Eğitim ve Bilim
2010, Cilt 35, Sayı 158

Education and Science
2010, Vol. 35, No 158

Analyzing Peer Bullying of 6th, 7th, and 8th Grades Primary School Students from the Aspect of Different Variables in Erzurum

Erzurum'daki İlköğretim 6., 7., 8. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Akran Zorbalığının Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi

Şükrü ADA*

Atatürk Üniversitesi

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine the significance of the effects of students' peer bullying on variables of academic success and disciplinary status of students at the second stage of the primary schools; and to analyze prediction degree of predictor variables of age and number of siblings regarding peer bullying. The study was conducted with the participation of students studying at 6th, 7th, and 8th grades of primary schools within city center of the Erzurum province and surrounding towns in Turkey. Data of the study were obtained through Bully and Victim Determining Scale-Child Form. The difference was found in favor of the students who are subjected to bullying. Predictor variables of age and number of siblings were found to predict peer bullying scores of students at a significant level.

Keywords: Primary schools, peer bullying, academic success, disciplinary state

Öz

Araştırmada, ilköğretim 6., 7., 8. Sınıf öğrencilerinin akran zorbalıklarının akademik başarı, disiplin durumu değişkenlerine göre anlamlı düzeyde farklılaşıp farklılaşmadığı ve yordayıcı değişken olarak analize sokulan yaş ve kardeş sayısı değişkenlerinin akran zorbalığını yordayıp yordamadığının belirlenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Araştırma, Türkiye'de Erzurum İli ve merkez ilçelerinde bulunan ilköğretim okulları 6., 7., 8. sınıflarda öğrenim gören öğrenciler üzerinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmada veriler, "Zorba ve Kurban Belirleme Ölçeği Çocuk Formu" ile elde edilmiştir. Öğrencilerin akademik başarı düzeylerine göre, zorbalık yapmada sözel zorbalık ve eşyaya zarar verme; zorbalığa uğramada ise sözel zorbalık boyutlarında anlamlı farklılaşma olduğu görülmüştür. Öğrencilerin disiplin durumlarına göre, zorbalık yapmanın ceza alanlarda anlamlı düzeyde yüksek olduğu bulunmuştur. Yordayıcı değişken olarak analize sokulan yaş ve kardeş sayısının birlikte akran zorbalığı yapma puanlarını anlamlı düzeyde yordadığı görülmüştür.

Anahtar Sözcükler: İlköğretim, akran zorbalığı, akademik başarı, disiplin durumu.

Introduction

Today, schools are associating with violence. Each day the reports on bullying, violence and hostility taking place in schools come with news. The same things prevails primary schools as well. Children spend most of their time in school or outer environment scared of bullying and they cannot express their fears.

O'Moore and Hillery (1989), Olweus (1991), Smith (1991), Rigby (1997), Glover (2000) have proved the existence of bullying in different parts of the world despite theirbeing at different proportions. Jarrett (2001) pointed out that teachers either cannot notice bullying or can they intervene the action. Acoording to Öğülmüş (2006), school is a private environment allowing students to prepare for the future. The main duty of the school is to train students and prepare

* Asst. Prof. Dr. Şükrü ADA, Atatürk University, Faculty of Kâzım Karabekir Education Faculty, Department of Educational Management; In spection, Planning, Economy, sukruada @atauni.edu.tr

them for the future. The schools should be made safe places to fullfill their duties.

Olweus (2003) defines bullying as the use of physical strength in order to frighten or hurt helpless person. According to Koç (2006), a behavior must be exhibited on the intention of harming the other person, it must be continous and must not be done for the protection purpose in order to be considered as bullying. As Kandemir (2006) stated, bullies are the popular individuals who easily get provoked and find pleasure in violence. Accoding to Griffin and Gross (2004) defines bullying as the deliberate hostile behaviors towards others whereas, other scientists insist on the feature of those behaviors' following a regular continuous pattern in order to be named as bullying. The most frequently used definition is the Olweus (1987)'s: "A person can be considered as the victim of bullying if he is subjected to deliberate, repeatedly occuring or at least for a while continuing behaviors". Those negative behaviors are expressed as the deliberately hurting and annoying behaviors. This definition help us to make distinction between random behaviors and bullying acts (Griffin & Gross, 2004). In hostility there are those behaviors which are exhibited for the purpose of hurting and harming. It can be considered from two different prospects. The first prospect consists antagonism, it is emotional and it is revenge directed. The second one is instrumental, intentional and depredation oriented (**Vitiello,** Behar, Hunt, Stoff, & Ricciuti, 1990). According to Price and Dodge (1989) the first prospect of the hostility is reactive and it is a defensive reaction occurs as the result of perceived threatening. The second prospect of the hostility consists of more intentional and aforethought behaviors.

According to Connor (1998), bullying is a hostile behavior occurs in case of the unequal strength. It is different from normal conflict case. Conflict is inevitable in interactions. Hostility could be a part of conflicts at different ages. "Bullying" is repeated negative behaviors centers upon a specific victim. The most typical affective behavior of bullies is the difficulty in establishing empathy. The most important characteristic of bullying is the misuse of violence and power (strength). There are affective and cognitive instability in case of bullying. Victim mostly has trouble defending himself. According to Furniss (2000), bully children come from the families, lack of family relations, applying for physical punishment and protective style of upbringing.

In one of his study conducted on primary school students, Pişkin (2006) attained the result that 35%of the students consistently get subjected to the bullying and 6% of the students bully. Furthermore, it was also ascertained that male students commit the bullying significantly more than the female students and female students get subjected to the bull ying significantly more., In their study Kepenekçi and Çınkır (2006) found that 35,5% of the high school students get subjected to physical bullying , 28,3% emotional bullying and 15,6% sexually bullying.

Through literature review; Dake, Price and Telljohann (2003) outlined the prominent characteristics of children who resort to bullying and those who are exposed to bullying as follows :

Characteristics of the children who resort to bullying :

-They suffer depression.

-They are suicidal.

-They suffer psychiatric problems.

-They have eating disorder.

-They have an inclination towards substance abuse.

-They behave in aggression.

-They get involved in crime (theft, illegal posseson of weapon, vandalism)

-They exhibit academically negative behaviors (cheating in the exams, skipping school).

-Their academic standings are not that brillaint.

-They have bullyboy friends.

-They perceive the " making friend issue" as an easy one.

-They exhibit physically and socially aggressive behaviors towards their partners.

-They have authoritative parents.

-Their parents use punitive disciplinary approach.

-They have parents with low sense of responsibility and less supportive.

-They are deprived of grown-up role models.

-They suffer abusive problems.

-They experience adaptation problems to the school (in terms of doing homeworks, obeying the rules etc.)

Characteristics of the children who are exposed to bullying :

-They suffer depression.

-They are suicidal.

-They are lonely.

-They have low level of self-respect.

-They suffer anxiety.

-They suffer psychiatric problems.

-They have eating disorder.

-They are less popular than the other children.

-They spend most of their time alone.

-They have parents who offer very few opportunities for them to control social conditions.

-They have parents with low sense of responsibility and less supportive.

-They come out unkind and unfavourable house environments.

-They suffer abusive problems.

It was also revealed by some studies that the individual who is subjected to bullying develops lower self-esteem, has trouble in going to school on an ongoing basis and developes negative attitudes towards school (Olweus, 1994; Banks, 1997; Pişkin & Ayas, 2005). As Olweus (1993) stated, there was found a high correlation between bullying behaviors in primary schools and committing illegal acts in latter period of the life. Byrne (1994) on the other hand ascertained that the individual who is subjected to a bullying act in childhood period, develop lower self-esteem in adolescence period.

According to Hughes (2005) the bullying emerging as aggression in early early ages may lead to certain serious crimes such as illegal possesion of gun, rape, robery and extortion Olweus (1994), on the other hand, ascertained that the children who were involved in four or more bullying issues in the primary school period are more inclined to commit crimes in adulthood period referring to 60% of male individuals who committed bullying are involved in at least one serious crime and 35-40% of them with at least three crime records before they are 24 years old. Forero, McLellan, Rissel and Bauman (1999) revealed the probability of bullyboys' drinking and smoking in early ages, vandalising the private and public properties, being included in bad gangs, having low academic standing, playing truants and working in jobs not complying their skills and mental capacities. Bullying also manifests itself as a mental health disorder in long term.

Çetinkaya, Nur, Ayvaz, Özdemir and Kavakçı (2009) observed that the students in the school with different socio-economical levels demonstrate bullying, and in the schools with low socio-economical level, peer bullying is significantly high. Besides, depression level of the students increase with being bullied, and the level of their self respect decreases.

As Muscari (2003) suggested, the most important step in preventing bullying are professionally prepared programs. In some studies, educative programmes to reduce bullying have been reported to reduce peer bullying significantly (Olweus 1992., Pepler at all, 1994., Eslea and Smith,1998., Stevens at all 2000., Kartal, H. and Bilgin, A. 2007). One of the fundamental principles of preventing bullying is providing school, house and family environments which are friendly, cordial, positive with the participation of grown-ups on one hand and in which undesired behaviors are confined with proper methods on the other side. Determined rules and restrictions should not be hostile and physical sanctions or prohibitions should not be applied and all approaches need to be consistent.

Their in-school and out-school behaviors should be monitored and controlled (Olveus, 1995). One of the widely known different bullying prevention programs is the "Olweus Bullying Prevention Program" that is developed by Olweus and Limber. This program was intended for primary and secondary school students and its execution responsibility was mostly given to the teachers and the school managers. This program guides the whole school personnel to create a warm, friendly and participative school environment. Program contains some characteristics such as, restricting behaviors, being consistent, applying non-hostile behaviors against breaking the rules (Conveyed by Smokowski and Kopasz, 2005). This program was applied in Norway and it was proven to lessen the bullying up to 50%. Moreover, it was also proved to be effective on the adjustment of anti-social behaviors. In a monitoring study conducted 20 months after this research, mentioned acquirements proved to be lasting. Furthermore, in studies conducted by Melton et al. (1998); (Whitney, Rivers, Smith and Sharp, 1994) positive results were achieved through the repetition of the "Olweus Bullying Prevention Program"

The studies on bullying first appeared in the world in 1970, and in Turkey in 1990, however they are not enough to make the subject clear in quality and quantity. This study is expected to give a new point of view of different variaables such as academical success, disciplinary state, age and the number of brothers and sisters, as well as the researches upon this subject. In addition, the findings obtained as a result of this research, will provide important contributions to this areas a source for studies on this subject as well as allowing some additions.

Problem

Does the situation that the students of the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades of Primary Schools do the peer bullying and are exposed to being bullied make difference in terms of academical success and disciplinary state? Also, do the variables of age and the number of siblings influence bullying and being bullying?

The research questions of this study are as follows:

1. Are there significant difference between acted peer bullying and being subjected to peer bullying scores at 6th, 7th, and 8th grades of primary school students in accordance with academic success and disciplinary status?

2. Do the age and number of siblings variables predict commited peer bullying and being subjected to peer bullying scores at 6th, 7th, and 8th grades of primary school students?

Method

Research Design

In this study, to determine bullying peers in Primary School - 6th, 7th, and 8th grades students- according to the variables the achievement level, state of discipline, number of siblings and age, descriptive methods were used.

Sample (Participants)

The population of the study consists of 21803 students studying at the 6th, 7th and 8th grades of primary schools in city center and central districts of Erzurum province within 2008-2009 acdemic year. The sample, consists of 488 randomly chosen students 230 (47.1%) of which were female students and 258 (52.9%) of which were male students studying 2 schools from city center and one from central districts.

Research Instruments

Bully and Victim Determining Scale-Child Form. Data of the study was obtained through "bully and victim determining scale-child form" which was developed by Pişkin and Ayas (2007). This scale consists of 37 items and 5 factors (physical, verbal, isolation, spreading rumor and vandalism) to determine bullies students and the ones who are subjected to bullying.

Bullying Scale

Validity:

We applied for an expert for validity study and then did confirmative factor analysis. In the result of the first scale Detrended Fluctuation Analysis (DFA), adaptation index was found as Chi-square = 1422.14 (df=616, p.= .00), Chi-square / df= 2.30 Root-Mean-Square Error Approximation (RMSEA)= 0.056, Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)= 0.85, Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI)= 0.82, Comparative Fit Index (CFI)=0.92, Normed Fit Index (NFI)=0.87 ve Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI)= 0.91, while in the second scale DFA,it was found as Chi-square = 1471.43 (df=621, p.= .0000), Chi-square / df= 2.36, (RMSEA)= 0.057, (GFI)= 0.84, (AGFI)= 0.82, (CFI)=0.96, (NFI)=0.87 ve (NNFI)= 0.91.

Reliability:

Cronbach Alpha self consistency reliability coefficient of Bully Scale is calculated as 0.87 for total scale, 0.71 for physical bullying subscale, 0.68 for verbal bullying, 0.60 for isolation subscale, 0.64 for casting rumour subscale and 0.70 for vandalism subscale.

Victim Scale

Validity: We applied for an expert for validity study and then did confirmative factor analysis for this scale.. In the result of the first scale (DFA), adaptation index was found as Chi-square = 1016.52 (df=617, p.= .00), Chi-square / df= 1.65, (RMSEA)= 0.039, (GFI)= 0.89, (AGFI)= 0.87, (CFI)=0.97, (NFI)=0.92 ve (NNFI)= 0.96, while in the second scale DFA,it was found as Chi-square = 1112.81 (df =624, p.= .0000), Chi-square / df= 1.783, (RMSEA)= 0.043, GFI= 0.88,

(AGFI)= 0.86, CFI=0.96, (NFI)=0.91 ve (NNFI)= 0.96.

Reliability*:* Cronbach Alpha self consistency reliability coefficient of Bully Scale is calculated as 0.90 for total scale, 0.74 for physical bullying subscale, 0.66 for verbal bullying, 0.68 for isolation subscale, 0.79 for casting rumour subscale and 0.76 for vandalism subscale.

These values in terms of the validity and reliability of both scales show that these values are at acceptable level. Pişkin & Ayas, 2007). Particularly in both scales, these values obtained as to validity and reliability of both scales have shown that these scales are at acceptable level (Pişkin & Ayas, 2007). As the first order and improved measurement models are statistically significant, the values of (p=.00 ve p=.0000) and (RMSEA), ..56 and .57 for bully scale, .039 and .043 for victim scale are under 0.10, which suggests that the data are compatible with the model (Kelloway, 1998). Moreover, information pertaining personal, social and academic variables of the sample group was obtained through "*Personal Information Form"* which was developed by the researchers. Reliability coefficient for the bully scale is found. 87, and. 90 for victim scale.

Procedure

Bully and victim determining scale-child form applied to 488 students. Before application, students were informed about the test and variables. Data were collected within the class hours with the institutional permission given beforehand.

Data Analyses

After research data collected, SPSS 16.0 packaged software was used for statistical analysis of data. t-test and one way variance analysis(ANOVA) and regression analysis were applied.

Findings

Findings and interpretations regarding bullying and subjected to bullying scores ın accordance with academic success level of children.

Table 1.

The Difference Between Bullying and Subjected to Bullying Scores of Children Regarding Academic Success Level of Them

Peer Bullying	Academic success level	n	$\overline{X}$	SD	F	p
Physical bullying (acting)	Ones with degree of honor	232	1.76	5.31	1.510	.222
	Ones directly pass the class	89	2.43	5.34		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	1.35	3.42		
	Total	488	1.74	4.76		
Verbal bullying (acting)	Ones with degree of honor	232	1.26	3.52	3.063	.048
	Ones directly pass the class	89	2.31	4.92		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	1.17	3.34		
	Total	488	1.42	3.77		
İsolation (acting)	Ones with degree of honor	232	0.91	2.93	0.084	.919
	Ones directly pass the class	89	0.94	2.89		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	0.82	2.29		
	Total	488	0.88	2.72		
Spreading rumor (acting)	Ones with degree of honor	232	0.21	1.19	2.765	.064
	Ones directly pass the class	89	0.76	3.02		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	0.34	1.84		
	Total	488	0.36	1.87		
Vandalism (acting)	Ones with degree of honor	232	0.42	1.54	4.428	.012
	Ones directly pass the class	89	0.53	1.83		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	1.04	2.81		
	Total	488	0.65	2.12		
Total (acting)	Ones with degree of honor	232	4.58	11.21	1.505	.223
	Ones directly pass the class	89	7.00	13.91		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	4.74	10.64		
	Total	488	5.08	11.58		
Physical bullying (subjected)	Ones with degree of honor	232	3.56	6.47	0.871	.419
	Ones directly pass the class	89	3.78	6.12		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	4.50	8.29		
	Total	488	3.92	7.09		
Verbal bullying (subjected)	Ones with degree of honor	232	3.61	6.14	4.765	.009
	Ones directly pass the class	89	6.07	7.53		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	4.83	6.81		
	Total	488	4.48	6.69		
Isolation (subjected)	Ones with degree of honor	232	2.11	4.33	1.937	.145
	Ones directly pass the class	89	3.22	5.19		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	2.57	4.58		
	Total	488	2.47	4.59		
Spreading rumor (subjected)	Ones with degree of honor	232	2.46	6.11	0.256	.774
	Ones directly pass the class	89	2.85	5.62		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	2.87	6.39		
	Total	488	2.67	6.11		
Vandalism (subjected)	Ones with degree of honor	232	2.81	5.48	2.794	.062
	Ones directly pass the class	89	2.31	4.54		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	3.98	7.33		
	Total	488	3.12	6.06		
Total (subjected)	Ones with degree of honor	232	14.57	21.98	1.698	.184
	Ones directly pass the class	89	18.25	23.02		
	Ones fail to pass directly	167	18.76	27.28		
	Total	488	16.68	24.14		

As is seen at the table above, there was found significant difference between verbal bullying ($F_{(2-485)}$= 3.063, p=.048) and vandalism dimensions ($F_{(2-485)}$= 4.428, p=.012) from the aspect of the bullies and verbal bullying dimension ($F_{(2-485)}$= 4.765, p=.009) from the aspect of the students who are subjected to bullying.

As the result of LSD analysis applied, the difference was found in favor of the students who directly pass their classes in the verbal bullying dimension from the aspect of the bullies the and students who are subjected to bullying; and in favor of the students who couldn't directly pass their classes in the vandalism dimension.

Findings and ınterpretations regarding bullying and subjected to bullying scores ın accordance with disciplinary status of children.

Table 2.

Bullying and Subjected to Bullying Scores of Students in Accordance With Their Disciplinary Status

Peer bullying	Disciplinary status	n	$\overline{X}$	SD	t	p
Physical bullying (acting)	Ones punished	56	2,67	5,12	1,555	,121
	Ones not punished	432	1,62	4,71		
Verbal Bullying (acting)	Ones punished	56	2,87	5,95	3,079	,002
	Ones not punished	432	1,23	3,35		
Isolation (acting)	Ones punished	56	2,00	4,03	3,278	,001
	Ones not punished	432	0,74	2,47		
Spreading rumor (acting)	Ones punished	56	1,00	3,64	2,723	,007
	Ones not punished	432	0,27	1,49		
Vandalism (acting)	Ones punished	56	0,94	2,33	1,079	,281
	Ones not punished	432	0,62	2,09		
Total (acting)	Ones punished	56	9,50	17,18	3,060	,002
	Ones not punished	432	4,50	10,53		
Physical bullying (subjected)	Ones punished	56	6,35	9,37	2,745	,006
	Ones not punished	432	3,61	6,68		
Verbal Bullying (subjected)	Ones punished	56	6,26	8,08	2,128	,034
	Ones not punished	432	4,25	6,47		
Isolation (subjected)	Ones punished	56	3,76	6,38	2,246	,025
	Ones not punished	432	2,30	4,29		
Spreading rumor (subjected)	Ones punished	56	4,62	8,03	2,546	,011
	Ones not punished	432	2,42	5,78		
Vandalism (subjected)	Ones punished	56	4,32	7,02	1,577	,116
	Ones not punished	432	2,96	5,92		
Total (subjected)	Ones punished	56	25,33	30,58	2,873	,004
	Ones not punished	432	15,56	22,98		

As is seen at the table above, there was found significant difference between verbal bullying (t_{486}= 3.079, p=.002), isolation (t_{486}= 3.278, p=.001), spreading rumor (t_{486}= 2.723, p=.007) and total dimensions (t_{486}= 3.060, p=.002) from the aspect of the bullies; and physical bullying (t_{486}= 2.745, p=.006), verbal bullying (t_{486}= 2.128, p=.034), isolation (t_{486}= 2.246, p=.025), spreading rumor (t_{486}= 2.546, p=.011) and total dimensions (t_{486}= 2.873, p=.004) from the aspect of the students who are subjected to bullying in favor of the students who are punished.

Findings regarding predictor variables of peer bullying.

Results of multiple linear regression analysis applied to determine the prediction strength of variables of age and number of siblings over peer bullying scores of students are given below.

Table 3.

Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Applied to Determine Prediction of Peer Bullying

Predictor variables	B	Prediction error	β	t	p
Age	2.015	.806	.113	2.499	.013
Number of siblings	-.069	.282	-.011	-0.246	.806
	R=.113	R^2=.013	$F_{(2-485)}$= 3.136		p=.044

As is inferred from the table above, predictor variables of age and number of siblings were found to predict peer bullying scores of students at a significant level (R=.113, R^2=.013, $F_{(2-485)}$=3.136, p=.044). This finding demonstrates that predictor variables together explains %1,3 of the variance regarding total peer bullying scores of the students. Taking the results of the independent t-test into consideration, the variable of age (β=.113) was found to be the strongest predictor (t=2.499, p= .013) of peer bullying. The variable of number of siblings (β=-.011) was found not to predict the peer-bullying scores obtained from the study.

Results of multiple linear regression analysis applied to determine prediction of exposure to the peer bullying

Table 4.

Results of Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Applied to Determine Prediction of Exposure to the Peer Bullying

Predictor variables	B	Prediction error	β	t	p
Age	3.434	1.684	.092	2.039	.042
Number of siblings	.188	.588	.014	0.319	.750
	R=.094	R^2=.009	$F_{(2-485)}$= 2.151		p=.117

As is inferred from the table above, predictor variables of age and number of siblings were found not to predict exposure to the peer bullying scores of students at a significant level (R=.094, R^2=.009, $F_{(2-485)}$=2.151, p=.117). Taking the results of the independent t-test into consideration, the variable of age (β=.092) was found to be the significant predictors (t=2.039, p= .042) of exposure to the peer bullying, but the procedure is low.

Discussion

This study has revealed that peer bullying in primary schools is still prevailing and it differentiates significantly in accordance with certain variables. Considering the data obtained from the aspect of the variable of academic achievement level at 6th, 7th, and 8th of grades primary school students; it has also brought out that bullying and being exposed to bullying, within verbal dimension, observed to be remarkably prevalent among the students who pass their classes succesfully. On the other hand, within vandalism dimension, bullying and being exposed to bullying was found out to be the more prevalent among the students who pass their classes with make-up exam than the students who pass their classes succesfully.

Some studies carried out on this subject suggest that the individuals bullied have poor self esteem, non-attendance to school, develop negative attitude to school (Olweus, 1994; Banks, 1997; Pişkin & Ayas, 2005). Regardful of the findings obtained from our study and the results of the study remarked, unsuccessful students in schools seem to have poor self esteem, more negative attitude to school and problem with attendance to school.

According to Olweus (1993), a close relationship was found between bullying in Primary School and guiltiness appearing after school life. Byrne(1994), in his study, determined that those

exposed to bully have a low esteem in their adult life. Judging from the findings of that study, along with those obtained from our study, we can say that the students who are not successful in their school life seem to demonstrate bully behaviour in their adult life.

In some studies carried out on this subject, it has been reported that educative programmes applied for reducing peer bullying have reduced it significantly (Olweus 1992., Pepler at all, 1994., Eslea and Smith,1998., Stevens at all 2000., Kartal, H. and Bilgin, A. 2007). These results show that if educative programmes are held and apllied in the school of research and other schools in which bully behaviours are seen, peer bullying can be reduced.

It has also been revealed that students receiving disciplinary punishment, exhibit mostly verbal, isolation and spreading rumour behaviors when bullying; and are exposed to bullying more in phisical, verbal, isolation and spreading rumour behaviors. According to Furniss (2000), The children with bully behaviours are those who try to look strong, aggressive, intentionally vandalize, and have low esteem. Bully children come from the families, lack of family relations, applying for physical punishment and protective style of upbringing. The children bullied are those who are isolated from the groups, live in fright, and are unreliable. Respectful of this thought, it can be said that discipline punishment can reduce self-esteem, isolate them from groups, and make them live in fright.

It was also ascertained that the age and number of siblings variables do predict the peer bullying at a significant level. Age, being one of the two independent variables, found out to be the strongest predicter of peer bullying. This result shows that the variables of age and the number of siblings can affect the students' bully behaviours.

Conclusion

Considering the results of this study, it could be asserted that all necessary precaution steps should be taken to promote academic success level in schools regarding the finding that students who pass their classes with make-up exam resort to bullying in the vandalism dimension more than the students who pass their classes succesfully. It was also found out that students who receive disciplinary punishment are more inclined to act bullying and exposed to bullying mostly. Therefore, the concerned people should be acknowledged on being more prudent inflicting a disciplinary punishment. Descriptive studies need to be conducted on bullying and being exposed to bullying and certain rehabilitation programs should be implemented within the direction of data obtained. More comprehensive studies analyzing the peer bullying from the aspect of different variables might be conducted. Considering age's being a significant predicter of the bullying, consciousness-raising studies should be applied interested people and personnel in order to understand the students of at 6th, 7th, and 8th of grades primary school better.

References

Banks, R. (1997.) Bullying in schools, ERİC Dacument Reproducion Service No: ED407154. Blackwell Publishers.

Byrne, B. J. (1994). Bullies and victims in school settings with reference to some Dublin schools. *Irish Journal of Psychology*, 15, 574-586.

Connor, D.F. (1998). Over categorical aggression in referred children and adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and AdolescentPsychiatry,* 67(1), 66-73.

Çetinkaya, S., Nur, N., Ayvaz, A., Özdemir, D.ve Kavakçı, Ö. (2009). Sosyoekonomik Durumu Farklı Üç İlköğretim Okulu Öğrencilerinde Akran Zorbalığının Depresyon ve Saygısı Düzeyiyle İlişkisi. *Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi,*, 10, 151-158.

Dake, J.A., Price, J.H. & Telljohann, J.K. (2003). The nature and extent of bullying at school. *Journal of Scholl Health,* 73 (5), 173-181.

Eslea, M.& Simith, P. K. (1998). The long-term effectiveness of anti-bulying work in primary school, *Educational Research*, 40, 203-218.

Furniss, C.(2000). Bullying in schools: it's not a crime -is it? *Educational and t Law*,12, 9-29.

Forero R, McLellan L, Rissel C, Bauman A. (1999). Bullying behaviours and psychosocial health among school students in New South Wales, Australia: cross sectional survey. *British Medical Journal*,319 (7206), 344-349.

Glover, D., Gough, G., Johnson, M. & Cartwright, N. (2000). Bullying in 25 secondary schools: Incidence, impact and intervention. *Educational Research*, 42 (2), 141-156.

Griffin, R.S. & Gross, A.M. (2004). Childhood bullying: Current findings and future directions for research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 9, 379-400.

Hughes G (2005). The Relationship between bullying and achievement; a study of related school and family factors. Master Thesis, The Universty of Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Jarrett, O.S. (2001). Play during recess and the effect of recess on classroom behavior. *Play, Policy & Practice Connections*, 6 (1), 11-17.

Kandemir, M. (2006). İlköğretimde Algılanan Sınıf içi Empatik Atmosfer ile Benlik Algısı Arasındaki Etkileşimin Akran Zorbalığı ile İlişkisi. Unpublished master thesis, Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Kartal, H. ve Bi lgin, A.(2007) . İköğretim Öğrencilerine Yönelik Bir Zorbalık Karşıtı Program Uygulaması: Okulu Zorbalıktan Arındırma Programı. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 3(2),207-227.

Kelloway, E.K. (1998). Using LISREL for structural Equation Modeling: A Researcher's Guide, Sage Publications*, International Educational and Professional Publisher*, Thousand Oaks.

Kepenekçi, Y. & Çınkır, S. (2006). Bullying among Turkish high school students. *Child Abuse & Neglect.* 30 (2), 193-204.

Koç, Z. (2006).Lise Öğrencilerinin Zorbalık Düzeylerinin Yordanması. [Levels of high school students bullying prediction]. Unpublished doctorate dissertation., Gazi Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık Bilim Dalı, Ankara.

Melton, G. B., Limber, S. P., Cunningham, P., Osgood, D. W., Chambers, J., Flerx, V., Henggeler, S., and Nation, M. (1998). Violence among rural youth. Final report to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Muscari, M. (2003). What can I do to help a child who is being bullied? *Medscape for Nurses: Ask the Experts*, available at http://medscape.com/viewarticle/451381

O'Moore, A.M. & Hillery, B. (1989). Bullying in Dublin schools. *Irish Journal of Psychology,* 10 (3), 426-441.

Olweus, D. (1987). Schoolyard bullying - Grounds for intervention*. School Safety*, Fall, 4-11.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among school children : Basic facts and effects of a school based intervenyion program. In Pepler, D. & Rubin, K. (Eds.), *The Development and Treatment of Child Agression,* (pp.411-448). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Olweus, D. (1992). Bullying among schoolchildren: intervention and prevention. In Peters, R. D. V., McMahon, R. J. & Quinsey, V. L. (eds) Aggression and Violence Throughout the Life Span. *Sage Publications*, Newbury Park, pp. 100–125.

Olweus, D. (1993). Bullying at school – What we know and what we can do. Malden, MA, Blacwell Publishers Ltd.

Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school: basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program, *Journal of Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 35 (7), 1171–90.

Olweus, D. (1995). Bullying or peer abuse at school: Facts and intervention. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4, 196-200.

Olweus, D. (2003). A Profile of bullying at school, *Educational Leaderships*, vol. 60 Issue 6, EBSCO host.

Öğülmüş, S. (2006).“Okullarda şiddet ve alınabilecek önlemler”, *Eğitime Bakış Dergisi*., 2,7, 16-24.

Pepler, D.J., Craig, W.M., Ziegler, S. & Charach, A. (1994). An evaluation of an anti-bullying intervention in Toronto schools. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*, 132, 95-110.

Pişkin, M. &Ayas, T. (2005, Eylül). Zorba ve Kurban Lise Öğrencilerinin Utangaclık, İçedonukluk, Dışaadonukluk ve Özsaygı Değişkenleri Bakımından İncelenmesi. [Bullies and victims of high school students shyness, introversion, extraversion, and self-esteem variable in terms of examining]VIII. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresinde sunulan bildiri, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Piskin, M. (2006, Mart). Akran Zorbalığı Olgusunun İlkögretim Öğrencileri Arasındaki Yaygınlığının İncelenmesi. [Cases among primary school students bullying their peers in the prevalence study]. I. Şiddet ve Okul: Okul ve Çevresinde Çocuga Yönelik Siddet ve Alınabilecek Tedbirler Sempozyumunda sunulan bildiri, İstanbul.

Pişkin, M. ve Ayas, T. (2007, Eylül). Akran Zorbalığı Belirleme Ölçeği Çocuk Formunun Geliştirilmesi.[Development of the scale of peer bullying child form]. XVI. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresinde sunulan bildiri, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Tokat.

Price, J. M., & Dodge, K. A. (1989). Reactive and proactive aggression in childhood: Relations to peer status and social context dimensions. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology,*17,(4), 455-471

Rigby, K. (1997). Attitudes and beliefs about bullying among Australian school children. *Irish Journal of Psychology*, 18 (2),202-220.

Smith, P.K. (1991). The silent nigtmare: Bullying and victimization in school peer groups. The Psychologist, 4, 243-248.

Smokowski, P.R. and Kopasz, K.H. (April, 2005). Bullying in school: an overview of types, effects, family characteristics and intervention strategies. *Children & Schools,* 27, 101-110.

Stevens, V., de Bourdeaudhuij, I, & Van Oost, P. (2000). Bullying in Flemish schools: an evaluation of anti-bullying interventions in primary and secondary schools. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70,195–210.

Vitiello, B., Behar, D., Hunt, J., Stoff, D.& Ricciuti, A. (1990). Subtyping aggression in children and adolescents. *The Journal of Neuropsychiatry & Clinical Neurosciences*, 2, 189-192.

Whitney, I., Rivers, I., Smith, P., & Sharp, S. (1994). The Sheffield project: methodology and findings In

P. Smith & S. Sharp (Eds.), School bullying: Insights and perspectives *London: Routledge*, 20-56.