

## Griffith Institute for Educational Research



---

The ACMA Cybersmart Outreach Program Evaluation

Qualitative Report  
October, 2011

---

Prepared by the Griffith Institute for Educational Research for  
the Australian Communications and Media Authority

---

## **Acknowledgements**

### ***Project Team***

- > Professor Catherine Beavis, Griffith University, Chief Investigator and Project Leader
- > Professor Donna Pendergast, Griffith University, Investigator
- > Dr Sandy Muspratt, Independent Consultant, Project Statistician
- > Roberta Thompson, Griffith University, Investigator and Project Manager
- > Anne Merten, Griffith University, Research Assistant
- > Ledua Waqailiti, Griffith University, Research Assistant
- > Jay Deagon, Griffith University, Research Assistant
- > Jo Reynolds, Griffith University, Research Assistant and Report Designer

### ***Authorship***

Professor Catherine Beavis, Professor Donna Pendergast, Dr Sandy Muspratt, and Roberta Thompson, designed the survey items, analysed the data, and undertook a role in writing various aspects of the project report. Professor Catherine Beavis, Professor Donna Pendergast, and Roberta Thompson undertook ten site visits and analysed the qualitative data. Dr Sandy Muspratt analysed the quantitative data and completed the quantitative report.

As project manager, Roberta Thompson organised ethical processes, oversaw the implementation of survey dissemination, coordinated the research team activities and undertook a major role in writing of the project report. Roberta was supported by Anne Merten and Ledua Waqailiti. Ledua worked on the ethics applications and Anne contacted schools by telephone and worked on general administration of the project report. Jay Deagon undertook additional thematic analysis of free-text data and Joy Reynolds was instrumental in the literature search and the design and presentation of the final report.

Thanks to the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA).

Last but not least, many thanks to all of the children, parents/carers and teachers who took part in this project.

Professor Catherine Beavis

*NOTE: All names have been replaced with pseudonyms to protect the identity of the participants and their schools.*

## Table of Contents

<b>1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Background .....	1
1.2. Research objectives .....	3
1.3. Context.....	3
1.4. Research design and project organisation.....	4
1.5. Key findings: response to delivery of ACMA ISAP and PD programs.....	4
1.6. Key Findings: increased knowledge and behavioural and attitudinal change.....	6
1.7. Key findings: Actions and strategies undertaken as a result of ISAP and PD programs .....	6
1.8. Perceived effects and value of these actions and strategies.....	7
1.9. Participants’ recommendations to the ACMA .....	8
1.10. Recommendations and directions for future research.....	8
<b>2. LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Children and Young People Online .....	10
2.2 Cybersafety Concerns .....	11
2.3 Good News for Children and Young People.....	12
2.4 Cybersafety Education – An Ongoing Concern .....	13
2.5 Coordinating Cybersafety Efforts.....	15
<b>3. RESEARCH DESIGN .....</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1 Focus of the Evaluation.....	17
3.2 Data gathering and analysis .....	17
3.3 Development of data collection instruments .....	18
3.4 Data gathering and analysis .....	20
<b>4. DETAILED FINDINGS: INTERNET SAFETY AWARENESS PRESENTATIONS (ISAPS) .....</b>	<b>22</b>
4.1 Increased knowledge and behavioural and attitudinal change.....	22

4.2	Actions and strategies undertaken following the presentation .....	25
4.3	Perceived effectiveness of the presentation and the value of actions and strategies undertaken .....	28
4.4	Additional findings .....	32
4.5	Perspectives from follow-up telephone interviews.....	34
4.6	Students', teachers', and parents/carers' recommendations for ACMA.....	35
<b>5.</b>	<b>FINDINGS: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATORS PROGRAM (PD PROGRAM) .....</b>	<b>38</b>
5.1	Introduction .....	38
5.2	Theoretical background .....	38
5.3	Development of the survey.....	39
5.4	Methods for selecting the sample .....	39
5.5	Findings .....	39
5.6	Real-life experiences .....	44
5.7	Summary .....	44
<b>6.</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>45</b>
6.1	Program evaluations: Internet Safety Awareness Presentations (ISAPs) .....	45
6.2	Program Evaluation: Professional Development for Educators .....	46
6.3	Recommendations .....	46
<b>7.</b>	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>48</b>

## Table of Figures

Table 3-1 Focus Group Schools.....	21
------------------------------------	----

# 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The ACMA is responsible for the regulation of broadcasting, the internet, radiocommunications, and telecommunications. This organisation works collaboratively with industry, other levels of government and the non-government sector in Australia on the development and delivery of its programs. It also works with international partners to ensure that it is delivering a world class and world first product that is tailored and relevant to the Australian environment. The ACMA taps into the best from Australian and international researchers as well as commissioning tailored research where needed.

## 1.1. Background

In May 2008, the Australian Government committed \$125.8 million over four years to a comprehensive cybersafety plan to combat online risks and to help parents and educators protect children from inappropriate material. One of the measures included increased funding towards cybersafety education and awareness raising activities. The government's commitment to cybersafety included funding to the ACMA to develop and implement a comprehensive range of cybersafety educational activities. One of the outcomes from this funding was the ACMA's Cybersmart program, a comprehensive response to the cybersafety information needs of the Australian community.

The Cybersmart program assists schools to identify and manage cybersafety risks by empowering teachers, students and parents with the knowledge, skills and strategies to effectively address cybersafety issues. The program also assists schools in developing consistent, whole-school approaches to cybersafety by working with the entire school community, including parents/carers, to adopt protective and preventative strategies.

The multi-jurisdictional, multi-sector education landscape in Australia has required the ACMA to collaborate widely to ensure that its Cybersmart program meets the needs of all education stakeholders. The ACMA has worked closely with each state and territory education department, the federal education department plus a number of education stakeholders who play significant roles in education in Australia. Resources and programs are robust and well regarded among the education sector. For example, the Professional Development for Educators program has been accredited or endorsed in each state and territory across Australia. Similarly, education departments are actively promoting the ACMA's Cybersmart program to teachers and schools.

Using the Cybersmart brand as the key distribution vehicle, the ACMA delivers a diverse, comprehensive, and effective set of cybersafety programs, presentations, and resources tailored to meet the needs of teachers, librarians, children and parents/carers. Key educational services include:

- > free, one-day professional development program for educators nationally (Professional Development for Educators program - PD);
- > a cybersafety training program for final-year education students at universities across Australia (Pre-Service Teacher Program – PST);
- > general cybersafety presentations at schools and other convenient locations for parents, teachers and students (Internet Safety Awareness Presentations – ISAP);
- > the comprehensive Cybersmart website, providing advice to young people and parents/carers about cybersafety and security issues and how to deal with them;
- > easy access to education resources for teachers on the Cybersmart website via the Schools Gateway;
- > the interactive learning programs, Cybersmart Detectives and Cybersmart Hero, designed to make primary school children aware of the risks of posting personal information online, and how to deal with cyberbullying;
- > the Cybersmart Online Helpline, providing free advice and counselling services for young people who have experienced issues such as cyberbullying; and
- > a self-paced online Cybersmart education program that offers teachers the knowledge, confidence, and resources to help students stay safe online (*Connect.ed*).

An important aspect of the ACMA’s brief is to help foster the skills and confidence required by children and young people to use new communications mediums and services safely. The Cybersmart Outreach program was launched in 2009 and has been delivered to over 300,000 participants. The Cybersmart Outreach program offers a number of key services to schools, most important the Professional Development (PD) for Educators program and the Internet Safety Awareness Presentations (ISAPs) for students, teachers, and parents/carers. Despite minimal advertising, the PD program and the ISAPs have continued to be consistently in high demand and internal evaluations of the PD program have indicated that 99% of participants rated the program as *“very good”* or *“excellent.”*

Nevertheless, the effectiveness of the Cybersmart Outreach program has not been evaluated using external measures. Therefore, in keeping with the ACMA’s key values of accessibility, accountability, transparency, professionalism, and responsiveness, the Griffith Institute for Educational Research (GIER) has been commissioned to undertake an external evaluation of the Cybersmart Outreach program. In particular, the Professional Development for Educators (PD) and Internet Safety Awareness Presentations (ISAPs) have been evaluated to determine how effective these two segments have been in promoting productive behavioural change in relation to cybersafety. The evaluation explored the reported effectiveness of the program after both short and long term intervals, in the immediate context in relation to the PD, and after a significant time lapse of between six and eighteen months in the case of the ISAPs.

The recommendations generated from the GIER research report are expected to be useful to the ACMA in adding value to the Cybersmart Outreach program and to improve outcomes for all participants.

## **1.2. Research objectives**

Overall, the aim of this project was to evaluate, independently, the effectiveness of the ACMA's Cybersafety Outreach program (in particular, the PD program and ISAPs) in promoting behavioural change in relation to cybersafety. The specific research objectives were to:

- > identify reported change and increased cybersafety awareness in students, teachers, and parents/carers following program involvement;
- > provide a mapping of the actions and strategies taken by the participants following program involvement;
- > provide an account of the perceived effect and value of participants' actions and strategies following program involvement; and
- > provide suggestions to the ACMA on how the program might be refined, reinforced, and improved for relevant parties.

## **1.3. Context**

The internet and other new communication technologies have become ubiquitous and integral to contemporary society. As important tools for accessing information, knowledge, and entertainment, usage rates have risen substantially in recent years. In particular, Australian youth have shown a dramatic shift in their use of communication technologies.

The use of communication technologies has many positive outcomes for young people. It can enhance intellectual and social development and may provide a wealth of opportunity and educational advantage. However, the popularity of communication technologies has given rise to concerns for the online safety of youth. Children and young people are not always aware of the risks that may exist in online environments and are often unaware of the "real-world" implications and consequences of their online behaviour. As such, addressing the potential online dangers has become a public priority.

A number of community stakeholders, including government bodies and police departments, have undertaken initiatives to assist teachers and parents/carers in educating young people about online safety. In May 2008, the Federal Government committed \$125.8 million towards developing a national cybersafety policy. Part of that funding has been directed towards important education and awareness-raising activities such as the ACMA Cybersmart Outreach program. Since 2009, the Cybersmart Outreach program has been in high demand and feedback has been positive.

Although a number of the online safety concerns are not new, the rapid expansion of technology, new social networking tools and platforms, and internet-enabled communication devices (such as tablet computers and internet-enabled phones) have changed the boundaries and speed of online interaction. As such, the effort to

educate and raise awareness of online safety issues requires frequent review. Consequently, the feedback from this GIER evaluation will enable the ACMA to update and refine program content to meet ongoing safety needs of young people.

#### **1.4. Research design and project organisation**

The project comprised both qualitative and quantitative data gathering and analysis procedures, and set out to gather data on a national scale. Located in extensive reading of the literature, and linked to the ACMA Cybersmart initiatives, five surveys were developed for online delivery in participating schools across Australia to assess behavioural and attitudinal change following participation in one or both of the ISAPs and PD program.

Following the completion of all Ethics requirements, surveys were rolled out in February to March 2010. A further, stand-alone survey was developed to assess the effectiveness of the PD program, to be completed by teachers at the time of undertaking the PD, in February to April 2010. Qualitative data in the form of focus group interviews, school documents and other material was collected from ten case study schools in five states – Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania – in March and April 2010.

The quantitative dimensions of the research have been treated separately as a pilot study, given low participation rates for the online surveys, but the qualitative data presented here has been supplemented by free-text responses from the school-based and PD surveys. *ACMA Cybersmart Outreach Program Evaluation: Qualitative Research Report* presents the qualitative findings, and recommendations for future action for the ACMA. Appendices showing details of the data, coding, and analytic procedures and discussion, are included in the *ACMA Cybersmart Outreach Program Evaluation Report: Appendices*. The quantitative dimensions of the research are presented in the *ACMA Cybersmart Outreach Program Evaluation: Quantitative Pilot Research Report*.

#### **1.5. Key findings: response to delivery of ACMA ISAP and PD programs**

Students, teachers and parents/carers overwhelmingly endorsed the value of the Cybersmart Outreach program, and incorporated the content of the program into a larger body of teaching, practice and discussion in a variety of ways. They overwhelmingly reported highly valuing the ISAPs and believed that they should be available to all Australian schools.

Attitudinal and behavioural change could rarely be traced to a single influence or input. Rather, the ACMA Cybersmart Outreach program sat as a prominent and significant intervention within a suite of formal and informal information channels addressing cybersafety.

A key benefit of both the ISAPs and PD program for students, teachers and parents/carers was awareness raising. For most of the parents/carers and teachers,

the content presented was “*eye-opening*” but for most of the students, the presentation offered an extension of what was already largely familiar.

Most students, teachers and parents/carers had a generalised memory of the ISAPs as being highly effective after six to eighteen months. They recalled a small number of details specific to the presentation, and reported an increased awareness of online and mobile phone behaviours at the time as consequence of the information presented. Most information specific to the presentation had since been integrated into their more general knowledge of cybersafety.

Presenter credibility contributed significantly to students’ receptiveness to the ISAP information. Students, teachers, and parents/carers recalled the presenters’ knowledge and passion as highly influential and persuasive.

A significant proportion of students, from Years 4 through 12, strongly believed that children needed access to this information at a younger age, and in some instances, provided information to younger children about the presentation they themselves had attended. Many students and parents/carers reported that the ISAP created an opportunity for families to discuss cybersafety in an open and relaxed manner around the dinner table or during chats about the student’s day at school.

A small number of students from Years 4 through 10 experienced some distress as a result of the ISAPs. This distress took a number of forms. It included generalised anxiety about their current online practice and a sense of helplessness in the face of the predatory nature of others online; fear generated by specific “*scary*” content shown in the course of the presentation; a renewed sense of threat and insecurity associated with their own or others’ previous experiences; and a strong sense of exposure, vulnerability, and immediate danger amongst students currently experiencing cyberbullying from their peers.

For many teachers, the most significant dimension and value of the ISAP was the support it offered them in their dealings with students—helping educators and parents/carers to promote attitudinal and behavioural change in students to improve online safety and wellbeing. Many reported that their own understanding of cybersafety issues (including cyberbullying) was greatly expanded. Teachers attending the PD program reported highly positive responses especially to the content focus of the program, to the opportunities for active learning, the importance of collective participation and the immediate usefulness of the program to their everyday work at school.

Schools had difficulty in gaining parent/carer participation in the ISAPs. Amongst those parents who did attend, without exception all agreed that the ISAP should be mandatory viewing for all parents/carers. Most parents felt more knowledgeable and reassured following attendance at the ISAP, and more confident in their own and their children’s capacity to take steps to be safe online.

The overwhelming majority of the teachers who attended the PD program believed that it enabled them to gain new skills or knowledge related to their profession, and that their skills and knowledge were enhanced through attending the PD program. They encountered information they could further follow-up themselves subsequent to the PD day, and felt that information gained during the program would enhance their teaching strategies, could be integrated into their everyday practice, and would help them meet their student's needs.

### **1.6. Key Findings: increased knowledge and behavioural and attitudinal change**

Students in most schools reported that they had learnt significant new information as a result of their attendance at the ISAP. Free-text survey data indicated the program had a strong impact for many students. However, a small percentage of the self-selected group who agreed to participate in the focus groups reported that the presentation had had little impact on them, as they were familiar with the information presented already. They tended to focus on issues arising through social networking sites, as opposed to issue perpetuation (such as cyberbullying) via mobile phones. An important part of what was "new" for many students and staff was increased awareness of what other people were doing online.

Teachers overwhelmingly reported that they learnt new information from the presentation about the internet and cybersafety issues, and about what young people were doing online and on mobile devices. They were frequently surprised at what young children such as those in their classes were doing, e.g. underage use of social networking sites. A large majority of teachers felt they learnt more about their own students as a result of attending the ISAP. They felt the ISAP helped them "get up to speed" with their students. Many teachers believed there had been an increase in student awareness of cybersafety issues as a result of the ISAP but noted that long-term benefit was difficult to gauge.

Parents/carers reported that they felt less fearful and more confident about their children's online interactions as a result of attending the ISAP.

### **1.7. Key findings: Actions and strategies undertaken as a result of ISAP and PD programs**

Many students, especially younger ones, reported being more careful and attentive on the internet, as a result of attending the ISAP and took a number of actions on the basis of information received. Actions included, for example, identifying fake websites, reflecting on the impact of their own wording on emails and mobile phones, avoiding problematic websites, not opening emails from unknown people. A large number made technical changes as a result of the ISAP, e.g. changing privacy settings, changing/limiting the presentation of information about themselves on social networking sites, and blocking users. However, a significant number of the secondary school students interviewed indicated that they had made no change as a result of the ISAP. Students at half the schools checked the ACMA Cybersmart website or utilised its resources following the ISAP.

At half the schools, teachers utilised the ACMA's Cybersmart resources following ISAP or PD program either directly or had integrated materials into existing lessons or had already built the Cybersmart resources into their well-being, pastoral care, resilience or anti-bullying programs. However, most teachers reported that the ISAP had had minimal direct impact on their practice. Rather, it informed the ways in which they approached students and pedagogy within the context of everyday classroom teaching and interactions incidentally.

Parents/carers who had attended an ISAP were more open to discussing online interactions and safety strategies with their children in ways that recognised the important of online culture, digital devices and mobile phones in children's lives. As a result of attending the ISAP, some parents/carers helped their children set up social networking sites under supervision, in some cases with younger children joining those sites as friends.

### **1.8. Perceived effects and value of these actions and strategies**

Students at most of the study schools that had made changes following the ISAP, such as implementing technical changes or knowing what to avoid, said they felt safer as a result. However, in some instances it was not clear whether the small-scale technical changes made, for example, removing a middle name from personal details on a social networking site would necessarily result in increased safety.

Almost all students interviewed would approach a trusted adult for assistance if they needed help. In general, the ISAP reinforced rather than introduced this message. Many talked with others about what they had learnt, passing on what they saw as valuable. In a number of instances, students told their parents/carers about the program in order to educate and protect their parents/carers, and help their parents/carers to stay safe.

Teachers at most of the study schools believed the ISAP had equipped them to better deal with their students' cybersafety concerns. The value of the presentation for teachers, and the support it offered them in their dealings with students in promoting attitudinal and behavioural change, was a significant dimension of the Cybersmart Outreach program.

A small numbers of parents/carers attended ISAPs at schools in the study group. However, of those that did, discussions with family members and changes made to home practices prompted by the ISAP, for example, joint participation in social network sites, meant parents/carers were happier to allow their children to participate in online activities and mobile phone usage. Some found the ISAP alarming, but most were pleased to have more information about the online world, and were able to use this information to contextualise the behaviours and values of their children and children's friends. For the most part, they were more accepting of the positive role that online engagement, mobile devices, and digital culture played in their children's lives, felt empowered that there were actions they could take to

help their children stay safe on line, and more confident of their children's capacity to do so.

### **1.9. Participants' recommendations to the ACMA**

Students, teachers, and parents/carers were invited to make recommendations to the ACMA about how the ACMA could further strengthen and follow up the ISAPs. Some recommendations relate to actions to be taken by the ACMA, others to actions to be taken at school level by educators. In many instances recommendations in fact coincide with activities and resources already developed by the ACMA, and available to schools, but of which schools and teachers were unaware. Such recommendations reflect participants' level of awareness of program availability, and suggest the need for schools to become more actively aware of the ACMA's Cybersmart resources, whether through their own actions or from further initiatives from the ACMA. In the case of student recommendations in particular, such comments should be read as an endorsement of the ACMA's current programs and directions.

Recommendations from students, teachers and parents/carers mainly concerned the need to ensure such high quality presentations continued to be available free of charge, the need to find ways for all schools, students, teachers and parent/carers to attend ISAPs, potential delivery variations, new content updates, school logistics and support, and suggestions for follow-up resources. Recommendations from students included requests for more opportunities for more active participation in the ISAP and in follow-up activities.

Recommendations relating to the PD program included requests for greater differentiation within the program to reflect the differing levels of knowledge and expertise amongst participating teachers, and more opportunity to follow up skills and knowledge developed through the program with follow-up presentations later in the year.

In the case of teacher comments, the recommendations suggest that greater school knowledge of the resources provided by the ACMA is required, and that schools would benefit from more actively utilising the available resources and incorporating them into their own educational programs.

A frequently expressed need, though not necessarily a recommendation, and addressed to both the ACMA and the school, was to find ways to increase parent/career attendance at the ISAPs, whether held at the school or elsewhere.

### **1.10. Recommendations and directions for future research**

The ACMA Cybersmart Outreach program, which includes the ISAPs and the teacher PD program, should continue for the foreseeable future. The ACMA should continue to provide strategies and information to support safe practice online, with mobile phones and with other mobile technologies, and to recognise the importance of this every day aspect of young people's lives. The ISAPs should continue to be offered to all schools free of charge and the service/staffing should be extended to ensure that

the Cybersmart Outreach program scope is extensive regardless of sector and/or locale (e.g., rural and remote regions). At a minimum, ISAPs should be available to all schools on a yearly basis.

A follow-up, large scale national survey of a representative sample of students, teachers and parents/carers who have participated in the ACMA's Cybersmart Outreach program should be undertaken to provide a broad scale picture of take up and needs. To expedite ethics clearance and data gathering procedures within the timeframe of the research project, agreement to participate in such research should be requested at the time of school's requests for ISAP or PD program attendance, with, as a general rule, participation in this research contingent on their preparing to so agree.

Follow-up and/or booster presentations that review ongoing concerns and introduce new technological issues should be developed for teachers. Supplementary resources and student worksheets should be developed and provided to schools as an ongoing tool for maintaining and upgrading the Cybersmart Outreach program.

Consistent with ACMA strategic planning, program content to be reviewed and updated every six months to make certain that the most current information is provided to students, teachers, and parents/carers. However, it is not realistic to assume that complete coverage of all aspects of online engagement and mobile device usage is possible. Rather, ISAPs and the PD program should aim to be as current and comprehensive as possible, but also encourage the mind-set and technical skills required to deal with new sites and phenomena as they arise.

Schools need to take greater responsibility and a more proactive approach in partnering with the ACMA and making full use of the Cybersmart Outreach program in integrating it cybersafety awareness into school-based programs and initiatives. Consistent with recommendations in the literature, schools need to work with the ACMA to develop a coordinated approach to encourage and promote parent attendance and participation at ISAPs. Parents/carers are a valuable educational resource; enacting their support and assistance to help protect young people online is vital. Further research into broadening parent/carer participation should be undertaken.

Good pedagogy dictates that learners need to be actively engaged and that learning needs to start from 'where the learner is at'. In its present form, the ISAPs and PD program recognise the importance of online interaction, mobile devices and digital culture in young people's lives, and while acknowledging the diversity of levels of interest, access, involvement and expertise, recognise and celebrate the agential and proactive nature of the ways in which most young people manage this aspect of their lives. Future developments should capitalise on this awareness, and provide greater opportunities for young people to actively contribute to developing resources and materials that celebrate these strengths while also providing information and support.

The ACMA's Cybersmart Outreach program looks to share the positive stories of connections – a place that supports young Australians to develop positive values in online communities, with an emphasis on positive dialogue that includes words like *belonging, citizenship, connectedness, collaboration, community*. The Cybersmart Outreach program should contribute to the arena of inquiry and debate – a place for provocation and different perspectives.

There is potential for resources to be expanded to showcase examples of creative, collaborative work made by young people. This would challenge the emphasis on youth online as being one solely beset with problems and shift towards sharing what is possible.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Computers, mobile phones, and other internet-enabled communication devices have become an integral part of contemporary life. The effective use of the internet and other online tools has grown to be an important skill for everyday living. For young people, communication technologies represent the means to network with friends and family, acquire new skills, develop existing skills, and access the knowledge economy.

### **2.1 Children and Young People Online**

Australian youth have shown a dramatic increase in their use of these communication tools. Between 2006 and 2009, youth access to the internet increased by 14% (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2009). In 2007, the ACMA found that Australian families were becoming technology rich. Nine in ten families had an internet connection and three-quarters had broadband while ninety-five per cent owned a mobile phone. Moreover, they found that the internet played a significant part in children and young people's lives with eight to seventeen-year-olds spending one and a quarter hours a day online. Although media preferences changed with age, many children were found to be engaged with some form of web authorship including social network sites. Most certainly, with ongoing technological development, expanding network platforms, and improved availability of cost-effective hardware, the use of new communication technologies by Australian youth will continue to grow.

The rapid uptake of communication technologies by young people has had many positive outcomes. Enhanced intellectual and social development and opportunity for educational advancement are a few examples (Guan & Subrahmanyam, 2009). Young people use the internet to keep in touch and to make plans with friends. They visit chat rooms to find information or support, they play games, they role play, and they engage in conversations (Subrahmanyam & Greenfield, 2008). More important, social network sites, such as Facebook, have rapidly become highly trafficked online sites of young people. While exact Facebook usage figures tend to vary, in July 2011, reports indicated that there were 10.5 million active Australian Facebook users (Facebook, 2011) and that the average time spent per person was seven hours and

seventeen minutes (Nielsen, 2011). Of these users, thirteen per cent were identified as aged between thirteen and seventeen-years-old. Furthermore, the report noted that close to half of all Facebook users accessed their account from a mobile device, which suggests that young people may be more likely to engage in social networks with reduced adult supervision.

Early writings addressing the effect of social network sites on social interaction and behaviour noted that the single category of “friend” resulted in a “flattening” of relationships and interactions (boyd, 2007). Despite this shift, Tufekci (2008) found users of social network sites were not “overly worried” about their online engagement although they did exhibit a complex pattern of management and boundary negotiation. Furthermore, Ellison and colleagues (2011) have pointed out that the “earlier online communities” once used to connect people based on shared interests have moved to sites where individuals share a more common social geography. It seems likely that young people will use these sites more and more to articulate and reflect upon peer-based friendships rather than to “hook-up” with unknowns (strangers). This means that young people, in their use of social network sites, will be engaging with their school-based peers more frequently in provocative online spaces with minimal adult support. Although there has been little research published which focuses on the use of social network sites by close friends, it seems likely that school-based peer communication patterns will become more dynamic as offline/online interactions overlap and become more exclusive to the group. Moreover, the offline and online worlds of young people will become intricately interwoven and relationship problems may move more frequently between, across, and within communication platforms. Subsequently, one can expect the nature of young people’s online communication patterns to continue to transform. Such transformations may lead to a more concentrated set of cybersafety concerns including intensified cyberbullying, sexting concerns, contact issues, and privacy issues.

## **2.2 Cybersafety Concerns**

Early scholarship in the field identified three dominant online safety concerns: exposure to ‘risky’ content, privacy risks, and contact risks (Livingstone, Bober, & Helsper, 2005; Livingstone & Helsper, 2007). Exposure to ‘risky’ content was defined as incidental or deliberate access to pornographic material and commercial or violent content. Privacy risks include identity theft and financial sabotage whereas contact risks involve exposure to online sexual solicitation, sharing personal information with online ‘friends’, and going to offline meetings with people met online. However, young people have reported that cyber-aggression has been of greater concern to them, in particular, cyberbullying and hostile messaging (Cross et al., 2009; Lenhart, Madden, Rankin-MacGill, & Smith, 2007; Patchin & Hinduja, 2006; Urbas & Krone, 2006; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004). School administrators, teachers, and parents/carers have voiced similar concerns and when recently surveyed, almost all of the participating Australian parents/carers indicated that they had concerns about their child’s internet use (ACMA, 2009).

Unfortunately, the prevalence of cyberbullying has been difficult to gauge. Self-reporting mechanisms used to ascertain cyberbullying levels have not used consistent terminology to describe the behaviour and survey methodologies have varied. Furthermore, young people have been notoriously reluctant to report online bullying for fear of retaliation and/or not being taken seriously by adults. In addition, threats of disconnect have been shown to hinder students' reporting of online problems to adults (Cross et al., 2009). Kraft and Wang (2009) found that without the internet and a mobile phone, students felt disconnected and isolated from their peer group. However, regardless of methodology concerns and reporting issues, there has been sufficient empirical evidence to suggest that the problem does exist, continues to grow, and has intensified and become more complex (Hinduja & Patchin, 2009; Kowalski, Limber, & Agatston, 2008; McDougall, 2009; Spears, Slee, Owens, & Johnson, 2008).

One of the leading concerns associated with cyberbullying has been the underlying problem of youth anxiety and depression. In extreme cases, cyberbullying has led to teen suicide and peer murder (Hinduja & Patchin, 2008; Kowalski et al., 2008; Shariff, 2008). In less severe cases, students have experienced a general malaise or disenchantment from modern society, which has affected their physical, psychological, and academic wellbeing (Craig & Pepler, 2004; Olweus, 1993; Rigby, 2002; World Health Organization, 2004). The potential for young people to experience negative offline consequences following exposure to online victimisation has raised serious concerns about the safety and wellbeing of young people.

### **2.3 Good News for Children and Young People**

However, it is not all bad news. Most people recognise the benefit of young people engaging in online contexts and the need for them to participate in the digital economy (ACMA, 2009). The need for a continued focus on the factors that affect young peoples' online experiences, the developments in technology, and the changes to user guardianship have been identified as key intervention points. A number of Australian and international organisations have effectively responded to these and other cybersafety issues that confront our young people.

At the broad structural level, significant efforts have gone into developing cybersafety education, awareness-raising and assistance programs, and cybersafety policy. In Australia, the key government bodies undertaking work in this field include the Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy (DBCDE), the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA), the Australian Federal Police (AFP), the Department of Education, Employment, and Workplace Relations (DEERW), and the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA). Each state/territory in this country has developed safety frameworks and/or adopted internet usage policies which support the safety and wellbeing of young people. In addition, work is being undertaken in other Australian jurisdictions including industry partners (e.g., Telstra) and non-government organisations (e.g., Alannah and Madeline Foundation).

Cybersafety research has been comparatively limited. However, the common characteristics between cyberbullying and traditional bullying have led to the premise that similar intervention strategies will be effective for both and a whole school approach coordinated across systems has been recommended. The key feature to such an approach is the emphasis on education as a vehicle for developing and extending cybersafety awareness. Cybersafety education initiatives have been developed and delivered by many groups in Australia. One of the key programs that offer a coordinated approach to cybersafety education is the Cybersmart Outreach program presented by the ACMA.

The Cybersmart Outreach program includes an Internet Safety Awareness Presentation (ISAP) for students, teachers, and parents/carers. The one hour presentation highlights key cybersafety issues and delivers important messages and practical advice on how to minimise cyber risks. In addition, the program includes an accredited Professional Development (PD) for Educators program that covers a diverse range of issues including cyberbullying, safe social networking, identity theft and exposure to inappropriate content and contact. This program gives teachers hands-on experience in how to effectively use the ACMA's cybersafety resources and teaching guides. A pre-service teacher program has been added to the Cybersmart Outreach program which aims to equip teacher education students with the skills and knowledge to educate their future students about cybersafety issues. The Cybersmart Outreach program is supported by a set of ACMA's educational resources which includes the Cybersmart website and other interactive resources such as Hector's World, Cyberquoll, Cybernetrix, and Wiseuptolt.

Important to the broad structural cybersafety initiatives, a universal school-wide program has been recommended as a cost-effective and efficient approach to educating young people about cybersafety (Lam & Frydenberg, 2009). This approach involves establishing a school-wide comprehensive anti-bullying policy, consequence strategies for inappropriate use of technology, student contracts for school-based technology use, school and/or state internet filtering devices, and student/parent reporting procedures. In addition, schools have been encouraged to increase supervision of students' online work, to raise awareness about cyberbullying and other online risks via internet safety programs, and to implement an integrated cybersafety curriculum (Aftab, 2010; ACMA, 2009.; Balls, 2008; Brookover, 2008; Campbell, 2005; Daly, 2010; Willard, 2007). In the Australian context, a whole-school approach linked to government programs (such as the ACMA's Cybersmart program) has long term positive implications and connectivity to the ACARA national curriculum and the digital education revolution.

## **2.4 Cybersafety Education – An Ongoing Concern**

It must be noted that some aspects of the whole-school approach to cybersafety education have been met with criticism. Punitive and prohibition approaches, technical up-skilling, and awareness-raising programs have been at the forefront of these discussions (Kraft & Wang, 2009). For instance, Notley (2008) has drawn attention to the equality of opportunity aspect of prohibition approaches. She has

suggested that filtering devices and other access controlling mechanisms impede some young people's ability to use online networks effectively. For some, home internet access may be quite limited and the school represents the only opportunity to work on and develop digital literacy skills (Livingstone et al., 2005). Chibnall and colleagues (2006) found that internet safety programs effectively increased students' knowledge of safety strategies. For example, students were able to identify useful technological features aimed to minimise cyberbullying such as 'bully blocking'. However, to date, research has not found that increased knowledge and skills resulted in decreased risky behaviour or alternatively, increased socially approved actions (Kraft & Wang, 2009). Furthermore, Campbell (2009) has argued that cyberbullying is a complex problem that cannot be solved by "easy tips". She has suggested that telling a victim to "block the person" will only provide temporary respite from the problem – if someone intends to hurt you, he/she can always find another way. Moreover, young people have reported that the least effective strategies taught in internet safety programs are those in which adults say to them— "don't cyberbully" (Moessner, 2007). Students have indicated that they prefer prevention programs, which empower them to stop cyberbullying. For instance, young people want to know how they should respond when, as a bystander, they witness cyberbullying (Kowalski et al., 2008). Furthermore, overall success of programs has been linked to an ongoing cybersafety dialogue, consistent teacher/parent monitoring of online activities (Kraft & Wang, 2009), and follow-up booster presentations for students (Lam & Frydenberg, 2009). While some programs may be subject to particular omissions and/or oversights, the ACMA Cybersmart program has been developed to specifically address Australian children's and young people's online needs and sensitivities, including bystander response and the fostering of ongoing dialogue with trusted adults such as their parents and teachers.

Parent/carer participation in cybersafety education has been identified as a key feature of the whole school approach. For example, Aftab (2010) has suggested that parents/carers are in a good position to keep the cybersafety dialogue ongoing and can easily monitor children's online activities. Moreover, Kowalski and colleagues (2008) reported that young people felt more comfortable telling a parent about threatening incidences because, in general, young people believed school adults could not help them much. However, earlier research has shown that some parents/carers are often unaware of and ineffectual in responding to the risks their children take online (Livingstone & Bober, 2006). More recently, Aftab (2010) has suggested that parents/carers overreacting to inappropriate online actions and not taking the online threats seriously can be problematic. She has suggested that parents/carers need to be up-skilled on cybersafety strategies to minimise over reaction to common but inappropriate online actions.

While there has been much support for educating parents/carers in cybersafety, programs such as the ACMA's ISAP for parents/carers are often poorly attended or cancelled. Encouraging parent/carer attendance at information presentations has often been an ongoing concern highlighted by many teachers and school administrators. The increasingly sophisticated patterns of cyberbullying and the

rapid development of communication devices will require parents/carers to be better equipped with knowledge on how to help their child/ren with cyber-problems. Hence, the increased participation of parents/carers in the cybersafety whole-school approach would seem to be a highly relevant priority for all concerned parties.

## **2.5 Coordinating Cybersafety Efforts**

Although cybersafety education and cyberbullying prevention have been flagged as community concerns, some teachers and school administrators have questioned the school's responsibility in addressing the issue. However, Daly (2010), an experienced Australian educator, has argued that cybersafety is a school responsibility much the same as other social concerns (such as drug education, road safety, and safe sex). He has suggested that schools will need to take responsibility for cybersafety education because online safety skills will not necessarily be taught elsewhere. Daly has pointed out that most teachers understand they have a moral obligation to protect their students from danger, which includes online environments. Moreover, he has suggested that the debate should be about how to resource cybersafety education rather than whether or not it is the responsibility of the school. Many schools have not been allocated a budget for a cybersafety teacher therefore, it seems a realistic aim would be to encourage educators and parents/carers to engage with the available resources and services provided by the broader community.

As pointed out by Gaffney (as cited in Lee & Finger, 2010), the development of digital technologies has created an urgent need for strengthening the home-school nexus. Lee and Finger (2010) have argued that educators need an approach that goes beyond banning and filtering. They have proposed that educators embrace the concept of digital citizenship; an approach that is more about informing, critiquing, and building knowledge, skills and understandings in young people about digital spaces. They have suggested that as schools move to empower students in online environments, educators and policy-makers will need to take deliberate steps to enhance and promote a networked approach. Governing bodies have not overlooked the need for this networked approach. Groups like the ACMA have been pushing towards a whole-school approach through the coordinated and systemic approach of the Cybersmart Outreach program.

In 2003, the Australian Government released the first National Safe School Framework (NSSF), an agreed national approach that acknowledged the impact of bullying, harassment, violence, abuse, and neglect on school enjoyment and learning outcomes for children. As peer-to-peer relationship problems continued to evolve in online spaces, the Federal Government and other community organisation have initiated plans to educate and raise public awareness concerning online safety issues. Subsequently, the NSSF has been revised to include information and strategies for preventing/minimising student cybersafety concerns (Australian Government, 2011).

The NSSF (revised 2011) has been aligned to recommendations and suggestions for student online safety proposed by the national and international education and research community. Of the framework's nine elements, two features are important to cybersafety education. First, the framework has suggested that ongoing professional learning from experts in the field is effective practice for improving student safety and wellbeing. Providing quality professional learning opportunities to increase teacher awareness/capacity and technical literacy will help to improve responsiveness to student online safety concerns. Importantly, the effectiveness of professional development programs to enhance teacher efficacy and to improve student-learning outcomes has been well-documented (Desimone, 2009). Out-posting critical skill development and awareness raising activities in technology by experts for educators has important implications for student safety and wellbeing (Hanewald, 2008).

In addition, and relevant to cybersafety, the NSSF has indicated that partnerships with families and the community will help to develop and maintain safe student practices at school and in the community. As such, the NSSF has recommended that schools work with community organisations to provide a consistent message about online safety. Furthermore, working collaboratively with parents/carers to provide opportunity for education about online safety and student wellbeing has been suggested. Community and parent involvement in school-based process has been linked to improved school culture, improved student connectedness, and decreased student aggression. A positive school culture with strong student connectedness has been shown to improve student safety, which supports the underlying principles of the NSSF approach and links to government funding processes.

Overall, there needs to be a noticeable shift in the language used when discussing the online world – one from a protectionist angle, to a celebratory perspective. This shift allows movement from the *one size fits all* approach to one that ensures students engage in active discovery and produce materials inspired by their imagination. It is about knowledge sharing and collaboration – where the teacher also actively learns from his/her students. Online technology education to date has been limited to a safety and fear paradigm. Discourse needs to move onwards from language that includes words like *risk*, *protection* and *safety*. The ACMA's Cybersmart program could be a program that explores digital citizenship and shares the positive stories of these connections – a place that supports young Australians to develop positive values in online communities, with an emphasis on positive dialogue that includes words like *belonging*, *citizenship*, *connectedness*, *collaboration*, *community*.

## 3. RESEARCH DESIGN

### 3.1 Focus of the Evaluation

The Cybersafety Outreach program delivers face-to-face presentations to audiences of students, teachers, and parents/carers. Delivered without charge and Australia wide, the three programs currently available are:

- > Internet Safety Awareness Presentations (ISAPs) for students, teachers, and parents/carers;
- > Professional Development (PD) for Educators program; and
- > Pre-Service Teacher (PST) program (launched in June 2010).

The aim of the project was to identify reported behaviour change amongst students, teachers, and parents/carers in relation to cybersafety as a result of their participation in two key aspects within the Cybersafety Outreach Program in 2010/2011, the Internet Safety Awareness Presentations (ISAPs) for students, teachers, and parents/carers and the Professional Development for Educators program (PD). The research was designed to provide an evaluation of the success of the ISAPs and the PD program and to provide recommendations for future developments and research.

#### ***Internet Safety Awareness Presentations (ISAPS)***

The ACMA provides the Internet Safety Awareness Presentations (ISAPs) in support of a whole-school approach to cybersafety education. An ACMA Cybersafety Trainer provides 45–90 minute presentation on cybersafety issues for students, teachers, and parents/carers. These presentations are adapted to suit the different audiences (and ages of the student groups). The presentations are easy to understand, non-alarmist, thorough and informative. They cover a range of issues including:

- > the ways children use the internet and emerging technologies;
- > potential risks faced by children when online such as cyberbullying, identity theft, inappropriate contact and exposure to inappropriate content; and
- > tips and strategies to help children stay safe online.

#### ***Professional Development (PD) for Educators program***

The PD program was developed in consultation with key stakeholders and education bodies and launched by the ACMA in January 2009. This full-day program is designed to provide primary and secondary teachers with a comprehensive understanding of the technology students are using as well as current cybersafety issues and risks. It provides teachers with a comprehensive understanding of a modern student's technology profile, digital literacy, positive online behaviour, personal and peer safety and the legal obligations of schools and teachers to minimise and address risks.

### 3.2 Data gathering and analysis

The research design utilised a mixed methodology, with responses to the ISAPs and PD program collected through qualitative data gained from case study visits to ten

participating schools in February and March 2011, including focus group discussions with participants (students, teachers, and parents/carers) and through follow-up telephone interviews. Further data on the PD program was collected through surveys undertaken by participating teachers at the conclusion of seven PD programs, in February and March 2011. This dimension of the research was complemented by large-scale surveys of participating students, teachers, and parents/carers, which serve as a pilot study for future ACMA research. The findings presented in this report are drawn primarily from the qualitative data, supplemented by the 'free-text' commentary embedded in the quantitative survey instruments. Discussion of the quantitative surveys, data gathering processes, related issues and recommendations are presented in the accompanying document: the *ACMA Cybersmart Outreach Program Evaluation: Quantitative Pilot Research Report*.

### **3.3 Development of data collection instruments**

Two sets of data collection instruments were used, one for qualitative and one for quantitative data gathering and analysis. Data gathering instruments were developed side by side, to allow for data gathered from separate sources and instruments to be combined for the purposes of analysis.

#### ***Qualitative data gathering instruments***

Qualitative data gathering was comprised of observations, interviews and the collection of artefacts and was gathered through a range of methodologies. These included:

- > field visits comprised of attendance at school- based ISAPs for students, teachers, and parents/carers and attendance at the PD program;
- > focus group discussions at ten designated 'site study' schools with students, teachers, and parents/carers in two schools per state spread across five states: Tasmania, Victoria, South Australia, New South Wales and Queensland. Schools were selected from those schools on the list of participating schools originally provided to the Research Team by the ACMA, who had full ethics approval to participate in the research from the relevant state, dioceses or school council, and who had indicated a willingness to do so – see below;
- > materials developed by the schools as part of their cybersafety or anti-bullying programs;
- > responses sent to schools from parents/carers to the ISAP and cybersafety initiatives undertaken by the schools; and
- > follow-up phone interviews with participants following the research team's visit.

Interview schedules for the focus group interviews were developed in tandem with survey items, and benefited from the refinement of these items through several drafts and feedback from the students, teachers, and parents/carers who piloted the survey questions. As with the survey items, discussion schedules drew on relevant literature in the fields of cybersafety, new media and digital culture, middle years schooling and teacher professional development. Interview questions were designed

to allow insights made available through analysis of the quantitative data to inform, illuminate and/or elaborate the analysis of qualitative data, and vice versa. Thus, questions for students, teachers, and parents/carers for the focus group presentations corresponded broadly to individual items in the surveys for students, teachers, and parents/carers, but provided scope for greater differentiation and specificity.

Interview schedules were organised under five headings:

- > students', teachers', and parents/carers' responses to the ISAPs,
- > new knowledge, reported behavioural and attitudinal change,
- > actions taken by students, teachers, and parents/carers at home and at school as a result of the presentations
- > perceived issues and impediments to implementing structures and actions to support behavioural change.
- > recommendations to the ACMA in relation to future presentations.

The thematic analysis of case study school reports for students, teachers and parents/carers are provided as Appendix 1 in the accompanying volume, (*ACMA Cybersmart Outreach Program Evaluation: Appendices.*) The reports themselves are provided as Appendix 8. The telephone interview text is provided as Appendix 9.

### ***Quantitative data gathering instruments***

A survey gathering teachers' assessment of the effectiveness of the PD program - Measuring the Effectiveness of Professional Development (MEPD) - was located on the ACMA server and undertaken onsite by participating teachers at the conclusion of PD program in February and March 2011. Survey items were organised under five headings:

- > Content
- > Active learning
- > Coherence
- > Duration
- > Collective participation

Details of the MEPD surveys and extended discussions of analysis and findings are provided in Appendices 4 and 5 (*ACMA Cybersmart Outreach Program Evaluation: Appendices*).

Additional wide scale quantitative data was gathered through five online surveys administered through participating schools. From the pool of schools that had undertaken the ACMA Cybersmart Outreach program in 2009-2010, 222 were eligible to participate. Questions for the surveys administered through the schools were developed by the research team based on explicit and implicit analyses of key themes in the literature and research on online safety, issues identified in the tender briefing document, and analyses of key themes in the literature and research on effective teacher professional development. The surveys were administered online using the *LimeSurvey* software package operating on a server located at Griffith

University. Low response rates led to this aspect of the original research design being treated as a pilot. Free-text data from those surveys completed, however, provides a useful supplement to qualitative data gathered via the school visits and follow-up telephone interviews. A brief discussion of the organisation, management and analysis of the surveys and survey data as it pertains to the use of free text data in this qualitative report is presented in Appendix 11 (*ACMA Cybersmart Outreach Program Evaluation: Appendices*). The surveys as a whole are reproduced in the accompanying document, the *ACMA Cybersmart Outreach Program Evaluation: Quantitative Pilot Research Report*, together with a full discussion of their analysis, findings and implications, together with recommendations for future research.

### **3.4 Data gathering and analysis**

Data gathering took place during the first school term of 2011, with analysis and the preparation of this report taking place in the May-June period, 2011.

Field observations of the Cybersmart Outreach program took place in August and September 2010 and the visits to the study schools took place in March and April 2011. Three members of the research team attended the PD program in August 2010, using field notes and observations to provide guidelines for development of the survey designed to evaluate this program and to inform the interview schedules developed for use in the ten study schools. Three members of the research team attended the ISAPs provided successively to students, teachers, and parents/carers at one school in September 2010, with field notes and observations similarly informing the development of the interview schedules for use in the study schools. At the same time, the surveys that comprised the main element of the proposed quantitative dimensions of the research went live online in participating schools. While data from these surveys has not been incorporated into this report, for reasons of scale and validity, free text comments provided by students, teachers, and parents/carers within the online surveys have been used where appropriate to supplement the qualitative data that forms the basis of this report.

The completion rate of the MEPD surveys evaluating the effectiveness of the PD program were sufficiently robust to allow for the incorporation of findings from the separate survey specifically addressed to this aspect of the Cybersmart Outreach program. Findings specifically related to the PD program, and collected through the MEPD survey, are discussed below.

#### ***Sample selection of case study schools: ISAP evaluation.***

The ten study schools were chosen to provide a range of perspectives, and to provide small scale, textured insights into the ways in which the Cybersmart Outreach program was experienced and acted upon in specific school contexts. Schools were selected from schools that had agreed to be followed up and would be participating in all three ISAPs (student, teacher, parent/carer) within the period identified for school visits in September and October 2010. ACMA provided a list of 13 schools in the five states identified as likely to provide a good indication of range

while also being financially within the scope of the project. Two schools each were located in Tasmania, Victoria, South Australia, New South Wales and Queensland, and included primary and secondary schools, State and Catholic schools, in both metropolitan and regional settings. All schools were co-educational.

**Table 3-1 Focus Group Schools**

School Code	School Name	Sector	Division	Location	State	Cohort Size
1	Cedar Tree High	State	Secondary	Metro	Qld	1500
2	Maple Leaf State Primary	State	Primary	Metro	Qld	750
3	Elm Street Primary	State	Primary	Rural	SA	100
4	The Tree Fern School	State	P-12	Outer Metro	SA	1450
5	English Oak Primary	State	Primary	Metro Beach	NSW	250
6	Magnolia Public	State	Primary	Metro Beach	NSW	1000
7	Rowan Woods Secondary	Catholic	Senior Sec	Outer Metro	Tas	900
8	Beechnut College	Catholic	K-10	Outer Metro	Tas	950
9	St Parklands Primary	Catholic	Primary	Metro	Vic	350
10	Rosebud Park Primary	State	Primary	Outer Metro	Vic	450

Three members of the research team participated in the first visit to a study school to establish common understandings, protocols and expectations for interviews undertaken subsequently in the nine remaining schools. Visits to the remaining nine schools were shared amongst three members of the research team. Interviews were recorded and the school reports written up within the week. Contextual information about each school, including demographic data, mission statements and details of existing cybersafety and student welfare programs was collected prior to each school visit, and provided framing material for the visit and the report. Related information and artefacts, such as materials used in existing programs and emails sent by parents/carers to the schools in appreciation of the program, were also collected at this time. The complete reports for each of the ten schools are presented as Appendix 8.

Interview data was analysed for key themes, grouped according to student, teacher, and parent/carer insights. Findings are discussed in detail in the following section, with the summary grid showing themes and representative comments presented as Appendix 1. Free-text from student surveys has been used to supplement commentary on these findings (Appendix 2). Vignettes drawn from study sites are presented to provide a richer picture of the experience and impact of ISAPs in situ.

### ***Sample selection for the Measuring the Effectiveness of Professional Development survey.***

Teachers attending all PD programs scheduled for the data-gathering period (February to March 2011) were invited to participate in the survey. Of sixty-six teachers who undertook the surveys onsite during the PD program, sixty completed the survey in full. The online survey tool is presented as Appendix 4, and detailed discussion and analysis of the data is presented as Appendix 5.

## **4. DETAILED FINDINGS: INTERNET SAFETY AWARENESS PRESENTATIONS (ISAPS)**

The GIER evaluation examined the effectiveness of the ACMA's Cybersmart Outreach program for students, teachers, and parents/carers. The key purpose of the study was to determine how effective the presentations and programs were in promoting behavioural and attitudinal change in relation to cybersafety. This section focuses on the Internet Safety Awareness Presentations.

Visits to ten Australian metropolitan and regional schools were undertaken between March and April 2011. The data was collected through onsite focus group discussions with students, teachers, and parents/carers who had attended ISAPs in September and October 2010. Although it was understood that retrospective data collection may result in some detail loss, participants' recall after a six-to-seven month time lapse was considered a good indicator of the dominant effects of change in the participants' cybersafety practices.

Data was thematically analysed (see Appendix 1) and key elements and trends consolidated into four overarching areas, organised according to student, teacher, and parent/carer insights:

- > increased knowledge and reported behavioural and attitudinal change;
- > actions and strategies undertaken following the presentation;
- > perceived effectiveness of the program and the value of actions and strategies undertaken; and
- > additional findings.

Each section concludes with a short "real-life experience" vignette.

Recommendations from the three groups, students, teachers, and parents/carers follow.

### **4.1 Increased knowledge and behavioural and attitudinal change.**

#### ***Overview***

It is difficult to trace specific behavioural and attitudinal change about cybersafety practice to a single influence or educational program. A number of participants pointed out that there were several community services, which addressed online concerns. Some of these options included alternative professional development programs, guest speakers, educational resources, and websites. Several participants indicated that they did not use a single source of information to enhance student online safety. Instead, they used a cross-section of blended materials and services. For instance, a few teachers suggested that the school/state internet filtering device, when combined with information from the ISAP, was useful in raising student awareness about unsafe web sites. Another teacher indicated that the ISAP prompted her to "Google" other resources to use in her classroom and at home with her children.

In addition, some participants linked particular online actions and strategies to the ISAP, even though these topics may not have been specifically discussed. For example, one group of students spoke, in detail, about the “winner’s pop-up box.” Even though the students appeared to have reasonable memory of this feature of the presentation, the supervising teacher suggested that more immediate online issues, problems, and concerns were influencing the students’ responses. Discussion of pop-up boxes did not figure in her own memories of the presentation.

Most participants indicated that the ISAP sat as a prominent and significant intervention within a suite of formal and informal cybersafety information sources. In the main, students, teachers, and parents/carers considered the presentation to be of high quality, engaging, and very relevant to the current social and educational milieu. Participants agreed that they had gained new knowledge about cybersafety and that the ISAP was put together in a realistic yet age-appropriate manner. However, for a number of students (and a much smaller group of teachers and parents/carers) the presentation covered largely familiar ground. A number of participants viewed the ISAP as foundational to cybersafety and they believed it had great synergies with other services, each building on the other. Many teachers indicated that they had used the ISAP information to extend students’ cybersafety knowledge and awareness within the classroom, deliberately and/or coincidentally. Teachers who were also parents indicated that the ISAP information was helpful for both classroom and home-use. Several students indicated that they had shared important cybersafety points with parents/carers and siblings and, for many, program insights had informed home practice.

An important part of what was “new” for many students and adults was an increased awareness of what other people were doing online, colouring their perceptions of the sites and spaces in question. While the centrality of online activity to contemporary life was confirmed, and there was confidence for the most part in the effectiveness of measures that could be taken to stay safe, both students and adults stated that they were surprised that simple online games and networking sites for children, such as Moshi Monsters, were also subject at times to the intrusion of hostile or predatory behaviour. Both adults and children used the words “eye-opening”, “frightening”, and “kinda scary” to express the program’s impact on their understanding of what happens in online environments. Several participants indicated that they already knew “quite a bit” about online safety concerns. However, for most attendees, the program provided a deeper understanding of online environments and established a scale of cyber-activity.

*“It (the internet) was much bigger than I imagined ... you think you’re getting on the computer but there are all those other people and links.”*

For this respondent, the scale of cyber-activity, once understood, was “kinda scary.”

### ***Student insights***

In most schools, students indicated that they enjoyed the ISAP and that they had learned a significant amount of new information about cybersafety. Students

described it as *“fun”, “useful”, and “enjoyable”*. As one student observed, *“I’m really glad someone is out there trying to help us”*.

Students consistently reported that the presenter understood *“what people liked about going online”* and that the presenter’s accounts of personal online experiences were valued. However, a number of students reported that they found the programs’ content *“confronting”* and *“a bit scary”*. The strong impact of the ISAP was supported by students’ free-text survey data collected during the quantitative pilot study (Appendix 2).

Although the majority of students believed the program extended their existing knowledge in useful ways, some students felt that the presentation had little or no impact on them or relevance to their particular technology usage. *“This presentation gave little impact as I have been through all this information before at various times with teachers and other presentations”*.

### ***Teacher insights***

Teachers overwhelmingly described the ISAP as excellent and indicated that they had learned a great deal about the internet, cybersafety issues, and young people’s online behaviour *“the session [presented at the staff meeting] was excellent ... fantastic ... informative ... it was the best staff meeting ever.”*

Some teachers reported that the presentation had given them the *“tools to talk to young people at their level”* while other teachers felt that the ISAP had helped them to *“get up to speed with the kids.”*

Teachers frequently reported that they were *“amazed”* at what children *“got up to”* considering *“they can’t even remember their own password.”* Many expressed surprise at the number of under-age children with Facebook profiles. For some, this was a matter of concern and shock. Some teachers discussed the legalities around underage membership and what they regarded as the naivety of parents/carers who sign-up their children for Facebook accounts.

While a number of teachers spoke positively about Facebook and other social network sites, and seemed comfortable about the place of such sites in young people’s lives, for some information about the misuse of sites presented in the ISAP tended to eclipse the pro-social aspects of this form of online activity. Some teachers linked bullying to these online sites.

*“some of the bullying we deal with at school, when you dig into it, it comes back to what they are doing in places like these.”*

Several teachers believed that the ISAP had increased student awareness of cybersafety issues. However, they also indicated that the long-term benefit of the presentation was difficult to gauge. Staff indicated that the student ISAPs had been presented quite some time ago and they believed many students might not remember the finer details.

### ***Parent/carer insights***

For the most part, parent/carer comments mirrored the teachers' view of the ISAP. They agreed that the presentation was informative and that it helped to give adults a better picture of young people's online behaviour. Parents/carers found the experience to be extremely positive and indicated that it was relevant for families with children of all ages. One parent reported that the presenter showed them *"how they could use this valuable resource safely"* and she came away from the presentation *"feeling more positive and more confident"*. The key message was that there were things parents/carers could do about online problems – *"let them do it but be vigilant about how they do it."*

*"I actually feel better about it – he made me feel more positive because I was so worried about it, I felt my children were vulnerable."*

Overall, parents/carers believed that all families should be encouraged to attend the ISAPs. *"We cannot stop communication. Parents need to develop a new attitude; they need to be part of it."*

### ***Real-life experiences***

#### ***Eve's perspective: changing attitudes for one parent***

Prior to attending the parent ISAP, Eve did not allow her children to have social networking profiles. She was worried about the *"creepy behaviour"* of online personalities and *"how easy it was for people to find you with only a little bit of information"*. However, the presentation had a profound impact on her attitude and actions regarding cybersafety. Eve came to realise that with a more open approach towards communication technology, she would be better able to protect her children. The evening after the parent presentation, she sat down with her oldest child (a 13 year-old boy) and together, they created a Facebook profile. She took this opportunity to review safe online practices and emphasised the need to be open and honest about online activity. By attending the parent ISAP, Eve came to understand that she needed to go with technology—be a part of it with her child. Banning certain social network sites was not going to stop her child from finding other ways to communicate with online friends.

## **4.2 Actions and strategies undertaken following the presentation**

### ***Overview***

One of the objectives of this evaluation was to identify whether participation in the presentation initiated a change in attendees' online actions and strategies. Many students reported that they had made technical changes to their online communication processes following the ISAP. In addition, several students indicated that they had become more careful and attentive while online. At half the study schools, students reported that they had used the ACMA Cybersmart resources and/or checked information on the ACMA Cybersmart website. However, some students indicated that they did not change anything after attending the ISAP.

By and large, adults were less likely to report changes to their own online actions and strategies. Half the teachers indicated that the presentation had minimal impact on their teacher practice, while half indicated that they had incorporated the ACMA Cybersmart resources into their existing lessons. One school reported that they were in the process of developing and integrating a cybersafety scope and sequence series into the school curriculum, complemented with ACMA Cybersmart resources and web materials. The majority of parents/carers indicated that they did make some changes to their home practice following the presentation.

### ***Student insights***

Students at study schools, and in free-text responses, reported making a broad range of technical changes to their online practice following attendance at the ISAP. For example, students made changes to their privacy settings on social networking profiles, changed or limited the presentation of personal information on their pages, altered details on their social network site accounts to minimise identity theft, remove or changed photos and images, and blocked certain users from their personal accounts.

Many students reported checking their social network accounts “*straight away*”. Most commonly, they checked accounts for their personal details (such as contact phone number and home address) and their personal images. One boy indicated that he made sure that any photos posted showed him with a group of friends not by himself. Another boy said he had taken down images of himself and replaced them with photos of objects he liked (for example, a basketball because he enjoyed playing the game).

Students at most study schools indicated that they were being more careful and attentive while on the internet as a result of attending the ISAP. For instance, students suggested that they were more likely to check the authenticity of websites they visited, consider and reflect upon the wording of their emails and mobile phone texts, and avoid problematic and/or inappropriate websites.

Some students reported that they were more cautious about opening emails/messages from unknown people and avoided adding unknown online friends to social network pages. Two students stated that after the presentation, they started checking “*the profiles of friends of friends*”. One younger girl said that she started thinking more about the wording of emails. “*One email was supposedly from my sister. I’m just thinking WHAT ... my sister wouldn’t say that!*”

Half of the students reported using the ACMA Cybersmart resources and/or checking the Cybersmart website following the presentation. For example, one child revealed that his siblings were hacking into his online accounts so he used the information from the ACMA Cybersmart website to improve the strength of his password.

However, half of the students reported that they did not use any of the Cybersmart resources afterwards and several indicated that there was little follow-up and discussion from teachers since. This suggests there is a need for ongoing support at

the school level and that the effectiveness of Cybersmart Outreach program could be increased through subsequent school-based activity, to provide scaffolded learning with longer lasting benefits and success.

Some students made the point that nothing had happened to them that required seeking help and/or resources from the ACMA Cybersmart website. Other students had poor or incorrect recall of the presentation content. For example, one student said that you should lie about your age (*“that would be helpful and protect you”*) while another student said that *“it would be safer to change your name”* so she put in a *“fake middle name”*. Still other students reported that they did not know where to go for follow-up information. *“I don’t remember if they said there was a website but you can imagine there would be one”*. One girl was very clear that she would NOT talk to any adults about online problems. She feared that by discussing her online troubles, her online participation would be restricted: *“adults will overact and it will cause more trouble for me”*.

### ***Teacher insights***

For the most part, teachers indicated that the key benefit of the presentation was awareness raising and many reported that their own understanding of cybersafety issues (including cyberbullying) was greatly expanded. However, teachers’ increased awareness was not always translated into changes to their personal online actions and strategies. Several teachers, as parents/carers, indicated that they already had a strong sense of what children *“got up to”* online and, therefore, had a number of cybersafety strategies in place at home. Strategies in place included rules for online activity, filtering devices, and placing computers in a public place.

One of the youngest teachers indicated that he had a very strong sense of what could be done on the internet so he wasn’t surprised by the material presented at the ISAP. Following the presentation, this teacher checked his privacy settings, *“cleaned up”* his social networking site profile, and hid his *page “deeper—I really hid it!”* Another teacher reported that he spoke to his own children about the ISAP content although he felt that they did not really listen—*“they think they know everything because they are older (18 and 19).”*

Some teachers indicated that the program had not had a direct effect on their teaching practice, particularly in schools where the ISAPs formed part of a pre-existent or ongoing program, or conversely, in schools where teachers did not believe that internet safety issues applied to the children in their school, because of the children’s relatively young age, or family background. For instance, one school believed on the whole that cybersafety concerns were problematic for older children. They reported that they already had guidelines in place for student use of computers and that students were monitored at all times. There had been a focus on the security of student passwords but this process was not connected to the ISAP. In essence, there were no changes reported and the school considered none to be necessary. One teacher commented that she thought of cybersafety as a *“high school teenage girl”* problem. At another school, one teacher indicated that she had

attempted to order the Cybersmart materials online but had had some difficulties in doing so. She was not clear on the problems, although she later mentioned that the materials *“need to be easier to immerse into lessons”*, there is *“too much to read”*, and it is *“a bit daunting”*. Overall, there was a sense that some of the teachers believed that the program helped to modify people’s thoughts, but whether or not it changed their behaviour was difficult to measure.

However, a number of teachers reported the opposite effect. These teachers indicated that the ISAP information and resources were an efficient way of incorporating cybersafety content into their teacher practice. One teacher said she filtered the ISAP content into her lessons when moments come up. For example, she might ask the students *“how they would identify a reliable online source and then relate their responses back to the ISAP”*. Another teacher reported that she went to the ACMA Cybersmart website following the presentation and trialed some of the curriculum materials in her classroom. She described them as *“fabulous - little packets of five or so lessons”*.

### ***Parent insights***

Several parents/carers reported making household changes immediately following the ISAP. One parent made changes that evening. She discussed the content of the presentation with her children and implemented some of the things the presenter discussed, such as modifying privacy settings. This parent also set up a computer usage timetable, which introduced computer-free days. Another parent developed a set of rules for computer use that included these steps—*“ask to go online, tell me what you are looking at online, and tell me how long you will be online”*. One parent indicated that she now sits closer to her child while he is online. She has become more vigilant and mindful of what her son is doing online but tries to do so non-intrusively. Another parent changed his entire family’s Facebook settings, removed information from each member’s profile, and checked all of the photos. He also stated that he has told all his family and friends, please don’t tag my photos.

## **4.3 Perceived effectiveness of the presentation and the value of actions and strategies undertaken**

### ***Overview***

Students, teachers, and parents/carers believed that the ISAP had equipped them with strategies to better deal with cybersafety concerns. In many cases, the respondents felt safer as a result of attending the ISAP. Most respondents had implemented technical changes recommended by the presenter and were more knowledgeable about what to avoid online. Overall, attendees perceived the ISAP as an effective and valuable means for informing the public about cybersafety. *“Tell everyone that all students at St Parklands Primary School ... loved it!”*

### ***Student insights***

A number of students indicated that they felt safer and “more secure” after attending the ISAP and implementing the presenter’s recommendations. For some

students the content was not new, although most reported that the presentation had extended their knowledge base in useful ways.

*"I already knew quite a bit but the program gave me more depth."*

*"I knew how to make myself safer, but learnt more about how dangerous it is out there."*

Some students reported a sense of reassurance – *"the core message was that you can be online and you can be safe"*. This notion was important to them because adults often tell young people that communication environments are not safe.

*"I am really glad that people are out there trying to help us. He was really straightforward and gave clear guidelines about what to do."*

A number of students indicated that their first response to the information presented in the ISAP was to feel scared and/or worried. One boy reported that his initial response *"was to become quite worried about what people were doing on the other end"*. A number of students *"got worried"* so went home *"and Googled themselves straight away"*. For most of these students, the sense of fear abated as the presentation progressed.

*"I felt a bit upset because I was more aware but he showed us how to do things so I felt better – I felt scared then safe."*

However, at one site, a teacher reported that after the ISAP, his primary school students were *"spooked"* and *"in tears"* because they were worried about what they had on their Facebook page and that the teachers could see their profiles.

One student reported that the presentation was not successful in alleviating her concerns about online safety. She was already fearful, and her previous experiences had led her to believe that there was not much point in trying to protect yourself online because *"they will find you if they want to"*.

Almost all of the students interviewed indicated that they would approach a trusted adult if they needed help with online troubles. Many students could identify the steps to take if problems did occur. They indicated that young people should tell a parent and/or teacher, block the user, remove personal details from profiles, use the site report button, and stop going to sites where problems have occurred.

*"The video in the presentation showed us what to do if there is a problem, you should do the same thing, go to your mum."*

*"You go to someone you trust like a teacher and get proof."*

A number of students reported that their parents/carers, friends, and teachers had already discussed many of these things with them before but that the presentation reinforced the information in an engaging way.

*“The video [as shown in the ISAP] helped to stick it in your mind.”*

At most schools, students, to varying degrees, talked to friends and parents/carers about the presentation and shared what they found to be most valuable. For many of the students, the ISAP created an opportunity for families to discuss cybersafety in an open and relaxed manner around the dinner table or during chats about the student’s day at school.

A number of children indicated that following the ISAP, they were more concerned for parent/carer and sibling safety in online contexts and believed it would be helpful for their families to adopt some of the strategies to stay safe.

*“It was helpful for my mum to know.”*

*“My parents didn’t know some of the stuff.”*

*“I told my brother things about Facebook and he changed some things.”*

*“The things that happen don’t just happen to kids, they happen to parents as well.”*

However, a few of the older students believed sharing the ISAP information with their parents/carers was not necessary. They indicated that *their “parents did not need to know about the internet”* because *“young people know more about it than their parents anyway, their parents trusted them to know what they were doing”*, and *“they did not want their parents to stop them doing things”*. One girl was very clear about not talking to adults about online problems because she feared they would limit her online participation – *“adults will overreact and it will cause more trouble for me”*.

For the most part, students agreed that, although *“eye-opening”* and *“kinda scary”*, children and young people of all ages would benefit from attending the ISAP.

*“It was a shock but it was good to know all that stuff.”*

### ***Teacher insights***

Teachers at most schools believed that the ISAP provided them with actions and strategies to better deal with students’ cybersafety concerns. For many, the presentation increased their overall awareness of the ways in which children used online spaces. The presentation offered teachers a platform for ongoing discussion and staff development about cybersafety. Some teachers commented that the online cybersafety curriculum offered by the ACMA Cybersmart website made it easier for them to draw on relevant and up-to-date content when addressing pressing classroom concerns. For many teachers, the program provided them with a sense of power and control over problematic online behaviour and closed the gap in their own knowledge base.

However, for some teachers there appeared to be a growing sense of weighty responsibility for students’ online behaviour and some reluctantly observed that a

loss of control over young people’s behaviour seemed inevitable in the online context.

*“Kids are always five paces in front of teachers. We’re never going to catch up. We’re only in front for a millisecond.”*

For many teachers, the most significant dimension and value of the ISAP was the support it offered them in their dealings with students—helping educators and parents/carers to promote attitudinal and behavioural change in students to improve online safety and wellbeing.

*“Overall, the program raised our awareness and now the goal is to try to introduce cybersafety – make it visible and focused in lessons and the curriculum.”*

### ***Parent insights***

For most parents/carers, the ISAP provided an opportunity to engage with teaching staff and share concerns about young people in online environments. A number of parents/carers had made significant changes to their online actions and had incorporated new online practices into the home environment. Some parents/carers indicated that the presentation had had a profound effect on their attitude towards the internet and social networking sites. A number of parents/carers indicated that the presentation had given them a new opportunity to talk to their children about cybersafety. For the most part, parents/carers indicated that although a number felt “it was scary”, they believed that children could benefit from online environments and stay safe. Without exception, parents/carers agreed that the ISAP should be mandatory viewing for all parents/carers.

*“As a parent, I think it is wonderful. I would like to see it go through the whole school community.”*

*“This was a comprehensive package. The presenter was so up to date; he had a handle on the latest and was not ‘nerdy’. The program should be offered every year, perhaps at the beginning of the year so that teachers could build on and revisit the content.”*

### ***Real-life experiences***

#### ***Amy presents a Year 7 response***

Here is my report about the Internet Safety Awareness Presentation. We did not have very much education about cybersafety at our school so the presentation was great. Most of the kids at our school felt safer after they saw the presentation. Some children were still a bit scared later on. One girl said she put a video of herself up on YouTube and one of her friends said that was not safe. She was kinda scared about that.

The presenter told us many things that we did not know before. For example, he talked about fake web sites and problems that young people have on social networking sites. We were all surprised that Moshi Monsters could be unsafe. Lots

of us stopped going there after that. Several students felt uncomfortable when the man asked us about social network sites that were for older kids. Some of us felt a bit guilty about having an account on Facebook. I was very happy to find out how to deal with bullying. These are the steps the man spoke about.

1. Show your mum or dad.
2. Make a copy of the message.
3. Show the police and tell them who it is, if you know.

The man from ACMA also told us not to give out our phone numbers to people we did not know, not to pass on other people's phone numbers, not to respond or argue back, stay off sites where bullies are, and not to give your details to strangers or people you have just met.

I spoke to younger children in my school about what the man had said. Some of my friends thought it might scare them but I think that it is important for them to know. My parents were very happy that I went to this free presentation to find out more about what was really going on. My mum wanted to come along but she had to work so I told her all about it.

I did make some changes to my online behaviour. I deleted some people from my Facebook account that I did not know, I stopped clicking on pop-up boxes, and I definitely stopped going to some websites including Moshi Monsters. This presentation was really good. It was a convincing and informative afternoon. The man from ACMA gave us all internet awareness and I feel safer. Thank you!

#### 4.4 Additional findings

##### ***Presenter credibility***

The presenter's credibility contributed significantly to students', teachers', and parents/carers' receptiveness to the ISAP information. The currency of the presenters' knowledge and their sympathetic awareness of digital culture and the importance of online interactions to students' worlds was key here, supported by sound educational experience and training. Students generally listened closely to the presentation and teachers indicated that their attentiveness was strongly linked to the quality, style, and authenticity of the presenters' stories. Students consistently reported that the presenter understood what young people like to do online. Students indicated that they valued the personal accounts from the presenter's own experience. Most students felt that the presenter was up to date and they emphasised that he/she presented information that was relevant to them. The presenter was overwhelmingly reported as engaging, and general impressions were extremely positive.

*"The kids thought the presenter was cool. He really grabbed their attention."*

*"We could tell they were impressed by him; they were hanging around him afterwards asking him questions."*

*"I heard one student say, how could he know all that stuff?"*

*"She spoke at our level. She found funny points and kept people interested."*

*"She didn't speak down to us."*

*"She made us realise what was happening but didn't make us feel bad about it."*

*"The presenter didn't just use words, he used visuals which made it more interesting."*

*"He didn't just talk to you and talk to you, he made it much more."*

### ***Parent participation***

Poor parent attendance was an overriding concern for many teachers and school principals. They believed that much of the online behaviour discussed in the presentation happened/started outside of school hours and for that reason, parents/carers needed to be updated on potential dangers. Many of the educators pointed out that the parents/carers were *"the first port of call"* and as such, it was important to think of ways to engage them in the program.

Although most schools found it difficult to attract parents/carers to the ISAPs, teachers and principals overwhelmingly believed that the students would benefit if their parents/carers attended.

*"If parents are signing their children up for Facebook when they are underage, then parents need to come to sessions to find out more about cybersafety issues and legal requirements for social networking sites."*

Teachers suggested various strategies to increase parent participation in the ISAP. For example, one principal asked the parents/carers to send in their comments about the presentation, which would be then used to help the school promote/advertise the 2011 parent ISAP (Appendix 10). At another school, the Principal, disappointed by parent turnout, copied the ACMA Cybersmart website link into the school newsletter, and recommended that parents/carers review the important information found there.

### ***Underage engagement with social network sites***

Many of the teachers reported that they were *"shocked"* at the number of underage students with accounts on social network sites. Teachers suggested that if parents/carers attended the ISAP, they would probably be less likely to allow their children to engage with these types of network sites, or would have a greater understanding of what children did online and might support them to be safe more actively. A few teachers believed that some of the younger children were encouraged by older siblings to go onto social network sites or that, at the very least, older siblings might be signing younger family members up for such accounts. One teacher asked, *"what does that say about parent/carer supervision at home?"*

However, one teacher said that she thought parents/carers did try to monitor their children online but that they were not very good at it because they did not know what to look for. Some parents/carers have supported this comment. *“I feel that my children are safer because, after attending the parent session, I am more mindful in the home”.*

### ***Real-life Experiences***

#### ***Deputy Principal Kerry’s views on improving parent/carer attendance***

*“Online safety is a community-based problem and we need parents/carers to be involved. Parents will not let their children walk home from school but they let them loose on the internet. Then, when a problem comes up, the school is the first port of call ... but generally, the issues are happening outside the schoolyard.*

*“Parents really need to attend this presentation to be more aware of online concerns. We think the best way to go about this would be to engage the children in the parents/carers’ presentation. When we want parents/carers to attend something important, we ask the children to present part of the content or to role-play an aspect of the presentation. We always get full parent participation when their children are in the spotlight. For example, when we held a drug education program for parents/carers as a part of our health and wellbeing unit, we had the students work with the program facilitators to present the content – full house!”*

### **4.5 Perspectives from follow-up telephone interviews**

The project plan included follow-up telephone interview with adult participants from the ten study schools. These interviews were to be conducted two weeks following participation in the ISAPs. However, the interviews did not occur at that time because in some regions, ethical clearance was still pending. As an alternative to this process, telephone interviews were conducted two to three weeks following focus group participation. Interviewees included teachers and/or administrators from nine of the ten participating schools (Appendix 8). A teacher from one of the school sites had moved to another institution hence was not available for comment. Due to the busy nature of schools, the encroaching school holidays, and the difficulties in ‘catching’ interviewees at an appropriate time, the telephone interviews were often shorter than planned.

Teachers and administrators, overwhelmingly, reported that the focus group presentations had been a positive experience and that participation in the presentation had had a constructive flow-on effect for the school and the students. Interviewees reported that the research process was clearly explained and the questions asked led to an excellent discussion and sharing of valuable viewpoints.

Most teachers/administrators reported that the participating students found the focus group presentation interesting and relevant with some students reporting further modification to their Facebook profile following the focus presentation. However, one Deputy Principal suggested that it would have been optimum to have the focus group discussion closer to the presentation delivery date to improve

student memory. Some students indicated that they had been a bit nervous and were concerned that they may not have answered the questions well because six months has passed since they had seen the ISAP. A few students reported that during the discussion they were a bit confused by the different terms used amongst fellow students such as social networking, Facebook, email, chat, and Twitter.

Following the focus groups presentations, several schools reported a revitalised interest in cybersafety among the staff and students. One Deputy Principal indicated that the ongoing need for further education in the area of cybersafety had been reassessed and they were cancelling their Road Safety Education Program to use the time for Cybersafety Education. In addition, this same school had applied to participate in the PD program and were actively pursuing online resources to educate their students further. One teacher indicated that the focus group presentations provided parents/carers with an opportunity to reflect on their children's use of the internet and it brought the topic back into family discussions. She reported that the research presentation provided students with a valuable opportunity to re-visit what they had learned from the ISAP the previous year. Another interviewee reported that ICT and cyberbullying were priority focus areas at their school and they expressed sincere thanks for the opportunity to participate in the GIER evaluation process. He found it beneficial to hear his staff's viewpoints and felt that the information they shared was very valuable.

#### **4.6 Students', teachers', and parents/carers' recommendations for the ACMA**

Recommendations from students, teachers, and parents/carers for the ACMA concerning potential delivery variations, new content updates, school logistics and support, and follow-up resources have emerged from the Cybersmart Outreach program evaluation. Some of these recommendations are already in place.

##### ***Student Recommendations***

Students provided a number of recommendations about how the ISAPs might be improved for young people.

##### ***Potential Delivery Variations***

- > modified versions of the presentation be available for children of different ages;
- > ensure presentations to younger students are not frightening and do not create worry;
- > provide presentations for students at least once a year;
- > cover similar content in repeat presentations but present it differently with new examples and resources;
- > include hypothetical and drama scenarios ... what would you do if ... ;
- > present information to younger children before they go on Facebook, but remove any reference to suicide, ('you don't want little kids to freak out!');
- > don't keep telling students ... don't do this, don't do that;

- > include some humour and add some jokes to help students remember the information;
- > provide detailed demonstrations on how to change the settings on a range of the more popular sites; and
- > tailor the presentations to Year levels.

### ***New Content Updates***

- > include more information about piracy;
- > include a full report on viruses and spyware;
- > provide more information about the Google “are you feeling lucky” link;
- > provide more information about how to check out online friends.;
- > provide more information on how hackers think and how what to do about people who hack into your profiles, etc.; and
- > update the program to keep pace with technology.

### ***School Logistics and Support***

- > encourage teachers to review different aspects of cybersafety regularly, e.g. at weekly assemblies;
- > do not schedule presentations for parents during the day;
- > put a cybersafety notice on the school website; and
- > provide chairs rather than require students to sit on the floor - students need to be comfortable to learn.

### ***Follow-up Resources***

- > provide students with a step-by-step information sheet on how to stay safe online;
- > provide students with show bags with information brochures and small posters;
- > provide students with a fridge magnet or a sticker with a contact helpline, website, or telephone number;
- > set up a safe website for kids to use to communicate to each other;
- > create a game for younger children where they gain points by doing the right thing (e.g., block a 50-year-old paedophile – gain lots of points);
- > provide parents with a CD disc of the program so that they can watch it when they are not busy;
- > create test sites to practice cybersafety skills and then send students to another site to check answers;
- > create a catchy phrase or logo to help kids remember the helpline;
- > give the students an exam to make sure they understand the key messages; and
- > provide follow-up worksheets or reports to complete at school to encourage more discussion after the presentation.

### ***Teacher Recommendations***

Teachers and principals also provided a number of recommendations about how the ISAPs might be improved for young people.

### ***Potential Delivery Variations***

- > provide more time to review the ACMA Cybersmart resources during the ISAPs; and
- > engage students in the presentation by allowing them to present part of the ISAP content.

### ***New Content Updates***

- > update the ISAPs on a regular basis to include new and changing online situations and technology;
- > provide practical presentation for students on how to change privacy settings;
- > develop a more advanced level of the program for repeat presentations;
- > continue to update the ACMA Cybersmart website and resources with more stories and activities so that the materials can be used with students for several years;
- > provide information on how to create alternative forums for children to engage in safe online networks; and
- > provide a list of safe options for children rather than just saying 'this is bad'.

### ***School Logistics and Support.***

- > develop strategies to help schools encourage parents/carers to attend the ISAPs;
- > send out factoids or 'how to' email bulletins to the school community (including parents/carers);
- > advise schools when presentations are on in their area so that schools could share or piggy-back on each other's presentations;
- > increase the availability of presentations;
- > run the ISAPs in conjunction with other safety awareness programs; and
- > offer two parent presentations to improve parent participation, one at drop-off time, and one in the evening.

### ***Follow-up Resources***

- > provide refresher courses or follow-up presentation for teachers;
- > prepare a sheet of short snappy warnings and reminders so that schools can use these statements in daily or weekly bulletins/newsletters;
- > provide some sort of hand-out material for teachers with a follow-up activity for students; and
- > provide a current list of educational websites and problem websites.

### ***Parent/Carer Recommendations***

Parents and carers provided a number of school logistic and support recommendations to ensure greater parent participation at the ISAPs. Their recommendations primarily require action from the school, rather than from the ACMA.

### ***School Logistics and Support***

- > develop more ideas and particular strategies to encourage parents/carers to attend the ISAPs;
- > capitalise on opportunities for other community-based services could offer the presentation to make it more accessible to parents/carers (e.g. Church Safe Place Committee);
- > offer an evening presentation followed up by a day presentation, where “word-of-mouth” might help to increase the number of parents/carers attending; and
- > attempt to reach parents/carers through their children.

## **5. FINDINGS: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATORS PROGRAM (PD PROGRAM)**

### **5.1 Introduction**

Between February and April 2011, the effectiveness of the PD program delivered at school-based and off-site locations was assessed using data gathered through an online survey undertaken at the completion of each program. Sixty-six teachers who had attended one of seven PD programs conducted during this time undertook the survey with sixty of these completing the survey in its entirety. The survey instrument, ‘Measuring the Effectiveness of Professional Development’ (MEPD) was originally developed by Pendergast and Main (Under review) and adapted to this context. The survey instrument is provided in Appendix 4. The following sections of the report outline the processes and outcomes from that survey. Full details of this report are provided in Appendix 5.

### **5.2 Theoretical background**

Drawing on the work of Desimone (2009), the PD program was evaluated for its effectiveness in terms of meeting the key features necessary for effective professional development for teachers. Based on richly informing literature, Desimone (2009) has developed a core theory of action for professional development which typically follows the following steps:

- > teachers experience effective professional development;
- > the professional development increases teachers’ knowledge and skills and/or changes their attitudes and beliefs;
- > teachers use their new knowledge and skills, attitudes, and beliefs to improve the content of their instruction or their approach to pedagogy, or both; and
- > the instructional changes foster increased student learning (Desimone, 2009 p.184).

The sequence Desimone outlines can be hindered at any stage along the process, and frequently stalls at the first step —teachers experiencing effective professional development. Assessing the effectiveness of PD programs is therefore essential to ensuring successful professional development.

There are five core features that are widely endorsed by the field as being critical components for effective teacher professional development: content focus; active learning; coherence; duration, and collective participation (Penuel et al., 2007). *Content focus* refers to the knowledge and skills necessary for teachers to carry out their day-to-day work with respect to the topic of the professional learning, within the classroom. *Active learning* refers to opportunities to be actively engaged in meaningful discussion, planning and practice during the professional development activity and the reality of their day-to-day work. *Coherence* refers to the connection between the professional development activity and the reality of the classroom. *Duration* refers to the need for the professional development to be of sufficient duration to enable engagement, leading to possible intellectual and pedagogical change. Finally, *collective participation* refers to the opportunity for participants to undertake professional development with others from the same school or group that sets up potential for interaction and discourse, which can be a powerful form of learning. In using this theory to inform the development of the survey, a focus on the first step in the desired sequence is possible.

### 5.3 Development of the survey

Using these five core features as a base, an instrument currently under development by Pendergast and Main, and trialled elsewhere to evaluate their own effectiveness as educators delivering teacher professional development, was modified for use in this study. The initial instrument has been used in a range of settings, and was used in this study to gain insights into the comprehensiveness of core features regarded to be critical for effective teacher professional development. The survey has two parts: demographic information; and, evaluation of the professional development program.

### 5.4 Methods for selecting the sample

Teachers attending the PD program in February, March, and April 2011 were invited to complete the MEPD survey. This survey was located on the ACMA Cybersmart website and teachers Australia-wide were directed to the site as part of their evaluation of the PD program at the end of the presentation.

### 5.5 Findings

The surveys were administered online using the *LimeSurvey* software package operating on a server located at Griffith University. The data was downloaded from the *LimeSurvey* server in a Comma-Separated Values (csv) format. All general data processing was completed and initial descriptive statistics were obtained using the R statistical environment (R Development Core Team, 2010), and graphical output was produced using the *ggplot2* package (Wickham, 2009, 2010) – a package written for the R statistical environment.

#### ***Demographic background of respondents***

A total of 60 teachers responded to the MEPD survey in its entirety; 44 were female and 16 were male. A further six began the survey but did not complete it. The dates

on which the survey was completed indicated that they attended one of seven PD programs, run between mid-February and early April.

The teaching experience of the teachers ranged between two years through to more than 30 years, but the majority of respondents (45%) had between 6 and 15 years teaching experience. The teachers represented 36 schools, a mixture of state, Catholic and independent schools. Most schools were represented by one or two teachers, but one school was represented by six teachers. In addition, there were nine teachers who were not attached to a particular school but rather were relief teachers (teachers who could be called upon to do relief work in a number of schools). Four teachers did not name a school. Other questions asked teachers about their qualifications and the work they perform within the school (the year levels they teach, the roles they perform, and their positions of responsibility).

The most common qualification held by participating teachers was a Bachelor degree: secondary teachers usually held a degree plus a Graduate Diploma in Education; primary teachers had usually completed a degree in teaching. Most of the teachers were either generalist primary school teachers or secondary classroom-based subject specialists. Some teachers were responsible for student wellbeing, pastoral care, or pupil welfare, and some held senior management positions, such as year-level coordinators or deputy principals. The most common position of responsibility nominated was 'Classroom Teacher'. The second most common position of responsibility was 'Other'. Respondents in this category may have required a further category currently missing from the list on the survey form such as 'House Coordinator' or similar. With respect to the year levels in which teachers currently teach, the distribution was reasonably uniform, with the number of teachers across the year levels ranging between 17 (for Year 7) and 25 (for Year 9).

### ***Evaluation of the effectiveness of the PD program***

There were five sections in the survey dealing with the effectiveness of the professional development, arranged to reflect the core features:

- > Content Focus containing nine questions;
- > Active Learning containing ten questions;
- > Coherence containing eight questions;
- > Duration containing five questions; and
- > Collective Participation containing six questions.

This resulted in 38 questions in total. The questions were in the form of statements. The response scale was a five-point Likert-type scale (ranging between "Strongly Agree" through to "Strongly Disagree") asking teachers to indicate their level of agreement with each statement. Ten statements were negatively worded. Each of the five sections finished with an open response item that invited respondents to make further comments on the usefulness and/or appropriateness of each element in turn. The number of comments overall was small, and the length of the comments brief. This resulted in insufficient qualitative data to conduct thematic content analysis, as intended in the research design. Instead, comments were analysed using

valence to capture the overall positive or negative nature of the responses. Direct quotes are included to provide insights into the types of comments made by respondents.

On the whole teachers were in agreement with the Content Focus, Active Learning, and Coherence statements. Teachers appeared to be less in agreement with some Duration and Collective Participation items. The majority did not disagree, with two exceptions concerning the need for additional time for the Professional Development. The list of items for each heading are outlined in Appendix 4, with findings summarised below.

### ***Content***

The overwhelming majority of the teachers believed that the PD enabled them to gain new skills or knowledge related to their profession, and that their skills and knowledge were enhanced through this PD. They believed they could see areas related to the material presented on the day that they could follow up with further individual research, that the PD would help them enhance their teaching strategies, and that the PD took into account the learning needs of all the teachers in attendance. Most felt that the PD met their learning goals, would help them meet the needs of their students, and they would be able to integrate this PD into their day-to-day practice. A slightly smaller majority (5/6) believed the PD topic was important because it linked directly to state or national goals.

Respondents were invited to make additional comments regarding the Content Focus of the professional development and 35 took the opportunity to do so. Overall the comments were very positive, with only 3 of a neutral or slightly negative valence. Typical positive comments included:

*“Content was very relevant and made valuable links with real life scenarios and classroom situations.”*

*“Excellent content focus. Suggest that peppering anecdotes through the presentation also enhances the reality of the content and gives attendees 'hooks' to hang on to and to apply to real life application.”*

*“Very well presented and delivered. Relevant curriculum content for K-12.”*

### ***Active Learning***

With respect to Active Learning, the overwhelming majority again was in agreement with the statements on the survey. For the first item in the list ("I believe that I will be able to apply what I have learned"), all respondents were in agreement. The vast majority agreed that they would be able to explain the content to others who had not attended, that they were given the opportunity to practice new skills during the activity and that they were able to give feedback on the ideas of others, and that they were able to observe others modelling good practice around the PD model. More than two thirds believed they were encouraged to share best practice during the PD, were able to solve a problem they had or suggest a solution to a problem

someone else had, were able to practice skills under simulated conditions, were given feedback on their ideas, and that the lead role was not confined to the facilitator.

Respondents were invited to make additional comments regarding the Active Learning focus of the professional development and 22 took the opportunity to do so. Comments were overwhelmingly positive, with only 1 having a negative valence. Typical positive comments included:

*“The interactive nature of the program made it very effective in delivering the content. The ability to log directly onto the websites discussed enhanced my understanding of the issues involved.”*

*“The program was a good combination of listening to relevant information and independent exploration of the provided resources.”*

*“It was great to have a scenario in mind to guide my exploration of the ACMA resources. I thought this was an efficient way to achieve both learning outcomes.”*

### **Coherence**

There was a similar pattern of results for the Coherence set of items, with the exception of the last two items in the list. Questions in this area concerned the relationship between the PD program and its connection to their day-to-day work and other professional development activities. They included questions about whether participants saw a direct link between this PD and their everyday practice, whether learning about this topic would improve their work, whether they could see this topic linking to other professional development activities, whether putting what they had learnt at the PD into practice would improve student outcomes, whether they could put what they had learnt on the day into practice, and whether they were able to address any problems they experienced. The last two items dealt with prior knowledge of the content of topic of the professional development. Although there is, on the whole, very strong agreement with the first 6 items, in relation to the last two – whether they already knew enough about the topic and whether they had done any training in the area before – there were large numbers of teachers who already knew about the topics, or who had already done some training other than that provided by the ACMA in the area of online safety.

Respondents were invited to make additional comments regarding the Coherence focus of the professional development and 12 took the opportunity to do so, all making comments with a positive valence. Typical positive valence comments included:

*“This presentation flowed effectively, and made relevant links to real situations within the school environment.”*

*“Excellent!”*

### ***Duration***

With respect to Duration, teachers were mostly in agreement with the proposition that the PD program was long enough (item 1 in the Duration set), but conceded that they might need more training in the future (item 5) although not necessarily a "refresher course" (item 3). However, they were in disagreement with the statements concerning the need for additional time for the current PD (items 2 and 4).

Respondents were invited to make additional comments regarding the Duration of the professional development and 23 took the opportunity to do so. The overall valence of the comments was split across the domains, but with more positive (13) responses, the remaining being neutral or negative. Typical positive valence comments included:

*"Duration was appropriate. If the course is too long—information overload can occur."*

*"To keep up to date with what is happening in the cyber world it would be useful to update skills at least biannually. The length of this PD was just right and with just enough content."*

A number of neutral valence comments related to Duration referred to varying knowledge bases of participants and the need to vary presentations accordingly:

*"Maybe you need to have different PD activities for people with different prior learning bases"*

Negative valence responses tended to refer to the PD being too short, e.g.:

*"could be longer to go more in depth."*

### ***Collective Participation***

This section of the survey asked participants whether they believed there was real benefit if several members of the school attended this PD together, whether they were able to develop a common understanding of the knowledge or skill with their colleagues, whether peer support would help them apply learnings from the PD, whether they could discuss concepts and skills with the colleagues with whom they worked most closely, whether they did any planning on their own or with colleagues, and whether they believed it was important for all teachers to participate in this activity in order for them to improve their own practice. No teachers were in disagreement with any of the propositions, but there was some uncertainty concerning the items dealing with discussions with colleagues, planning either with colleagues or on their own, and the extent to which an improvement in their practice depended upon the attendance of other teachers at the PD (item 3).

Respondents were invited to make additional comments regarding the Collective Participation focus of the professional development and 13 took the opportunity to do so. The overall valence of the comments was split across the domains, but with

more negative (8) responses, the remaining being neutral or positive. The key message to come from the comments in this section was the potential benefit of having colleagues present to engage in the presentation together. This is evident in the majority of the responses, such as:

*“There is power in numbers and I believe that it would have been useful to attend with other teachers/welfare staff from my school.”*

*“In order to achieve a whole school approach for cybersafety or an holistic approach in any school a collective participation approach would be essential.”*

*“I attended on my own, but feel that there would be a benefit from a team attendance.”*

## 5.6 Real-life experiences

### ***Jessica, John, and Jeremy attend the ACMA’s Cybersmart PD program***

Two teachers, Jessica and John, along with their Deputy Principal, Jeremy, attended the ACMA’s Cybersmart PD program. All members were excited about the program content; *“it was fantastic!”* They appreciated the online interaction presentation at the end of the program and were able to download the many resources to take back to their school.

The three staff members found the program so helpful that they decided to present the PD content to their colleagues in a follow-up presentation at school. The staff who attended this presentation said that the enthusiasm of their colleagues indicated a lot about the quality of the ACMA’s PD program. Many of the staff described the ACMA information as *“a real eye opener”* and that, in reality, *“teachers didn’t know the half of it!”*

The wave of enthusiasm carried across the entire staff and as such, the school developed and is now implementing a school wide ICT scope and sequence curriculum. The series has embedded the ACMA Cybersmart resources and website *“as is, without any change”*. The teachers agreed to use these resources because they are easy to access, the quality is very good, and they are aimed at the right level for their students. No need to reinvent the wheel when the quality is so good!

## 5.7 Summary

Utilising Desimones (2009) core theory of action for professional development, the first step of evaluating teachers experience about the effectiveness of the professional development was evaluated in this survey. Respondents reported generally positive responses to the sub-elements of each of the five core elements, especially the Content focus and to a lesser degree Active Learning; Coherence and Duration. The element of Collective Participation was regarded to be important but a slightly smaller majority of participants experienced this during the PD presentations. This may be in part due to choices at school level about how many participants to send to professional development days but underlines the need for schools to send more than one staff member, and to adopt a whole of school

approach to cybersafety awareness and the importance of helping students stay safe on line in an increasingly digital world.

## **6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The evaluation clearly demonstrated very high levels of support for the Cybersafety Outreach program amongst students, teachers, and parents/carers, and an expressed need to consolidate and extend both the program and program coverage further.

### **6.1 Program evaluations: Internet Safety Awareness Presentations (ISAPs)**

The content of the ISAP and the extensive knowledge, credibility and presence of presenters were key factors in the success of the ISAP with students, who found the content current, relevant and in many instances eye-opening. The personal qualities of the presenters and their sympathetic awareness of the importance of internet - enabled communication and mobile devices in students' lives, meant that students attended closely to the ISAPs and felt 'understood'.

The ISAPs tapped into complex matters of everyday life where they were negotiating issues of friendship, peer group culture, identity, representation and bullying, and helped them see constructive paths through difficult situations. Strategies presented to them by the ISAPs were discussed with friends and family, and provided specific actions they could take to keep themselves safe. Students from mid Primary level through to the final years of schooling all commented on the value of the presentations, on what they had learnt, and on the desirability of the ISAPs being available to all students, in all schools. While some, especially younger students, became more fearful as a result of the information presented at the ISAP, almost all felt wiser and empowered as a result of their attendance, becoming both more cautious and informed, and making changes in both minor and more significant ways in their online and communicative practices. A number of students took it upon themselves to speak to younger children about what they had learned through the ISAPs in order to extend a similar protection to them.

Teachers were unanimously enthusiastic in their praise for the ISAPs. The information presented was new to most, and for many teachers a revelation of the level and sophistication of digital culture and online communication, of the complexity of issues faced by students, and their skill, for the most part, in negotiating these. Teachers felt the presentations helped them understand more about their students, and about some of the behaviours they encountered on a daily basis at the school. These ranged from the exacerbation of tensions, unhappiness common to some friendship groups through the extension of off-line relationships into online contexts such as social networking sites or the misuse of mobile phones through to the targeting of individual students for bullying, or the entrapment and surreptitious filming of teachers and classroom contexts in set up situations.

Teachers incorporated information provided at ISAP into their pastoral care, in some

instances integrated it into classroom teaching, and integrated the ISAPs into larger programs focussing on well-being, resilience and anti-bullying.

Parents talked with their children about information gathered at the ISAPs and in the case of younger children worked with them to help them set up social network accounts or undertake other forms of online participation in ways that allowed both parents and children to feel safe. Parents distinguished between the knowledge, interests, and nous of different children, and in the case of older children particularly, were prepared to trust their children's judgement and good sense in online and mobile phone interactions. In some instances they suggested scare tactics should be used as a mechanism to get more parents to attend ISAPs at school, while in others they wrote letters and emails of affirmation for schools to put into newsletters to encourage other parents to attend.

## **6.2 Program Evaluation: Professional Development for Educators**

Teachers who attended the PD program regarded the presentations as extremely useful along several dimensions including content, active learning, coherence, duration and collective participation.

## **6.3 Recommendations**

The ACMA Cybersmart Outreach program, which includes the ISAPs and the teacher PD program, should continue for the foreseeable future. At a minimum, the ISAPs should be available to all schools on a yearly basis.

Program content should be reviewed and updated every six months to make certain that the most current information is provided to students, teachers, and parents/carers.

Follow-up and/or booster presentations that review ongoing concerns and introduce new technological issues should be developed for teachers.

Supplementary resources should be developed and provided to schools as an ongoing tool for maintaining and upgrading the Cybersmart Outreach program.

The Cybersmart Outreach program should continue to be offered to all schools free of charge and the service/staffing should be extended to ensure the program reach is extensive regardless of sector and/or locale (e.g., rural and remote regions).

More important, the ACMA will need to develop strategies for schools which will help them to encourage and promote parent/carer attendance and participation at ISAPs. Parents/carers are a valuable educational resource; enacting their support and assistance to help protect young people online is vital.

The Cybersmart Outreach program should combat discourses of fear and while providing information about current mobile and online practices and cybersafety issues, promote confidence for teachers, parents/carers and children in children's abilities and common sense in managing their engagement with these sites and

technologies. The program should continue to provide strategies and information to support safe practice online, with mobile phones and with other mobile technologies, and to recognise the importance of this every-day aspect of young people's lives.

In light of these participant recommendations and the ongoing need for continued cybersafety education, the evaluation of the ACMA's ISAPs and PD program suggests that further research, the consolidation of existing elements and resources, and the development of new, more proactive approaches to fostering student confidence and competence that allow them to be agential in the creation of safety awareness resources, should be developed.

The Cybersmart Outreach program should be a program that shares the positive stories of connections – a place that supports young Australians to develop positive values in online communities, with an emphasis on positive dialogue that includes words like *belonging*, *citizenship*, *connectedness*, *collaboration*, *community*. The Cybersmart Outreach program should contribute to the arena of inquiry and debate – a place for provocation and different perspectives.

There is potential for resources to be expanded to showcase examples of creative, collaborative work made by young people. This would challenge the emphasis on youth online as being one solely beset with problems and shift towards sharing what is possible. This would also give voice to those who may, indeed, be more familiar and skilled with the technology than the people who take on the role of policing it. Critical thinking skills and reflective practices need to become integrated with existing online practices. The Cybersmart Outreach program should ensure resources are non-fear based that showcase the possibilities presented by effective online connections.

Resources should aim to achieve student presence in their construction. The Outreach presentations and programs have reached a stage where they have adequately informed and raised awareness. The need now is to move beyond this in order to stay at the forefront of valuable cybersafety education by respecting young people's expertise and getting them involved in risk-prevention education. Initiatives could include developing Wellbeing, Mindfulness and Compassionate Communication programs across all ages of schooling; creating a national youth forum to explore the presence of young people in online spaces where best practices and problem-solving strategies are shared; involving young people in the creation/implementation of acceptable use policies in schools in order to ensure their ongoing commitment.

## 7. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aftab, P. (2010). Parry Aftab's guide for schools on cyberbullying. Retrieved from [http://www.stopcyberbullying.org/educators/guide\\_for\\_schools.html](http://www.stopcyberbullying.org/educators/guide_for_schools.html)
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2009). Children's participation in cultural and leisure activities. Retrieved from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Products/4901.0~Apr+2009~Main+Features~Internet+use+and+mobile+phones?OpenDocument>
- Australian Communications & Media Authority [ACMA]. (2007.). *Media & communications in Australian families: Report of the Media & Society Research Project*. Retrieved from <http://www.acma.gov.au>
- Australian Communications and Media Authority [ACMA]. (2009). *Click and Connect: Young Australians' use of online social media*. Retrieved from <http://www.acma.gov.au>
- Australian Government. (2008). Cybersafety plan. Retrieved from [http://www.dbcde.gov.au/online\\_safety\\_and\\_security/cybersafety\\_plan](http://www.dbcde.gov.au/online_safety_and_security/cybersafety_plan)
- Australian Government. (2011). *National Safe Schools Framework (revised 2011)*. Carlton South, Victoria: Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs (MCEECDYA).
- Balls, E. (2008). Children, schools and families: Safer children in a digital world (Byron Review). Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.the-stationary-office.co.uk/pa/cm200708/cmhansrd/cm080327/wmstext/80327m0001.htm>
- Brookover, L. (2008). State policies on school cyber bullying. Retrieved from [http://www.firstamendmentcenter.org/PDF/cyberbullying\\_policies.pdf](http://www.firstamendmentcenter.org/PDF/cyberbullying_policies.pdf)
- boyd, d. (2007). None of this is real: Identity and participation in Friendster. In J. Karaganis (Ed.), *Structures of participation in digital culture*. New York: Social Sciences Research Council, 132-157.
- Campbell, M. (2005). Cyber bullying: An old problem in a new guise? *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 15(1), 68 - 76.
- Campbell, M. (2009). Why cybersafety tips don't work for cyberbullying [Electronic Version]. *On Line Opinion: Australia's eJournal of Social and Political Debate*.
- Chibnall, S., Wallace, M., Leicht, C., & Lunghofer, L. (2006). *I-safe evaluation. Final report*: Caliber ICT Consulting Company.
- Craig, W., & Pepler, D. (2004). Book Foreword. In K. Sullivan, M. Cleary & G. Sullivan (Eds.), *Bullying in Secondary Schools: What it looks like and how to manage it*. London: Paul Chapman

- Cross, D., Shaw, T., Hearn, L., Epstein, M., Monks, H., Lester, L., et al. (2009). *Australian Covert Bullying Prevalence Study (ACBPS)*. Perth: Child Health Promotion Research Centre, Edith Cowan University.
- Daly, K. (2010). Being cybersafety aware [Electronic Version]. *Screen Education*, 58, 42-46. Retrieved from 52  
<http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=210479024946648;res=IELHSS>
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures [Electronic Version]. *Educational Researcher*, 38, 181-199. Retrieved from  
<http://edr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstrcat/38/3/181>.
- Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2011). Connection strategies: Social capital implications of Facebook-enabled communication practices. *New Media & Society*, 13(6), 873-892. Retrieved from doi:10.1177/1461444810385389
- Facebook Australia User Statistics – August 2011. Retrieved from  
<http://searcheverywhere.net/facebook-australia-statistics-august-2011/>
- Guan, S. A., & Subrahmanyam, K. (2009). Youth Internet use: Risks and opportunities. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 22, 351-356.
- Hanewald, R. (2008). Confronting the Pedagogical Challenge on Cybersafety. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(3).
- Hinduja, S., & Patchin, J. (2009). *Bullying beyond the schoolyard: Preventing and responding to cyberbullying*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.
- Kowalski, R., Limber, S., & Agatston, P. (2008). *Cyberbullying: Bullying in the digital age*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kraft, E., & Wang, J. (2009). Effectiveness of cyber bullying prevention strategies: A study on students' perspectives. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology*, 3(2), 513-535.
- Lam, C. W. C., & Frydenberg, E. (2009). Coping in the cyberworld: Program implementation and evaluation - A pilot project. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 19(2), 196-215.
- Lee, M., & Finger, G. (2010). *Developing a networked school community: A guide to realising the vision*. Camberwell, Victoria, Australia: ACER Ltd.
- Lenhart, A., Madden, M., Rankin-MacGill, A., & Smith, A. (2007). Pew Internet & American Life Project: Teens and social media: The use of social media gains a greater foothold in teen life as they embrace the conversational nature of interactive online media [Electronic Version], 1 - 44. Retrieved November, 14, 2009 from

[http://www.pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2007/PIP\\_Teens\\_Social\\_Media\\_Final.pdf](http://www.pewinternet.org/~media/Files/Reports/2007/PIP_Teens_Social_Media_Final.pdf).

Livingstone, S., & Bober, M. (2006). Regulating the Internet at home: Contrasting the perspectives of children and parents. In D. Buckingham & R. Willett (Eds.), *Digital generations* (pp. 93-113).

Livingstone, S., Bober, M., & Helsper, E. (2005). Internet literacy among children and young people: Findings from the UK Children Go Online project. Retrieved April 30, 2011 53

Livingstone, S., & Helsper, E. (2007). Taking risks when communicating on the Internet: the role of offline social-psychological factors in young people's vulnerability to online risks [Electronic Version]. *Information, Communication & Society*, 10, 619-644. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13691180701657998>.

McDougall, B. (2009, September, 22). Students suspended over sex video on phone. *The Daily Telegraph*.

Moessner, C. (2007). Cyber bullying [Electronic Version]. *Trends and Tunes*, 6, n.p. Retrieved from [http://www.harrisinteractive.com/news/newsletters/k12news/HI\\_TrendsTunes\\_2007\\_v06\\_i04.pdf](http://www.harrisinteractive.com/news/newsletters/k12news/HI_TrendsTunes_2007_v06_i04.pdf)

Neilsen (2011). *State of the media: The social media report Q3 2011*. Retrieved from <http://blog.nielsen.com/nielsenwire/social/>

Notley, T. (2008). Online network use in schools: Social and educational opportunities. *Youth Studies Australia*, 27(3), 20-29.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know & what we can do*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyberbullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4(2), 148 - 169.

Pendergast, D. & Main, K. (Under Review) Measuring the Effectiveness of Professional Development (MEPD) in the middle years. *Australian Journal of Middle Schooling*.

Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 921-958.

R Development Core Team. (2010). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL: <http://www.R-project.org>.

- Rigby, K. (2002). *A meta-evaluation of methods and approaches to reducing bullying in pre-schools and early primary school in Australia*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Shariff, S. (2008). *Cyber-bullying: Issues and solutions for the school, the classroom and the home*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Spears, B., Slee, P., Owens, L., & Johnson, B. (2008). *Behind the scenes: Insights into the human dimension of covert bullying* (No. DEST RFT PRN9497). Adelaide: University of Australia.
- Subrahmanyam, K., & Greenfield, P. M. (2008). Online communication and adolescent relationships [Electronic Version]. *The Future of Children*, 18. Retrieved April 29, 2010 from [https://www.princeton.edu/futureofchildren/publications/docs/18\\_01\\_06.pdf](https://www.princeton.edu/futureofchildren/publications/docs/18_01_06.pdf).
- Tufecki, Z. (2008). Can you see me now? Audience and disclosure regulation in online social network sites. *Bulletin of Science, Technology, & Society*, 28(1), 20-36.
- Urbas, G., & Krone, T. (2006). Mobile and wireless technologies: Security and risk factors *Trends and Issues in crime and criminal justice*. Canberra, ACT: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Willard, N. (2007). *Cyber bullying and cyberthreats: Responding to the challenge of online social cruelty, threat, and distress*. Champagne, ILL: Research Press
- World Health Organization. (2004). Young people's health in context. Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) study: International report from the 2001/2002 survey. In C. Currie, C. Roberts, A. Morgan, R. Smith, W. Settertobulte, O. Samdal & V. Barnekow-Rasmussen (Eds.), *Health Policy for Children and Adolescents, No. 4*. Copenhagen, Denmark: World Health Organization.
- Ybarra, M. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2004). Online aggressor/targets, aggressors, and targets: A comparison of associated youth characteristics. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 45, 1308 - 1316.