Journal of Online and Digital Education
Spring 2024, Volume 3 Issue 1

ANALYSIS OF SAFETY MEASURES OF INTERNET AMONG STUDENTS' AT UNIVERSITY LEVEL

*Dildar Hussnain**Ghulam Haider

ABSTRACT

The Internet has become an integral part of our daily lives, both personally and throughout our community. Technological solutions are no longer sufficient to ensure Internet safety. It is primarily accomplished by users practicing safe Internet usage. The Internet is an inexorable technology. However, during its brief history, it has generated numerous concerns over security and safety. Technological improvements are no longer sufficient to ensure internet safety. It is primarily accomplished through responsible internet usage by the user. A comprehensive analysis was undertaken to ascertain the significance of internet safety. This study examines the assessment of internet safety measures among university students. The population under study consisted of all students enrolled at the University of Education, Jauharabad Campus. The researcher employed a Multistage sampling technique to pick a total of 190 students from five different departments. Data collection was conducted using a self-developed questionnaire called the Knowledge and Attitude Internet Safety Survey (KAISS). Cronbach The instrument's alpha dependability was calculated to be .740. A clear differentiation was seen between male and female students regarding online safety precautions. The average achievement score indicated that there is no discernible disparity between male and female pupils considering the significance of the internet and the safety precautions associated with Google websites, Facebook, Twitter, and Gmail.

Key Words: *Safety Measure, Google website, Internet, Facebook, Twitter*

*PST, Govt. Primary School Muhammad Shah, Email: dildarshah136@gmail.com
** PST, Govt. Elementary School Shahzad Pur, Email: haiderqazi82@gmail.com

Introduction

In recent years, there has been a growing concern about the safety of internet use among university students. The increasing availability of online resources and the integration of technology in educational settings have resulted in a rising reliance of students on the internet for activities such as research, communication, and learning. However, apart from the benefits of internet access, there are also risks and challenges related to online security, including cyberbullying, identity theft, exposure to inappropriate content, and vulnerabilities in cybersecurity. Understanding the safety precautions implemented to protect university students when using the internet is crucial for creating a secure and suitable educational environment. The aim of this research is to analyze the current status of internet safety measures among university students, identify the existing challenges, and propose recommendations for enhancing online safety in higher education settings.

The body of research on internet safety among university students covers several aspects, such as legislation, practices, technology, and instructional interventions designed to encourage safe and responsible online conduct. This study critically analyzes prominent studies and research outcomes in the field, emphasizing the many strategies used to ensure internet safety inside academic environments.

Policies and regulations are often implemented by universities to restrict the use of the internet and foster a culture of online safety among students. These rules may include criteria for authorized use, consequences for breaching cybersecurity regulations, and mechanisms for reporting instances of cyber threats or harassment (Jones et al., 2018). The establishment of clear expectations and the promotion of a culture of responsible digital citizenship among university students are contingent upon the implementation of effective policies.

Universities use a range of cybersecurity measures to fortify its network infrastructure and ensure the protection of student data against unauthorized access or cyber assaults. Dawson & Deka, (2020) suggested that the security measures include firewalls, encryption methods, antivirus software, and intrusion detection systems. Moreover, institutions have the potential to provide cybersecurity awareness training programs aimed at educating students about prevalent dangers and optimal strategies for safeguarding their personal information on the internet.

Educational activities and materials are often provided by universities with the objective of fostering online safety awareness and cultivating digital literacy skills among students. The programs include a range of educational activities, including workshops, seminars, online tutorials, and informative campaigns, which aim to address various subjects such as privacy protection, online etiquette, and safe social media use (Khan et al., 2019). Universities may effectively decrease the hazards connected with internet use by equipping students with the necessary information and abilities to navigate the online world in a secure manner.

The establishment of collaborative partnerships among universities, government agencies, and industry partners is of utmost importance in order to effectively tackle developing cybersecurity concerns and remain up to date with the ever-changing landscape of threats. Universities have the potential to establish collaborative relationships with cybersecurity corporations, law enforcement agencies, and nonprofit groups to facilitate the exchange of resources, knowledge, and threat information to (Huang et al., 2021). These joint endeavors enhance the overall ability of the academic community to withstand cyber assaults.

Student support services are offered by universities to aid students who have experienced cyberbullying, harassment, or online abuse. These services include counseling centers and helplines. These programs provide emotional support, advice, and tools to assist students in managing the psychological and social repercussions of online abuse (Fernández-Caballero et al., (2019). Establishing a campus atmosphere that is both supportive and inclusive is crucial for fostering student well-being and resilience in the presence of cyber dangers.

This research enhances the existing body of literature on promoting safe internet usage among university students. The internet is highly beneficial for students in their academic pursuits. It provides them with complimentary access to resources such as notes, assignments, books, literature, and more. The internet has become an indispensable tool for self-directed learning. Google, Yahoo, and Bing facilitate the acquisition and exploration of diverse resources for

accessing up-to-date information. The primary reasons for internet usage were social communication, entertainment, homework, and professional communication. The frequent utilization of digital media has become an essential aspect of our daily existence. The internet's greatest advantage is in the abundance of information it provides. It facilitates the pupils' learning process by simplifying the knowledge. The internet is a global phenomenon that greatly benefits people worldwide. Therefore, it should be utilized for benevolent intentions. It significantly influences the delivery of education to students. The importance of this study lies in the university undergraduates' capacity to tackle the issues associated with internet usage and its impact on their academic performance. A significant number of internet-enabled phone users appear to be deeply absorbed in the excitement of social interaction facilitated by their devices, with limited or no understanding of the consequences involved. This insight will greatly empower university students to attain the essential equilibrium between internet usage and academic pursuits.

Objectives of the Study

- To explore the extent of students' knowledge acquisition on internet safety.
- To investigate students to obtain accurate information about internet safety.
- To analyze the nature of Students' attitude towards internet safety.

METODOLOGY

In this study, researcher designed quantitative research. Survey questionnaire was used for the purpose of data collection.

Population

All students of University of Education Jauharabad Campus were the population of study.

Sample and Sampling Technique

Sample was select by using multistage sampling technique. At first stage researcher was purposively select four Department of University. 1: Department Of Business. 2: Department Of Information Technology. 3: Department of Physics. 4: Department of English. At second stage researcher was randomly select 40 students randomly from each Department.

Instrumentation

To achieve the research objective, the researcher used survey questionnaire tagged as: Knowledge and Attitude internet safety survey (KAISS) to capture data for study.

Data analysis

Table 4.1

Detail	Frequency	Percent

Gender wise participation of Students		
Male	90	47.4
Female	100	52.6
Location wise participation of Students		
Urban	99	52.1
Rural	91	47.9
Department wise participation of Students.		
Education	30	15.8
Physics	40	21.1
IT	40	21.1
English	40	21.1
BBA	40	21.1
Semester wise participation of Students		
1st	50	26.3
3rd	50	26.3
5th	50	26.3
7th	40	23.1

Table 4.1 presents the findings that provide valuable insights into the demographic makeup and distribution of student engagement in the research, classified by to gender, geographical area, academic department, and semester level.

The analysis of gender-based participation indicates a very even distribution, with 47.4% of participants being male and 52.6% being female. The equitable distribution of genders in our sample indicates a diversified representation, which was crucial for collecting a wide range of viewpoints and experiences related to online safety among university students.

In terms of participation based on geography, there was a small majority of participants from urban regions, accounting for 52.1% of the sample, while 47.9% are from rural areas. The distribution underscores the need of taking into account possible disparities in internet accessibility, use behaviors, and safety considerations among students residing in urban and rural areas.

The distribution of involvement across different academic fields was fair, with each department contributing around 20% to 21.1% of the overall sample. The inclusion of participants from many departments, including Education, Physics, IT, English, and BBA, suggests a broad spectrum of backgrounds and interests.

The distribution of involvement throughout various phases of academic advancement was quite similar, with each semester accounting for around 23.1% to 26.3% of the overall sample. This implies that the research includes students at different points in their academic progression, spanning from first-year students to senior students. This ensures a thorough investigation of internet safety attitudes and behaviors across different stages of university education.

Table 4.2

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	T	P
Difference between Gender of Students about the						
Importance of internet	male	90	4.18	.377	1.156	.249
	Female	100	4.12	.419		
Google	Male	90	4.02	.469	.648	.518
	Female	100	3.98	.518		
Facebook	Male	90	4.11	1.07	1.35	.179
	Female	100	3.95	.523		
Twitter	Male	90	3.98	.739	-.995	.321
	Female	100	4.13	1.20		
Gmail	Male	90	4.12	.445	-.224	.823
	Female	100	4.14	.494		
Difference between Location of students about the						
Importance of internet	Urban	99	4.17	.373	.653	. 515
	Rural	91	4.13	.429		
Google	Urban	99	4.14	.406	4.09	.001
	Rural	91	3.85	.549		
Facebook	Urban	99	3.97	1.06	-.934	.351
	Rural	91	4.08	.479		
Twitter	Urban	99	4.13	1.24	1.00	.317
	Rural	91	3.98	.67		
Gmail	Urban	99	4.15	.452	.575	.566
	Rural	91	4.11	.490		

Table 4.2 shows that the average results for male (Mean=4.18) and female (Mean=4.12) students demonstrate a significant perception of the internet's relevance, with male students giving it a slightly higher ranking. Nevertheless, the obtained t-value of (t=1.156) was quite modest, while the p-value of .249 above the significant level of .05. These findings indicate that there was no statistically significant disparity in the perceived importance between male and female students.
The average scores for male and female students on Google, Facebook, Twitter, and Gmail were similar, with minor fluctuations. The obtained t-values and their accompanying p-values for the comparisons suggest that there was no statistically significant difference between the perceptions of significance for these particular platforms between male and female students.

The average ratings obtained by students from urban (Mean=4.17) and rural (Mean=4.13) areas indicate a significant level of perceived significance attributed to the internet, with urban students exhibiting a slightly higher ranking.
However, in line with the gender comparison, the t-value (t=.653) was rather modest, and the p-value (.515) above the threshold of .05, suggesting that there was no statistically significant disparity in perceived significance between urban and rural pupils.
The significance of Google and Gmail was shown to be greater among urban students in comparison to rural students, as evidenced by the statistically significant differences seen in the

t-values and p-values. In contrast, there was a lack of statistically significant disparities in the views of significance between urban and rural pupils regarding Facebook and Twitter.

Table 4.3

	Sum of Squares	***df***	**Mean Square**	***f***	**Sig.**
Impact of Department about the importance of internet					
Between Groups	2.128	4	.532	3.491	.009
Within Groups	28.200	185	.152		
Total	30.328	189			
Impact of Department students about Google Websites					
Between Groups	2.480	4	.620	2.614	.037
Within Groups	43.876	185	.237		
Total	46.355	189			
Impact of Department about Facebook					
Between Groups	12.901	4	3.225	5.052	.001
Within Groups	118.098	185	.638		
Total	130.998	189			
Impact of Department Experience about Twitter					
Between Groups	17.347	4	4.337	4.548	.002
Within Groups	176.395	185	.953		
Total	193.742	189			
Impact of department experience on Gmail					
Between Groups	6.567	4	1.642	8.604	.000
Within Groups	35.301	185	.191		
Total	41.869	189			
Impact of Semester Experience about Importance of internet					
Between Groups	2.065	3	.688	4.530	.004
Within Groups	28.263	186	.152		
Total	30.328	189			
Impact of Semester about Google website					
Between Groups	.799	3	.266	1.087	.356
Within Groups	45.556	186	.245		
Total	46.355	189			
Impact of Semester about Facebook					
Between Groups	5.833	3	1.944	2.889	.037
Within Groups	125.166	186	.673		
Total	130.998	189			
Impact of Semester on Twitter					
Between Groups	3.493	3	1.164	1.138	.335
Within Groups	190.249	186	1.023		
Total	193.742	189			
Impact of Semester about Gmail					
Between Groups	2.379	3	.793	3.736	.012
Within Groups	39.489	186	.212		
Total	41.869	189			

In table 4.3 presents the findings provided in this study are derived from an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test that aimed to evaluate the influence of department on students'

judgments of the significance of the internet and Google webpages. Here is the analysis of the results:

- **Impact of Department on the importance of Internet**

The sum of squares (SS) across groups was calculated to be 2.128, with a corresponding degree of freedom (df) of 4. This illustrates the diversity in perspectives about the significance of the internet across various academic fields. The within-groups standard deviation was (SD=28.200), with a degree of freedom of 185. This observation demonstrates the disparity in perspectives across different academic departments. The F-statistic obtained in this study was 3.491, with a corresponding p-value of.009. The obtained p-value of.009 was below the commonly accepted significance threshold of.05. This suggests that there was statistical significance. Hence, there exists empirical data indicating a statistically significant relationship between the department and students' beliefs on the significance of the internet.

- **Impact of Department students about Google websites**

Table 4.3 show that the, between groups, the standard deviation was calculated to be (SD=2.480), with a degree of freedom of 4. The sum of squares within groups was 43.876, with a degree of freedom of 185. The F-statistic obtained in this study was 2.614, with a corresponding p-value of.037. The obtained p-value of.037 was below the predetermined significance level of.05, suggesting statistical significance. Additionally, there exists empirical data indicating a statistically significant relationship between the department and students' opinions of Google webpages.

- **Impact of Department about Facebook**

The standard deviation across groups was (SD=12.901), with a 95% confidence level (df). The statistical significance within groups was 118.098, with a degree of freedom of 185. The F-statistic obtained in this study was 5.052, with a corresponding p-value of.001. The obtained p-value of .001 was below the conventional threshold of 0.05, suggesting a statistically significant result. Hence, there exists empirical data indicating a statistically significant relationship between the department and students' impressions of Facebook.

- **Impact of Department experience about Twitter**

There was a standard deviation of (SD=17.347) across groups, with 4 degrees of freedom. The sum of squares within groups was 176.395, with a degree of freedom of 185. The F-statistic obtained in this study was 4.548, with a corresponding p-value of.002. The obtained p-value of.002 was below the conventional threshold of 0.05, suggesting a statistically significant result. Hence, there exists empirical data indicating a statistically significant relationship between department experience and students' impressions of Twitter.

- **Impact of Department experience on Gmail**

The standard deviation across groups was (SD=6.567), yielding a value of 4 degrees of freedom. The statistical significance within groups was 35.301, with a degree of freedom of 185.

The F-statistic obtained in this study was 8.604, and the corresponding p-value was.000. The obtained p-value of.000 was below the conventional threshold of .05, suggesting a statistically significant result. Additionally, there exists empirical research indicating a statistically significant relationship between department experience and students' impressions of Gmail.

- **Impact of Semester experience about importance of Internet**

The standard deviation across groups was (SD=2.065), with a degree of freedom of 3. The standard deviation among groups was (SD=28.263), with a total of 186 degrees of freedom. The F-statistic obtained in this study was 4.530, with a corresponding p-value of.004. The obtained p-value of.004 was below the conventional threshold of 0.05, suggesting a statistically significant result. Hence, there exists empirical data indicating a statistically significant relationship between students' opinions of the internet's relevance and their semester experience.

- **Impact of Semester about Google website**

The statistical significance between groups was (SD=.799), with 3 degrees of freedom (df). The statistical significance within groups was 45.556, with a total of 186 degrees of freedom. The F-statistic obtained in this study was 1.087, with a corresponding p-value of.356. The obtained p-value of.356 above the predetermined significance level of.05, suggesting that there was insufficient evidence to support the notion that semester has a statistically significant influence on students' impressions of Google webpages.

- **Impact of Semester about Facebook**

The standard deviation across groups was (SD= 5.833), with a degree of freedom of 3.Within groups, the standard deviation is calculated to be 125.166, with 186 degrees of freedom. The F-statistic obtained in this study was 2.889, with a corresponding p-value of.037. The obtained p-value of.037 was below the predetermined significance level of.05, suggesting statistical significance. Hence, there exists empirical data indicating a statistically significant relationship between the semester and students' impressions of Facebook.

- **Impact of Semester about Twitter**

There was a standard deviation of (SD=3.493) across groups, with 3 degrees of freedom. In the context of groups, the standard deviation was (SD=190.249), with 186 degrees of freedom. The F-statistic obtained in this study was 1.138, with a corresponding p-value of .335. Based on the obtained p-value of .335, which was above the significance level of.05, it can be concluded that there was no statistically significant influence of semester on students' impressions of Twitter.

- **Impact of Semester about Gmail**

The standard deviation across groups was (SD=2.379), with a degree of freedom of 3. Within groups, the standard deviation (SS) was calculated to be (SD=39.489), using 186 degrees of freedom. The F-statistic obtained in this study was 3.736, with a corresponding p-value of

0.012. The obtained p-value of 0.012 is below the predetermined significance level of 0.05, suggesting statistical significance. Thus, there exists empirical data indicating a statistically significant relationship between the semester and students' opinions of Gmail.

Conclusions

The data presented provides an overview of the demographic breakdown of student engagement, categorized by gender, geographical area, academic department, and semester level. The sample consists of 47.4% male and 52.6% female students in terms of gender representation. In terms of geographical distribution, 52.1% of the participants reside in urban regions, whilst 47.9% were in rural areas. Each academic department, including Education, Physics, IT, English, and BBA, contributes around 21.1% of the overall sample, resulting in a very equal distribution among academic departments. Furthermore, the distribution of involvement across different semester levels was well balanced, with around 26.3% of students from each of the first, third, and fifth semesters, and somewhat lower percentages (23.1%) from the seventh semester.
In relation to gender disparities, the examination demonstrates that while there exist minor disparities in average scores between male and female students across various platforms, a substantial portion of these disparities lack statistical significance. The p-values corresponding to the t-tests for the significance of the internet, Google, Facebook, Twitter, and Gmail all above the traditional threshold of significance ($p > .05$), suggesting that there was no statistically significant difference in views between male and female students.

Conversely, the examination of disparities depending on geographical location reveals some significant observations. In terms of the significance of the internet, there was no statistically significant difference detected in the mean scores between male and female students from urban and rural locations. Nevertheless, with closer examination of certain platforms, significant disparities become apparent between students residing in urban and rural areas. In the context of Google, it was seen that urban students assign a much greater level of significance to the platform compared to their rural counterparts, as shown by the statistically significant low p-value of.001. Similarly, in the case of Facebook, although there was no substantial disparity in average scores between students from urban and rural areas, the p-value of.351 indicates a tendency towards statistical significance.
The data offered provide valuable insights into how students' impressions of the internet's relevance and particular online platforms like as Google, Facebook, Twitter, and Gmail were influenced by their academic department and semester experience. The sums of squares (SS) categorized as "Between Groups" in the analysis indicate the extent of variation in perceptions across various departments or semester levels. On the other hand, the SS categorized as "Within Groups" represents the variability within each category. The "F" statistic and its corresponding "Sig." (significance) values determine the statistical significance of the observed differences.

In general, the findings indicate that students' opinions across several dimensions were highly influenced by both their academic department and semester experience. There were notable variations in students' perspectives on the significance of the internet, Google, Facebook, Twitter, and Gmail among various academic disciplines. These findings indicate that students' educational backgrounds influence their perspectives on online platforms. Likewise, the

experience of a semester also has a substantial influence on students' beliefs of the significance of the internet and Gmail. This suggests that as students advance in their academic pursuits, their attitudes may undergo changes.

Nevertheless, it was important to note that not all platforms and variables exhibit substantial variations across different departments or semester levels. For instance, while there were notable variations in students' perspectives on Facebook and Gmail across different academic departments, the influence of semester on views of Google and Twitter do not demonstrate statistical significance. In conclusion, the results highlight the intricate relationship among academic departments, semester experiences, and students' views of elements connected to the internet. These observations have the potential to provide valuable guidance to educators and policymakers in customizing treatments and allocating resources to effectively cater to the unique needs and preferences of different student groups.

Discussion

It is of utmost importance to priorities the safety of university students on the internet, considering the growing dependence on digital resources for academic, social, and personal reasons. Various precautionary measures are commonly employed to safeguard pupils from online hazards, such as cyberbullying, identity theft, phishing schemes, and exposure to improper content (Dennen, 2019). An essential safety step involves the adoption of strong cybersecurity measures by university IT departments. This encompasses the use of firewalls, antivirus software, and intrusion detection systems to proactively hinder unauthorized entry to sensitive data and counteract harmful assaults (Ransbotham, Kiron, & Prentice, 2015). Furthermore, it is imperative to regularly update and apply patches to software in order to mitigate vulnerabilities that may be susceptible to exploitation by malicious individuals. Education and awareness efforts are essential for fostering secure internet usage among students. Universities frequently offer training sessions or workshops on cybersecurity, which cover topics such as password management, identifying phishing efforts, and protecting personal information on the internet. Universities may mitigate the risk of cyber-attacks by equipping students with the necessary information and skills to securely traverse the online environment. Furthermore, it is crucial to develop explicit policies and norms governing the utilization of the internet. Universities should implement acceptable use policies that clearly define the authorized internet activity and the corresponding repercussions for any violations (Bossler & Holt, 2009). By establishing clear guidelines for student conduct and implementing appropriate consequences when needed, this initiative contributes to the development of a more secure digital space (Livingstone & Helsper, 2007). In addition, incorporating technology measures such as content filtering and parental control software can effectively restrict pupils' access to improper or hazardous internet information. These tools are especially advantageous in university environments where students may have the opportunity to utilize pooled networks and resources. Nevertheless, it is crucial to acknowledge that although technical solutions and policies play a vital role in ensuring internet safety, cultivating a culture of digital citizenship holds equal significance (Blythe & Hobbs, 2020). Promoting transparent communication, compassion, and regard for others on the internet can help alleviate the dangers linked to cyberbullying and harassment, fostering a more comprehensive and supportive online community inside the university.

Recommendations

Based on the study's findings, the following recommendations;

- HEC and University administration may organize a course of ICT for students.
- University educators and counsellors may arrange a collective counselling session to provide students with guidance and awareness on Internet Safety.
- The university educator and counsellor can instruct students on the perils of divulging excessive personal information on the internet..
- Teachers provide basic and important information to students about Internet Safety so that they might protect their data.

References

Dawson, C., & Deka, D. (2020). Cybersecurity in higher education: A review and synthesis of the literature. Journal of Applied Security Research, 15(3), 373-395.

Fernández-Caballero, A., Navarro, E., Rivera, J. J., & Bravo-Rodríguez, J. (2019). Cyberbullying detection on social networks for university students: A systemic review. Information Processing & Management, 56(3), 1020-1039.

Huang, H. J., Hsu, Y. C., & Kuo, F. C. (2021). The status of cybersecurity education in higher education: A literature review. Computers & Education, 172, 104237.

Jones, B., & Castelfranchi, C. (2018). Understanding cybersecurity policies and controls in higher education. Computers & Security, 78, 165-178.

Khan, I. A., Ullah, F., Ali, W., Khan, K. A., & Ali, S. (2019). Internet safety measures among university students: A study of university of Malakand. International Journal of Computer Applications, 181(26), 9-14.

Adeniran,A.I.(2011). Café culture and heresy of yahooboyism in Nigeria. In K.Jaishankar,Cyber criminiology: Exploring Internet crimes and criminal behavior (3-12). London: Taylor and Francis Group.

Andrews, D., Alathur, S., &Chetty, N. (2020). International efforts for children online safety: A survey. *International Journal of Web Based Communities*, *16*(2), 123-133.

Arnott, L, Palaiologou, I, Gray, C (2018) Digital devices, internet-enabled toys and digital games: The changing nature of young children's learning ecologies, experiences and pedagogies. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *49*(5): 803–806.

Bozzola, E., Spina, G., Ruggiero, M., Memo, L., Agostiniani, R., Bozzola, M., Corsello, G., &Villani, A. (2018). Media devices in pre-school children: The recommendations of the Italian pediatric society. *Italian Journal of Pediatrics*, *44*(1), 1-5.

Eagly, A.H,Chaiken,,S.(1993). The psychology of attitudes. Forth Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Furnell, S.(2010) Hackers, Viruses and Malicious software, in: Jewkes.Y.and Yar, M.(2010). The handbook of the internet crime, pp.173-193. William publishing- UK.

Keong,C.C., Horani,S.&Daniel,J.(2005). A Study on the use of ICT in Mathematics teaching Malaysian online Journal of instructional technology, 2(3), 43-51.

Lau,B.T.&Sim,C.H.(2008). Exploring the extent of ICT adopting among secondary school teachers in Malaysia. International Journal of computing and ICT Research,2(2), 19-36.

Macharia, J.&Ngakwende,E.(2010). Influence of university factors on the Students' acceptance of internet based learning tools in higher education. Journal of communication and computer 7(10), 70-82.

Quinn, David M. "Legal issues in Educational Technology: Implications for school leaders" Education AdministrationQuarterly 39(2003): 187-2007.

Thorn burgh, Dick and Herbert Lin, "Youth, Pornography, and the Internet". Issues in sciences and technology. 20(2004): 43-58.

Naval C.Ch. Sadaba YJ Brigue 2004 Impacto de lasTic (Technologias de la information y conomunication) Universidad de Navarra.

Quayle,E.(2010) Child pornography in Jewkes.Y.and Yar, M. (2010). The handbook of the internet crime, pp.173-193. William publishing- UK.

Wykes, M.and Harcus, D, D.(2010) Cyber-terror; Construction, Criminalization and control, in: Jewkes, y. and Yar, M. (2010). The Handbook of Internet crime. Pp.214-229, William publishing-UK.

Wishart, Jocelyn. "Internet Safety in Emerging Educational contexts" Computers & Education 43(2004): 193-204.