It may be also related to parental monitoring and control. In a one parent families the level of monitoring and controlling will be decrease. Therefore, it can be concluded that parental status is an important factor that may be risk factor for people cyber bullied.

Lastly, previous bullying experience was a predictor of cyber victimization. It is an important result that is coherent with the literature. It was found that people who harassed others were prone to be harassed online (Ybarra, and Mitchell, 2004) and vice versa, being a cyber victim may be a risk factor for being a bully (Livazovic, and Ham, 2019). With the help of internet and its power anonymity people who have not courage to fight back to her perpetrator may also use internet in cyber bullying (Erdur-Baker, and Kavşut, 2007), and this may also result in victimization. It can be inferred from these previous bullying experiences was a risk factor for being bullied in online.

Although we had added grade, working status of mother, working status of father, primary caregiver, and socio-economic status variables to the analysis, we could not find any significant difference among the groups in terms of their cyber bullying and cyber victimization levels. This may be because of the characteristics of the sample which includes mostly participants from middle socioeconomic status, less from other socioeconomic statuses. Participants were mostly raised by mothers as caregivers, other caregivers were less in the present study. Therefore, future studies should consider these deficiencies in this study and should balance the number of participants in each group to compare the group differences in a more comprehensive manner.

4.4. *Limitation and Future Suggestions*

The present study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. Firstly, it is a correlational study which does not give causal reasoning among cyber bullying, cyber victimization, object relation, and narcissism. To explain the causal nature of the relations, longitudinal studies are suggested to be conducted.

Secondly, as it is known that object relations focus on the early relationships and it has its own conceptualization. Therefore, it is hard to evaluate such a wide concept with a self-measurement. BORRTI is a self-report measure which focuses on person's daily life relationships. Participants answer questions with consciousness about their relationship however, object relations may be based on early unconscious processes. There are contradictory findings about evaluating object relations, Stricker, and Healey (1990) stated that object relations can be evaluated with performance tests because the concepts are unconscious. On the other hand, Huprich,

and Greenberg (2003) showed that object relations may be evaluated by using both performance and self-report measurements. The results of the study can be replicated with another measurements like Rorschach or TAT. Additionally, BORRTI has its own object relations dimensions that would create confusion in comparisons with findings obtained with other measurement tools (Huprich, and Greenberg, 2003). In addition to that, narcissism was measured by pathological narcissism inventory. Therefore, in the future studies different measures can be used, because in PNI total scores found to be indicated vulnerable narcissism (Şen, 2019). Moreover, to measure the grandiose narcissism a different scale can be preferred.

Furthermore, the study was conducted among university students so, it may not be generalizable to other age groups. Additionally, number female and male participants were not balanced. Therefore, in the future studies, to be able to make precise comparisons among genders, it is recommended to choose a sample which have similar sample size of each gender. Another limitation was the data was collected via online forms. People could not able to easily ask questions to the researcher, they were able to send e-mail but they may not prefer to send it. Moreover, some of the people may have difficulty to access the internet or use online survey sites. So, they may not apply the surveys. It is thought that a large number of items may create a confounding effect on the findings such as fatigue, boredom, and distraction. Lastly, the present study did not focus on non-involvers who have neither engaged in cyber bullying or ever victimized, further studies can evaluate the relationship of other positions with narcissism and object relations.

CHAPTER 5:   CONCLUSION

5.1.   Conclusion and Implications

The aim of the current study was to evaluate the role of object relations, narcissism, on cyber bullying and cyber victimization among university students. Additionally, some sociodemographic variables namely gender, parental status, daily internet usage, previous bullying and victimization experiences were also analyzed. As a result of the regression analysis, it was found object relations, insecure attachment, and vulnerable narcissism were significant predictors of cyber bullying. Similarly, in the analyses done for cyber victimization it was seen that object relations, insecure attachment and vulnerable narcissism were significant predictors of cyber victimization.

In the additionally analyses, it was seen that various socio demographic variables such as previous bullying experience, daily internet usage, parental status and gender were also predictors of cyber bullying. On the other hand, for the cyber victimization sociodemographic variables namely previous victimization experience, parental status and previous bullying experience were found to be significant predictors.

This study is unique in terms of its theoretical design. Specifically, there were not any studies focusing on the role of object relations on cyber bullying and cyber victimization. Moreover, the present study was unique by evaluating object relations and narcissism together, on cyber bullying and victimization. Therefore, the present study makes an important contribution to the limited knowledge in the literature. Another strength of the study can be its analysis method. Specifically, the results were analyzed by both total and the sub scales of the BORRTI. Therefore, it is leading the literature with its findings, even though some of them were not significant.

Since there are many studies on cyber bullying and cyber victimization which were mostly focused on prevention and intervention (Dilmaç, 2009; Bal, and Karaman, 2015), bullying was still a significant problem for both adolescents and also emerging adults. . Moreover, altough it is well-known that cyber bullying have some detrimental effects on individual's development from secondary school students to emerging adults (Tanrıkulu, 2015), the origins and developmental course of cyber

bullying has not been well understood yet. . Therefore, examining personality characteristics, especially object relations and narcissism, will contribute to literature to understand the role of personality characteristics on cyber bullying and cyber victimization.

The present study makes important contributions to the literature with its sample. As a result of the current study, it can be said that problematic family relationships, attachment, and vulnerable narcissism were the risk factors for both cyber bullying and cyber victimization. To strengthen the object relations and decreasing vulnerable narcissism will help students who are cyber bullies and cyber victims. In the prevention programs people who have divorced or separated parents may be incorporated. Situations which may cause to have problematic object relations and insecure attachment styles, such as loss, traumatic life events can be considered among the university students can be considered by the counselors. Intervention programs may design to include converting both the self and others object negative to positive, this may decrease problematic object relations. Beside these, both the academic personal, and the university students may be informed about the nature and the risks of cyber bullying. Additionally, safe internet usage and communication technology can be presented during classes. Because, cyber bullying and victimization also effect students' mental health, interpersonal relationships and academic success. Considering the results of the present research, counselling of the universities design group works. University students may be far away from homes and social/parental support, thus, supporting, monitoring cyber victims in university students is an important factor for preventing and solving cyber bullying and victimization.

Examining the cyber bullying and cyber victimization among university students. It is known that cyber bullying is mostly faced with secondary and high school years. However, as mentioned before it is still a problem among university students. It is important to handle with cyber bullying and cyber victimization during these years. Because it is known that when it is not solved in the university, cyber bullying may continue in adulthood or in the workplace (Kota et al., 2014). Therefore, it is also important topic for universities and counseling departments. Every counseling department should support cyber victims, cyber bullies and people who have problematic object relations and vulnerable narcissism, and help them beside the

prevention programs. The results also demonstrate that early childhood experiences, parent-child relationships, early school experiences and relationships with friends are really important and fundamental in a person's health developments. Thus, clinicians should focus on these concepts and developmental areas in their clients.

REFERENCES

Aberson, C.L., Healy, M. and Romero V. (2000) *Ingroup bias and self-esteem: A meta-analysis,* Personality and Social Psychology Review, Vol. 4(1), pp. 157-173.

Agnew, R. (1992) *Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency*, Criminology, Vol. 30(1), pp. 47–88.

Akbulut, Y., Şahin, Y.L. and Erişti, B. (2010) *Cyberbullying victimization among Turkish online social utility member,* Journal of Educational Technology & Society, Vol. 13(4), pp. 192-201.

Akhtar, S. (2000) *The shy narcissist,* in Sandler, J., Michaels, R., Fonagy, P., ed., *Changing İdeas in a changing World: The revolution in psychoanalysis.* Essays in honor of Arnold Cooper, 1st Edition, pp. 111-119.

Almeida, A., Correia, I., Marinho, S. and Garcia, D. (2012) *Virtual but Not Less Real,* in Li, Q Cross, D. and Smith, P.K., *Cyberbullying in the Global Playground: Research from International Perspectives,* 1st Edition, Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Allen, J. P., Porter, M., MacFarland, C., McElhaney, K.B. and Marsh, P., (2007*) The relation of attachment security to adolescents' paternal and peer relationships, depression, and externalizing behavior,* Child Development, Vol. 78(1), pp. 1222-1239.

Amichai-Hamburger, Y. (2002) *Internet and personality,* Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 18(1), pp. 1-10.

Ang, R.P., Ong, E. Y., Lim, J. C. and Lim, E.W. (2009) *From narcissistic exploitativeness to bullying behavior: the mediating role of approval of aggression beliefs,* Social Development, Vol. 19(4), pp. 721–35.

Ang, R.P., Tan, K. and Mansor, A.T. (2011) *Normative beliefs about aggression as a mediator of narcissistic exploitativeness and cyberbullying,* Journal of Interpersonal Violence, Vol. 26(13), pp. 2619–2634.

Arafat, S.M.Y., Akter, H., Islam, M.A., Shah, M.M.A. and Kabir, R. (2020) *Parenting: Types, Effects and Cultural Variation,* Asian Journal of Pediatric Research, Vol. 3(3), pp. 32-36.

Arıcak, O.T. (2009) *Psychiatric symptomatology as a predictor of cyberbullying among university students,* Euroasion Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 9(34), pp. 167-184.

Arıcak, T., Siyahhan, S., Uzunhasanoğlu, A., Sarıbeyoğlu, S., Çıplak, S., Yılmaz, N. and Memedov, C. (2008) *Cyberbullying among Turkish adolescents,* CyberPsychology and Behavior, Vol. 11(3), pp. 253-261.

Aslan, A., and Önay Doğan, B. (2017*) Çevrimiçi Şiddet: Bir siber zorbalık alanı olrak Potinss örneği,* Marmara İletişim Dergisi, Vol. 1(27), pp. 95-119.

Ayas, T. and Horzum, M.B. (2011) *Öğretmenlerin sanal zorbalık algılarının çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi,* International Online Journal of Educational Science, Vol. 3(2), pp. 619-640.

Ayas, T. and Piştkin, M. (2011) *Investigation of bullying among high school students with regard to sex, grade level and school type,* Elementary Education Online, Vol. 10(2), pp. 550-568.

Bacal, H. A. and Newman, K. M., (1990) *Theories of Object Relations: Bridges to Self Psychology*. 2nd Edition. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bal, P.N. and Kahraman, S. (2015) *The effect of cyber bullying sensibility inprovement group training program on gifted students,* Journal of Gifted Education Research, Vol. 3(1), 48-57.

Balan, R., Dobrean, A., and Balazsi, R. (2018) *Indirect effects of parental and peer attachment on bullying and victimization among adolescents: The role of negative automatic thoughts,* Aggressive Behavior, Vol. 44(6), pp. 561-570.

Bandura, A. (1997) *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control,* New York: Freeman.

Banks, R. (1997) *Bullying in Schools* [Online]. Available at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED407154.pdf, (Accessed: 20 August 2020).

Batıgün, A.D. and Hasta, D. (2010) *İnternet bağımlılığı: Yalnızlık ve kişilerarası tarzları açısından bir değerlendirme,* Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi, Vol. 11(3), pp. 213-219.

Baroncelli, A., Perkins, E. R., Ciucci, E., Frick, P. J., Patrick, C. J. and Sica, C. (2020) *Triarchic model traits as predictors of bullying and cyberbullying in adolescence,* Journal of interpersonal violence, (in press), pp. 1-27.

Barlett, C.P., Madison, C.S., Heath, J.B. and DeWitt, C.C. (2019) *Please browse responsibly: A correlational examination of technology access and time spent online in the Barlett Gentile Cyberbullying Model,* Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 92(1), pp. 250-255.

Bartholomew, K. and Horowitz, L.M. (1991) *Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four category model,* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 61(1), pp. 226-244.

Batıgün, A. D. and Hasta, D. (2010) *İnternet bağımlılığı: Yalnızlık ve kişilerarası ilişki tarzları açısından bir değerlendirme,* Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi, Vol. 11(1), pp. 213-219.

Baumeister, R.F., Bushman, B.J., and Campbell, W.K. (2000) *Self-esteem, narcissism, and aggression: Does violence result from low self-esteem or from threatened egotism?,* Current Directions in Psychological Science, Vol. 9(1), pp. 26–29.

Bell, M. D. (1995) *Bell Object Relations and Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI).* 1st Edition. Manual. California: Western Psychological Services.

Beran, T. and Li, Q. (2005) *Cyber-harassment: A study of a new method for an old behavior,* Journal of Educational Computing Research, Vol. 32(3), pp. 265–277.

Beran, T. and Li, Q. (2007) *The relationship between cyberbullying and school bullying,* Journal of Student Wellbeing, Vol. 1(2), pp. 15-33.

Beran, T. (2009) *Correlates of peer victimization and achievement: an exploratory model,* Psychology in the school, Vol. 46(4), pp. 348-361.

Bergman, S.M., McIntyre, M. D., and James, L.R. (2007) *Identifying the aggressive personality,* Journal of Emotional Abuse, Vol. 4(3-4), pp. 81-93.

Beyazıt, U., Yılmaz, Z., Aslan, S.B., and Bütün Ayhan, A. (2019) *Ebeveynlerin çocuklarını ihmal durumları ile çocuklarındaki internet bağımlılığı ve siber zorbalık davranışları arasındaki ilişki,* Turkish Studies Educational Science, Vol. 14(3), pp. 993-1008.

Bevilacqua, L., Shackleton, N., Hale, D., Allen, E., Bond, L., Christie, D., Elbourne, D., Fitzgerald-Yau, N., Fletcher, A., Jones, R. Miners, A., Scott, S., Wiggins, M., Bonell, C. and Vines, M. R. (2017) *The role of family and school-level factors in bullying and cyberbullying: A cross-sectional study,* BMC Pediatrics Vol. 17(1), pp. 160–170.

Bhat, S.C. (2008) *Cyberbullying: Overview and strategies for school counsellors, guidance officers, and all school personnel,* Australian Journal of Guidance and Counseling, Vol. 18(1), pp. 53-66.

Bingöl, T.Y. (2018) *Determining the predictors of self-efficacy and cyber bullying,* International Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 7(2), pp. 138-143.

Bollmer, J.M., Harris, M.J. and Milich, R. (2006) *Reactions to bullying and peer victimization: Narratives, physiological arousal, and personality,* Journal of Research in Personality, Vol. 40(5), pp. 803–828.

Bonanno, R.A. and Hymel, S. (2013) *Cyber bullying and internalizing difficulties: above and beyond the impact of traditional forms of bullying,* Journal of youth and adolescence, Vol. 42(5), pp. 685–697.

Bowlby, J. (1973) *Attachment and Loss: Volume II: Separation, Anxiety and Anger.* 1st Edition. New York: Basic Books.

Brochado, S., Soares, S. and Fraga, S. (2016) *A scoping review on studies of cyberbulllying prevalence among adolescents,* Trauma, Violence & Abuse, Vol. 18(5), pp. 523-531.

Bruhn, A.R. (1992). *The early memories procedure: A projective test of autobiographical memory: II,* Journal of Personality Assessment, Vol. 58(2), pp. 326-346.

Brunstein Klomek, A., Kopelman-Rubin, D., Al-Yagon, M., Berkowitz, R., Apter, A and Mikulincer, M. (2015). *Victimization by bullying and attachment to parents and teachers among student who report learning disorders and/or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder,* Learning Disability Quarterly, Vol. 39(3), pp.1-9

Buelga, S., Martinez-Ferrer, B. and Cava, M. J. (2017) *Differences in family climate and family communication among cyberbullies, cybervictims, and cyber bully-victims in adolescents,* Computers in Human Behavior, Vol.76(1), pp. 164-173.

Buelow, G., McClain, M., and McIntosh, I. (1996) *A new measure for an important construct: The Attachment and Object Relations Inventory,* Journal of Personality Assessment, Vol. 66(3), pp. 604–623.

Bulfinch, T. (1913). *Stories of Gods and Heroes.* 1st Edition. New York: Crowell.

Burnukara, P. (2009). *İl ve Orta Ergenlikte Geleneksel ve Sanal Akran Zorbalığına Betimsel Bir İnceleme.* Unpublished Master's Thesesis. Hacettepe University.

Calvete, E., Orue, I., Estevez, A., Villardon, L. and Padilla, P. (2010) *Cyberbullying in adolescents: Modalities and aggressors' profile,* Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 26(5), pp. 1128-1135.

Campbell, M.A., Slee, P.T., Spears, B., Butler, D. and Kift, S. (2013) *Do cyberbullies suffer too? Cyberbullies' perceptions of the harm they cause to others and to their own mental health,* School Psychology International, Vol. 34(6), pp. 613–629.

Campbell, M., Spears, B., Slee, P., Butler, D. and Kift, S. (2012) *Victim's perceptions of traditional and cyber bullying, and the psychosocial correlates of their victimization,* Emotional and Behavioral Difficulties, Vol. 17(3-4), pp. 389-401.

Canestrari, C., Del Moral Arroya, G., Carrieri, A., Muzi, M. and Fermani, A. (2021) *Parental attachment and cyberbullying victims: the mediation effect of gelotophobia,* Current Psychology, A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues [Online]. Available at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12144-021-01642-6 (Accessed: 25 May 2021).

Cassidy, J. (1994) *Emotion regulation: Influences of attachment relationships,* Monographs of the society for research in child development, Vol. 59(2-3), pp. 228-249.

Chen, Q., Lo, C.K., Zhu, Y., Cheung, A., Chan, K.L. and Ip, P. (2018) *Family poly-victimization and cyberbullying among adolescents in a Chinese school sample,* Child Abuse and Neglect, Vol. 77(1), pp. 180-187.

Cillessen, A.H.N. and Rose, A.J. (2005) *Understanding popularity in the peer system,* Current Directions in Psychological Science, Vol. 14(2), pp. 102-105.

Cain, N.M., Pincus, A.L. and Ansell, E.B. (2008) *Narcissism at the crossroads: Phenotypic description of pathological narcissism across clinical theory, social/personality psychology, and psychiatric diagnosis,* Clinical Psychology Review, Vol. 28(4), pp. 638-656.

Connolly, I. and O'Moore, M. (2003) *Personality and family relations of children who bully,* Personality and Individual Differences, Vol. 35(3), 559–567.

Cooper, A.M. (1984) *Narcissism in Normal Development,* In Zales, M.R. ed., *Character Pathology: Theory and Treatmen.* 1st Edition. New York: Brunner.

Crothers, L.M. and Kolbert, J.B. (2008) *Tackling a problematic behavior management issue: Teachers' intervention in childhood bullying problems,* Intervention in Schol and Clinic, Vol. 43(3), pp. 132-139.

Çelik, S., Atak, H. and Erguzen, A. (2012) *The effect of personality on cyberbullying among university students in Turkey,* Eğitim Araştırmaları- Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 12(49), pp. 129-150.

Davies, J.M. (1996) *Dissociation, repression and reality testing in the countertransference the controversy over memory and false memory in the psychoanalytic treatment of adult survivors of childhood sexual abuse,* Psychoanalytic dialogues, Vol. 6(2), pp. 189-218.

Dickinson, K.A. and Pincus, A.L. (2003) *Interpersonal analysis of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism,* Journal of Personality Disorder, Vol. 17(3), pp. 188-207.

Dilmaç, B. (2009) *Psychological needs as a predictor of cyber bullying: A preliminary report on college students,* Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, Vol. 9(3), pp. 1307–1325.

Dorey, R. (1981) *La Relation d'emprise,* Nouvelle Revue de Psychanalyse, Vol. 24(1), pp. 117-140.

Dorland, W. A. N. (1986), *The American Illustrated Medical Dictionary*, 22nd Edition, Philadelphia: Sounders Company.

Durbin, J. and Watson, G.S. (1951) *Testing for serial correlation in least-squares Regression II.,* Biometrika, Vol. 38(1-2), pp. 159–177.

Eagly, A.H. and Crowley, M. (1986) *Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature,* Psychological bulletin, Vol. 100(3), pp. 283-308.

Ekşi, F. (2012) *Narsistik kişilik özelliklerinin internet bağımlılığı ve siber zorbalığı yordama düzeyinin yol analizi ile incelenmesi,* Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, Vol. 12(3), pp. 1683-1706.

Emmons, R.A. (1987) *Narcissism: Theory and measurement,* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 52(1), pp. 11-17.

Erbaş, S. (2015). *Yeme Tutumlarının nesne İlişkileri Kuramı Çerçevesinde İncelenmesi,* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Hacettepe University.

Erdur-Baker Ö. and Tanrıkulu, İ. (2010) *Psychological consequences of cyber bullying experiences among Turkish secondary school children,* Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 2(2), pp. 2771-2776.

Erdur-Baker, Ö. and Kavşut, F. (2007) *Akran zorbalığının yeni yüzü: Siber zorbalık,* Eğitim Araştırmaları, Vol. 27(1), pp. 31-42.

Estell, D.B., Farner, T.W., Irvin, M.J., Crowther, A., Akos, P. and Boudah, J.D. (2009) *Students with exceptionalities and the peer group context of bullying and victimization in late elementary school,* Journal of Child Family Studies, Vol. 18(2), pp. 136-150.

Fagot, B.I. and Kavanagh, K. (1990) *The prediction of antisocial behavior from avoidant attachment classifications,* Child Development, Vol. 61(3), pp. 864-873.

Fairbairn, W. R. D. (1944). *Endopsychic structure considered in terms of object relationships.* International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, Vol. 25(1), pp. 70-92.

Fan, C., Chu, X., Zhang, M. and Zhou, Z. (2019) *Are narcissists more likely to be involved in cyberbullying? Examining the mediating role of self-esteem,* Journal of Interpersonal Violence, Vol. 34(15), pp. 3127-3150.

Fanti, K.A., Demetriou, A.G and Hawa, V. (2012) *A longitudinal study of cyberbullying: Examining risk and protective factors,* European Journal of Developmental Psychology, Vol. 9(2), pp. 168 –181.

Fanti K.A., and Frangou G. (2018) *Narcissism and Bullying,* in Hermann A., Brunell A., Foster J. eds., *Handbook of Trait Narcissism.* 1st Edition. Cham: Springer

Fanti, K.A. and Henrich, C.C. (2014) *Effects of self-esteem and narcissism on bullying and victimization during early adolescence.* The Journal of Early Adolescence, Vol. 35(1), pp. 5–29.

Fanti, K.A. and Kimonis, E.R. (2012) *Bullying and victimization: the role of conduct problems and psychopathic traits,* The Journal of Early Adolescence, Vol. 22(4), pp. 617–631.

Fanti, K.A. and Kimonis, E.R. (2013) *Dimensions of juvenile psychopathy distinguish "bullies", "bully-victims", and "victims".* Psychology of violence, 3(4), pp. 396-409.

Farnicka, M. and Grzegorzewska, I. (2016) *Interpersonal correlates of aggression in adolescents: Determinants of undertaking the role of the perpetrator and the victim,* Current Issues in Personality Psychology, Vol. 3(1), pp. 25-35.

Faucher, C., Jackson, M., and Cassidy, W. (2014). *Cyberbullying among university students: gendered experiences, impacts, and perspectives.* Educational Research International [Online]. Available at: https://www.hindawi.com/journals/edri/2014/698545/ (Accessed at: 10 April 2021)

Ferenczi, S. (1949) *Confusion of the tongues between the adults and the child,* Internal Journal of Psycho-Analysis, Vol. 30(1), pp. 225-230.

Fields, A. (2009) *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS.* 3rd Edition. Newbury Park: Sage.

Finn, J. (2004) *A survey of online harassment at a university campus,* Journal of Interpersonal Violence, Vol. 19(4), pp. 468–481.

Finnegan, R.A., Hodges, E.V.E. and Perry, D.G. (1998) *Victimization by peers: Associations with children's reports of mother-child interaction,* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 75(1), pp. 1076-1086.

Fite, J.P., Greening, L. and Stoppelbein, L. (2008) *Relation between parenting stress and psychopathic traits among children,* Behavioral Sciences and the Law, Vol. 26(2), pp. 239-248.

Fossati, A., Borroni, S., Eisenberg, N. and Maffei, C. (2010) *Relations of proactive and reactive dimensions of aggression to overt and covert narcissism in nonclinical adolescents,* Aggressive Behavior, Vol. 36(1), pp. 21-27.

Foster, J. D. (2007). *The Narcissistic Self: Background, an Extended Agency Model, and Ongoing Controversies*, in Sedikides, C. and Spencer, S. eds. *Frontiers in Social Psychology: The Self,* Philadelphia: Psychology Press, 1st Edition. pp. 1-43.

Freis, S.D. and Gurung, R.A.R. (2013) *A Facebook analysis of helping behavior in online bullying,* Psychology of Popular Media Culture, Vol. 2(1), pp. 11–19.

Freud, S. (1915) *Instincts and their vicissitudes.* The standard edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XIV: On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement, Papers on Metapsychology and Other Works, *pp. 109-140.*

Freud, S. (1957) *On Narcissism: An Introduction, in Strachey, J ed. The standard edition of the complete works of Sigmund Freud*, 1914 (Reprint), London: Hogarth Press Ltd.

Gabbard, G. (1989) *Two subtypes of narcissistic personality disorder,* Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, Vol. 53(6), pp. 527 - 532.

Genç, G. (2020). *Çift İlişkisinde Evlilik Uyumunun Nesne İlişkileri ve Bağlanma Stilleri Açısından İncelenmesi,* Unpublished Master Thesis, Bahçeşehir University.

George, D. and Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference, 17.0 update,* 10th Edition, Boston: Pearson

Gómez-Ortiz, O., Romera, E.M., and Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2016) *Parenting styles and bullying, The mediating role of parental psychological aggression and physical punishment,* Child abuse and neglect, Vol. 51(1), pp. 132–143.

Goodboy, A. K., and Martin, M.M. (2015) *The personality profile of a cyberbully: Examining the dark triad,* Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 49(1), pp. 1-4.

Gradinger, P. (2014, November). Lecture at XIX Workshop. *Risk factors for and prevention of cyberbullying.* Available at: https://www.paedpsy.tu-berlin.de/fileadmin/fg236/Fotos_MitarbeiterInnen/Jan_Pfetsch/Workshop_Aggression_2014_Final_Program_01.pdf

Greenberg, J. (1983). *Object Relations in Psychoanalytic Theory*. 1st Edition. USA: Harvard University Press.

Green, S.B. (1991) *How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis?,* Multivariate Behavioral Research, Vol. 26(3), pp. 499–510.

Hardie, E. and Tee, M. (2007) *Excessive internet use: The role of personality, loneliness and social support networks in internet addiction,* Australian Journal of Emerging Technologies and Society, Vol. 5(1), pp. 34-47.

Hase, C.N., Goldberg, S.B., Smith, D., Stuck, A. and Campain, J. (2015) *Impacts of traditional bullying and cyberbullying on the mental health of middle school and high school students,* Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 52(6), pp. 607-617.

Hazan, C. and Shaver, P. (1987) *Romantic Love Conceptualized asan Attachment Process,* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 52(3), pp. 511-52.

Hinduja, S. and Patchin, J.W. (2006) *Cyberbullying emotional and psychological consequences.* [Online]. Available at: www.cyberbullying.us (Accessed: 17.06.2020).

Hibbard, S. (1992) *Narcissism, shame, masochism, and object relations: An exploratory correlational study,* Psychoanalytic Psychology, Vol. 9(4), pp. 489.

Hinduja, S. and Patchin, J.W. (2007) *Offline consequences of online victimization: School violence and delinquency,* Journal of School Violence, Vol. 9(3), pp. 89-112.

Hinduja, S. and Patchin, J.W. (2008) *Cyberbullying: An exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization,* Deviant behavior, Vol. 29(2), pp. 129-156.

Hojat, M. (1982) *Loneliness as a function of selected personality variables,* Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 38(1), pp. 137-141.

Hong, J.S. and Espelage, D.L. (2012) *A review of research on bullying and peer victimization in school: an ecological system analysis,* Aggression and Violent Behavior, Vol. 17(4), pp. 311–322.

Horzum, M. B. (2010) *Öğretmenlerin Web 2.0 araçlarından haberdarlığı, kullanım sıklıkları ve amaçlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi,* Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi, Vol. 7(1), pp. 603-634.

Hunt, C., Peters, L. and Rapee, R.M. (2012) *Development of a measure of the experience of being bullied in youth,* Psychological Assessment, Vol. 24(1), pp. 156–165.

Huprich, S.K. (2003) *Depressive personality and its relationship to depressed mood, interpersonal loss, negative parental perceptions, and perfectionism,* The Chicago Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, Vol. 191(2), pp. 73-79.

Huprich, S.K., and Greenberg, R.P. (2003) *Advances in the assessment of object relations in the 1990s,* Clinical Psychology Review, Vol. 23(5), pp. 665-698.

Huprich, S.K., Porcerelli, J.H., Binienda, J., Karana, D. and Kamoo, R. (2007) *Parental representations, object relations and their relationship to Depressive Personality Disorder and Dysthymia,* Personality and Individual Differences, Vol. 43(8), pp. 2171–2181.

Ildırım, E., Çalıcı, C. and Erdoğan, B. (2017) *Psychological Correlates of Cyberbullying and Cyber-Victimization,* The International Journal of Human and Behavioral Science, Vol. 3(2), pp. 7-21.

'İntihar eden Sibel Ünli'nin ailesi: Kardeşimi siber zorbalar öldürdü'. (2020). *Karar Gazetesi*, 5 January [Online]. Available at: https://www.karar.com/intihar-eden-sibel-unlinin-ailesi-kardesimi-siber-zorbalar-oldurdu-1435369 (Accessed: August, 2020).

Jauk, E., Weigle, E., Lehmann, K., Benedek, M. and Neubauer, A.C. (2017) *The Relationship Between Grandiose and Vulnerable (Hypersensitive) Narcissism,* Frontiers in Psychology, Vol. 8(13), pp. 1-10.

Johnson, C.L. (2011). *An Examination of the Primary and Secondary Effects of Cyber-Bullying: Development and Testing of a Cyber-Bullying Moderator/Mediator Model.* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Graduate School of Wayne State University.

Johnson, P. (2015). *What Makes a Cyberbully/Victm? Factors Associated with The Perpetration of Cyberbullying By Cyber Victims.* Unpublished Thesis. Macquarie University.

Jordan, C.H., Spencer, S.J., Zanna, M.P., Hoshino-Browne, E. and Correll, J. (2003) *Secure and defensive high self-esteem,* Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 85(5), pp. 968–975.

Juvonen, J. and Gross, E. F. (2008) *Extending the school grounds? Bullying experiences in cyberspace,* Journal of School Health, Vol. 78(9), pp. 496–505.

Miller, J.D., Hoffman, B.J., Gaughan, E.T., Gentile B., Maples, J. and Campbell, W.K. (2011) *Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: a nomological network analysis,* Journal of Personality, Vol. 79(5), pp. 1013-1042.

Kernberg O. F. (1975) *Borderline Conditions and Pathological Narcissism,* in Kernberg, O., ed., *The British Journal of Psychiatry.* 1st Edition. New York: Jason Aronson.

Kernberg, O.F. (1991) *Aggression and love in the relationship of the couple,* Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, Vol. 39(1), pp. 45-70.

Kestel, M. and Akbıyık, C. (2016) *Siber zorbalığın öğrencilerin akademik, sosyal ve duygusal durumları üzerindeki etkisnin incelenmesi,* Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Vol. 12(3), pp. 844-859.

Kiriakidis, S.P. and Kavoura, A. (2010) *Cyberbullying: A review of the literature on harassment through the internet and other electronic means,* Family and communication Health, Vol. 33(2), pp. 82-93.

Klein, M. (2011) *Haset ve Şükran.* 3rd Edition. O. Koçak and Y. Erten, Trans. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Klein, M. (1932). The psycho-analysis of children. International Psycho-Analytical Library, 1st Edition. London: The Hogarth Press.

Klein, M., 1946 Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms. Int J Psychoanal, Vol. 27(1), pp. 99-110, [Online] Available at:
https://europepmc.org/article/med/22700275 (Accessed: 12 June 2021)

Kline, R. B. (2011) *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling.* 3rd Edition. New York: The Guildford Press.

Klomek, A.B., Kopelman-Rubin, D., Al-Yagon, M., Berkowitz, R., Apter, A. and Mikulincer, M. (2016) *Victimization by bullying and attachment to parents and teachers among student who report learning disorders and/or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder,* Learn Disability Quarterly, Vol. 39(3), pp. 182-190.

Kırcaburun, K. Demetrovies, Z., Király, O. and Griffiths, M.D. (2018) *Childhood emotional trauma and cyberbullying perpetration among emerging adults: a multiple mediation model of the role of problematic social media use and psychopathology,* International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, Vol. 18(1), pp.548-566.

Kocaşahan, N. (2012). *Lise ve Üniversite Çğrencilerinde Akran Zorbalığı ve Sanal Zorbalık.* Unpublished Master Thesis, Balıkesir Unüversity.

Koh, K. B. (2013). *Somatization and psychosomatic symptoms.* 3th Edition. New York: Springer.

Kohut, H. (1968) *The psychoanalytic treatment of narcissistic personality disorders:*

Outline of a systematic approach, Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, Vol. 23(1), pp. 86–113.

Kohut, H. (1977). *The Restoration of the Self.* 1st Edition. New York: International Universities Press.

Kokkinos, C.M. (2013) *Bullying and victimization in early adolescence: Associations with attachment style and perceived parenting,* Journal of School Violence, Vol. 12(2), pp. 174-192.

Kota, R., Schoohs, S., Benson, M. and Moreno, M.A. (2014) *Characterizing cyberbullying among college students: Hacking, dirty laundry, and mocking,* Societies, Vol. 4(4), pp. 549-560.

König, A., Gollwitzer, M. and Steffgen, G. (2010) *Cyberbullying as an act of revenge?,* Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling, Vol. 20(2), pp. 210-224.

Kurutaş, M. (2017). *Siber Zorbalık ve Siber Mağduriyet ile Internet Bağımlılığı ve Çocukluk Çağı Travmaları Arasındaki Ilişki,* Unpublished Master Thesis, İstanbul University.

Kowalski, R.M., and Limber, S.P. (2007) *Electronic bullying among middle school students,* The Journal of Adolescent Health: Official publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine, Vol. 41(6), pp. 22-30.

Kowalski, R. M., Limber, S. P. and Agatston, P. W. (2008). *Cyber bullying: Bullying in the digital age*. 1st Edition. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Kowalski, R.M, Giumetti, G.W., Schroeder, A. W. and Reese, H. H. (2012) *Cyber Bullying Among College Students: Evidence Domains of College Life,* Wankel, C. and Wankel, L. eds., *Misbehavior Online in Higher Education.* 2nd Edition. UK: Emerald Publishing Group.

Kowalski, R.M., Giumetti, G.W., Schroeder, A.W. and Lattanner, N.R. (2014) *Bullying in the digital age: a critical review and meta-analysis of cyberbullying research among youth,* Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 140(4), pp. 1073–1137

Kowalski, R.M. and Limber, S.P. (2013) *Psychological, physical, and academic correlates of cyberbullying and traditional bullying,* Journal of Adolescent Health, Vol. 53(1), pp. 13-20.

Lash, C. (1978). *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in An Age of Dimishing Expectations.* 1st Edition. New York: Norton.

Le, H.T.H., Dunne, M.P., Campbell, M.A., Gatton, M.L., Nguyen, H.T. and Tran, N.T. (2017) *Temporal patterns and predictors of bullying roles among adolescents*

in Vietnam: A school-based cohort study, Psychology, Health & Medicine, Vol. 22(1), pp. 107-121.

Leduc, K., Conway, L., Gomez-Garibello, C. and Talwar, V. (2018) *The influence of participant role, gender, and age in elementary and high-school children's moral justifications of cyberbullying behaviors,* Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 83(C), pp. 215-220.

Levy, K.N. (2012) *Subtypes, dimensions, levels, and mental states in narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder,* Journal of clinical psychology, Vol. 68(8), pp. 886-897.

Li, Q. (2006) *Cyberbullying in schools: A research of gender differences,* School Psychology International, Vol. 27(2), pp. 157-170.

Li, Q. (2007) *Bullying in the new playground: Research into cyberbullying and cyber victimization,* Australian Journal of Educational Technology, Vol. 23(4), pp. 435-454.

Li, D.Y. and Gao, X.M. (2011) *Research on the relationship between covert narcissism and aggression,* Health Medicine Research and Practice, Vol. 8(3), pp. 29–31.

Livazović, G. and Ham, E. (2019) *Cyberbullying and emotional distress in adolescents: the importance of family, peers and school,* Heliyon, Vol. 5(6), pp. 2-9.

Locke, K.D. (2009) *Aggression, narcissism, self-esteem, and the attribution of desirable and humanizing traits to self versus others.* Journal of Research in Personality, Vol. 43(1), pp. 99-102.

Lucas, K.T. (2018). *Cyber-bullying Among Colege Students: A Test of Social Learning Theory.* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Luty, S.E., Joyce, P.R., Mulder, R.T., Sullivan, P.F. and McKenzie, J.M (2002) *The interpersonal sensitivity measure in depression: Associations with temperament and character,* Journal of Affective Disorders, Vol. 70(3), pp. 307-312.

MacDonald, C.D., and Roberts-Pittman, B. (2010) *Cyberbullying among college students: Prevalence and demographic differences,* Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 9(1), pp. 2003-2009.

MacDonald, G., Saltzman, J.L. and Leary, M.R. (2003) *Social approval and trait self-esteem,* Journal of research in personality, Vol. 37(2), pp. 23-40.

Madan, A.O. (2014) *Cyber aggression/cyber bullying and the dark triad: Effect on workplace behavior/performance,* International Journal of Social, Management, Economics and Business Engineering, Vol. 8(6), pp. 1725-1730.

Mahasneh, A.M., Al-Zoubi, Z.H., Batayenh, O.T. and Jawarneh, M.S., (2013) *The Relationship between Parenting Styles and Adult Attachment Styles from Jordan University Students,* International Journal of Asian Social Science, Asian Economic and Social Society, Vol. 3(6), pp. 1431-1441.

Mayeux, L. and Cillessen, A.H.N. (2008) *It's not just being popular, it's knowing it, too: The role of self-perceptions of status in the associations between peer status and aggression,* Social Development, Vol. 17(4), pp. 871-888.

McWilliams, N. (2020) *Psikanalitik Tanı: Klinik Süreç İçinde Kişilik Yapısını Anlamak,* 2nd Edition. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Middleton, A. E. (2004). *Differentiating Adolescents with Borderline Personality Disorder from Normal Adolescents and Adolescents with Other Disorders,* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Texas.

Miller, J.D. and Campbell, W.K. (2010) *The case for using research on trait narcissism as a building block for understanding narcissistic personality disorder,* Personality Disorders: Theory, research, and treatment, Vol. 1(3), pp. 180-191.

Martínez-Monteagudo, M.C., Delgado, B., García-Fernández, J.M. and Ruíz-Esteban, C. (2020) *Cyberbullying in the university setting. Relationship with emotional problems and adaption to the university,* Frontiers in Psychology, Vol. 10(1), [Online]. Available at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03074/full (Accessed: 17 April 2021).

Marín-López, I., Zych, I., Ortega-Ruiz, R., Hunter, S.C. and Llorent, V.J. (2020) *Relations among online emotional content use, social and emotional competencies and cyberbullying,* Children and Youth Services Review, Vol. 108(1), pp. 1-10.

Masterson, J.F. (1993) *The Emerging Self: A Developmental, Self, and Object Relations Approach to the Treatment of the Closet Narcissistic Disorder of the Self.* 1st edition. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

McCullough, M.E., Emmons, R.A., Kilpatrick, S.D., and Mooney, C.N. (2003) *Narcissists as ''victims'': The role of narcissism in the perception of transgressions,* Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, Vol. 29(7), pp. 885–893.

Meissner, W.W. (1979) *Internalization and object relations,* Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, Vol. 27(2), pp. 345-360.

Middleton, A.E. (2004). *Differentiating Adolescents with Borderline Personality Disorder from Normal Adolescents and Adolescents with Other Disorders,* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, The University of Texas at Austin.

Mills, B. and Aldag, R. J. (1999) *Exploring the relationship between object relations/reality testing functioning, coping styles, and somatic tension,* Journal of Business and Psychology, Vol. 14(1), pp. 5-24.

Mitchell, S.A. and Black, M.J. (1995) *Freud and Beyond: A History of Modern Psychoanalytic Thought.* 9th edition. Basic Books.

Nakano, T., Suda, T., Okaine, Y. and Morre, M.J. (2016). Analysis of cyber aggression and cyberbullying in social networking. *Tenth International Conference on Semantic Computing.* California USA: February 3-5, pp. 337-341.

Neal, J., and Frick-Horbury, D. (2001) *The effects of parenting styles and childhood attachment patterns on intimate relationships,* Journal of Instructional Psychology, Vol. 28(3), pp. 178–183.

Navarro, R., Yubero, S., Larrañaga, E., and Martínez, V. (2012) *Children's cyberbullying victimization: Associations with social anxiety and social competence in a Spanish sample,* Child indicators research, Vol. 5(2), pp. 281-295.

Nikiforou, M., Georgiou, S.N. and Stavrinides, P. (2013) *Attachment to parents and peers as a parameter of bullying and victimization,* Journal of Criminology, Vol. 1(1), pp. 1-9.

Okada, R. (2010) *The relationship between vulnerable narcissism and aggression in Japanese undergraduate students,* Personality and Individual Differences, Vol. 49(2), pp. 113-118.

Olenik-Shemesh, D., Heiman, T. and Eden, S. (2012) *Cyberbullying victimisation in adolescence: Relationships with loneliness and depressive mood,* Emotional and Behavioral Difficulties, Vol. 17(3-4), pp. 361–374.

Olweus, D. (1980) *Familial and temperamental determinants of aggressive behavior in adolescent boys: a causal analysis,* Developmental Psychology, Vol. 16(6), pp. 644–660.

Olweus D. (1993) *Bullying in schools: what we know and what we can do*, Wiley InterScience, Vol. 40(6), pp. 699-700.

Olweus, D. (2012) *Cyberbullying: An overrated phenomenon?* European Journal of Development Psychology, Vol. 9(1), pp. 520-538.

Otway, L.J. and Vignoles, V.L. (2006) *Narcissism and childhood recollections: A quantitative test of psychoanalytic predictions,* Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, Vol. 32(1), pp. 104-116.

Ozan, E., Kırkpınar, İ., Aydın, N., Fidan, T. and Oral, M. (2008) *Narsistik Kişilik Bozukluğu Gelişim Süreleri ve Yaşamı,* Reviews, Cases and Hypotheses in Psychiatry, 2-12 *[Online]. Available at:* https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/cms/asset/0288b3eb-b193-4edc-9329-27f906ccd983/pits.10114.fp.png (Accessed: 05 March 2021).

Öngider, N. (2006). *Evli ve Boşanmış Ailelerde Algılanan Ebeveyn Kabul veya Reddin Çocuğun Psikolojik Uyumu Üzerindeki Etkileri,* Unpublished Master Thesis, Ege University.

Öngen, D.E. (2010) *Relationships between narcissism and aggression among non-referred Turkish university students,* Procedia-social and behavioral sciences, Vol. 5(1), pp. 410-415.

Özdemir, M and Akar, F. (2011) *Lise öğrencilerinin siber-zorbalığa ilişkin görüşlerinin bazı değişkenler bakımında incelenmesi,* Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi, Vol. 17(4), pp. 605-626.

Özden, M. S. and İçellioglu, S. (2014) *The perception of cyberbullying and cybervictimization by university students in terms of their personality factors*, Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 116(1), pp. 4379–4383.

Özözen Danacı, M., Kavaklı, N. and Tıkız, G. (2018) *Eğitim fakültesinde öğrenim gören öğretmen adaylarının narsisiszm düzeylerinin siber zorbalığa duyarlık ve internet bağımlılığı düzeylerine etkisi,* Ulusal Eğitim Akademisi Dergisi, Vol. 2(2), pp. 86-98.

Pabian, S. and Vandebosch, H. (2014) *Using the thory of planned behavior to understand cyberbullying: the importance of beliefs for developing the interventions,* europian Journal of Developmental Psychology, Vol. 11(4), pp. 463-477.

Pad, R.A., Huprich, S.K. and Porcerelli, J. (2019) *Convergent and discriminant validity of self-report and performance-based assessment of object relations*, Journal of personality assessment, Vol. 102(6), pp. 858-865.

Peker, A. (2015) *Ergenlerin saldırganlık ve siber zorbalık davranışları arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi*, Ekev Akademik Dergisi, Vol. 19(61), pp. 323-336.

Pepler, D.J., Craig, W.M., Connolly, J.A., Yuile, A., McMaster, L. and Jiang, D.P. (2006) *A developmental perspective on bullying*, Aggressive Behavior, Vol. 32(1), pp. 376–384.

Papatraianou, L.H., Levine, D. and West, D. (2014) *Resilience in the face of cyberbullying: An ecological perspective on young people's experiences of online adversity*, Pastoral Care in Education, Vol. 32(4), pp. 264- 283.

Pincus, A.L., Ansell, E.B., Pimentel, C.A., Cain, N.M., Wright, A.G. and Levy, K.N. (2009) *Initial construction and validation of the pathological narcissism inventory,* Psychological Assessment, Vol. 21(3), pp. 365- 379.

Pincus, A.L. and Lukowitsky, M.R. (2010) *Pathological narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder*, Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, Vol. 6(1), pp. 421-446.

Plexousakis, S.S., Koukoutas, E., Giovazalias, T., Chatira, K. and Nikolopoulos, D. (2019) *School bullying and post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms: the role of parental bonding,* Front. Public Health, Vol. 75(7), pp. 1-15.

Jonason, P.K. and Webster, G.D. (2010) *The Dirty Dozen: A concise measure of the Dark Triad*, Psychological Assessment, Vol. 22(2), pp. 420-432.

Rai, R., Smith, E., and Svirydzenka, N. (2017, September). British Psychological Society Developmental Section Conference. *Egocentrism and cyberbullying: Imaginary audience and personal fable ideation predict cyberbullying and cyber victimisation in adolescents and emerging adults.* pp. 1. Available at: https://dora.dmu.ac.uk/handle/2086/14724 (Accessed: 05 March 2021).

Raskauskas, J. and Stoltz, A.D. (2007) *Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents*, Developmental psychology, Vol. 43(3), pp. 564-575.

Reijntjes, A., Vermande, M., Olthof, T., Goossens, F.A., van de Schoot, R., Aleva, L. and van der Meulen, M. (2013) *Costs and benefits of bullying in the context of the peer group: A three wave longitudinal analysis*, Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, Vol. 41(1), pp. 1217-1229.

Reijntjes, A., Vermande, M., Thomaes, S., Goossens, F., Olthof, T., Aleva, L. and Van der Meulen, M. (2016) *Narcissism, bullying, and social dominance in youth: a longitudinal analysis*, Journal of Abnormal Child and Adolescent Psychopathology, Vol. 44(1), pp. 63–74.

Robson, C. and Witerberg, R. T. (2013). *The influence of moral disengagement, morally based self-esteem, age, and gender on traditional bullying and cyber bullying.* Journal of School Violence, Vol. 12(1), pp. 211-231.

Roelofs, J., Meesters, C., Huurne, M., Bamelis, L., and Muris P. (2006) *On the links between attachment style, parental rearing behaviors, and internalizing and externalizing problems in non-clinical children*, Journal of Child and Family Studies, Vol. 15(3), pp. 319-332.

Roelofs, J., Meesters, C., and Muris, P. (2008) *Correlates of self-reported attachment (in)security in children: The role of parental romantic attachment status and rearing behaviors*, Journal of Child and Family Studies, Vol. 17(4), pp. 555–566.

Romera, E.M., Cano, J.J., Garcia-Fernandez, C.M. and Ortega-Ruiz, R. (2016) *Cyberbullying: social competence, motivation and peer relationship,* Comunicar, Vol. 24(1), pp. 71-79.

Ronningstam, E. (2005) *Identifying and Understand the Narcissistic Personality*. 1st Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Roques, M. (2020, December). *Zorbalık: Psikanalitik Yaklaşım ve Projektif Testlerin Katkısı,* Rorschach ve Projectif Testler Derneği Etkinliği, Online.

Rosenfeld, H. (1987). *Impasse and Interpretation.* 1st Edition. London: Tavistock.

Rudolph, K. D., Lansford, J. E., Agoston, A. M., Sugimura, N., Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, S. and Bates, J. E. (2014) *Peer victimization and social alienation: Predicting deviant peer affiliation in middle school,* Child Development, Vol. 85(1), pp. 124-139.

Sacco, M.L. and Farber, B.A. (1999) *Reality testing in adult women who report childhood sexual and physical abuse*, Child abuse and neglect, Vol. 23(11), pp. 1193-1203.

Salmivalli, C. (2010) *Bullying and the peer group: A review*, Aggression and Violent Behavior, Vol. 15(2), pp. 112–120.

Sanzone-Goodrich, M. (2013). *Cyberbullying, Self-Concept, and Perceived Parental Emotional Availability in Adolescents*. Doctoral Thesis. United States, ProQuest Publishing.

Schalin, L. (1995) *On autoeroticism and object relation in the psychosexual development,* Scandinavian Psychoanalytic Review, Vol. 18(1), pp. 22-40.

Schenk, A.M., Fremouw, W.J. and Kelaan, C.M. (2013) *Characteristics of college cyberbullies,* Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 29(6), pp. 2320-2327.

Schumacher, P., and Morahan-Martin, J. (2001) *Gender, internet and computer attitudes and experiences*, Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 17(1), pp. 95-110.

Semerci, A. (2017) *Investigating the effects of personality traits on cyberbullying*, Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi, Vol. 7(2), pp. 211-230.

Sengupta, A., and Chaudhuri, A. (2011) *Are social networking sites a source of online harrassment for teens? Evidence from survey data,* Children and Youth Services Review, 33(2), 284-290.

Shams, H, Gholamreza, G. and Saharnaz N. (2017) *Factors related to bullying: A qualitative study of early adolescent students,* Iranian Red Crescent Medical Journal Vol. 19(1), pp. 1–11.

Slonje, R. and Smith, P.K. (2008) *Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying?*, Scandanavian Journal of Psychology, Vol. 49(2), pp. 147–154.

Smaller, M.D. (2013) *The plague of bullying: In the classroom, the psychoanalytic institute, and on the streets.* Psychoanalytic Inquiry, Vol. 33(2), pp. 144-152.

Smith, P., Mandavi, J., Carvalho, M. and Tippett, N. (2005) *An Investigation into Cyberbullying, Its Forms, Awareness and Impact, And the Relationship Between Age and Gender in Cyberbullying.* London: Goldsmiths College.

Snyder, J. B. (1999). *The Relationship of Psychopathy and Antisocial Personality Disorder to The Object Relations and Reality Testing of Alcoholic Men,* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Temple University.

Sroufe, L.A. and Rutter, M. (1984) *The domain of developmental psychopathology,* Child Development, Vol. 55(1), pp. 17-29.

St. Clair, M. and Wigren, J. (2004) *Object Relations and Self psychology: An Introduction.* 4th Edition. Canada: Brooks/Cole.

Steffgen, G., König, A., Pfetsch, J and Melzer, A. (2011) *Are cyberbullies less empathic? Adolescents' cyberbullying behavior and empathic responsiveness,* Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, Vol. 14(11), pp. 643-648.

Stellwagen, K.K. and Kerig, P.K. (2013) *Ringleader bullying: association with psychopathic narcissism and theory of mind among child psychiatric inpatients*, Child Psychiatry and Human Development, Vol. 44(5), pp. 612–620.

Stricker, G. and Healey, B.J. (1990) *Projective assessment of object relations: A review of the empirical literature*, Psychological Assessment, Vol. 2(3), pp. 219–230.

Strom, P. and Strom, R. (2004) *Bullied by a mouse,* [Online]. Available at: http://www.childresearch.net/RESOURCE/RESEARCH/2004/MEMBERS35.HTM (Accessed: 22 March 2019)

Summers, F. (1994) *Object Relations Theories and Psychopathology: A Comprehensive Test.* 1ˢᵗ Edition. London: The Analytic Press.

Syts, Y. (2004). *Beyond the schoolyard: Examining Electronic Bullying Among Canadian Youth.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Carleton University.

Şen, G. (2019). *Narsistik Örüntüler ve Zorlayıcı Kişilerarası Deneyimlere Verilen Tepkiler: Bilişsel Kişilerarası Kuram Çerçevesinde Üniversite Öğrencileri Örnekleminde Bir İnceleme,* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Hacettepe University.

Şen, G. and Barışkın, E. (2019) *The standardization of the pathological narcissism inventory in the Turkish language and testing its validity and reliability,* Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi, Vol. 30(2), pp.1-11.

Şirvanlı Özen, D. and Aktan, T. (2010) *Bağlanma ve zorbalık sisteminde yer alma: Başa çıkma stratejilerinin aracı rolü*, Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, Vol. 25(65), pp. 101-113.

Ševčíková, A., Macháčková, H., Wright, M.F., Dědková, L. and Černá, A. (2015) *"Social Support Seeking in Relation to Parental Attachment and Peer Relationships Among Victims of Cyberbullying,"*, Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools, Vol. 25(2), pp. 170–182.

Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L.S. (2001) *SAS for Windows Workbook for Tabachnick and Fidell Using Multivariate Statistics.* 4ᵗʰ Edition. MA: Ally and Bacon

Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell L.S. (2013) *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 7ᵗʰ Edition. New York: Pearson.

Tarablus, T., Heiman, T. and Olenik-Shemesh, D. (2015) *Cyber bullying among teenagers in Israel: An examination of cyber bullying, traditional bullying, and socioemotiona functioning*, Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma, Vol. 24(6), pp. 707-720.

Taylan, H.H., Aydin, F., and Topal, M. (2017) *Ortaokul öğrencilerinin sanal zorba olma durumlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi: Sakarya ili örneği*, Online Journal of Technology Addiction and Cyberbullying, Vol. 4(1), pp. 41-59.

Tokunaga, R.S. (2010) *Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization*, Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 26(3), pp. 277- 287.

Thomas, D. (2012) *Narcissism: Behind the Mask.* 2ⁿᵈ Edition. Brighton: Book Guild Publishing.

Topçu, Ç. (2008). *The Relationship of Cyberbullying to Empathy, Gender, Traditional Bullying, Internet Use and Adult Monitoring*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Middle East Technical University of Ankara.

Topçu, Ç. and Erdur-Baker, Ö. (2012) *Affective and cognitive empathy as mediators of gender differences in cyber and traditional bullying*, School Psychology International, *33*(5), pp. 550-561

Topçu, Ç. and Erdur-Baker, Ö. (2018) *RCBI-II: The second revision of the revised cyber bullying inventory,* Measurement and Evaluation in Counselling and Developmen, Vol. 51(1), pp. 32-41.

Topçu, Ç., Erdur-Baker, Ö. and Çapa-Aydın, Y. (2008) *Examination of cyberbullying experiences among Turkish students from different school types*, Cyberpsychology and Behavior, Vol. 11(6), pp. 643-648.

Turner, P. and Ireland, J.L. (2010) *Do personality characteristics and beliefs predict intra-group bullying between prisoners?*, Aggressive Behavior, Vol. 36(4), pp. 261–270.

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu, (2020). *Hanehalkı Bilişim Teknolojileri (BT) Kullanım Araştırması,*[Online]. Available at: https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Survey-on-Information-and-Communication-Technology-(ICT)-Usage-in-Households-and-by-Individuals-2020-33679 (Accessed: 20 February 2021)

Twenge J. and Campbell W.K. (2003) *"Isn't it fun to get the respect that we're going to deserve?" narcissism, social rejection, and aggression*, Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29(2), pp. 261-272.

Uluç, S., Tüzün, Z., Haselden, M. and Erbaş, S.P. (2015) *Bell nesne ilişkileri ve gerçeği değerlendirme ölçeğinin (BORRTI) Türkçe'ye uyarlama çalışması,* Klinik Psikiyatri Dergisi, Vol. 18(4), pp. 112-123.

Üneri, Ö., Ş. (2012) Akran zorbalığı: çocuklarda zihinsel ve fiziksel gelişimi bozuyor. Popüler Psikiyatri, Vol. 65(1), pp. 34.

Varghese, M.E. and Pistole, M.C. (2017) *College student cyberbullying: Self-Esteem, depression, loneliness, and attachment*, Journal of College Counseling, Vol. 20(1), pp. 7-21.

van der Watt, R. (2014) *Attachment, parenting styles and bullying during pubertal years,* Journal of Child and Adolescent Mental Health, Vol. 26(3), pp. 251-261.

Waqas, A., Rehman, A., Malik, A., Aftab, R., Yar, A.A., Yar, A. A. and Rai A.B.S. (2016) *Exploring the association of ego defense mechanisms with problematic*

internet use in a Pakistani medical school, Psychiatry Research, Vol. 243(1), pp. 463-368.

Walrave, M. and Heirman, W. (2011) *Cyberbullying: Predicting victimization and perpetration*, Children and Society, Vol. 25(1), pp. 59-72.

Wang, J., Iannotti, R.J., and Nansel, T.R. (2009) *School bullying among adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber*, Journal of Adolescent Health, Vol. 45(4), pp. 368-375.

Waters, F., Blom, J.D., Jardri, R., Hugdahl, K. and Sommer, I.E.C. (2018) *Auditory hallucinations, not necessarily a hallmark of psychotic disorder*, Psychological medicine, Vol. 48(4), pp. 529-536.

Wegge, D., Vandebosch, H., Eggermont, S. and Pabian, S. (2014) *Popularity through online harm: The longitudinal associations between cyberbullying and sociometric status in early adolescence*, The Journal of Early Adolescence, Vol. 36(1), pp. 86–107.

Willard, N.E. (2007) *The authority and responsibility of school officials in responding to cyberbullying*, Journal of Adolescent Health, Vol. 41(6), pp. 64-65.

Williams, K. R. and Guerra, N.G. (2007) *Prevalence and predictors of internet bullying*, Journal of Adolescent Health, Vol. 41(6), pp. 14-21.

Wink, P. (1991) *Two faces of narcissism*, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 61(4), pp. 590-597.

Winnicott, D.W. (1969) *The theory of the parent-infant relationship,* International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, Vol. 41(1), pp. 585-595.

Winnicott, D.W. (2008) *Zihnin ruh-beden ile olan ilişkisi,* Traslated by Yavuz, E., Yansıtma Psikopatoloji ve Projektif Testler Dergisi, Vol. 5(9-10), pp. 215-226.

Winnicott, D.W., (2014) *Bebekler ve Anneleri,* 3rd Edition. İstanbul: Pinhani Yayıncılık.

Wolak, J., Mitchell, K. J. and Finkelhor, D. (2007) *Does online harassment constitute bullying? An exploration of online harassment by known peers and online-only contacts*, Journal of Adolescent Health, Vol. 41(6), pp. 51-58.

Wolke, D., Lee, K., and Guy, A. (2017) *Cyberbullying: A storm in a teacup?*, European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry,Vol. 26(8), pp. 899-908.

Wong-Lo, M. and Bullock, L.M. (2011) Digital *aggression: Cyberworld meets school bullies*, Preventing School Failure, Vol. 55(2), pp. 64–70.

Worsley, J.D., McIntyre, C. and Corcoran R. (2019) *Cyberbullying victimisation and mental distress: testing the moderating role of attachment security, social support, and coping styles,* Emotional and Behavioral Difficulties, Vol. 24(1), pp. 20-36.

Wright, V.H., Joy J.B., Christopher T.I. and Heather N.O. (2009)*Cyberbullying: Using virtual scenarios to educate and raise awareness.* Journal of Computing in Teacher Education, Vol. 26(1), pp. 35-42.

Yaşin, Ç.O., and Özcan, N.D. (2020) *Türkiye'de helikopter ebeveyn sahibi olan Y neslinin, aidiyet, yaşan becerisi ve özgüven problemleri,* Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, Vol. 7(2), pp. 450-470.

Ybarra, M.L. (2004) *Linkages between depressive symptomatology and internet harrasment among young regular internet usars,* CyberPsychology and Behavior, Vol. 7(2), pp. 247-257.

Ybarra, M.L. and Mitchell, K.J. (2004) *Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: A comparison of associated youth characteristics*, Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, Vol. 45(7), pp. 1308-1316.

Ybarra, M.L., Mitchell, K.J., Wolak, J., and Finkelhor, D. (2006) *Examining characteristics and associated distress related to Internet harassment: Findings from the second youth internet safety survey*, Pediatrics, Vol. 118(4), pp. 1169–1177.

Yusuf, S., Hassan, S., Abu Samah, B., Ibrahim, M.S., Ramlı, N.S., Atikah, N, Rahman, A. and Osman, M.N. (2018) *Parental attachment and cyberbullying experiences among Malaysian children,* Pertanika Journal of Scholarly Research Reviews, Vol. 4(1), pp. 67-80.

Zerach, G. (2016) *Pathological narcissism, cyberbullying victimization and offending among homosexual and heterosexual participants in online dating websites*, Computers in Human Behavior, Vol. 57(1), pp. 292-299.

Zezulka, L.A. and Seigfried-Spellar, K.C. (2016) *Differentiating cyberbullies and internet trolls by personality characteristics and self-esteem*, Journal of Digital Forensics, Security and Law, Vol. 11(3), pp. 7-26.

Zimmermann, P. (1999) *Structure and functions of internal working models of attachment and their role for emotion regulation*, Attachment and Human Development Vol. 1(3), pp. 291–306.

Zych, I., Beltrán-Catalán, M., Ortega-Ruiz, R. and Llorent, V.J. (2018) *Social and emotional competencies in adolescents involved in different bullying and cyberbullying roles*, Revista de Psicodidáctica, Vol. 23(2), pp. 86-93.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Ethical Board Approval

SAYI : B.30.2.İEÜ.0.05.05-**020**-*117*   03.03.2021

KONU : Etik Kurul Kararı hk.

Sayın Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Aylin Koçak ve Sevgi Mestçi,

"Exploring the Link between Narcissism, Stigmatization, Object Relations, Cyber Bullying, and Cyber Victimization among University Students" başlıklı projenizin etik uygunluğu konusundaki başvurunuz sonuçlanmıştır.

Etik Kurulumuz 02.02.202" tarihinde sizin başvurunuzun da içinde bulunduğu bir gündemle toplanmış ve projenin incelenmesi için bir alt komisyon oluşturmuştur. Projenizin detayları alt komisyon üyelerine gönderilerek görüş istenmiştir. Üyelerden gelen raporlar doğrultusunda Etik Kurul 03.03.2021 tarihinde tekrar toplanmış ve raporları gözden geçirmiştir.

Sonuçta 03.03.2021 tarih ve 118 numaralı "Exploring the Link Between Narcissism, Stigmatization, Object Relations, Cyber Bullying, and Cyber Victimization among University Students" konulu projenizin etik açıdan uygun olduğuna oy birliği ile karar verilmiştir.

Gereği için bilgilerinize sunarım.

Saygılarımla,

Prof. Dr. Murat Bengisu

Etik Kurul Başkanı

Appendix B: Master's Thesis Originality Report

Appendix C: Informed Consent

Değerli katılımcı,

Bu araştırma, İzmir Ekonomi Üniversitesi Klinik Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Programı kapsamında, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Aylin Koçak danışmanlığında, Sevgi Mestci tarafından yürütülmektedir.

Araştırmanın amacı; üniversite öğrencilerinin nesne ilişkileri, narsissizm ve damgalanma düzeyleri ile siber zorbalık ve siber kurban olma arasındaki ilişkileri incelemektir.

Çalışma yaklaşık 10-15 dakika sürecektir. Çalışmaya katılabilmeniz için 18-25 yaş aralığında ve üniversite öğrencisi olmanız yeterlidir.

Bu çalışmaya katılmak tamamen gönüllülük esasına dayanmaktadır. Çalışmaya katılmama veya istediğinizde çalışmayı yarıda bırakma hakkınız bulunmaktadır. Çalışma boyunca sizden herhangi bir kimlik bilgisi talep edilmeyecek ve tüm cevaplarınız gizli tutulacaktır. Bilgilere sadece araştırmacılar ulaşabilecek ve cevaplar toplu halde araştırmacı tarafından değerlendirilecektir.

Hazırlanan ölçeklerden elde edilen sonuçlar yalnızca bilimsel amaçlar doğrultusunda kullanılacaktır. Bu nedenle ölçeklerde bulunan sorulara vereceğiniz yanıtların gerçeği yansıtması, araştırmanın niteliği açısından oldukça önemlidir.

Lütfen her ölçeğin yönergesini dikkatle okuyunuz ve soruları sizi en iyi ifade eden şekilde cevaplamaya çalışınız.

Şimdiden katılımınız için teşekkür ederim.

Çalışmaya yönelik sorularınız için Sevgi Mestci (sevgiimestci@gmail.com) ile iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Çalışmaya gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul ediyor, istediğim zaman ayrılabileceğimi biliyorum. Bilgilerimin bilimsel amaçlı kullanılmasına izin veriyorum.

Evet Hayır

Appendix D: Demographic Form

1. Cinsiyetiniz:
   - Kadın
   - Erkek
   - Diğer

2. Doğum Yılınız: (Örn: 1998) _____

3. Sınıfınız:
   - Hazırlık
   - 1.Sınıf
   - 2.Sınıf
   - 3.Sınıf
   - 4.Sınıf
   - 5. Sınıf
   - 6. Sınıf
   - Yüksek Lisans
   - Doktora

4. Kiminle yaşıyorsunuz?
   - Romantik Partner
   - Aile üyeleri
   - Arkadaşlar
   - Yalnız
   - Diğer _____

5. ANNE
   - Öz anne
   - Koruyucu anne
   - Evlat edinen anne
   - Üvey anne
   - Anne hayatta değil

6. BABA
   - Öz baba
   - Koruyucu baba
   - Evlat edinen baba
   - Üvey baba

- Baba hayatta değil

7. Kaç kardeşe sahipsiniz?

  - Tek çocuğum

  - 1 kardeş

  - 2 kardeş

  - 3 ve daha fazla kardeşim var

8. Siz kaçıncı çocuksunuz?

  - İlk

  - İkinci

  - Üçüncü ve sonrası

9. Aile durumunuz

  - Annem-babam birlikte

  - Annem-babam ayrı

  - Diğer (belirtiniz) _____

10. Kendinizi/ Ailenizi hangi gelir grubuna ait görüyorsunuz?

  - Alt gelir grubunda

  - Ortanın altı gelir grubunda

  - Orta gelir grubunda

  - Ortanın üstü gelir grubunda

  - Üst gelir grubunda

11. Annenizin eğitim düzeyi:

  - Okur yazar değil

  - Okur yazar

  - İlkokul Mezunu

  - Ortaokul Mezunu

  - Lise Mezunu

  - Yüksek okul Mezunu (2 yıllık)

  - Üniversite Mezunu

  - Yüksek Lisans Mezunu

  - Doktora Mezunu

12. Babanızın eğitim düzeyi:

  - Okur yazar değil

  - Okur yazar

  - İlkokul Mezunu

- Ortaokul Mezunu

- Lise Mezunu

- Yüksek okul Mezunu (2 yıllık)

- Üniversite Mezunu

- Yüksek Lisans Mezunu

- Doktora Mezunu

13. Annenizin çalışma durumu:

- Şu anda çalışıyor

- Şu anda çalışmıyor

14. Annenizin mesleği: _____

15. Babanızın çalışma durumu:

- Şu anda çalışıyor

- Şu anda çalışmıyor

16. Babanızın mesleği: _____

17. Sizi kim büyüttü?

- Anne

- Bakıcı

- Okul

- Büyük Ebeveynler (anna anne vb.)

- Diğer

18. Herhangi bir psikiyatrik rahatsızlığınız oldu mu?

- Evet

- Hayır

19. Cevabınız evet ise lütfen belirtiniz?

20. İnternet kullanım sıklığınızı belirtiniz

- Günlük 0-1 sa

- Günlük 2-3 sa

- Günlük 4-5 sa

- Günlük 6-7 sa

- Günlük 8 sa ve fazlası

21. İnternette sıklıkla kullandığınız mecraları belirtiniz

Sosyal medya (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter vb.)

Arama motorları

Müzik Dinleme

Video (Youtube vb.)

Oyun

TicToc

Diğer _____

22. İlk/orta okul yıllarınızda zorbalık uyguladığınız oldu mu?

- Evet

- Hayır

23. İlk/orta okul yıllarınızda zorbalığa uğradığınız oldu mu?

- Evet

- Hayır

Appendix E: Bell Nesne İlişkileri ve Gerçeği Değerlendirme Testi (BORRTI)

1)Her bir maddeyi dikkatlice okuyun. Daha sonra sizin yanıtınız olan harfi daire içine alın. Eğer madde içinde söz edilen durum sizin için doğruysa *Doğru* sütununda yer alan D harfini daire içine alın. Eğer madde içinde söz edilen durum sizin için doğru değilse *Yanlış* sütununda yer alan Y harfini içine alın. Her bir madde için sadece bir tane harfi daire içine alın. Hiç atlamadan tüm maddeleri yanıtlayın.

Madde	Doğru Yanlış	
1. En az bir tane tutarlı ve doyurucu ilişkim var.	D	Y
2. Bazen içime şeytan girmiş olduğunu düşünürüm.	D	Y
3. Eğer biri benden hoşlanmazsa o kişiye iyi davranmak için her zaman daha fazla uğraşırım.	D	Y
4. Sonsuza kadar inzivaya çekilmek isterdim.	D	Y
5. Genellikle bazı şeylerin gerçekten mi olduğuna yoksa rüyada mı gerçekleştiğine karar vermekte zorlanırım.	D	Y
6. Birdenbire içime kapanabilir ve haftalarca kimseyle konuşmayabilirim.	D	Y
7. Algılarım doğru olmasa da, bunun hemen farkına varırım ve kendimi kolayca düzeltebilirim.	D	Y
8. Genellikle bana en yakın olanları eninde sonunda incitirim.	D	Y
9. Alkol ya da esrar kullanmak zihnimi öylesine şiddetli etkileyebilir ki, neyin gerçek olduğundan emin olamayabilirim.	D	Y
10. İnsanların üzüntülerini kontrol etme becerilerinin ya çok az olduğuna ya da hiç olmadığına inanırım.	D	Y
11. Çevremdekiler bana bir yetişkinden çok, çocukmuşum gibi davranır.	D	Y

12. Halüsinasyonlar (aslında var olmayan şeyler görme ya da duyma) yaşarım.	D	Y
13. İyi tanıdığım biri uzaklara giderse, onu özleyebilirim.	D	Y
14. Aile ilişkilerimi bozmadan evdeki anlaşmazlıklarla uğraşabilirim.	D	Y
15. Günlerce gerçeklikle bağlantımın koptuğunu hissederim.	D	Y
16. Eleştirilmeye karşı son derece hassasım.	D	Y
17. İnsanlar üzerinde güç kullanmaktan gizli bir zevk duyarım.	D	Y
18. Bazen istediğimi elde etmek için hemen hemen her şeyi yaparım.	D	Y
19. Gizemli güçlere sahibim.	D	Y
20. Bana yakın olan biri tüm dikkatini bana vermediğinde, çoğu kez kendimi incinmiş ve reddedilmiş hissederim.	D	Y
21. Genellikle, yeni bir durumu hızlıca değerlendirebilirim.	D	Y
22. Eğer biriyle yakınlaşmaya başlarsam ve bu kişi güvenilmez biri çıkarsa, olaylar bu hale geldiği için kendimden nefret edebilirim.	D	Y
23. Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman gerçeklik algımın doğruluğundan şüphe etmek için bir nedenim yoktur.	D	Y

24. Kendi duygularımı bilirim.	D	Y
25. Birine yakınlaşmak benim için zordur.	D	Y
26. Cinsel yaşamım tatmin edicidir.	D	Y
27. Bana karşı düzenlenen bir komplo var.	D	Y
28. Başkalarının benden beklediği gibi biri olmaya çalışırım.	D	Y

29. Bir ilişki ne kadar kötüye giderse gitsin, ona asılırım.	D	Y
30. Bir dış güç tarafından düşüncelerimin benden alınıp götürüldüğünü hissederim.	D	Y
31. Olaylar/durumlar hakkında genellikle güçlü fikirlerim yoktur.	D	Y
32. Çevremdekiler üzerinde hiçbir etkim yoktur.	D	Y
33. Kendi isteğim dışında konuşmaya veya hareket etmeye zorlanan bir robot olduğumu hissediyorum.	D	Y
34. İnsanlar, onları görmediğimde yoktur.	D	Y
35. Sıklıkla insanların davranışlarından gerçekte olmayan şeyler çıkarırım.	D	Y
36. Hayatta çok incitildim.	D	Y
37. En derin duygularımı paylaşabildiğim ve benimle böyle duygularını paylaşan biri var.	D	Y
38. Bana karşı bir komplo kurulduğuna inanıyorum.	D	Y
39. Ne kadar kaçınmaya çalışırsam çalışayım, en önemli ilişkilerimde aynı zorluklar ortaya çıkar.	D	Y
40. Takip ediliyorum.	D	Y
41. Biriyle tamamen "bir" olmak için güçlü bir istek duyarım.	D	Y
42. Hangi ay ya da yılda olduğumuzdan emin değilim.	D	Y
43. Genellikle doğru şeyleri söyleyebilirim.	D	Y
44. İlişkilerde, karşımdaki kişiyle sürekli bir arada olmadığım sürece tatmin olmam.	D	Y
45. Bedenim çeşitli yerlerinde açıklayamadığım garip hisler	D	Y

duyarım.		
46. Başkaları tarafından incitilmemenin tek yolu, bağımsız olmaktır.	D	Y
47. İnsanları çok iyi tartarım.	D	Y
48. Karşı cinsten olanlarla ilişkileri hep aynı şekilde sonuçlanır.	D	Y
49. Başkaları sık sık beni aşağılamaya çalışır.	D	Y
50. Diğer insanların duyamıyormuş gibi göründüğü sesleri duyabilirim.	D	Y
51. Kendi duygularımla teması nadiren kaybederim.	D	Y
52. Benim yerime kararlarımı vermeleri için genellikle başkalarına bel bağlarım.	D	Y
53. Gerçekten tanıyor olmasam da, insanların, mekânların ya da nesnelerin bana tanıdık geldiğine inandığım sık olur.	D	Y
54. Birine güvendiğimde genellikle pişman olurum.	D	Y
55. Bana yakın birine kızdığım zaman, bunu ayrıntılarıyla konuşabilirim.	D	Y
56. Düşüncelerim yayınlandığı için diğer insanlar benim ne düşündüğümü bilir.	D	Y
57. İnsanlar, kabul etse de etmese de genellikle bana kızgındırlar.	D	Y

58. İstediğimi almanın en iyi yolu başkalarını ustaca idare etmektir.	D	Y
59. Etrafımda karşı cinsten birileri varken genellikle kendimi gergin hissederim.	D	Y
60. Bazen bedenimin karşı cinse dönüştürüldüğünü hissederim.	D	Y

61. Bir şeylerin dışında bırakılacağımdan sık sık kaygı duyarım.	D	Y
62. Herkesi memnun etmem gerektiğini hissederim aksi takdirde beni reddedebilirler.	D	Y
63. Beni çok az tanıyan insanlar ne zaman isteseler düşüncelerimi okuyorlar.	D	Y
64. Bazen rüyalarım o kadar canlı olur ki uyandığım zaman gerçekten yaşanmış gibi gelir.	D	Y
65. Kendimi kapatıp birkaç ay kimseyle görüşmem.	D	Y
66. Hayatımdaki önemli insanlar tarafından olası reddedilmelere karşı duyarlıyımdır.	D	Y
67. Sıklıkla diğer insanların zalimliğinin kurbanı olurum.	D	Y
68. Arkadaş edinmek benim için sorun değildir.	D	Y
69. Lanetlenmiş bir insan olduğuma inanırım.	D	Y
70. Karşı cinsten olanlarla nasıl tanışılacağı ya da konuşulacağını bilmem.	D	Y
71. Bana yakın olan birine istediğim bir şeyi yaptıramadığımda, kızgın ya da incinmiş hissederim.	D	Y
72. Düşünce ve davranışlarım hakkında sürekli yorum yapan, başkalarının duymadığı sesler duyarım.	D	Y
73. Yalnız bir yaşam sürmek benim kaderimdir.	D	Y
74. Bana ait olmayan şeyleri düşünmeme ya da dürtülere sahip olmama zorlayan, kendi dışımda bazı güç ve etkilerin kontrolü altındayım.	D	Y
75. Duygu durumum, olayları/durumları nasıl gördüğümü	D	Y

etkiler.		
76. İnsanlar birbirine karşı asla dürüst değildir.	D	Y
77. Uykuya dalma ya da uyanma aşamasında olsam bile gerçek ve hayal olanı daima ayırt edebilirim.	D	Y
78. İlişkilere çok şey katar ve çok şey alırım.	D	Y
79. Yakında dünyanın sonunun geleceği hissine kapılıyorum.	D	Y
80. Karşı cinsten olanlarla tanışmak ya da konuşmaktan utanırım.	D	Y
81. Bir ilişkide benim için en önemli şey, diğer kişi üzerinde güç kullanmaktır.	D	Y
82. İyi bir yön duygum vardır ve yolumu hemen hemen hiç kaybetmem.	D	Y
83. Hoş olmayan tüm olayları görmezden gelmeye çalışırım.	D	Y
84. Açıklayamadığım kaygı duyguları yaşarım.	D	Y
85. Alkol ya da madde kullandığımda çevremdeki herkes bana zarar vermek istiyormuş gibi gelir.	D	Y
86. Kendi duygularıma o kadar çok dikkat ederim ki, başkalarının duygularını görmezden gelebilirim.	D	Y
87. Kendi mahallemde olsam bile, sıklıkla nerede olduğumu bilmem.	D	Y
88. Hayatımdaki trajik olayların gerçekliğini kabul etmede zorlanırım, ailedeki birinin ölümü gibi.	D	Y
89. İyi bir annenin, çocuklarını daima memnun etmesi gerektiğine inanırım.	D	Y
90. Bazen sadece görmek istediğimi görürüm.	D	Y

Aşağıda bazı tanımlayıcı ifadeler bulacaksınız. Lütfen her birini düşünün ve sizi ne derece iyi tanımladığını belirtin. Doğru ya da yanlış cevap yoktur. Basitçe her bir ifadenin sizi ne kadar iyi tanımladığını 6 dereceli ölçek üzerinde tek bir maddeyi işaretleyerek gösterin.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Beni Hiç tanımlamıyor	*Beni büyük ölçüde tanımlamıyor*	*Beni pek tanımlamıyor*	*Beni çok az tanımlıyor*	*Beni büyük ölçüde tanımlıyor*	*Ben tam olarak tanımlıyor*

	0	1	2	3	4	5
1.Sıklıkla bana hayranlık ve saygı duyulduğunu düşlerim.	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
2. Öz güvenimde çok fazla iniş çıkış olur.	0	1	2	3	4	5
3.Beni hayal kırıklığına uğrattıklarında, bazen başkaları ile ilgili beklentilerimden mahçubiyet duyarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
4.Genellikle herhangi bir konuda ikna edici olabilirim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
5.Yalnız olduğumda iyi hissetmekte zorlanırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
6.Başkalarıyla ilgilenerek kendimi mutlu edebilirim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
7. Yardım istemekten nefret ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
8. İnsanlar özel olarak beni fark etmediğinde kendimi kötü hissetmeye başlarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. Başkaları beni diğerlerine bağımlı ve muhtaç görecek korkusuyla sıklıkla ihtiyaçlarımı gizlerim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
10. İnsanları inanmalarını istediğim her şeye inandırabilirim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
11. İnsanlar onlar için yaptığım onca şeyi fark etmediklerindeöfkedençıldırırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
12. Yaptığım ya da söylediğim şeylerle ilgilenmeyen insanlar beni çok kızdırır.	0	1	2	3	4	5
13.Hayranlık duymadığım biriyle samimi düşünce ve hislerimin hepsini paylaşmam.	0	1	2	3	4	5
14. Sık sık çevrem üzerinde büyük bir etkiye sahip olduğumu düşlerim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
15. İnsanları parmağımda oynatmak benim için çok kolaydır.	0	1	2	3	4	5
16. Diğerleri beni fark etmediklerinde kendimi değersiz hissetmeye başlarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
17. Bazen beni hayal kırıklığına uğratacakları düşüncesiyle insanlardan uzak dururum.	0	1	2	3	4	5
18.Başkalarından istediklerimi alamadığımda hemen hemen her zaman öfkelenirim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
19.Bazen kendi değerimle ilgili güvence vermeleri için hayatımdaki önemli kişilere ihtiyaç duyarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
20.Diğer insanlar için bir şeyler yaptığımda, onların da benim için bir şeyler yapmalarını beklerim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
21. Başkaları beklentilerimi karşılamadıklarında,	0	1	2	3	4	5

genellikle istediklerimle ilgili mahcubiyet duyarım.						
22. Başkaları bana güvendiğinde kendimi önemli hissederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
23. İnsanları kitap gibi okuyabilirim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
24. Birileri beni hayal kırıklığına uğrattığında sıklıkla kendime kızarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
25. Başkaları için kendimi feda etmek beni daha iyi bir insan yapar.	0	1	2	3	4	5
26. Sık sık imkânlarımın ötesinde bir şeyler elde ettiğimi düşlerim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
27. Bazen istediğim şeyleri yapmayacaklarından korktuğum için insanlardan uzak dururum.	0	1	2	3	4	5
28. İçimde hissettiğim zayıflığı diğerlerine göstermek zordur.	0	1	2	3	4	5
29. Eleştirildiğimde öfkelenirim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
30. İnsanların bana hayran olduğunu bilmediğim sürece kendimi iyi hissetmem zordur.	0	1	2	3	4	5
31. Sık sık çabalarım için ödüllendirildiğimi düşlerim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
32. Zihnim, insanların çoğunun benimle ilgilenmediği fikri ve endişesiyle meşguldür.	0	1	2	3	4	5
33. Bana güvenen arkadaşlarımın olmasını seviyorum çünkü bu bana kendimi önemli hissettiriyor.	0	1	2	3	4	5
34. Onlar için yaptıklarımı takdir etmeyecekleri endişesiyle bazen insanlardan uzak dururum.	0	1	2	3	4	5
35. Herkes benim hikâyelerimi dinlemeyi sever.	0	1	2	3	4	5
36. İnsanların benden hoşlandıklarını bilmediğim sürece kendimi iyi hissetmem zordur.	0	1	2	3	4	5
37. Başkalarının ne kadar iyi bir insan olduğumu fark etmemeleri beni kızdırır.	0	1	2	3	4	5
38. Hak ettiğim her şeyi alana kadar yetinmeyeceğim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
39. Fedakârlıklar yaparak ne kadar iyi bir insan olduğumu göstermeye çalışırım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
40. İnsanlar beni fark etmediğinde hayal kırıklığına uğrarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
41. Sık sık kendimi başkalarının başarılarını kıskanırken bulurum.	0	1	2	3	4	5
42. Sık sık kahramanca işler yaptığımı düşlerim.	0	1	2	3	4	5

43. İyi bir insan olduğumu kanıtlamak için diğerlerine yardım ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
44. Kendim içten içe şüphe etsem bile bir şeyi tek başıma halledebildiğimi başkalarına göstermek önemlidir.	0	1	2	3	4	5
45. Sık sık başarılarımla tanındığımı hayal ederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
46. Sırtımı başkalarına dayamaya katlanamam çünkü bana kendimi güçsüz hissettirir.	0	1	2	3	4	5
47. Başkaları bana onlardan beklediğim şekilde davranmadıklarında, kendimi iyi hissetmeye devam etmem çok zordur.	0	1	2	3	4	5
48. Diğerlerinin beni kabul etmesine ihtiyaç duyarım.	0	1	2	3	4	5
49. Dünya çapında tanınmak isterim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
50. Başkaları ihtiyaçlarımı sezdiğinde gergin ve mahçup hissederim.	0	1	2	3	4	5
51. Bazen, diğer insanlardan her istediğimi alamayacağım gerçeğiyle yüzleşmektense, yalnız olmak daha kolaydır.	0	1	2	3	4	5
52. Başkaları benimle aynı fikirde olmadığında bayağı sinirlenirim.	0	1	2	3	4	5

Yenilenmiş Siber Zorbalık Envanteri- II

Aşağıda internet kullanırken kişilerin karşılaşabilecekleri bazı durumlar verilmiştir. Her bir durumun son 6 ay içerisinde ne sıklıkla başınıza geldiğini **Bana Yapıldı** bölümünde, bu davranışları ne sıklıkla yaptığınızı ise **Ben Yaptım** bölümündeki size uygun rakamı yuvarlak içine alarak belirtiniz. Lütfen her maddeyi **her iki bölüm** için de cevaplamayı unutmayınız.

İNTERNET aracılığıyla,	BANA YAPILDI				BEN YAPTIM			
	Hiç	Bir kez	2-3 kez	Üçten çok	Hiç	Bir kez	2-3 kez	Üçten çok
1.birine ait hesap şifresini ele geçirmek	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
2.başkasının hesabını izinsiz kullanarak onu küçük düşürecek paylaşımlar yapmak	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
3.birini tehdit etmek	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
4.birine hakaret etmek	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
5.utandırıcı veya kırıcı mesajlar göndermek	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
6.sahibinin görülmesinden rahatsızlık duyacağı bir fotoğrafı veya videoyu başkalarıyla paylaşmak	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
7.bir sırrı sahibinin izni olmadan başkalarıyla paylaşmak	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
8.dedikodu yaymak	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
9.bir başkası adına profil açıp oymuş gibi davranmak	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
10.küçük düşürücü internet sitesi/sayfası oluşturmak	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4