In abstract you say 11 teachers and 70 parents participated, in chapter 4 you say 33 teachers and 48 parents. In general, the abstract is difficult to follow; after reading it, I was not sure what your study was about or why you conducted it, but that is what needs to be communicated in an abstract (along with results and conclusions). Your research question is about differences between parents and teachers on self efficacy and perceptions. Say why you are testing for this difference - was there a theoretical reason for testing this difference? What practical implications would such a difference make in school policy and/or outreach initiatives?

In chapter 4, you have the hypotheses reversed: the null hypothesis (H0) is (should be) the hypothesis of no difference. The null hypotheses should be "There is not a difference between teachers and parents in their perception to address cyberbullying." and "There is not a difference between teachers and parents in their self-efficacy to address cyberbullying." Hypotheses are not statements about what you might find in the results of your study, they are statements about what is true in the population. Should be stated as "there is not a difference" (not "there will not be a difference"). Make sure these corrections are made everywhere in the dissertation where you state the hypotheses.

In the dissertation, you can't include the surveys in the appendix - so remove them. (you have permission to use the surveys, and we needed to see them in the proposal, but the dissertation will be published, and you don't have permission to publish the surveys in Proquest).

On page 74 you have misidentified the dependent and independent variables: the IV is relationship to student (teacher or parent) and the dependent variables are self efficacy and perception of cyberbullying.

On page 74 you say "Parents represented 88.89% of the sample and teachers only 9.88%. " The percentage of parents in the sample is 48/81 \* 100 = 59%.

I don't understand what is being presented in Table 2 where you say 20 teachers and 61 parents participated. The total adds up to 81, but the number of parents and teachers does not align with you previous statements that 33 teachers and 48 parents participated.

Not sure what Table 3 is referring to: the total is shown there is 51, but there are only 33 teachers in the sample?

In the tables for demographics, it would make more sense, given the research questions, to present the demographic distributions for parents and teachers separately (a column for parents, and a column for teachers).

In table 7, you cannot report the mean and SD for the categorical variables: Age, Gender, Education, Participant are all categorical variables. It is technically incorrect to calculate Pearson correlations with categorical variables, but because they are binary or ordinal the Pearson r is a close enough estimate.

Also in table 7, if self efficacy and perception of cyberbullying are both 10-item scales and items are scored on a scale of 1 to 5, the means should be in the same "ballpark", but your mean for perception of cyberbullying is 1.83 and the mean for self efficacy is 23.96. Did you take the average on perceptions and the total on self efficacy? Use either, but be consistent. I advise using the total score (sum over the 10 items).

The summary of qualitative responses is good, but it should go after the quantitative results.

You have stated the hypotheses twice in chapter 4. Once is enough, and I recommend stating them just prior to the reporting the results of the statistical test of the hypothesis.

Report the test for equality of variance before you report the results of the t-test. Report the means for each group before the results of the t-test. for example: There was not a significant difference in cyberbullying perceptions between teachers (M = 1.93, S = 0.28) and parents (M = 1.79, SD = 0.33), t (78) = 1.79, p = .094. VERY important - if the difference is not statistically significant, then you \*cannot\* reject the null hypothesis.

Cronbach's alpha should be reported before the descriptive statistics (means and SDs for the DV's). An alpha of .56 is very low and should be discussed.

How did you calculate the effect size you report on page 84? (If the effect size was actually .5, then there would have been a statistically significant difference.)

The bar charts are unnecessary and can be removed.