

---

# A Study of Personal and Environmental Factors Influencing Bullying

Su-Jeong Kim

---



München 2004



---

# **A Study of Personal and Environmental Factors Influencing Bullying**

**Su-Jeong Kim**

---

Dissertation  
an der Fakultät für Psychologie und Padagogik  
der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität  
München

Vorgelegt von  
Su-Jeong Kim  
Mokpo

München, September 2006

Erster Gutachter :                    Prof. Dr. Albert Ziegler  
Zweiter Gutachter:                    Prof. Dr. Kurt Heller  
Tag der Muendlichen Pruefung:                    2004 July

Introduction	7
1 Theoretical Backgrounds	11
1.1 The situation of bullying in the world and the researches.....	11
1.1.1 Western Countries .....	11
1.1.2 Asian Countries .....	19
1.2 Aggression.....	22
1.2.1 Definition.....	22
1.2.2 Types of aggression .....	25
1.3 Bullying.....	29
1.3.1 Reasons of Bullying .....	33
1.3.2 Characteristics of Aggressors .....	34
1.3.3 Characteristics of Victims .....	36
1.3.4 Effect of being bullied .....	38
1.3.5 Gender difference in Bullying Behavior.....	39
1.4 Effects of Attributions, Self, Social Relationships, Self-Perception and Social Support .....	42
1.4.1 Attributions.....	42
1.4.2 Attributions of aggression .....	43
1.4.3 Self .....	45
1.4.4 Social Relationship and Effects on Self .....	49
1.4.5 Self-Perception and Bullying.....	51
1.4.6 Social Support and Bullying.....	52
1.5 Effects of Environmental Factors .....	53
1.5.1 School Environment.....	53
1.5.2 Family Environment .....	54
1.6 Effects of Attitudes toward Aggression and Cultural Beliefs.....	57
1.6.1 Attitude toward Aggression.....	57
1.6.2 Cultural Beliefs .....	59
2 Hypothesis	63
2.1 Experience in Bullying.....	64
2.1.1 Number of Victims and Bullies .....	64
2.1.2 Bullied Experience .....	64

2.1.3	Bullying Experience .....	65
2.1.4	Reasons for Bullying and Reactions to Bullying.....	65
2.2	Factors Influencing Bully and Victim Tendencies.....	68
2.2.1	Attributions.....	68
2.2.2	Self-Perception .....	69
2.2.3	Attitude toward Aggression.....	69
2.2.4	Cultural Beliefs .....	70
2.2.5	Perceived Social Support .....	71
2.2.6	Family (Caregiver) Factor .....	71
2.3	Conclusive Factors to Explain Changes in Bully and Victim Groups.....	73
3	Method	74
3.1	Participants .....	74
3.1.1	Students .....	74
3.1.2	Caregivers .....	75
3.2	Procedure .....	75
3.3	Measuring instruments.....	75
3.3.1	Student Questionnaire .....	75
3.3.2	Caregivers' Questionnaire .....	86
3.4	Analysis .....	88
4	Results	89
4.1	Number of Bullies and Victims .....	89
4.1.1	Number of Victims .....	89
4.1.2	The Number of Bullies .....	90
4.2	Bullied Experiences and Perpetrated Bullying .....	91
4.2.1	Bullied Experiences .....	93
4.2.2	Bullying experience.....	102
4.3	Reason of Bullying and Reactions to Bullying.....	107
4.3.1	Victim Perspective .....	107
4.3.2	Bully Perspective .....	109
4.3.3	Bystander Perspective.....	111
4.4	Bully Tendency and Victim Tendency .....	113

4.5	Factors influencing Bully and Victim tendencies .....	117
4.5.1	Attributions and Self-Perception .....	117
4.5.2	Attitudes toward Aggression and Cultural Beliefs .....	123
4.5.3	Perceived Social Support and Bully and Victim Tendencies	126
4.5.4	Family Factors: Attitudes toward aggression, raring style and cultural beliefs .....	129
1.1.1	.....	132
4.5.5	Most effective factor among the variables.....	132
4.6	Discriminant analysis .....	133
4.6.1	Changes in the Normal Group .....	133
4.6.2	Changes in the Bulling Group .....	136
4.6.3	Changes in the Victims Group .....	137
4.6.4	Changes in the Bully-Victim Group .....	139
5	Summary and Discussion of the Results .....	142
5.1	Experience in Bullying.....	143
5.1.1	Number of Bullies and Victims .....	143
5.1.2	Being Bullied Experience .....	144
5.1.3	Bullying Experience .....	145
5.1.4	Reason of Bullying and the Reaction .....	146
5.2	Factors influencing bully and victim tendencies .....	148
5.2.1	Attributional style .....	148
5.2.2	Self-concept.....	149
5.2.3	Attitude toward aggression .....	150
5.2.4	Cultural Beliefs .....	151
5.2.5	Perceived Social Support .....	152
5.2.6	Family (Caregiver) Factor .....	153
5.3	Suggestions .....	155
6	References	159
7	Appendix	175

# Introduction

Students' bullying phenomenon in schools increasingly became a worldwide problem. After Dan Olweus started his first work on prevention and intervention of bullying problems in the late 70's (Olweus, 1978), a lot of research has been conducted on this topic that led to a growing understanding about bullying behavior and related factors. However, most of the work was done in western countries, that means individualistic cultures. Up to now, very few is known about the magnitude phenomenology and predictors of bullying behavior in collectivistic cultures. In general, the role of cultural beliefs was not examined in a sufficient manner.

In individualistic cultures, bullying is a serious problem. According to Bacchini et al. (1993), 40% of all students were bullied at least once a time in their school career. Admittedly, the estimations of the extent of bullying behavior vary in different studies (Hanewinkel & Knaak, 1997a; O'Moore & Hillery, 1989; Whitney & Smith, 1993). However, it is doubtless, that bullying behavior is particularly frequent in middle schools, i.e. in adolescence. At the same time this stage is crucial for the development of the identity and a positive self-concept. All the more alarming are these virulent rates in middle schools. Thus, effective interventions are badly needed.

Bullying behavior causes negative problems not only for the victim, but also the actor. Expectedly, victims suffer under strong and immediate negative effects lasting for years. They often show symptoms of depression, high anxiety, and similar negative emotional consequences (Rigby, 2000). In addition, bullying victims tend to show a low self-worth (Björkqvist, Ekman, & Lagerspetz, 1982).

In order to develop effective interventional programs, it is important to understand bullying phenomenon, characteristics of perpetrator and victims as well as related factors. Up to now, it is known that bullies tend



to be aggressive not only to their peers but also to adults (Olweus, 1996). Moreover, they attribute others' uncommon behavior mostly to their alleged hostile intentions (Hudley, 1990). Bullies tend to appraise aggressive problem solving strategies as positive and show also a more frequent use of these inadequate behaviors (Huesmann, Guerra, Miller, & Zelli, 1992).

Under a naïve view, victims are seen as passive, lonely, and abandoned. However, not all of them could be described in this manner. Actually, victims constitute heterogeneous group. Beneath the *passive type* of victims a *reactive type* was identified. Here, students are victimized and bully others at the same time. Both types of victims are characterized by different behavior styles, cognitions, emotions, and social relationships. According to Kwak & Lee (1999), aggressive victims seem to be most vulnerable. They report the lower self-worth, a lower degree of social support, and more depressive symptoms than passive victims. In addition, aggressive victims perceive the lowest degree of social support from significant others. This is especially crucial, because social support has a buffering effect on stressful situations and helps to cope with them. Children, belonging to the reactive type, often stem from families dominated by struggles. Their parents tend to be emotionally cold and often hold a rejecting rearing style (Patterson, 1984; Shaffer, 1994).

As stated above, most of these insights result from studies conducted in western countries. Beside the research deficit, concerning collectivistic cultures and cultural influences in general, there are some more shortfalls in the bullying literature. Especially, there are only few studies, which investigated the influence of cognitive, social, and environmental determinants of bully and victim tendencies. Therefore, it remains unclear, which of the factors named above plays the most important role, not only in prediction bullying behavior, but also in distinguishing bullies from victims. Moreover, the outnumber of the findings are based on a cross-sectional design. This circumstance lead to unclarities relating to the causal order of the relevant constructs.

The present work aims to enlighten the described deficits under a longitudinal perspective. The objection is to provide information about multiple influences of cognitive, social and environmental factors on bullying and victim tendencies, that is valid for collectivistic cultures. Additionally, it is the goal to describe and to predict changes in bullying behavior and related factors.

The present work consists of four main parts: Theoretical background and hypotheses, method, results and discussion. Chapter 1 of the theoretical background describes the worldwide situation of the bullying phenomenon and provides an overview of the relevant research literature. After a cursory outline of theoretical models on aggression and aggressive behavior in Chapter 2, theoretical approaches on bullying are considered in Chapter 3. Especially, different types of bullying actors and victims are distinguished. In chapter 4, cognitive and social factors, which are related to aggressive and bullying behavior, are discussed. Chapter 5 is dedicated to environmental factors, particularly to the influences of school and family characteristics. Chapter 6 explains attitudes toward aggression and - most important for the present work - cultural beliefs. Derived from the presented theoretical arguments the hypotheses of the empirical study are formulated in Chapter 7.

In the method section, the participants of the study are characterized (Chapter 8), the procedure is described (Chapter 9), the measuring instruments are introduced (Chapter 10), and the used strategies of data analysis are explained (Chapter 11).

In the third part of the study the results are presented. First of all, frequencies of the victims and bullies are reported (Chapter 12). Then, bullied and bullying experiences are provided as well as named reasons of bullying and reactions to bullying (Chapter 13). Most central, in Chapter 19 the results of hierarchical tests of multiple regression models, conducted in order to examine the relative influence of cognitive, social, and environmental factors on the bullying behavior, are presented. Finally,

the results of the examination of discriminant analysis are presented, which were conducted to distinguish bullies and victims (Chapter 20).

# 1 Theoretical Backgrounds

## 1.1 The situation of bullying in the world and the researches

Over the last 20 years most of the empirical data about bullying have come from the Scandinavian countries, based mostly on the pioneering work of Olweus (1978). In terms of the extent of bullying, Olweus (1999) conducted an extensive study of 140.000 Norwegian students aged 8-16 years in 1987. In this study, it was found that 9% of students reported being bullied, whereas 7% of students were bullying others 'now and then' or more often. Besides researches from Olweus, many researches investigating bullying phenomena have been conducted in the several countries, e.g. Sweden, Australia, and Japan, and by many researchers and various results were found out. This chapter presents the bullying situation and researches in theme 'bullying' in the several countries.

### 1.1.1 Western Countries

#### *Sweden*

In the late 1970's, Olweus initiated the investigation of wide spread school aggression problems. His first project on bullying - a longitudinal study - was started in 1970 in Sweden (Olweus, 1978). He examined the effects and stability of bullying and bullied experiences as well as the stability of individual differences in aggressiveness.

Olweus' longitudinal study started with 900 6-9-grade boys in Stockholm and is still being carried out. In addition, information of their childhood was collected through retrospective interview with parents. Registers of participants' official crimes were investigated up to the age of

24, as well. In this study he found a high stability of individual difference in aggressive behaviors over time. He found out that 60% of boys who were characterized as bullies in grades 6-9 (according to teacher nomination and peer ratings) had been convicted of at least one officially registered crime by age of 24.

After Olweus conducted studies to investigate school aggression, many Swedish schools and even communities followed Olweus' proposals to set up a law against bullying at school (Olweus, 1992, 1993a): According to this law, it is a fundamental democratic right of a child to feel safe in school. Schools and communities made use of Olweus' bully-victim questionnaire arranged a school conference day on bullying and undertook to intervene the aggression problems in school, class and individual levels.

In 1994, the Swedish parliament enacted a new school law article, including formulation that is very similar to Olweus' proposal. Since 1993, the *National Agency for Education* has financially supported numerous local school projects that aimed at preventing and intervening bullying at school. Furthermore, additional actions have been undertaken as an effort to counteract against bullying among children and adolescents since the beginning of 1995. More than 6000 participants, aged 13, wrote letters to express their own views of bullying problems and made suggestions for counteracting. These activities are named *Ombudsman activities* (Olweus, 1999) and still continued. The students participating the activities argued the importance of the cooperative work among school steps, governments, students and communities.

### *Norway*

Although mass media, teachers and parents were concerned about bullying problems between 1970's and the beginning of 1980's, there was no trial to resolve the problems from schools in Norway. But problems

became so serious that three students committed suicide as a consequence of severe bullying by their peers.

This incident triggered many reactions and activities, which reached a nationwide campaign against bullying phenomenon in Norwegian primary and junior high schools. The *Ministry of Education* initiated this campaign in the fall of 1983. With these activities bully-victim problems could be identified through teacher assessments and peer nominations. 15 % of students in primary and junior high schools from grades 1-9 were involved in bullying (Olweus, 1993). About 9% of the students were victimized by other peers and 7% of the students were identified as bullies who bully others regularly. In sum, a total of approximately 5 % of the students were involved in more serious bullying problems.

Tremendous sensation by Norwegian erupted, when the result of Olweus' study had been informed, because the bullying problem was much more serious than they had thought. They tried to find the solution of the bullying problem undertook nationwide campaign against bully/victim problems.

A 32 page booklet for school personnel explaining about the bullying and suggesting how to prevent and intervene the problem, a four-page folder with information and advice to parents of victims and bullies, a video cassette displaying bullying episodes, and a questionnaire to ask about different aspects of bullying were produced and distributed to schools and communities nationwide in Norway. When the Olweus had evaluated the effects of the campaign on the problem, he found out the great reductions in frequencies of bullying and general antisocial behavior. Although the problem did not disappear, order and discipline improved and positive social relationship increased.

### *Finland*

The researchers in Finland started their investigation of the bullying problem, when the Olweus' studies had been known. The situation in Finnish school was relatively good. According to Lagerspetz, K. M., Björkqvist, Berts, & King (1982), 5.5 % of their 12-16 year-old samples were bullies and 3.9 % of them were victims in Finland. Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, K.M.J., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K. & Kaukiainen, A. (1996), 70 % of students neither participated in bullying actively nor helped victims. However, the situation became worse. The study conducted by Puukari(2001) 9% of boy and 6% of girls participated survey research in age 11 to 15 years were bullied at least once a week during the school smemster.

In order to counteract the bullying problem, an organization 'home and school' was founded and undertook the prevention and intervention activities of the problem according to the Olweus' principles. The organization gave advices, lectures , applied programs against bullying. Beside of the Olweus' principles, Pikas' method, and Nuutinen's victim slide show displaying photos and X-rays of injured young victims were applied. The results of those activities have not been evaluated, yet. Therefore, the exact effects of the activities are not known.

### *Germany*

In Germany, the bullying phenomenon grasped worldwide people's attention in the 1990's. Abundant empirical studies and intervention programs have been implemented since then (Lösel & Bliesner, 1998; Schäfer, 1996; Knaack & Hanewinkel, 1999). It has appeared that the bullying behavior is reported to be most serious from the eighth to tenth grades (about 14 to 17 year-old students). Although there are differences depending on the age, area and definition of bullying in the light of frequency and persistency of bullying in prior studies, they vary between 4

and 12 %. Hanewinkel and Knaack (1997) found that 9.2 % of the students became victims at least once a week. Schaefer (1996) reported of 5.3%.

For intervention of the bullying, the commission on Violence was established and various programs were designed. Information about aggression at schools and brochures for students was published, training courses for teachers were implemented, and the school curriculum pays more attention to ethical issues. In addition, magazines for adolescent dealt with bullying problem, urged understanding the victims. About 140 programs were established and implemented, for example, the government of the Schleswig-Holstein stat set up a statewide program “Mobbing: Prevention of violence in schools in Schleswig-Holstein” which is still running and 375 schools participated in. According to the evaluation of the program, there was marked reduction in bullying problem.

### *England and Wales*

The foundation supported also the famous *Sheffield study* (Whitney & Smith, 1993) which was the first large scale survey study of school bullying with students in 24 schools in England. 2600 primary and 4100 secondary school students participated in this study and the Olweus anonymous self-report questionnaire was used. 27% of primary school students reported being bullied ‘sometimes or more frequently’, and it included 10% bullied ‘once a week or more frequently’. Whitney and Smith (1993) found a modest effect of socioeconomic deprivation, accounting for about 10% of the variance. This means that more bullying in schools occurred in more deprived areas. Even in several studies, racist bullying phenomenon as well as sexuality biased bullying, for example against gay, lesbian, was discovered (Blatchford, 1991; Kelly & Cohn, 1988).

Since 1989, the *Galbenkan Foundation* supported a number of initiatives to intervene against the bullying phenomenon. Publication of booklets, telephone help-lines, drama works and a bibliography were included in



these initiatives. The foundation set up an advisory group on 'Bullying in schools' in 1989. The telephone help line received about 40-200 calls a day (Smith, 1999).

The *Department for Education* supported an intervention project, based in 23 of the 24 schools in the Sheffield survey. The interventions involved a whole-school policy, curriculum work, work in playground, and work with individual students and small groups involved in bullying situations. The effects of interventions were monitored over two years with anonymous self-report questionnaires, and other assessment measures. The bullying phenomenon reduced significantly.

### *Ireland*

In Ireland, Bryne (1999) replicated the research of Olweus with his questionnaires at primary and post primary schools in 1987 and 1992. He found out that about 5% of students were turned out to be involved as bullies and a similar number as victims. In Bryne's study, 80.5% of participating teachers thought that the bullying is a significant problem in schools in general. However, only 39% of the teachers recognized the significance of problems related to bullying in their own schools. In October 1996, O'Moore, Kirkham and Smith completed a nationwide research supported by *Gulbenkian Foundation* and the *Department of Education*. The research was conducted involving children between first and sixth graders. The questionnaires developed by Olweus were applied to be completed by 320 primary and 210 secondary schools participated in the study. According to the results, 5% of the primary school children were bullied once a week and 51% of the students were involved in bullying other students whom they did not like. It was noticed that the number of victimized students that do not report their situation to school tended to increase with age.

Through the studies, the bullying problem in Ireland got the public attention and people tried to find out the solution of the problems. The

*Sticks and Stones Theatre Company's School Program* was founded at the first conference on bullying in Ireland in 1993. In addition, O'Donnell founded a Campaign against Bullying (*CAB*) which is an advisory campaign on reducing the bullying phenomenon and arrayed information about bullying.

### *Italy*

A survey study with the bully/victim questionnaires developed by Olweus was investigated by a group of researchers from the universities of Florence and Cosenza in 1993 (Bacchini et al.). 784 students aged between 8-14 from five primary schools and four middle schools in Florence and 595 students from four primary schools and four middle schools in Cosenza participated in this study. According to the results of the study, bullying problem in Italian school is more serious than in schools of other countries. 41.6% of primary school students and 26.4% of secondary school students answered that they had been bullied sometimes or more frequently in the last term. 28% of students in primary and 10.8% of students in secondary schools had bullied other children.

Researchers and media were surprised at the high rates of bullying experience among students according to the research. The percentage is much higher than the other European countries, e.g. England and Norway. The result let researchers and teachers explore the measure for intervening and preventing bullying problem. They translated the books dealing with the intervention against bullying into Italian. Researchers organized a national conference dealing with psychosocial difficulties in adolescence in 1995. At the conference, researchers and Dan Olweus from Norway told about the present bullying problem. They searched the intervention strategies and preventing methods. Menesini and his colleagues (Ada Fonzi, 1999) carried one of first intervention treatment conducted with primary school students. Discussion about bullying problem, writing on their own experience in bullying, role-playing activities

were included in the intervention program. It took three months and took place about one or two hours per week. The results of the intervention showed that awareness of bullying by children participated in the intervention grew, whereas their behavior pattern didn't changed a lot. Victimization and standing by and seeing the victim increased, while being victimization decreased. Besides the intervention treatment, there were an intervention through video and movie and a project including teacher training, role-playing activities, and problem solving bullying. The results of those interventions were promising. Through the interventions, bullying behavior decreased 5-8%. In addition, some interventions are still conducted by several researchers.

#### *USA*

In a study involving 165 students from third to sixth grade, Perry (1988) found out that 10% of students were victimized by their peers repeatedly. Bosworth, K., Espelage, D., DuBay, T., Daytner, G., Karageorge, K. (2000) investigated a study with 558 middle school students from a Midwestern metropolitan area for evaluating a violence prevention program. They made use of a scale including questions about the involvement of teasing, name-calling, threatening of physical harm to assess bullying behaviors. In the study, 29 % of students answered involving a bullying behavior in the past 30 days. According to another study (Hoover, Hazler, 1991), 75 % of participants had experience in having been bullied by their peers at times at school.

Although there is no evaluations of intervention programs, there are interventions addressed general aggressive behavior and including social skill training, conflict resolution, friendship groups, etc.

### *Australia*

Rigby (1997a) continued investigating bullying with the method of self-reports. He conducted a study on the incidence of bullying among 685 children between 6 and 16 years in south Australian schools. The study, which included 15,152 boys at a mean age of 13.83 years and 10,247 girls at a mean age 13.60 years, drew the result that 20.7% of boys and 15.7% of girls had experienced being bullied at least once a week.

Slee(1996) developed and carried a intervention program including guidance for school steps and students, developing relevant policy, counseling children and parents, and evaluation the intervention. After implementing the intervention program, the bullying problem reduced at least 25 % in schools which it has been applied the program.

According to the results of the studies in western countries described above, between 5-41.6% of students have ever been bullied by their peers and form 5 to 51% of students have bullied other students. Since 1983, the government, group of researchers, teachers and parents' groups.

#### 1.1.2 Asian Countries

Asian countries except Japan relatively late recognized what a serious problem bullying is. They started to attempt to reduce bullying problem in 1990's.

### *Japan*

In Japan, the bullying problem increased and decreased in turns like tide of the sea since the end of 1970's until current years (Yohji, Haruo, Kumiko, Mitsuru, 1999).

In the late 1970's, some of teachers have found out new type of problematic behavior, which is called *ljime* or *Yowaimono ljime*, which is a similar term to bullying. It is the phenomenon which can be easily encountered in Japanese daily life. However, according to the teachers, *ljime* at school are different from normal *ljime* in the common life in the aspect of numbers of perpetrators, cunning and duration. In early 1980's, the *ljime* phenomenon at school gradually decreased as a result of effort made by government, police, educational administrator, teachers, parents and students for prevention and intervention. However, in the middle of 1980's several students committed suicide because of being victims of *ljime*. This indicated that the problem became again more serious. Society and media paid attention to the problems. In 1987, it was announced by the *Department of Education* that the number of *ljime* occurrences and of schools reported *ljime* incidence decreased sharply. However, in 1993, several suicide cases as a result of *ljime* occurred and in 1995 alone, 57,000 cases of *ljime* were reported in elementary schools, middle schools, high schools and special education schools.

Between 1994 and 1995 the *Researchers' Conference Regarding Problematic Behavior among Children* investigated a survey study which asked about bullying problems. In this study about 9420 students attending elementary, middle and high schools, 9420 parents and 557 teachers were involved. The result of this nation-wide study showed that 21.9% elementary school students, 13.2% middle school students, and 3.9% high school students had experienced being bullied. 25.5% of elementary, 20.3% of middle, and 6.1% of high school students reported that they bullied others at that time or they had bullied others the previous year.

The problem of bullying was indicated in Japan relatively earlier than other Asian countries and the people in many arenas in Japan, for instance Japanese government and researchers, have tried to intervene and decrease this problem. In order to prevent and intervene the bullying problem, they monitored the playgrounds, made strict school rules, e.g.

nobody is allowed to inflict bullying on another, and showed cooperative activities among teacher, parents, and the police. Actually, the intervention programs are similar to European programs, such as Sticks and Stones Theatre Company's School Program. Those programs have functioned effectively.

### *Korea*

In May 1997, a middle school student in Daegu committed suicide because of *Wangtta* (which refers to a similar meaning to bullying) by their peers and in 1999 a middle school boy tried to attempt suicide, because he had been consistently bullied by some of his classmate for one year. After those incidents had happened, scholars and educational institutes started to pay attention to the phenomenon 'Wangtta', Samsung insurance (1997) conducted a research, which included 2,565 middle and high school students in Seoul. In the study, 11.0% of the participants reported that they had experienced being bullied and 16.0% of the participants reported having experience bullying others. The *Korean Educational Development Institute* carried out another investigation with 6,893 elementary, middle, and high school students from 57 schools in Korea. In the study, 24.2% of the participants had the experience being bullied by other students. The problem was most serious in middle schools (26.9%), and elementary school (25.1%) and high schools followed in order. The *Korean Teacher Union* investigated to find out the situation of bullying in Seoul and metropolitan area in 1999. 1,100 middle and high school students from Seoul and the metropolitan area, were surveyed with a questionnaire, which asked about the bullying and bullied experience. 4.7% of the participants studied in this survey reported the bullied experience by other. Kim, Park, & Cho (1997) found out that 48.1% of the students that participated in this study, had ever bullied others and 30% had ever been bullied by others at school.

Lee (1999) surveyed 572 middle school students in Seoul. 16.1% students of samples answered that they had experienced being bullied. In a research carried out by Kwak and Lee (1997) 1,500 students between fourth grade in elementary school and third grade in middle school were asked about bullying and being bullied experiences, characteristics of victim, characteristics of the perpetrator group and reason of bullying etc. According to the results of the study, 18.3% of total participants had experienced being bullied in the previous semester and 26.8% of total participants had ever bullied others in the previous semester.

Recently, 26.1% students of 14,638 elementary, middle, and high school students from 150 schools reported that they have ever been bullied (Hankyoreh, 2003).

In accordance with the reports of the studies in Japan and Korea explained above, about 5-30% of students were fallen in the victim of bullying and between 6.1-25.5% of students have ever bullied other students. Although the attention to the bullying problem started recently, educational institutes in Asian countries continue to try to prevent and intervene the problem.

## 1.2 Aggression

### 1.2.1 Definition

Although there is a consensus in the academic field to define aggression as a negative or antisocial behavior that has little to do with psychological health and well-being (Krahe, 2001), there is no one substantial agreement on definition on aggression among researchers like other psychological terms. Researchers suggest various concepts of aggression in accordance with their own academic perspectives. The definitions from

the same distinctive perspectives on the field of aggression study would be followed.

### *Freudian Perspectives*

According to Freud, human-being naturally possess two basic instincts, which are the “life instinct” (=eros) and the “death instinct” (=thanatos). Every behavior is driven by these two basic forces. When these instincts came in conflicts within an individual, these conflicts can be resolved only by directing the destructive force to another person instead of oneself. Therefore, according to this view, aggression is a trial to keep an equilibrium in an individual and is beyond the control of the individual (Geen, 2001).

### *Behavioristic Perspectives*

A group of psychologists at Yale University (Dollard et al., 1939) suggested a definition of aggression, which translated the Freudian propositions into more objective behavioral terms. According to them, aggression is a result of a drive to end a state of frustration whereby frustration is defined as external interference with the goal-directed behavior of a person (Eron, 1994).

According to typical behavioristic perspectives (Buss, 1961), aggression is any behavior that may produce harm or injury to another person or noxious and physical stimuli to another organism. This definition is interested in the tangible and physical results of actions but doesn't pay attention to the perpetrators intentions or emotions. It means the perspective defines accidental outcomes without any intentions to harm others as aggressions but not failed intentional behavior to harm others.

However, people can differentiate the actions with intentions from the actions which are results of uncontrollable and unpredictable forces. It means that doing harm by itself does not distinguish between aggressive and nonaggressive behavior. After some criticisms about the definition,



Buss (1971) supplemented the concept of malicious intention to the behavioristic perspectives.

*Attributional Perspectives (social cognitive)*

In order to distinguish between aggressive and nonaggressive behavior, researchers started to pay attention to the actors' intentions. According to social cognitive perspectives, any behavior that has the intention to harm other person is to be considered as aggression. For example, Dollard et al. (1939) defined attributional concept of aggression as a "behavior whose goal-responds is the inflicting of injury on some object of person"(Kornadt, 1984). Nevertheless, it is not always possible that one can distinguish actual willingness to harm other, real intended harm-inducing behavior and accidental harm-inducing behavior. However, Kaufmann (1970) asserted that a behavior performed with aggressive intent carries a higher degree of expectancy of attack that will harm a target, compared to that which does not include an aggressive intent. If a person believes that there is any probability that a behavior will harm another person and then engages in that behavior, then it can be said that the harm was intentional and the behavior can be referred to aggression.

However, a lot of actions produce multiple outcomes at the same time, which are harm doing, helpful and neutral. When the actor undertakes to help others in the future with a partially harm generating action, one could not consider it as intended aggression. Therefore, Tedeschi and Felson (1994) defined an intentional action as an act performed with the expectation that it will produce a proximate outcome of value to the actor. The proximate outcome is valued because of its causal relationship to some terminal outcome.

### *Social Interactional Perspectives*

Social interactionist normally use the term “coercive action more often; which is an action taken with the intention of imposing harm on another person or forcing compliance” (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994) than “aggressive behavior”. They interpret coercive actions as a form of social influence. According to them, actors engaged in coercive actions expect that their behavior will either harm the target or lead to compliance, and they value one of these proximate outcomes. The value, which they attach to compliance or harm to the target arises from their belief about the causal relationship between compliance or harm and terminal values.

### *Social Learning Perspectives*

Bandura (1983) proposed that aggressive behavior is a learned behavior through direct or vicarious experiences in the environment, and that learning of aggression is reinforced through rewards and punishment.

Summing up, aggression is an intentional action with expectation to produce physical, psychological and social harm or injury to other organism and is a programmed behavior through self and vicarious experiences. Besides, it can be controlled by reinforcements.

#### 1.2.2 Types of aggression

A harmful behavior must be carried out with the intention to inflict negative consequences on the target, with the expectancy that the action will produce a particular outcome. Baron and Richardson (1994) suggested to use the term aggression to describe ‘any form of behavior directed toward the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such treatment’. It means that aggression has the function to

express negative feelings or reach an intended goal by means of the aggressive act as an instrumental aggression.

### *Affective Aggression and Instrumental Aggression - proactive, reactive*

#### (1) Affective (angry) aggression

Aggression is often accompanied by strong negative emotional states like anger. The emotion that we call anger is usually aroused by some provocation. When a person is provoked by others, the central and autonomic nervous systems are activated and controlled by central processing of environmental situation then increased blood flow to the musculature, heightened blood pressure and pulse rate, papillary dilation and decreased flow of blood to the viscera. Then, aggressive responses are likely to be directed to the provoking person or organism (Johansson, 1981). Therefore, in the angry aggression, the actor intends primarily to cause harm or injury to the victim and there seems no other outcome relevant to the actor's intention. In the social context, reactive aggression can act as a dysregulated, undercontrolled form of communication to express discontent (Schwartz, 2000). According to Schwartz (1997), the children, who used reactive aggression, were targeted for peer victimization as a consequence of their overly reactive behavior.

#### (2) Instrumental aggression

People often perpetrate aggressive behavior to others, even though the others did not do anything to them and they don't feel any negative emotional arousal toward them. To come in to power or to get what one wants, people often use physical, social, psychological aggression. It can be called proactive aggression (Crick & Dodge, 1996). Accordingly, individuals use aggressive behavior as one tool to gain and access to resources (Hawley, 1999). According to Prinstein and Cillessen (2003),

proactive aggression was associated with high popularity among adolescents, while reactive aggression was associated with low social preference.

One pole of the aggression is self-defense, which most of law courts recognize as a valid justification for acts of violence. Another type of instrumental aggression is the attempt to establish coercive power over others through violence or the threat of violence (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). In the Second World War, a lot of normal people committed serious violence against others just to obey to commands from the authorized person.

In the daily life, both forms of aggressions are not always exactly distinguishable and are often compounded in one activity.

### *Direct Aggression and Indirect Aggression*

Another dimension to distinguish aggressive behaviors, one is direct aggression and the other is indirect aggression. Direct aggression is the physical or verbal violence on a victim directly, whereas indirect aggression is the way to hurt a victim with psychological and social methods. The explanation about those aggressions in detail follows.

#### (1) Direct aggression

- *Physical (Overt) aggression.* Physical aggression is a form of aggression, that a person or group hurts other person's body or material things with physical methods or threaten other person to do those things. According to Olweus (1999), physical aggression occurs when people use their body or an object to inflict injury or discomfort upon another individual. The physical aggression includes from slapping, breaking bones to hurts endangering one's

life. Threatening to hurt physically any moment is considered as a physical aggression (Jürgen, 2000).

- *Verbal aggression*: Telling someone hurtful words is sometimes more effective instead of slapping a person, although it is invisible. Insulting, intimidating, criticizing, cursing, or cursing about appearance can be the verbal aggression. In the school, the verbal aggression very often occurs.

## (2) Indirect aggression

- *Psychological aggression*: It is a kind of aggression to hurt someone psychologically without using physical aggression, but it includes verbal and social means. Unlike physical aggression, psychologically violent acts can range from the overt to the subtle (Sonkin, 1995). According to Walker (1994), psychological aggression includes isolation of victim, induced debility-producing exhaustion, monopolization of perceptions, including obsessiveness and possessiveness, degradation, including humiliation, denial of victim's power and verbal name calling and so on.
- *Relational aggression*: Individuals may use their relationships as a weapon to harm others, e.g. by withdrawing friendship support or ignoring (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Galen & Underwood, 1997). According to Prinstein and Cillessen (2003), relation-based aggressive behaviors were most effective for manipulating the social hierarchy within a specific friendship clique.
- *Reputational aggression*: Others follow specific implications for the status of an individual within the group hierarchy (i.e., telling gossip or rumors, enlisting others to dislike a peer). It was defined as attempts to damage another person's social reputation (Hart, Yang, Nelson, Robinson, Jin, & Wu, 2001). It is the only form of aggression associated with social network centrality, that is strongly affiliated

members of peer cliques are most likely to use this form of aggression effectively (Xie, Cairns, & Cairns, 2002). Children, who had higher level of peer-perceived popularity, often made use of reputational aggression. However, children, who had low levels of peer-perceived popularity, tended to often use reputational aggression. Therefore, it was associated with high and low levels of peer-perceived popularity (i.e., a J-shaped curve) and moderated levels of social preference (Prinstein & Cillessen, 2003). According to Xie et al. (2002), reputational aggression are most frequently used during the initiation of conflict, while relational aggression are more typically used in retaliation, maintenance, or escalation of conflict.

Direct aggression harms a person or an organism with physical or verbal violence like hitting, jostling, intimidating, and so on, while indirect aggression hurts victim's social relationship, reputation or mental health.

Aggression is considered with two dimensions above, which are 'affective vs. instrumental' and 'direct vs. indirect'.

### 1.3 Bullying

Bullying is also a certain kind of aggressive behavior. The definition and the characteristic of bullying would be looked over bellows.

The concise Oxford English Dictionary (1991) defines the verb 'to bully' in following way: "persecute, oppress, tease, physically or morally, frighten into or out" and 'bully' was defined as "blusterer, tyrant (among boys), coward and tyrant, hired ruffian" (Arora, 1996). Heinemann (1973) was one of the first researchers who draw attention to bullying. He worked in Sweden and called the activity 'möbbing'(e.g. mobbing). He had borrowed the term 'mobbing' from the Swedish version of a book on aggression written by the ethologist Konrad Lorenz (1968). In ethology,

the term mobbing refers to collective attack by a group of animals on an animal of another species, which is usually larger and a natural enemy of the group. Lorenz made use of term 'mobbing' to characterize the action of a school class or a group of soldiers ganging up against a deviating individual (Olweus, 1994). In both, the English and Swedish language, this word limits the process to an action initiated and cried out by a group. In Scandinavia, it is called 'mobbing' which means a group or gang in English (Arora, 1994).

Olweus (1991) broadened the definition of mobbing to the psychological or mental aspects and set up the term 'bullying'. After researchers paid their attention to the long-term and systematic aspect of bullying, they needed to find out a distinguishable term from mobbing for the definition. Nowadays, the term 'mobbing' refers to an aggression which is perpetrated by a group of young people.

According to the British legal definition, bullying is long-standing violence, physical or psychological, conducted by an individual or group and directed against an individual, who is not able to defend himself in the actual situation, with a conscious desire to hurt, threaten or frighten that individual or put him under stress (Heald, 1994). This definition expresses a combined meaning of the different aspects of bullying.

Besag (1989) suggested, similarly, that bullying is a behavior which can be defined as the repeated attack- physical, psychological, social or verbal-by those in a position of power, which is formally or situationally defined, on those who are powerless to resist, with the intention of causing distress for their own gain or gratification. This definition stresses especially the aspect of the bullies' intention.

Olweus (1994) described bullying as a special type of aggression, that one physically attack or threat an individual, who is weak and powerless, to make the person feel frightening, restricted or upset over a considerable length of time, both because of the emotional trauma following such an attack but also due to the fear of renewed attacks. This definition shows that bullying is different from the odd fight or quarrel that

two people of about the same strength have (Whitney & Smith, 1993). In this case, the actor and the victims are part of the same interacting social group.

According to researchers perspectives above, bullying is a complex problem. Bullying is not an isolated behavior that is grounded in such variables as status, power, and competition. It is social behavior that occurs in relatively stable groups and involves the participation of others in regular capacities. Bullying is a form of aggression that takes place at school or at working place. Arora (1994), who investigated the concept of bullying with a 'life in school checklist', found out that bullying are observable actions and are actually taking place between young people in school which cause them to feel hurt or under stress or which are in other ways perceived as a problem by them.

Bullying involves an imbalance of strength and power, leaving the victims unable to defend themselves effectively against the negative behavior. A bullying behavior is perpetrated by an individual and also by a group that the victim also belongs to. It is an interaction in which a dominant individual or group repeatedly exhibits aggressive behavior intended to cause distress to a less dominant individual. Perpetrators normally possess a higher social status in their group than the victims. According to Delwyn and Tattum (1989), bullying is longstanding violence, physical or psychological, conducted by an individual or a group and directed against an individual who is not able to defend himself in the actual situation. It can only occur once or twice, but is normally conducted repeatedly and consistently. Bullying is a fairly stable kind of interaction between a violent agent and a somewhat helpless victim (Roland, 1998).

Unlike other aggressive acts that involve one-off or short term attacks, bullying typically occurs continuously over extended periods of time, leaving the victim in a sustained state of anxiety and intimidation.

The victims for their part suffer the physical and psychological abuse of their persons, isolation and loneliness, insecurity and anxiety



arising from the treating atmosphere that surrounds them (Delwyn & Tattum, 1989). They are not able to resist against bullying.

Bullies perpetrated Bullying behaviors in various ways. Bullying can be carried out in a physical or psychological way. Bullying Means of physical bullying includes kicking, pushing, jostling, punching, assaulting or beating the victim. Means of psychological bullying are name-calling, creating the threatening atmosphere, teasing and so on. The alienating methods are keeping from contacting with other students, looking down on, ignoring, criticizing, provoking a quarrel, exposing weakness, taunting, tormenting, and intimidating etc. This alienating is serious enough for young children to be afraid of going to school.

Smith and Whitney (1993) claimed that it has to be called bullying, when a person is hit, kicked or threatened, locked inside a room, sent nasty notes, when no-one ever talks to them and things like that. Nevertheless, if two young people of about the same strength have an odd fight or quarrel, then it is not bullying. According to Arora and Thompson (1987), 60% of the students answered bullying is like physical aggression. Arora (1994) got a similar result from a study, which was conducted with a checklist 'Life in school'. In the study, about 50% of the students answered bullying relates to physical aggression.

However, verbal aggression (like name calling), psychological aggression (like humiliation) and social aggression (like exclusion from a group activity) are used as bullying methods. Comie-Olafsson, & Liefoghe (2002) conducted a study in which fourteen countries participated in and which was applied to 8-year-old students and 14-year-old students. Their results showed that younger children relate bullying to physical aggression, older children include social exclusion.

In sum, bullying is a goal-oriented aggression: a bully aims to harm another person, who is not able to resist against him/her, in order to dominate others or preserve the solidity of a group at school or at a working place. An individual or a group of perpetrators are located at the

higher stature in the group than the victim. They conduct physical, psychological, social and verbal aggression repeatedly.

### 1.3.1 Reasons of Bullying

Reasons for bullying are various. Among them, students use bullying most frequently in order to preserve the solidity and conformity of the group, and to dominate others. The reason of bullying is normally attributed by not only bullies but also bystanders to the victim's social or physical problem.

Victim's perspectives: According to prior studies (Kim, 1997; Kwag, & Lee, 1999), most of victims did not know why they were bullied. They thought, as the reasons of bullying, they were too bashful in front of others, not have close friend, or they were too weak to resist against bullies. Some of victims regarded their bad school grade and bullies' evilness as the reason of bullying (Kim, 1997; Schaefer, 1998).

Bullies' perspectives: there are some discrepancies in bullies' perspectives about the reason of bullying among the prior studies. According to Schaefer (1998), most of bullies answered that they bullied in Kim's research thought victim problem. Beside of them, parents' house, revenge and victim's bad school performance were selected as the reason of bullying.

Bystanders' perspectives: most of bystanders (83.4%) thought victim's problematic behavior or characteristics induced them to become a victim of bullying (Kwag & Lee 1999). Then, 40.7% of the bystanders answered bullies behave just like others. Others behavior became a model and also a kind of pressure. The Situations let their personal responsibility for bullying incident decrease. There were some other reasons of bullying: bullies tried to show their strength.

### 1.3.2 Characteristics of Aggressors

Olweus (1994) explored that bullies can be characterized by a high potential of general aggressiveness. They attack, in one way or another, not just their victims, but also their teachers, parents and siblings. They display more positive attitudes toward aggression than students in general and than the victims. They lack empathy with victims and have a strong need to dominate others. Among boys, bullies are physically stronger than their peers. According to the view of psychologists and psychiatrists, aggressive individuals are actually anxious and insecure 'under the surface' and have a very low level of self-esteem as well. However, Olweus (1993) found out opposite results in his studies in terms of the insecurity of bullies. He tested this assumption with indirect methods such as stress hormones and projective techniques. In his studies, bullies showed little anxiety and insecurity or were roughly average on such dimensions like students in general (Olweus, 1981a, 1984, 1986; Pulkkinen & Tremblay, 1992). Many of them were grown up under such family conditions in which they develop hostility toward the environment (Patterson, Littmand & Bricker, 1976). Olweus (1993a) found out in a longitudinal study that approximately 60% of the boys in grades 6 to 9, who were characterized as bullies, had been convicted of at least one officially registered crime by the age of 24.

Not all aggressive boy can be classified as a bully. According to Olweus (1993a), 40-60 % of the highly aggressive boys in his study are nominated as bullies by their teachers.

Furthermore, two kinds of perpetrators were figured out (e.g. Olweus, 1994; Poulin & Boivin, 1999). One of them is a proactive perpetrator, who uses aggression as an instrument to achieve his goal, and then the other is a reactive perpetrator, who uses aggression as a reaction to a provocation. To make a clear-cut distinction, proactive perpetrators are bullies and reactive perpetrators are bullies and, at the same time, could be victims. Therefore, reactive perpetrators are also

called aggressive, provocative victims or ineffectual aggressors. The definition of provocative victims will follow in chapter 2.3.3.2.

As said before, bullying is an instrumental behavior in which someone tries to dominate others. It is also a dynamic interaction between people and environments. Status, power, competitiveness and needs play an important role. Bullying is carried out although it may have reactive or hostile aspects.

Bullies as proactive aggressors tend to attach a positive value to the use of aggressive behavior (Crick & Dodge, 1996). They have a strong need to control others and enjoy themselves subduing others. They are positively associated with leadership and sense of humor (Dodge & Coie, 1987). Bullies often have friends who possess a similar tendency. According to Kraak (1997), bullies are socially well integrated. Normally, the group, which the bullies belong to, supports the bullies or reinforces their aggressive behavior. Because of the bullies' aggressive values and behaviors, they are generally rejected by the majority of students and by the more general school culture (Coie & Dodge, 1998). However, some bullies are popular and leaders of aggressive cliques. But their popularity decreases in the higher grade. Bullies nearly do not feel empathy for their victims (Besag, 1989).

However, some bullies perpetrated it just because other peers bully the victims. They are mostly normal and non-aggressive. Nevertheless, they conduct that kind of behavior, when they lose the feeling of responsibility and guilty, or they sometimes observed that others were rewarded from those bullying behavior. There are even some bullies, who deliver an attack toward victims because of other bullies' pressure, otherwise they would be bullied by other bullies. Those situations foster an aggressive behavior by non-aggressive students.

### 1.3.3 Characteristics of Victims

Victims are not homogeneous but heterogeneous. There are some of distinctive characteristics of victims reported. It is normal that victims are physically weaker than their bullies, or handicapped. And some of victims are bullied because of their peculiar appearance (Olweus, 1993). Most students in the prior research believed that victims have social problem, for example to be boastful, to ignore others (Kim, 1997; Schaefer, 1997).

These various characteristics of victims can be included into two representative categories of victims; one is the submissive victim and the other is the reactive victim. Actually, a reactive victim refers to nearly same meaning to reactive aggressor. They perpetrate aggressive behavior to others, but at the same time they are victim of aggression. Melzer and Rostampour (1996) examined that 54 % of repetitive perpetrators were also persistent victims of violence. The descriptions of victims in detail follow.

#### *Submissive Victims*

According to Olweus (1994), submissive victims are typically more anxious and insecure than the average students, with a tendency to be cautious, sensitive and withdrawn. In a study carried out by Olweus (1993a) parents of victims were interviewed. They reported that their children had been cautious and sensitive from an early age. In case they are boys, they were physically weaker than boys in general (Olweus, 1978). Their typical reaction to being bullied is not to resist, but to withdraw and try to avoid their tormentors. They have a generally negative view of themselves and their everyday situation, and they tend to be lonely, isolated and nonaggressive. They suffer from low self-esteem, often consider themselves as a failure or a loser and feel stupid, ashamed and unattractive.

They usually don't have a single close friend in their classroom. Accordingly, they feel lonely and abandoned at school. They have generally negative attitudes toward aggression (violence) and prohibit using aggressive means. Therefore, they are not aggressive, teasing in their behavior or provoke others. It is not the reason of being a victim in the case that they provoked others' aggressive reaction, but they are easy to be attacked because of their weakness. Boys feel difficulties to assert themselves in peer groups and are not very popular within their age group.

Those passive victims account for about 10% of school-age children and adolescents (Olweus, 1993; Schwartz et al., 1993; Schwartz, Dodge, Petit & Bates 1997).

*Wangtta* is called a victim of psychological, physical aggression. According to Ku (1997), two or more persons, intentionally, exclude or alienate a certain person, who belongs to the same group, and restrict roles of this person as a member of their group. In other words, it is the behavior, that several persons inflict psychological, physical punishment to a person in a group (Lee & Kim, 1999). This term can be translated as the bullied in English. However, *Wangtta* is more passive aggression than bullying (Lee et al., 1998).

### *Aggressive Victims*

Aggressive victims are described by an over-reactive and emotionally dysregulated behavioral pattern. They are characterized by a combination both of anxious and aggressive reaction patterns. They are easily angered and provoked. They tend to possess hostile attributional biases to a provocative situation and are not very capable to interpret intention cues (Dodge & Coie, 1987). Accordingly, they are both similar to and different from both bullies and submissive victims. They are reactive but don't use aggression as an instrument to reach their goal, whereas bullies make use of an aggressive method as an instrument. Bullies are nominated by their peers as a person who starts fighting. However, aggressive victims not

only start fighting, but also are being picked up by others. They use aggression as a retaliation of a provocation from their peers, which they perceive as threat. It may be an emotional response, not a calculated initiative. According to Dodge et al. (1997), reactive aggression is positively related to attention deficits and impulsivity and to peer victimization.

Aggressive victims distinguish themselves from bullies, because they don't systematically choose weaker children as target of their aggression. They may use aggression as a result of losing self-control.

Perry et al. (1992) found out that aggressive victims involved in emotionally charged exchanges with their peers. They consistently lose control if they display anger or frustration. These aggressive victims are only poorly able to modulate emotional distress. Aggressive victims are least popular among children and most rejected by their peers. Therefore, they are most vulnerable to negative development, such as dropping out of school, behavior problems and homicide (Parker & Ascher, 1987).

Aggressive victims are usually boys. According to a study (Schwartz, 2000), which compared subtypes of victims and aggressors in elementary school peer groups, 5.1% boys of 354 10.3-year-old students belonged to the aggressive victim group and no girls belonged to the group.

#### 1.3.4 Effect of being bullied

##### *Effects of Bullying*

Being bullied by others induce psychological and behavioral problem in victims. Kwak and Lee (1999) found out that victims of bullying and bully-victim show more depressive tendencies than normal students and bullies. Rigby (2000) discovered that the high level of victimization and the low level of social support correlated with higher anxiety, depression, social dysfunction, and psychosomatic symptom. Craig (1998) also found out

that victims had higher level of anxiety and depression than bullies. Even there is a latent risk in bully group to show negative self-worth and depression after several years later (Olweus, 1993)

Peer group victimization could be a predictor of children's behavior problems. According to the study, which was conducted with 1<sup>st</sup> through 4<sup>th</sup> graders of elementary school (Shari Miller-Johnson, John D. Coie, Anne Maumary-Gremaud, Karen Bierman, and the Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 2002), being rejected and aggression by peers were associated with the impulsive and emotionally reactive behaviors. In addition, being rejected by peers in 1<sup>st</sup> grade could predict early starting conduct problems in 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grades.

The behavior of the bully is shaped to some extent by the reactions of the victim. According to Salmivalli et al. (1996), some respond to bullying with counter-aggression (e.g. hitting back, speaking up) and others by becoming helpless (e.g. crying, missing school, threatening to report the incident to the teacher). Some of the victims react very aggressively not only to the attacker, but also to other peers. They transpose their anger from the perpetrator to others. In addition, still others responded by affecting an air of nonchalance (e.g. staying calm, ignoring the bullying, appearing not to be bothered), which is the reaction that is shown most often.

### 1.3.5 Gender difference in Bullying Behavior

There are consistent discussions about the gender difference in aggressive behavior. On the one hand, some of researchers found out that the rates of aggressive behavior and bullying behavior are much higher in boy group than girl group. On the other hand, the other researchers argue that there is not gender difference between boys and girls, but the form of aggression, they use is different. In addition, some



researchers insist that there is a difference in help seeking behavior between two genders.

### *Frequencies of Aggressive Behavior according to Gender*

There are continual findings that about twice more boys are victimized than girls and about three times more boys bully others than girls (Roland, 1980; Olweus, 1985, Schaffer, 1994).

Some of researchers (Jacklin, 1989; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1980) attribute the difference to the biological reason, e.g. hormone and others (Mills & Rubin, 1990; Parke & Slaby, 1983; Ross, Bernstein, & Gordon, 1975) attribute the gender difference in aggressive behavior to the socialization that boys are encouraged to be aggressive and competitive, but girls are enforced to be nurturant and expressive. Nevertheless, Roland (1987) conducted a study, which interviewed 300 students in grades four to six about the involvement of bullying activities. In the study, he found out that girls are involved almost as much as boys in aggressive activities and also victimized.

Through a meta-analysis, Hyde (1984) suggested that gender difference in aggressive behavior were not large and the difference is decreasing in the recent investigation, although boys are more aggressive than girls.

### *Forms of Aggression according to Gender*

“Boys may use their fists to fists to fight, but at least it’s over with quickly; girls use their tongues, and it goes on forever “(Galen & Underwood, 1997, p 589).

Boys and girls (Lussier, Murray, & Newman, 2001) have different strategies to resolve peer conflicts. Girls tend to use prosocial, constructive, and sometimes avoidant means than boys. Girls try to

resolve social conflict, and simultaneously maintain a relationship with the other child, whether by sharing, discussing, taking turns, or acquiescing to the other's position. On the other hand, boys tend to resolve peer conflicts with strategies that are controlling and sometimes hostile. There are several researches, which proved that girls prefer the indirect form of aggression to physical and verbal forms of aggression in general (Björkqvist, 1994; Crick, 1995). According to a study from Galen and Underwood (1997), girls considered relational aggression more seriously than boys and were angrier to the relational aggressive girl than boys. Because girls try to resolve peer conflict with social way, they more often ask for help to other person, e.g. teacher, than boys (Lussier & et al., 2001).

Bullying is a complex problem like described above, which has various aspects; blended personal and social aspects. In addition, it has multifarious reasons, different types of participants, and duration, and shows diverse types of aggressive behaviors, like psychological, social, and physical. Therefore, it is affected by various factors, psychological, physical, and social-environmental factors influencing bullying behavior would be considered as follows.

## 1.4 Effects of Attributions, Self, Social Relationships, Self-Perception and Social Support

### 1.4.1 Attributions

The relationship between attributional style and aggressive behavior was found out by several researchers (Crick & Dodge, 1994; Hudley, 1994; Hudley, Britsch, Smith, Wakefield, & Demorat, 1998; Shantz, 1983).

According to Kelley (1955), people desire to predict the things that occur in their surroundings to get control about situations. Therefore, if something occurs, people try to find out reasons for the happenings. In other words, people attribute outcomes to various causes. Heider (1958), who is one of the pioneers of attribution theory, suggested that people operate very much like quasi scientist in their attribution activities. They observe an event and then, often in a logical, analytical way, attempt to discover the connections between various effects and possible causes. He did not argue that people are always objective and rational in their behavior. He pointed out that sometimes people make attributions that are not based on enough information and an adequate analysis of information, or that are distorted by psychological needs and motivations.

Heider proposed the first systematic analysis of causal attributions. The most fundamental distinction between causes made by Heider (1958) was stated as follows: "In common-sense psychology (as in scientific psychology) the result of an action is felt to depend on two sets of conditions, namely factors within the person and factors within the environment" (p. 82). The classification of individuals in "internals" and "externals" became a dominant focus in psychology. A number of subsequent distinctions were guided by the differentiation between internal versus external control. However, most close definition of Rotter's locus of control was described by de Charms (1968), which considered person as origins (internal directed) or pawns (external driven). Kelley

suggested causal schemata, which relates causes and effects (see Weiner, 1992).

Kelley (1955) and Weiner (1992) added other dimensions of attribution to Heider's and Rotter's construct 'locus of control'. According to Kelley (1975), people use three types of information to find explanation for outcomes. These are (1) distinctiveness, (2) consistency, and (3) consensus. (1) Distinctiveness means that people compare an event with control condition without target stimulation. They (2) compare the target person's reaction with other persons' reaction to the same event (consistency) and (3) they compare the person's reaction to the target stimulus in the same way (consensus). Weiner (1992) introduced four dimensions of attribution, which are the „internal-external“, “stability“, “controllability“, and “generality“.

According to Weiner (1992), people consider

- whether the reason factor is an internal or an external control,
- whether the reason factor is constant or reluctant
- whether the reason is controllable or not
- whether the reason is general for the person or not.

Especially important aspect is that Weiner distinguishes the controllability dimension from the internal-external dimension, because there are factors, which are internal but uncontrollable.

According to Kelley, past experience may provide individuals with a backlog of understanding relative to causal relations. Individuals can call on this store of knowledge when an inference has to be made quickly.

#### 1.4.2 Attributions of aggression

Persons' retaliative responds or frustration depend less on the types of provocation, rather depend more on whether the person attributes more to about provocateur's person than to characteristics of the situation. Anger and its subsequent behavior are greater when the provocation is

seen as intentional rather than unintentional, expectable, rather unexpected, or perpetrated for socially unacceptable rather than socially acceptable reasons (Dyck & Rule, 1978; Ferguson & Rule, 1983; Greenwell & Dengerink, 1973). Counteraction or retaliation against instigator is determined by the person's perception if the instigator is responsible or not for the incidence. In the case that a person is faced with an incentive from another person, he could attribute this to provocation or just to mistake. According to Weiner's classification, intention belongs to an internal and controllable factor. This means that the person attributes the responsibility of the incentive to the actor

An experiment from Snyder and Swann (1978) showed that people react in different ways to an incentive, if they attribute this to an uncontrollable factor or if they attribute this to a hostile motive. In this experiment, participants were informed that their partners were aggressive. These participants reacted more aggressive to the partners' noise than the person who had attributed their partners' action to the situation.

According to Shantz (1983), children are able to distinguish accidental and deliberate intent by the age of 5 or 6. But highly aggressive children often inaccurately suspect others intention. These children showed a hostile attributional style (Hudley, 1994). Especially, aggressive boys reacted quicker than other boys in ambiguous situations and reacted aggressively (Crick & Dodge, 1994). Hudley et al. (1998) proved that attribution retraining reduced peer directed aggression.

Therefore, the hostile attributional style positively relate to the aggressive behavior.

### 1.4.3 Self

Prior research reported a significant correlation among self-concept, social support and aggressive behavior. Then, the relationship among those factors and aggressive behavior would be considered.

First, the meaning and roles of self-concept, social support, will be briefly mentioned.

According to Erikson (1968), the self is described as one's feeling of being at home in one's body, as a sense of 'knowing where one is going' and as an inner assuredness of anticipated recognition from those who count. It includes global self-knowledge about oneself, e.g. attributes, characteristic, capacities, and preferences. Many theorists suggest two kinds of self: the self as a subject and the self as an object. The „self as a subject” is called “existential self” or “I” and the “self as a object” is named “categorical self” or “me” (Lewis 1983; Lewis & Brooks-Gunn, 1979a). According to Lewis (1992), the „categorical self” is defined in respect to the external world and is also called “recently self-concept”. Self-concept means a general, entire, and stable picture of oneself. Therefore, it can be distinguished from the “self-identity”, which is more specific according to different situations.

#### *Social Relation in Late Childhood and Early Adolescence*

Human beings are not able to survive without others' physical and psychological helps. In their early ages, they get those supports nearly from their caregiver. However, they gradually interact with more other people, for example playmates, neighbors, who apart from their caregivers. Therefore, the network of significant others is restructured while they are getting older. Whereas children become less attached to their parents, friends get more and more important position in the child's social network. The 'childlike' bond with parents develops into a more equal relationship between the adolescents and their parents; during this

development peer friendships form an important source of support (Helsen, Vollebergh & Meeus, 2000).

### *Self-Concept in Late Childhood and Early Adolescence*

The late childhood and the early adolescence belong to the life-span which belongs to the so called formal operational period by Piaget. During this, the ability of abstractive and inductive thinking is developing. Based on own observations, children are able to imagine and formulate hypothesis and draw conclusions. Their self-systems are also influenced by this cognitive development. Therefore, they begin with setting up hypothesis about their own attributes and themselves as well as with describing themselves by abstractive attributes gradually.

Damon and Hart (1988) investigated self-portraits of young adolescents through a self-description method. The young adolescents should delineate their interpersonal attributes and social skills. According to Harter (2002), their interpersonal attributes and social skills enhance their acceptance by peers. According to the case that they play different social roles in different contexts and come in contact with various people, they should construct multiple selves. They learn to integrate their various traits into higher-order generalization. However, Fischer (1980) found out that these representations are segmented each other in the early adolescence. They even exaggerated differences among the single peculiarities at various situations. Although they compartmentalized self-images in different circumstances, they don't perceive the conflicts yet, when the attributes in the different roles express opposites. According to Fischer, young adolescents are not able to compare the attributes to one another at the same time, hence they cannot recognize or be concerned about the possibility of conflicts between attributes. With the development of cognitive ability, they become more sensitive to compare among attributes.

Until 1960's, scholars, who had investigated self-judgment had presented unidimensional models of self-theories, for example the theory of global self-worth. However, investigators found out that self-theories of children differentiate in various fields/ domains of their life and their self-theories were classified as different factors. According to Harter (2000), children from the beginning of middle childhood are able to judge themselves generally as a person and represent distinctive self-evaluation across a variety of domains, although they cannot describe these self-judgments verbally. She presented the domains and the development of the self-concept at each period of the life span. Table1 displays her results.

According to Harter (1993), young children make judgments in two dimensions: "competence versus judgments" and "personal and social



Table 1. Domains of the Self-concept Tapped by Our Instruments at Each Period of the Life Span (Harter, 1999)

Early Childhood	Middle to late childhood	Adolescence	College years	Early through middle adulthood	Late adulthood
Cognitive competence	Scholastic competence	Scholastic competence	Scholastic competence Intellectual ability Creativity	Intelligence	Cognitive abilities
Physical competence	Athletic competence	Job competence Athletic competence	Job competence Athletic competence	Job competence Athletic competence	Job competence
Physical appearance	Physical appearance	Physical appearance	Physical appearance	Physical appearance	Physical appearance
Peer acceptance	Peer acceptance	Peer acceptance Close friendship Romantic relationship	Peer acceptance Close friendship Romantic relationships Romantic relationship with parents	Sociability Close friendship Intimate relationships	Relationships with friends Family relationships
Behavioral conduct	Behavioral conduct	Conduct/morality	Morality Sense of humor	Morality Sense of humor Nurturance Household management Adequacy as a provider	Morality Nurturance Personal, household management Adequacy as a provider Leisure activities Health status Life satisfaction Reminiscence
	Global self-worth	Global self-worth	Global self-worth	Global self-worth	Global self-worth

adequacy". According to table 1, adolescents exhibit five domain-specific self-perceptions: Scholastic Competence, Athletic Competence, Peer Likeability, Physical Appearance, Behavioral Conduct and Global Self-worth. Some researchers argued that the domain-specific self-perceptions include the global self-worth. However, Rosenberg (1979) claimed that the global self-worth should be considered as an independent entity from the domain-specific self-concepts.

#### 1.4.4 Social Relationship and Effects on Self

##### *Parents' Support and the Self in Parents-Child Relationships*

A newborn baby is very fragile and weak and their survival depends on others' protection and nursing. Except protection and caring, parents or the family are the most important socializing institute. They educate their children to accommodate to social criteria and present a base knowledge for living.

Therefore, the relationship between parents and their child in early childhood is characterized as unilateral authority through parents' orders resp. commands (Youniss & Smollar, 1990). According to the view of constructivists, parents don't treat their children as they are but treat them based on parents' understanding about their child; this is called personification.

However, the nature of the relationship between them changed with child's growing up. On the one hand, the child asserts his own ideas, which his parents would not approve, and tries to persuade them and legitimate his ideas through discussions or arguments. On the other hand, parents often try to convince their child that the parents ideas are more useful. When a discrepancy in ideas, in addition, exists, many parents attempt to negotiate for agreements (Youniss & Smollar, 1985). Then the child can accept their parents' perspectives because he can understand them more as persons than they did previously. Constructivists call this process individuation (Youniss & Smollar, 1990). Therefore, parents

support their child through compromises and advices during the late childhood. According to psychodynamic and attachment theorist, supportive and acceptant parents support their child to develop positive self-representation (Harter, 1999). However, when parents' rearing style was unstable or ambivalent as avoidant, their child showed uncertain ineffective behavioral characteristics (Crittenden, 1990).

### *Peers and Friends' Support and the Self in Relationship with Peers and Friends*

For children in young childhood friendship is based on the symmetry of reciprocal relationship (Smoller & Youniss, 1980); for example if others approve them, they approve others. In addition, they define a friend children with whom they get along well. They start to communicate their feelings, hopes, and thoughts as they begin to break the ties to home and parents. During this age, they are more likely than children to mention the sharing of intimate feelings in describing their close friendships (Kail & Wick-Nelson, 1993). For children, parents are the only important persons in the children's social networks. However, as children are getting older, peer relationship or friendship get more and more important. Youniss and Smollar (1985) found out that adolescents clearly distinguish relationships with friends from relationships with parents in the following way: "Listens to my side"; "talks out differences"; "accepts my point of view"; and "depend on each other for advice". Especially, friendship provides the function of clarification and validation due to sharing similar experiences and feelings and thinking over the solution of their problems together. They give advice to each other (Youniss & Smollar, 1990). Adolescents believe that friendship show others that they are respected for who that they are: "It is important for a person to know that she's care about" (Youniss, 1984). During the end of childhood and early adolescent, relationships with peers or friends play an important role according to the perceived self-worth. The feeling being accepted by friends promotes

child's self-esteem and adjustment. Harter (1983) distinguishes between "support from close friends" and "support from classmates". Especially, peer support is a more predictive factor of self-worth than the close friends' support. According to Harter (2000), support from others in more public domains may better represent an acceptance from the generalized other, approval that is perceived as more objective or from more credible sources than the support from one's close friends. However, support from close friends would be a secure psychological base.

#### *Special Adults' Support and the Self in relationship with Special Adults*

Except from the influence of parents and friends, there are also other adults which support children and have an impact on the development of their self-worth (Darling, 1991; Galbo & Mayer-Demetruvias, 1996). In a study by Harter and Talmi (1998) conducted with adolescents, 60% of the participants reported that they had a special adult, whose support was perceived as high. Harter (2000) claimed that the support from a special adult could compensative parental support but could not substitute it. Teachers are very important socializing agents in schools. They not only instruct students in academic knowledge, but also in social norms, values, and ethos. Through educating and evaluating, they could influence students' scholastic and social self.

#### 1.4.5 Self-Perception and Bullying

People have a basic need for belonging to and being accepted by other people. Social exclusion and interpersonal rejection are associated with lower self-esteem (O'Leary, 1999). According to prior studies, victims of bullying tend to have low global self-worth and negative social competence. Longitudinal studies reported that students who have low self-concept are apt to be victimized by peers and students who were

bullied by peers tend to show low self-concept. However, the results of perpetrators' self-perception are inconsistent and ambivalent. While some of researchers (Edens, Cavell, & Hughes, 1999; Hay, 2000; Wells & Rankin, 1983) insist that people don't react aggressively to a provocation, when they have positive self-concept, other researchers (Kwak & Lee, 1999; assert perpetrators are apt to show more positive self-concept or higher self-worth than victims and sometimes even than normal students. Olweus (1994) also reported that bullies answered feeling self-assured, confident, and worthy. Especially, he could not find any signal of anxiety and self-doubt in a study, which used biological methods, e.g. measuring hormones and measuring perspiration, for investigation. Staub (1999) attributes the aggressor's positive self-concept to a substitution of their social value: strength, power, and physical domination of others for competence and good performance. In a study by Kwak and Lee (1999), Differences in self-concepts among normal students, bullying perpetrators and bullying victims were investigated. Bullied students or students, who bullied others and were bullied by others at the same time, reported lower perceived social acceptance and global self-worth than normal students or bullying group students. In comparison, perpetrators exhibited the highest social acceptance and physical competence among normal, bully, victim and bully-victim students. Andreou (2001) was able to confirm the result of the study done by Kwak and Lee (1999): The most vulnerable group is the bully-victim group, in other word the reactive aggressors. They showed the lowest global self-worth perception and the social acceptance.

#### 1.4.6 Social Support and Bullying

Social support functions a buffer, when a person faces difficult situations. Supportive relationships with important others decreases the psychological impact of the situation and improves an adjustment. According to Bowlby (1972), the relationship between parents and their

child is critical for the child's other relationship. When a child experiences safer and better relationship with its parents, it develops autonomy. The child, who has a supportive relationship with its parents, is better able to build supportive relationship with friends than the child, who has an insecure and unsupportive relation with its parents (Helsen, Wilma, & Wim, 2000). According to Kwak and Lee (1999), normal students reported, in fact, the highest perceived social support, the aggressive victim group perceived the lowest social support and perpetrators perceived higher social supports than victim or aggressive victim group students. Andreou (2001) found out that boys, who bullied others, had a significantly higher tendency to seek a social support than victims of bullying. This is not the case for girls.

Although there are inconsistencies among prior research, social support and positive self-concept contribute to build desirable social relationship and prevent confliction with others. Therefore, social support and positive self-concept have negative relation to bullying behavior.

## 1.5 Effects of Environmental Factors

### 1.5.1 School Environment

#### *Physical Environment*

There are some discrepancies in the results of the studies, which examined the influence of physical school environment, e.g. the size of school, the size of classroom (Olweus, 1984; Stephenson & Smith, 1982). However, the peer relationship and peer status showed correlation with aggressive behavior.

### *Peer Acceptance and Peer Status*

Children, who are popular, enjoy normally high status (Schaffer, 1994). Popular children possess well-developed role-taking skills (Kurdek & Krile, 1982; Pellegrini, 1985). Boivin and Begin (1988) found out that there are nonaggressive rejectees, and they are anxious, low in self-esteem, and inclined to withdraw from peer contacts. Rejected children tend to annoy or anger their peers. However, aggression is a major reason of peer rejection. According to several studies, bullying and aggressive victimization was negatively related to peer popularity (Parke & Slaby, 1983). Recently, researchers explored that there are Differences in peer statures among aggressors. There were bullies, who were popular in their clique and those bullies tended to make use of aggression instrumentally (Coie, Dodge, Terry, & Wright, 1991; Bartini, Brooks, & Pellegrini, 1999). Especially, aggressive children prefer aggressive peers to normal peers as friends (Gariepy, 1989). Cillessen & Prinstein (2003) also found out that the proactive use of aggression were associated with higher peer stature and reactive use of aggression were associated with low social preference.

### 1.5.2 Family Environment

Family is a most important socializing institution. Since a child is born, parents do not only take care of the well-being of child's physical circumstance, but also bring up, educate them, so that they can prepare to contribute to the society as a member of society. Therefore, the relationship between parents and their child, parents' value, and the interaction among family member are extraordinary important factor for the child. This chapter would pay attention to the parental influence on the child' aggressive behavior and tendency to be a victim.

According to prior studies, a significant relation between aggressive behavior and family stature, e.g. family structure, SES, is very weak or sometimes does not exist (Funk, 1995; Fuchs, Lamnek & Luedtke, 1996; Patterson & Capaldi, 1991). Nevertheless, parent' attitude toward aggression and the interaction between parents and their child influence the child's aggressive tendency

### *Parents' Attitudes toward Aggression*

Parents transfer social norms and values to the next generation through direct instruction and in vicarious way (modeling). Beliefs and norms are a source of expectations and cognitive structures, which codetermine enduring aggression motives and stability of aggression manifestation. The child's belief, moral values and attitudes toward social issues originate from family's general life (Frączek & Kirwil, 1992). Therefore, the children, whose parents favor aggressive solution, are inclined to make use of aggressive tactic (Bandura & Walters, 1959). According to Bandura, *Aggressive child's parents modeled aggressive attitudes and, while nonpermissive and punitive for aggression toward themselves, they actively encouraged and rewarded aggression directed at others outside the home* (1983, p.23).

Guera & Slaby (1988) conducted a study, which examined the correlation between parents' beliefs toward aggression and child's self-reported aggression. In the study, the correlation between mother's approval of aggression and child' aggression was high ( $r=0.40$ ). Kirwil (1990) conducted a study, which examined if the parental value had any effect of aggressive and submissive behavior of the child in interpersonal relations with peers at school. He discovered that the parents of aggressive boys expressed higher approval of aggression in social life.



### *Interaction with Child and among Family members*

The relationship between parents and the child and parents' rearing style influence child social behavior including aggressive and altruistic behaviors.

Parental rejection, which refers to negative emotional attitudes towards the child, and child's aggressive behavior correlate each other in positive way. However, parents' aggressive punishment did not influence the child's aggressive behavior directly, but child's aggression depended on the parents and child relationship, e.g. identification of the child with the parent, moral standards of the family (Frączek, 1986b). Cold and rejecting rearing style make the child's emotional needs frustrate and can play a model to be lack of considerateness for others (1994, Shaffer). Funk (1995) found out the degree of the attachment between parents and the child is more predictable factor than the parents' rearing style.

Warm, authoritative, and sensitive parenting style contributes child's positive social behavior and supportive peer relationship (Baumrind, 1971; Dekovic & Janssens, 1992; Helsen et al., 2000). However, permissive parents is legitimizing combative activities and failing to provide many opportunities for the child to control his or her aggressive urges (Schaffer, 1994). Carlo, Roesch and Melby (1998) reported that a high degree of maternal support and high level of anger bring the child to be antisocial and lack of sociability.

In addition, the conflict between adult in the family can easily stimulate child's aggressive inclination. Patterson (1982) found out that the highly aggressive child were from the family, of which member struggle with one another. In addition, Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates (1997) compared the Differences in the home environment variable among passive victim, aggressors, and normal boys. They found out that there is no difference between victim group and normal group on home environment variable, but aggressive group had greater exposure to adult aggression and conflict.

## 1.6 Effects of Attitudes toward Aggression and Cultural Beliefs

As Aristotle told the human-being is the social animal, an individual can not be alive without other people. Therefore, they generally belong to a society and make a living as a member of the society with other members of it. Each society or culture retains its own rules and customs, and any member of the society is requested to keep to those. In a specific situation, an individual is, therefore, expected to behave or react in a specific way based on the beliefs or attitudes, which the members in the society share. Attitude toward aggression is influenced by those attitudes and beliefs (Guerra & Nucci, 1992; Smetana, 1982). The influences of attitudes toward aggression and cultural beliefs on aggressive behavior are explained bellows.

### 1.6.1 Attitude toward Aggression

According to Kohlberg (1969), children's moral development can be divided into six stages based on moral reasoning. There are two stages of pre-conventional thinking, two stages of conventional thinking and two stages of post-conventional thinking. Furthermore, he distinguishes two dimensions of moral development: One is "convention" and the other is "authority" or "justice and welfare". Later, Kohlberg argued that morality problems occur in complex situations; therefore, the moral judgment is often confused with prudence, authority and convention. Guerra and other scholars also argued that moral judgment is used as a benchmark that people consider in situations, in which they have to deliberate the potential harm to persons. Smetana (1982), for example, explored that some pregnant women consider an abortion as a moral issue, others regard this as a personal issue or a personal discretion.

Guerra and Nucci (1992) found out that from 9 to 12-grade students self-reported delinquency and their judgments of the harmfulness and wrongness of prototypical moral, conventional, personal, and prudential issues. In this study, delinquent students showed a lower tendency to consider moral issues as wrong and harmful than their nondelinquent peers, and they considered it as a matter of personal choice. Therefore, on the one hand, there are people, who solve their problems with a peaceful and legitimated method, and on the other hand, there are people, who admit themselves to solve their problems through an aggressive and illegitimated method and belief that this is legitimated. Social cognitive theorist argued that aggressive persons tend to expect a lower sanction of aggressive behaviors and belief that aggressive behavior is rewarded. However, it does not simply depend on the expectation of the consequences of aggressive behavior. According to Guerra (1992), the process of drawing judgments is highly routinized based on various knowledge systems and with developing these systems. There are many sources which influence the knowledge system during decision-making, a person's self-guiding belief belongs to this. Self-guiding beliefs provide guides for behavior based on justifications for specific actions and include evaluative and informational concepts. An example: if parents belief physical punishment is acceptable (evaluative) because it proved to be effective to change a child's undesirable behavior (informative), these beliefs include moral judgments. The information influences the meaning of a specific action and therefore influences the understanding of moral issues. Slaby and Guerra (1988) found out that aggressive adolescents showed higher tendencies to believe that aggressive reactions are acceptable than less aggressive adolescents. An interventional study carried out by Slaby and Guerra (1990) showed that aggressive behavior can be reduced through changing adolescents' beliefs.

### 1.6.2 Cultural Beliefs

Subjective culture may be defined as shared beliefs, attitudes, norms, roles, and values found among speakers of a particular language who live during the same historical period in a specified geographic region (Triandis, 1995). Human behavior normally takes place in a various social and cultural context according to the place and time. Therefore, in every social system individuals occupy positions for which certain behaviors are expected; these behaviors are called roles. Each role occupant is the object of sanctions that exert social influence, even pressure, to behave according to social norms standards. A social system is not random, but is organized or structured by each cultural group (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, Dasen, 1992). Researchers attempt to find out distinctive and effective cultural norms or beliefs. One of the dimensions is the distinction between collectivism and individualism.

On the one hand, there are people who are group-oriented and interdependent with others. For those, it is important to be in harmony with the members who belong to the same group as they. In the other hand, there are some people who consider their independence from others. The belief, which was explained former, is called collectivism and the later one is called individualism. There is one more criterion, which has been often made use of, to classify cultures. The criterion is interested in the equality among the group members. In this chapter, the cultural beliefs and the relationship with group aggression would be described.

#### *Individualism*

The people in those cultures have a tendency to be personally oriented and to have individualistic cognitive construction. When they see a situation, they tend to consider a situation based on their own interest and pleasure. The culture accentuates high self-esteem (Katz, 1993).

Among individualists (Triandis, 1995), the self is defined independently of specific collectives. Individualists may have personal goals that are inconsistent with the goals of their ingroups. When conflict exists between the collective and the individual in individualistic cultures, it seems 'natural' that the individual will attempt to reach her goals and ignore the goals of the ingroup.

According to the criterion of equality of individuals in a society, individualism would be divided into two, which have independent characteristics each other and are called (1) horizontal individualism and (2) vertical individualism (Triandis, 1995):

(1) *Horizontal Individualism* does not like to be unique and conspicuous but they are extremely self-reliant (Hofstede, 1980). Horizontal individualistic people like to live as please. In those of society, resources must be distributed equally.

(2) *Vertical individualism* accepts inequality of society. The peoples, who are vertical individualistic, want to be distinguished and to "stick out" (Markus & Kitayama, 1991a). Therefore, they behave in ways that tend to make them distinct. Each person receives resources commensurate with her/his contributions.

### *Collectivism*

In collectivistic cultures, people orient to the group, which they belong to. They are inclined to pay attention to collective attributes, when they are confronted with a social situation.

With ingroup members, they have the interdependent relationship each other. Therefore, it is always important to be harmony with others in their group. If they think it is necessary for the harmony of their group, they try to sustain even the relationships, which sacrifice their own interest (Kim, U., Triandis, H.C., Kagiteibasi, C., Choi, S-C & Yoon, G., 1994).

They feel more comfortable than individualists when they find similarity to others. Among collectivists the self includes many of the attributes of the groups a person belongs to.

Concerned with the goals of collectives and individuals. Such goals are consistent, so the individual does what the collective expects, asks, or demands, without opposing the will of the collective. In collectivist cultures, it is understood that the collective's goals override those of the individual. The collective goals have priority. The culture focuses on norms, obligations, and duties guide much of social behavior

According to Triandis (1995), there are two collectivism, which are (1) horizontal collectivism and (2) vertical collectivism. The short description of the both collectivism follows.

*(1) Horizontal Collectivism* includes a sense of social cohesion and of oneness with members of the ingroup. Horizontal dimension emphasizes that people should be similar on most attributes, especially status. There is much emphasis on intimacy, nurturance, altruism, caring, selflessness, generosity, sharing, and concern for others. However, there is also strong ingroup favoritism and hostility toward outgroups, which can be linked to racism, genocide, and super-nationalism (Fiske, 1991).

*(2) Vertical Collectivism* includes a sense of serving the ingroup and sacrificing for the benefit of the ingroup and doing one's duty. Vertical dimension accepts inequality, and rank has its privileges. Resources are divided according to rank. This dimension leads to a focus on respect, deference, loyalty, and obedience, and the impertinent are punished.

Table (2) shows the characteristics of the four cultural belief dimensions, which was presented by Triandis (1995). This table excludes the description of Fiske orientation and political system from the original table. The table includes Rokeach's values, which is the rank-order value, like freedom and equality.

Table 2. Comparing Differences in Self and Orientation (Triandis, 1995)

	Vertical	
	Collectivism	Individualism
Kind of Self	Interdependent Different from others	Independent Different from others
Rokeach Values	Low equality Low freedom	Low equality High freedom
	Horizontal	
	Collectivism	Collectivism
Kind of Self	Interdependent Same as others	Independent Same as others
Rokeach Values	High equality Low freedom	High equality High freedom

### *Cultural beliefs and Bullying*

The People, who come from different cultures, have different sub-cultural backgrounds, or possess different cultural beliefs, are inclined to show different attitudes toward aggression and its use (Maeda, 1999; Sherer & Miller, 2004). According to Fraczek and Kirwi (1992), the children who received the achievement-oriented education, typical characteristic of vertical individualism, showed positive attitudes toward aggression more than the children who did not receive the education. When their parents place stress especially on competition rather than cooperation with other children, this tendency was salient. In addition, Sherer and Miller (2004) found out that Israelis, possessing more individualistic norms and beliefs, use aggression more often than the Arabs in Israel, who have collectivistic beliefs, even though Arab parents use more physical aggression toward their children than the Israeli parents do.

## 2 Hypothesis

Students' bullying behaviors in school cause perpetrators, victims, and bystanders many negative effects. In his longitudinal studies, Olweus (1993a) found out that 60% of boys who were characterized as bullies in grades 6-9 had been convicted of at least one officially registered crime by the age of 24. Victims sometimes afflict under depression or psychological dysfunction for long time after the incidence (Schäfer, 1996). In the serious case, victims commit suicide (Mogi Yuttakka, 1996).

The phenomenon of bullying has various aspects according to the attributes of participants, the situations in which it takes place and, it can be explained by many factors. In order to develop most appropriate methods of prevention and of intervention, it is necessary to consider all these variables. There are inconsistent findings about gender differences concerning experiences of being bullied, bullying and bystander behavior. In spite of the existence of studies, which investigated the relationship between students' aggressiveness and popularity, there exists no study, which has compared the difference in experiences of victim, bullying behavior and point of view as bystander among different popularity groups. Therefore, in this longitudinal study, differences in experiences of being bullied, bullying and bystander behavior between boys and girls in Korea as well as among different popularity groups will be compared. Furthermore, it will be analyzed if cognitive, social, and environmental factors predict bully and victim tendencies at a special point of time and half a year later, because most existing studies simply compare differences in these factors among different groups. Finally, four groups (normal, bully, victim, and bully-victim) that display distinctive dispositions, are built according to the bully and victim tendencies. The differences in above mentioned factors among the normal, bully, victim, and bully-victim groups and the changes in these factors and groups are examined. After contemplating the changes in different types of bully and victim groups



and the changes in the mentioned factors, discriminant analyses are calculated to find out the most conclusive variables to differentiate the groups and the changes.

## 2.1 Experience in Bullying

### 2.1.1 Number of Victims and Bullies

Since Olweus conducted his pioneering researches in the field of 'Bullying' in late 70s', a lot of studies in this field have been conducted, which report students' experiences in bullying and being bullied. Although the studies report that bullying is perpetrated typically by a group against an individual, few research (Kwak, & Lee, 1999) examined the numbers of victims and bullies in a class so that the characteristics and the structure of bullying can be better grasped. Therefore, the number of victims and bullies in a classroom are calculated in this study. Because of the characteristic of bullying as a group aggression, it is expected that there are several bullies but normally only one victim in a class.

### 2.1.2 Bullied Experience

Prior studies reported very various results. In these studies 4 to 60% of the students answered that they had been bullied by their peers. However, the students' experiences in being bullied are specified and limited within the issuing semester, so that the accurate rates of being bullied experience in a specific period can be founded. In order to find out which forms of bullying are frequently committed, the bullied methods and the frequencies were asked. The first experience of being bullied is examined in order to find out when students normally start to be a victim. Questions about experience of reporting about the incidence to parents or teachers after having been bullied are asked, so that possibilities to adults to experience their child's victimization can be examined.

### 2.1.3 Bullying Experience

Prior researches show that 5.5% to 15% of the students reported that they ever have bullied others (Lagerspetz et al., 1982; Olweus, 1993). Like bullied experience, the question limited the experience in the issuing semester. In this study the first experiences of bullying will be examined in order to find the time of starting bullying and being bullied in general. The result, might help finding out the appropriate time of intervention. In the bullying behavior, student perpetrate directly harm against victims but also commit aggression indirectly. To find out which method of bullying students often perpetrate and how often they use the methods, experienced bullying methods and the frequencies of these experiences were asked.

### 2.1.4 Reasons for Bullying and Reactions to Bullying

Victims, bullies, and bystander were asked about the reasons of bullying and reactions to bullying, so that it is possible to build a picture of the perspective of each group of participants in bullying. It might help to intervene the bullying problem based on the perspectives from the people who play different roles in bullying.

#### *Victims' Perspective*

Victims tend not to know the reason why they are bullied by others (Kwak, & Lee, 1999; Ku, 1997). However, there are some victims, who attribute the incidences to perpetrators' bad characteristics. In this study, the victims' perception to the reason was asked, so that it can be examined which inferences to the bullied reason the participants of the study display. According to prior researches (Olweus, 1994), there are two kinds of victims, one who undertake counterattack against others' provocation and

one who avoid conflict with peers and become passive. In the study, the (direct and indirect) reactions to bullying were asked to find out their types and frequencies. In addition, it was asked which attempts victims undertake to resolve the problem.

### *Bully's Perspective*

Bullies tended to attribute the reason of bullying to the victims (Kwak, and Lee, 1999; Olweus, 1993). However, there are some reports in which bullies answered feeling guilty ( Park,1997). Because the result of prior studies are inconsistent, this study examined the reasons of bullying from bullies' perspectives again.

### *Bystanders' Perspectives*

Although it seems that bystander don't have an active part in bullying, they can play a role to provoke the bullying behavior or to inhibit committing bullying by bullies. It means that the bystanders' perspectives are important in the situation. Hence, the reasons' of bullying from bystanders' perspective are asked and also which reactions they undertake while others are bullied.

Gender differences and the influence of popularity were surveyed in different ways that are described below. Researchers continually found out that more boys take part in bullying behaviors than girls: Twice more boys were victimized by others than girls and three times more boys bully others than girls (Roland, 1980; Schaffer, 1994). However, there are studies, which proved no difference or very small difference in the frequencies of perpetrating bullying and being bullied between boys and girls (Hyde, 1984). Girls did not want to answer truthfully to questions about their own involvement in violent interactions. In his interview study,

Roland (1987) found out that girls participate in the bullying almost as much as boys, as victims and as bullies. In addition, girls more often bully others or are bullied in inconspicuous ways than boys. *Therefore, it is expected that there is no significant gender difference in the frequencies of perpetrating bullying and of being a victim in general.* The way to hurt others is not always necessary to be a direct physical or verbal aggression like kicking or cursing. Although spreading rumor and ostracism are indirect, they hurt people as much as a direct form of aggression. Several researches reported that girls prefer the indirect form aggression to direct form of aggression (Bjorkqvist, 1994; Crick, 1995). In Korea, girls are, especially, obliged to be socially more harmonious than competitive (Kwak & Lee, 1999). It should be found out more indirect methods to hurt others for girls so that they would be less discovered and criticized because of their aggressive behavior. In hence, it is expected that girls use more indirect form of bullying methods than boys. Besides gender differences are examined concerning various other variables. For example it is examined if there are differences concerning the first experience of bullying and being bullied, reporting incidents to adults, the reasons of bullying and being bullied, the trials to solve the problems, and the distributions in normal, bully, victim, and bully-victim groups.

Parke and Slaby (1983) discovered that bullying and aggressive victimization was negatively related to peer popularity. Rejected children are often likely to annoy or anger their peers and to be uncooperative and critical of peer-group activities. The children can be easily targets of peer victimization. According to Olweus (1996), reactive victims tend to irritate their peers; hence they provoke negative reactions. *Therefore, it is expected unpopular and rejected students are more often bullied than popular or normal students.* In addition, the first bullies experience, the experience of reporting to adult about the bullied incidences, and the distributions in normal, bully, victim, and bully-victim groups. Researchers, recently, explored the Differences in peer statues among aggressors. The

proactive aggressors, who used aggression instrumentally, were inclined to belong to a clique and they were popular in the group (Coie, Dodge, Terry, & Wright, 1991), whereas the reactive aggressors (bully-victim), who were inappropriately and highly aggressive, were unpopular (Cillessen & Prinstein, 2003). *It is expected that reactive aggressors tend to be unpopular and rejected by their peers.*

## 2.2 Factors Influencing Bully and Victim

### Tendencies

In order to examine to which degree attributional styles, self-concepts, attitude toward aggression, parental factors, social support, and cultural beliefs can predict students' bully and victim tendencies, stepwise regression analyses were conducted. In order to examine long term effects, questions about students' bully and victim tendency were asked twice: at the beginning of the school year and at the end of the school year.

#### 2.2.1 Attributions

Attributions play a conclusive role to interpret and to react to others' incentives and the situation. In order to assess the actor's responsibility for harm, the perceiver tries to discern whether harm was intended or unintended by the actor and whether the action was controllable or uncontrollable. Counteraction or retaliation against the actor is determined by the person's perception if the instigator is responsible or not for the incidence. According to Shantz (1983), children are able to distinguish accidental and deliberate intent by the age of 5-6. However, highly aggressive children often inaccurately suspect others behavior to be intentional, while the children who are able to control their emotional arousal attribute others' instigation to be unintentional and uncontrollable (Hudley, 1994). Therefore, it is expected that children who attribute an

instigative situation to the actors' intention and perceive the incident as controllable tend to have higher bully tendency. *It is expected that an attributional style that interprets incentives as controllable and intentional predict higher bully tendencies.*

### 2.2.2 Self-Perception

The results of perpetrator's self-perception are inconsistent and ambivalent. While some researchers (Edens, Cavell, & Huhess, 2000; Rankin & Wells, 1983) found out that people with a positive self-concept don't react aggressively, the dominant number of researches found out that perpetrator tend to be more self-assured and self-confident than normal students (Olweus, 1981, 1984, 1986, 1994; Pulkkinene & Tremblay, 1976). Staub (1999) argued that the aggressor's high self-concept might be a substitution of their social value; strength, power, and physical domination of others for competence and good performance. However, students with a low self-confidence and being less assertive are apt to be a target of aggression (Gaudi, 1999; Olweus, 1999). *Therefore, it is expected that negative self-concept and a low degree of self-worth perception predict higher victim tendency.*

### 2.2.3 Attitude toward Aggression

Guerra and Nucci (1992) found out that delinquent students showed a lower tendency to consider moral issues as wrong and harmful than their nondelinquent peers, and they considered moral issue as a matter of personal choice. Slaby and Guerra (1988) found out that aggressive adolescents showed higher tendencies to believe that aggressive reactions are acceptable than less aggressive adolescents. *Therefore, it is expected that higher positive attitude toward aggression predicts higher bully tendency.*

#### 2.2.4 Cultural Beliefs

People living in individualistic cultures are tend to behave in more aggressive way (Shere & Miller, 2004).

People in collectivistic cultures are inclined to be group-oriented. They always aspire harmony with others in their group. However, there are two kinds of collectivistic beliefs that are horizontal collectivism and vertical collectivism. Characteristics of both of the beliefs are independent to each other. The people, who have horizontal collectivistic beliefs, tend to emphasize similarity with ingroup members and altruism, selflessness, sharing, while vertical collectivistic people focus on the loyalty, obedience, and scarifying for the group. Horizontal collectivism includes a sense of serving the ingroup and sacrificing for the benefit of the ingroup and doing one's duty, otherwise people get punishment (Triandis, 1995).

People, who have individualist beliefs, are inclined to be personal oriented. There are two kinds of individualistic beliefs. One is horizontal individualism and the other is vertical individualism. Horizontal individualistic persons are self-reliant (Hofstede, 1980) and they are sure that social resources must be distributed equally, while vertical individualistic persons want to be distinguished (Markus and Kitayama, 1991a) and receive resources according to their contributions.

According to Sherer and Miller (2004), the Israeli adolescents, who are individualistic, used more aggression than Arabic adolescents, who are collectivistic. Especially, vertical individualistic cultures focus on the individual success and their achievement in the society. Verticla individualistic person makes their endeavors to be distinctive. For them, the competition is natural and they compete each other to get more or reach better position than others. Fraczek and Kirwil (1992) found out the children having the parents, who stress on the achievement and competition, tended to be more aggressive than the other children. In addition, they strive after the fame and a high position in their group. For the purpose, they are willing to use aggression for surpassing other rival or for possessing higher peer stature. On the other hand, collectivistic

beliefs are oriented on benefit and harmony of the group. The people coming from vertical collectivistic cultures can, especially, even scarify themselves for their group and do their duty. Therefore, they would eager to be prosocial and harmonious with other, otherwise it is expected that they would be blamed or punished by their group members. Then, they would not have trouble with their peers. Based on this inference, a regression model, which displays the relationship between cultural beliefs and child's bully and victim tendencies, will be deduced. *It is pexpected that the vertical individualist predicts the bully tendency and the vertical collectivism predicts victim tendency.*

#### 2.2.5 Perceived Social Support

Kwak and Lee (1999) found out that normal students showed the highest degree of perceived social support, while aggressive victims showed the lowest degree of perceived social support. Social support functions as a buffer in a stressful situation. Especially, the child, who has a supportive relationship with its parents, is better able to build a supportive relationship with friends (Helsen et al., 2000). In hence, it is expected that the children perceiving a lower degree of social support tend to be victims. *It is expected that a higher degree of social support predicts a lower degree of victim tendency.*

#### 2.2.6 Family (Caregiver) Factor

Parent's values and beliefs are important factors to constitute the child's values and beliefs. Parents transfer social norms and values to the next generation through direct instruction and in vicarious way.

##### a) Raring style



The relationship between parents and their children and parent's rearing style influence children social behavior including aggressive and altruistic behaviors. A conflictive, cold and rejecting rearing style leads to a lack of considerateness for others (Shaffer, 1994). There are inconsistent findings about permissive parenting and parental supports. Some researchers argue that permissive and supportive parenting style legitimizes child's aggressive behavior (Carlo et al., 1998; Schaffer, 1994), while others insist that supportive parenting style contribute children's positive social behavior and supportive peer relationship (Baumrind, 1971; Helsen et al., 2000). Hence, conflictive, cold and rejecting parental rearing style predict the bully tendency of students.

b) Attitudes towards aggression

When parents favor aggressive solution, their child is inclined to make use of aggressive tactic (Bandura & Walter, 1959). Guera and Slaby (1988) reported a high correlations between parental attitudes toward aggression and children's self-reported aggression. *Therefore, it is considered that parental attitude toward aggression predicts their child's bully tendency.*

c) Cultural Beliefs

Cultural beliefs relate to maternal supportive rearing style. Trommsdorff (1993) found out that mothers in Japan, a representative collectivistic country, tended to be more supportive and cooperative, in terms of horizontal collectivism, to their child in a stressful situation than German mothers. Those rearing style encourage their child's prosocial and cooperative behavior. Therefore, their child could get along with other children. The emphasis on obedience and loyalty is similar to the authoritarian rearing style, which is forceful and coercive. Children, whose parents used an authoritarian rearing style are more aggressive and tend to be disliked by their peers (Dekovic & Janssens, 1992; Schaffer, 1994).

*Therefore it is anticipated that a high degree of parental vertical collectivistic belief predicts children's higher bully and victim tendency, while a high degree of parental horizontal collectivistic belief predicts child's lower victim tendency.*

### 2.3 Conclusive Factors to Explain Changes in Bully and Victim Groups

According to students' bully and victim tendencies, four groups (normal, bully, victim, and bully-victim resp. reactive aggressor) were classified so that the distinctiveness of the groups can be found out and possibilities of intervention to bullying phenomenon based on the result can be drawn. Normal group students are those who did not reported a high degree of bully and victim tendencies. Bully students are those who reported a high degree of bully tendency but no victim tendency. Victims are students who present a high degree of victim tendency but no bully tendency. Bully-victims are students who display a high degree of bully and victim tendencies.

The questionnaire was applied twice applied, at the beginning of the school year, and at the end of the school year in order to examine the changes in bully and victim groups and discriminant analyses were conducted in order to find out the conclusive factors in the changes in bully and victim groups. *It is examined discriminant function of the cognitive, social, and belief factors on the changes in bully and victim groups*

## 3 Method

The method section starts with the description of the samples, first with the students sample, second with the sample of the caregivers. In a next step, the procedure is depicted. Students and caregivers' questionnaire are explained afterwards. Last, used statistical procedures are presented.

### 3.1 Participants

#### 3.1.1 Students

The sample of the study consisted of 505 students (333 boys and 172 girls) in seventh and eighth grade at two middle schools and their caregivers in Mokpo Korea. These students are between 12 and 14 years ( $M=13.19$ ,  $SD=0.70$ ). 405 of these students participated as well at the second measuring point. Only those students who had taken appendix both of the surveys were included in following analysis. An overview about the distribution according to gender and grade is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Number of Students according to Gender and Grade

		Gender				Total <i>N</i>
		Boys		Girls		
		<i>N</i> (%)		<i>N</i> (%)		
Grade		7 <sup>th</sup>	8 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup>	8 <sup>th</sup>	
School	A	49 (33.3)	46 (37.1)	30 (42.9)	23 (35.9)	148
	B	98 (66.7)	78 (62.9)	40 (57.1)	41 (64.1)	257
Total		147	124	70	64	405
		271		134		

### 3.1.2 Caregivers

306 of caregivers of students, who participated in the study, answered the survey, mostly parents (mothers=67.98 %, fathers=30.72%; see also Table 4)

Table 4. Number of Caregivers

Relation	Frequency	Percentage
Mother	208	67.98
Father	94	30.72
Grandmother	2	0.65
Others	2	0.65
Total	306	100

## 3.2 Procedure

The surveys were conducted twice in order to investigate long-term effect. The school year in Korea starts at the beginning of March and ends in the end of December. The first measurement took place at the beginning of June (beginning of the school year), the second in the middle of December (end of the school year). The parents' questionnaire was applied once at the beginning of the school year. For filling out the questionnaire, students needed about one hour and a half. Because of time limitation, students received two questionnaires at school, one for themselves, the other for one of their caregivers. They completed them at home and students submitted both questionnaires the following day.

## 3.3 Measuring instruments

### 3.3.1 Student Questionnaire

One aim of this study is to figure out the current situation of bullying in Korean schools. Furthermore, these factors should be detected that

influence the bullying phenomenon at classrooms and schools. The peer victimization is normally committed in the class. According to Kwak and Lee (1999), most victims reported that they had been bullied in their class, only a few that they had been bullied out of school. Therefore, the questions focus on the incidences in the classroom.

Students' questionnaire was divided into three parts. The first part consists of questions about students' personal attributes like age, gender and grade. In the second part, students were asked about the bullying phenomenon in general, about bullying experience, victims' characteristics, reasons of bullying and reactions to bullying. The third part includes questions, which ask about students' self-perception, bully-victim tendencies, perceived social supports, attributional styles and cultural beliefs. For the first measuring point 143 items were used, for the second 139 items. The whole questionnaires are presented in the Part I. For illustration, sample items are presented in the following sections.

### *Bullied and Bullying Experience*

Items, which refer to the situation of bullying at school, were taken from a questionnaire by Lee and Kwak (1999), some questions were added by the researcher. Furthermore, items of the Bully/Victim Questionnaire from Olweus (1993) were used. 20 multiple-choice questions, which were designed by Lee and Kwak (1999), were added as well as two items designed by the researcher.

Questions about the frequency of bullying with various methods (7 items) as well as questions of victimization were taken from the Bully/Victim questionnaire developed by Olweus (1993). For an overview see Table 5.

Table 5. Sample Items of Bullying Experience and Bullying

Scale	Sample Item	Answering Format				
		Never	Once or twice	Twice or three times per month	Once per week	Several times per week
Bullying Experience	I cursed other students and made fun of them.					
Bullied Experience	How many times have you been alienated from other friends this semester?					

### *Reasons of Bullying*

Lee and Kwak (1999) designed a questionnaire that refers among others to perceived reasons of bullying and victimization, to characteristics of victims and to reactions to bullying ( See in table 6).

### *Reactions to Bullying*

Questions were taken from the questionnaire developed by Lee and Kwak (1999). Most questions requested to select only one choice, for some questions all applicable choices can be selected. Table 6 presents an example of one of the used multiple choice questions.

Table 6. Examples of Multiple Choice Questions taken from the questionnaire designed by Lee and Kwak (1999)

- **Why did you bully other students (Please, circle all of applicable items)?**
  - I have never bullied others
  - Because he/she puts on an air importance.
  - Because he/she ignores friends.
  - Because my teacher likes only him/her.
  - Because he/she is a well-heeled person.
  - Because his/her appearance is too attractive.
  - Because his/her appearance is peculiar.
  - Because he/she can not be in harmony with others.
  - Because there are bad students in my classroom.
  - I don' t know the reason.
  - Because he/she is too poor to play with.
  - Because he/she always puts on air of a rich.

---
- **Which kind of method do you use to solve the problem after being bullied?**  
**Choose all of these alternatives, which are similar to your situation or your opinion.**
  - I have never been bullied.
  - I tell this my parents.
  - I discuss this with a teacher.
  - I visit a counselor at school or a counseling center.
  - I go to the police to report this
  - I will change school.
  - I will be temporary absent from school.
  - I will resist bullying behavior.
  - I ignore these students.
  - I endure it without doing anything against it.
  - I try to make myself agreeable.
  - I join the group to prevent being bullied.
  - I will bully other students, too.

---

### *Bully and victim Tendencies*

In order to exam students' bully and victim tendencies, peer victimization scale (Callaghan & Joseph, 1996) and Bullying behavior scale (Neary & Joseph, 1994) were taken use of. Each scale consists of 6 items, which describe concrete bully and victim tendencies. A 4-point Likert scoring format was used. The construction of these items is similar to the self-perception profile: Each item has two opposite descriptions, whereby each description is divided into two possible answering options ('Sort of true for me' and 'Really true for me'). First, students should choose between the

two descriptions, second they have to choose between ‘Sort of true for me’ and ‘Really true for me’. The higher the score the more positive is the self-perception. Table 7 presents examples of items of the bully and victim tendency. The Cronbach’s alpha of the bully tendency scale was .74, the alpha of victim tendency scale was .78.

Table 7. Sample Items of the Bully-Victim-Tendency Scale

Scale	Sample Item						
	Really true for me	Sort of true for me				Sort of true for me	Really true for me
Bullying Behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students don't hit and annoy other students	but	Others hit and annoy other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Victimization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students are sometimes needed by other students	but	Others are not needed by other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### *Popularity*

In order to find out difference in bullying experiences according to students' popularities, students were divided into three groups, which were popular, normal and unpopular groups.

Students were asked to name three persons in the class, whom they would like to sit by at most, and also to name three persons in the class, whom they would like to sit by at least in order to find out students' popularities. The raw popularity scores were the numbers that the frequencies of being selected as a favorite person subtracted the frequencies of being selected as an unwelcome person. An example of questions is presented in the Table 8.

Table 8. An Example of Popularity Questions

Please name three persons, whom you favor to sit by.
_____



### *Attributions*

In order to find out Differences in bullying behavior and victimization based on attributionals, hostile attributions were used as a criterion.

To figure out students' attributional styles, the investigator of this study designed two scenarios. These scenarios include the situations, in which students are bothered or disturbed by someone in someway. Each of the scenarios presents some attributional statements: students should consider the causes for this situation. The first scenario describes a situation in which a classmate sitting next to oneself disturbs consistently in the physics experiment. 4 attributional statements were presented. In the second scenario a classmate who looks unclean and ragged is characterized. Students were asked how much they agree to statements that concern reasons why the described classmate looks unclean and ragged. All in all, 4 attributional statements are presented. A 5-point-Likert format was used from 'absolutely disagree' to 'absolutely agree'.

These scales were designed and applied for the first time. Therefore, a factor analysis was conducted to setup scales and to determine the reliability of these scales. The corresponding items were analyzed with Oblimin Rotation method. Two factors possessing eigenvalue over 1.0 were found. The variance was 47.55% for the data of the first measuring point and 55.7% for the second time (see Table 9 for more details). The Cronbach's alpha Values of the factors show that the scales are reliable

Table 9. Factor Loading of the Attribution Items at the first Measuring point

Item	Factor Loading	
	I Intentional	II Uncontrollable
He or she is always the same. Every time he/she gets a new chance he/ she gets he/she is rude to other people, even when there is no reason.	.85	
He/She always tries to disturb other person. It is his/her hobby.	.85	
He/She does it intentionally. When he/she doesn't interrupt other persons, it means that he/she is absent.	.85	
It's normal. It's not just for today. He/She is always unclean.	.50	
I know that he/she did it without any intention. He/She is normally very friendly.		.59
It's natural: Physics experiments make people very nervous and sensitive, because they should be very careful with the experimental instruments.		.51
He/She has problems with experimental instruments, therefore, he/she just wants to ask how to use it.		.53
He/She fell in a dirty puddle on the way to school, but he/she didn't have time to change his clothes		.67
His/Her mother is sick. Therefore, it is very difficult for him/her to change his/her clothes everyday.		.66
He/She often plays soccer. Although he/she comes in a fresh cloth everyday, he/she becomes dirty quickly.		.63
	Reliability	$\alpha=.81$
		$\alpha=.80$

### *Harter's self-perception profile*

To get a picture about students' self-perception, the Harter's self-perception profile was applied. Originally it consists of six categories, which are (1) scholastic competence, (2) social acceptance, (3) physical appearance, (4) global self-worth, (5) athletic competence and (6) behavioral conduct. Each category consists of 6 items. This scale has a 4 point-Likert format. Each item has two opposite descriptions, for each description two answering options are possible ('Sort of true for me' and 'Really true for me'). First, students have to choose between these two descriptions, second, they have to choose between alternatives 'Sort of true for me' and 'Really true for me'. A higher score means a more positive

self-perception. Sample Items for all used categories are shown in Table 10.

The items of athletic competence and behavioral conduct were excluded from the analysis because they were not reliable enough. Beside of the reason, the tendencies of answers about athletic competence items are similar to physical appearance items and answers to the behavioral conduct items displayed a similar tendency to the answers to the global self-worth.

*(1) Scholastic competence*

The scholastic competence category consists of questions in which students' are asked about their self-perception in the academic field. Reliability analysis showed that the Cronbach's alpha for the scholastic competence was .63.

*(2) Social acceptance*

Students' perceived social skills are measured with the help of the social acceptance scale. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .61.

*(3) Physical appearance*

Perceived self-perception about their own appearance was asked with 6 questions. These questions formed the physical appearance scale. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .74.

*(4) Global self-worth*

Additionally, global self-worth was measured with 6 questions. The Cronbach's alpha for the global self-worth scale was .72.

Table 10. Sample Items for measuring Self-perception (Harter, 1985)

Scale	Sample Item						
	Really true for me	Sort of true for me				Sort of true for me	Really true for me
Scholastic Competence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids feel that they are very good at their school work	but	Other kids worry about whether they can do the school work assigned to them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Social Acceptance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids find it hard to make friends	but	Others kids find it's pretty easy to make friends.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Physical Appearance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are happy with the way they look	but	Other kids are not happy with the way they look.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Global self-Worth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are often unhappy with themselves	but	Other kids are pretty pleased with themselves.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### *Attitudes toward Aggression*

Questions about attitudes toward aggression were designed by Noh et al. (1999). Whether a person has a negative or a positive attitude toward aggression is asked in this questionnaire as well. This scale consists of 7 items (5-point-Likert scoring format from 'absolutely disagree' to 'absolutely agree'). The Cronbach's  $\alpha$  of the items was .74. An example of the items of this scale is presented in following Table 11.

Table 11. Sample item of the Scale *Attitudes toward Aggression*

	strongly disagree	Little bit disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Little bit agree	strongly agree
It is necessary to use aggression to maintain the public order.					

### *Cultural Beliefs*

In order to investigate cultural beliefs, the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism-Collectivism Scale from Triandis and Gelfand (1996) was applied. Sample items and reliabilities are shown for all subcategories in

Table 12. The scale consists of 4 subcategories: (1) horizontal individualism (5 items), (2) vertical individualism (8 items), (3) horizontal collectivism (8 items) and (4) vertical individualism (6 items). The items have 5 Likert scoring format from ‘absolutely disagree’ to ‘absolutely agree’.

*(1) Horizontal Individualism (HI)*

The items of horizontal individualism ask how a person values their own uniqueness.

*(2) Vertical Individualism (VI)*

The items of vertical individualism ask about the degree of achievement orientation.

*(3) Horizontal Collectivism (HC)*

The scale of horizontal collectivism deals with degree of emphasis on the cooperation with in-group members. However, one horizontal collectivism question was not reliable sufficiently. Therefore, it was excluded from the analysis and 7 items were analyzed.

*(4) Vertical Collectivism (VC)*

The vertical collectivism stresses the royalty to the in-group. Therefore, the items ask the person’s perception about the royalty.

Table 12. Sample Items of the Horizontal and Vertical Individualism-Collectivism Scale

Scale	Sample Item	Reliability
Horizontal Individualism	I’d rather depend on myself than others	.66
Vertical Individualism	It is important that I do my job better than others	.77
Horizontal Collectivism	If a coworker of mine gets a prize, I would feel proud	.83
Vertical Collectivism	I usually sacrifice my self interest for the benefit of my group	.77

*Note:* One item had to be excluded because of lacking reliability.

### *Harter's Social-Support Profile*

Harter's social-support profile was used as an instrument to investigate students' perceived social support. This social support profile consists of 4 categories, which are (1) parent support, (2) classmate support, (3) teacher support and (4) close friend support. Each scale consists of 6 items, a 4 point Likert scoring format was used like the self-perception profile (for more details and sample items see Table 13) .

#### *(1) Perceived Supports from Parents*

Students should rate the degree of parental support. When checking for reliability, a satisfactoring result was detected (Cronbach's alpha =.75).

#### *(2) Perceived Supports from Classmates*

Items, which describe whether students think that they get some support from their classmates, form the scale of perceived support from classmates. The Cronbach's alpha for the classmate support scale was .65. However, one item of the classmates support category decreased the reliability. Therefore, this item was excluded from the analysis.

#### *(3) Perceived Supports from Teachers*

Whether students get some help from their teachers is asked with items of the "perceived support scale"-scale. The alpha of the teacher support category proved a high reliability (Cronbach's alpha=.81).

#### *(4) Perceived Support from Close Friends*

Items of the "close friend support"-category describe whether students obtain some help from their close friend or not. The Cronbach's alpha of the "close friend"-category was .83 and therefore, the scale was accepted as reliable.

Table 13. Sample Items for the Social Support Scale (Harter, 1985)

Scale	Sample Item						
	Really true for me	Sort of true for me				Sort of true for me	Really true for me
Perceived Support from Parents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have parents who don't really understand them	but	Other kids have parents who really do understand them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Perceived Support from Classmates	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have classmates who like them the way they are	but	Other kids have classmates who wish they were different.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Perceived Support from Teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have a teacher who helps them if they are upset and have problem	but	Other kids don't have teacher who helps them if they are upset and have a problem.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Perceived Support from Close Friends	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have a close friend who they can tell problems to	but	Other kids don't have a close friend who they can tell problems to.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 3.3.2 Caregivers' Questionnaire

#### *Attitude toward Aggression*

Questions to examine the attitude toward aggression were taken from the students' questionnaire developed by Noh (1999) and rewritten. The items have a 5 point- Likert scoring format .The scale consists of 7 items, one item was not reliable and had to be excluded from the analysis. The Cronbach's  $\alpha$  Values of the scale is .66.

#### *Caregivers' Raring Style*

In order to examine the relationship between the caregiver and the child, a shorter version of PACHIQ (Parent-Child Interaction Questionnaire) was applied called PACHIQ-R. This questionnaire was designed by Lange, Blonk and Wiers in 1998 and was revised and simplified by Lange, Evers, Jansen and Dolan in 2002. It assesses the parental perception of their relationship to their children. Attitudes and behavioral interactions

between parents and the child are asked. The questionnaire consists of two scales, “conflictive and rejecting” and “acceptation”. Each items is in a 5 point-Likert scoring format.

The scale ‘conflictive and rejecting’ consists of 12 items, 9 items were analyzed. 3 items were excluded from the analysis because of low reliability and low factor loadings. The resulting Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  of the factor ‘conflict resolution’ is .79.

8 items cover the scale “acceptance”. 2 items, which have too low factor leadings and reliabilities, were excluded. The Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  of the factor is .67. All used items and their factor loading are presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Factor Loading of Caregivers’ Raring Style

Items	Factor loading
I show my appreciation clearly when my child does something for me.	.77
I am very proud of my child.	.66
My child listens when I explain something.	.72
I compliment my child.	.78
I take my time to listen to my child.	.80
I like to listen to my child’s stories.	.82
My child really trusts me.	.66
I decide which friend my child can visit.	.50
I enjoy physical contact with my child.	.61
There are many conflicts between my child and me that we cannot solve.	.65
I am often dissatisfied with my child.	.58
I don’t feel like listening to what my child has been doing.	.45
When I spend the whole day with my child, he/she starts to get on my nerve.	.68
When my child and I differ in opinion, I shout at him/her.	.61
My child breaks our house rules almost everyday.	.61
When my child is upset it is often unclear to me what is going on.	.50

### *Cultural Beliefs*

In order to examine the effect of the caregiver’s cultural beliefs on child’s bully-victim tendency, the scale of students’ questionnaire from Triandis



and Gelfand (1996) was applied. The scale consists of 4 subcategories, which already were mentioned (horizontal individualism, vertical individualism, horizontal collectivism and vertical individualism; see the Appendix. The scale is composed of 22 items, which consist of 4 horizontal individualism items, 6 vertical individualism items, 6 horizontal collectivism items and 6 horizontal collectivism items. Because of low reliability, one item of horizontal individualism, two items of vertical individualism, two items of horizontal collectivism were excluded from the analysis. The Cronbach  $\alpha$  Values of the factors proofed that all scales are reliable (Horizontal individualism:  $\alpha = .63$  / Vertical individualism:  $\alpha = .69$  / Horizontal collectivism:  $\alpha = .76$  / Vertical collectivism:  $\alpha = .73$ ). The example items are presented in the table 12.

### 3.4 Analysis

The data were analyzed with SPSS 11.05. ANOVAs, t-tests, qui-square tests, Game-Howell tests as Post-Hoc tests were conducted to compare differences between gender and among different popularity groups. In order to examine the regression models of cognitive, social, and belief factors and discriminant models of cognitive, social, and belief factors, stepwise regression analyses and discriminant analyses were conducted.

## 4 Results

This chapter consists of two parts; the first part presents the descriptive results of the study: the bullying and bullied experiences in general at the Korean schools. The second part reports the effects of cognitive, social, and environmental factors on the students' bullying and victim tendency.

### 4.1 Number of Bullies and Victims

#### 4.1.1 Number of Victims

At the first measuring point, the most of students 300 (60%) thought that there was no victim of the bullying from other classmates in their class. 119 (23.8%) of students answered that there is one victim and 56 (11.2%) of the students reported 2 victim of the bullying in their class. 11.4% (N=25) students answered that there were 3 or more than 3 victims in their class. At the second measuring point, fewer (47.5%) students perceived no victims and more students thought that there was one victim (28.5%) in the class than the first measuring point. at the second measuring point, 35.6% of girls reported that there is on victim in the class. There was no gender difference in the perceived number of victims in the study. Figure 1 presents the result of the perceived number of victim. Therefore, most of students among the students, who believed the existence of victim in the class, answered existence of one victim in the class.




Figure 1. Overview about the number of victims separated by gender and measuring point 1 and 2

#### 4.1.2 The Number of Bullies

The students were asked about the number of bullies in the class twice. The Figure 2 presents the results of the questions.

At the first measuring point, most of students (71.8%) reported at the first measuring point that there was no bully in the class, but among students answered that there was at least one bully in the class. Among the students, who answered the existence of bully in the class, the highest (15.5%) rate of students reported that there were 6 or more than 6 bullies in the class.

At the second measuring point, the 66.1% of students thought no bully in the class and 23.2% of students reported that there were 6 or more than 6 bullies in the class.

It means most of students among the students, who believed the existence of victim in the class, answered existence of one victim in the class.




Figure 2. Overview about the number of victims separated by gender and measuring point 1 and 2

## 4.2 Bullied Experiences and Perpetrated Bullying

In order to find out difference in bullying experiences according to students' popularities, students were divided into three groups, which were popular, normal and rejected groups. Students were asked to name

three persons in the class, whom they would like to sit by at most, and also to name three persons in the class, whom they would like to sit by at least in order to find out students' popularities. The raw popularity scores were the numbers that the frequencies of being selected as a favorite person subtracted the frequencies of being selected as an unwelcome person. The students, who belonged to the below 1 quartile score of the raw popularity score, were classified as a rejected person. The students, who belonged to between the 1 quartile score of the raw popularity scores and the 3 quartile score of the raw popularity scores, were arranged to the normal students group. The students, who were included above 3 quartiles of the raw popularity scores, were classified as the popular group. The frequencies of each group are presented in Table 15.

Table 15. Frequencies of the Each Popularity Group Members: Numbers, Percentages, and Result of Chi<sup>2</sup>-Test according to Gender

		Popularity groups			Chi <sup>2</sup> -Test	
		Popular	Normal	Rejected	df	$\chi^2$
		<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)		
Time 1	Boys	63 (24.2)	108 (41.5)	89 (34.2)	2	1.92
	Girls	33 (25.8)	60 (46.9)	35 (27.3)		
	Total	96 (24.7)	168 (43.3)	124 (32.0)		
Time 2	Boys	15 (19.5)	36 (46.8)	26 (33.8)	2	2.19
	Girls	7 (18.4)	13 (34.2)	18 (47.4)		
	Total	22 (19.1)	18 (47.4)	44 (38.3)		

Like Table 15 shows, the 24.7 % of students were classified to the popular group, 168 (43.3%) students belonged to the normal group, and 124 (32.0%) students were assigned to the rejected group at the first measuring point. More girls (77.1%) than boys (63.9%) belonged to the normal group and more boys than girls to the other groups. There was no gender difference in students' popularities.

In the second application of questionnaire, 19.1% of students were arranged to the popular students group. 47.4 % of students are classified as normal students and 38.3% of students are belonged to the rejected

students group. At the measuring point, there was no gender difference in students' popularities either.

Experiences of being a victim and Bullying experiences were compared according to the gender and the popularities. However, methods of bullying, reasons of bullying, and the reactions were not compared according to students' popularities.

#### 4.2.1 Bullied Experiences

##### *First Bullied Experience*

Most of students (83.5%) reported that they have never been bullied, 57 (11.5%) students have experienced being bullied in elementary school and 20 students (4%) reported that they were bullied first in middle school. Figure 3 presents the frequency of students' answer. More girls have ever been bullied by the peers significantly earlier than boys. 18.8% of girls have been victimized in elementary school, but only 7.6% of boys have been bullied by their peers in elementary school ( $\chi^2 (2)=18.385, p<.01$ ).




Figure 3. First Bullied Experience: Percentages according to Gender

As Table 16 presents, more rejected students (18.9%) were victimized by peers earlier than normal (10.4%) and popular students (7.3%). However, the significance of the result can not be calculated, because these are very few (less than 5) popular and normal students were bullied middle school for the first time.

Table 16. First Time of Being Bullied by others: Numbers, and Percentages according to Popularity

Popularity	First Bullied Time		
	No Experience	Elementary School	Middle School
	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)
Popular	86 (89.6)	7 (7.3)	3 (3.1)
Normal	141 (86.0)	17 (10.4)	4 (2.4)
Rejected	86 (70.5)	23 (18.9)	11 (9.0)
Total	313 (81.9)	47 (12.3)	18 (4.7)

#### *Bullied Experience in this Semester*

The result of the bullied experience of students is presented in the Figure 4. At the beginning of the school year, most of students (N=474, 93.9%) reported that they had not been bullied during the semester. 23 students (4.6%) answered that they had been bullied once or twice during the semester. There were 3 students (0.6%), who had been bullied several times per week. Less than 10% students had bullied experience and it is not even serious.

At the second measuring point, there is no significant change from the first measuring point. A little bit more students answered that they were bullied once or twice (19, 4.7%) even without the significant difference. The result is presented in the Figure 4.




Figure 4. First Bullied Experience: Percentages according to Students' Gender

At the first measuring point, rejected students were bullied by peers more frequently than normal and popular students (see Table 17). About 3% normal and popular students were victimized by peers, while about 15% of rejected students were bullied from peers. However, there is no significant difference according to students' popularity at the end of the school year. There were some cells that have expected counts less than 5. Therefore, the chi-square test was not significant.



Table 17. Frequency of Being Bullied this Semester: Numbers, and Percentages according to Popularity

Time	Popularity	Times of being bullied				
		Never	Once or twice	Twice or three times per month	Once per week	Several times per week
		<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)
1	Popular	92 (95.8)	4 (4.2)			
	Normal	164 (97.6)	4 (2.4)			
	Rejected	106 (85.5)	13 (10.5)	2 (1.6)	1 (0.8)	2 (1.6)
	Total	362 (93.3)	21 (5.4)	2 (0.5)	1 (0.3)	2 (0.5)
2	Popular	21 (95.5)	1 (4.5)			
	Normal	43 (93.9)	3 (6.1)			
	Rejected	40 (90.9)	2 (4.5)			2 (4.5)
	Total	107 (93.0)	6 (5.2)			2 (1.7)

#### *Experienced Bullied Methods and Frequencies*

There were 6 methods how to be bullied by others; they are ‘being cursed’, ‘being ignored’, ‘being kicked and threatened’, ‘being spoken ill’, ‘being deprived possessions’, and ‘being cursed about the appearance’. Table 19 reports frequency of experienced bullied methods and the frequencies of being bullied experiences were asked.

At the first measuring point, most of students were not bullied by others in any method except being cursed about their appearance. 93.8% students reported that they had been cursed about the appearance once or twice. 20% students experienced that other students had cursed them during the semester. About 10% of students reported that they had been bullied with other methods once or twice. There are very small rate of students (about 5 %), who had been bullied twice or three times per month or more. More boys than girls answered that they had been cursed (boys: 30.9%, girls: 16.4%,  $\chi^2 = 12.45$ ,  $p < .001$ ), kicked and threatened (boys: 14.2%, girls: 2.3%,  $\chi^2 = 17.44$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and deprived possession (boys: 10.8%, girls: 3.5%,  $\chi^2 =$  ,  $p < .01$ ).

Table 19. Experienced Bullied Methods, Frequencies, and Percentage according to Gender Group

Method	Time	Gender	Times of being bullied				
			Never <i>N</i> (%)	Once or twice <i>N</i> (%)	Twice or three times per month <i>N</i> (%)	Once per week <i>N</i> (%)	Several times per week <i>N</i> (%)
Being Cursed	1	Boys	230 (69.1)	81 (24.3)	11 (3.3)	2 (0.6)	9 (2.7)
		Girls	143 (83.6)	21 (12.3)	2 (1.2)	1 (0.6)	4 (2.3)
		Total	373 (74.0)	102 (20.2)	13 (2.6)	3 (0.6)	13 (2.6)
	2	Boys	195 (72.5)	49 (18.2)	9 (3.3)	1 (0.4)	15 (5.6)
		Girls	108 (81.8)	18 (13.6)	3 (2.3)	2 (1.5)	1 (0.8)
		Total	303 (75.6)	67 (16.7)	12 (3.0)	3 (0.7)	16 (4.0)
Being Ignored	1	Boys	284 (85.3)	35 (10.5)	7 (2.1)	5 (1.5)	2 (0.6)
		Girls	153 (89.0)	15 (8.7)	2 (1.2)	1 (0.6)	1 (0.6)
		Total	437 (86.5)	50 (9.9)	9 (1.8)	6 (1.2)	3 (0.6)
	2	Boys	229 (85.1)	31 (11.5)	5 (1.9)	1 (0.4)	3 (1.1)
		Girls	113 (85.6)	18 (13.6)	1 (0.8)		
		Total	342 (85.3)	49 (12.2)	6 (1.5)	1 (0.2)	3 (0.7)
Being Kicked and threatened	1	Boys	285 (85.8)	34 (10.2)	6 (1.8)	2 (0.6)	5 (1.5)
		Girls	168 (97.7)	3 (1.7)	1 (0.6)		
		Total	453 (89.9)	37 (7.3)	7 (1.4)	2 (0.4)	5 (1.0)
	2	Boys	236 (88.1)	21 (7.8)	2 (0.7)	2 (0.7)	7 (2.6)
		Girls	124 (93.9)	6 (4.5)	2 (1.5)		
		Total	360 (90.0)	27 (6.8)	4 (1.0)	2 (0.5)	7 (1.8)

*Note:* To be continued on the next page

Method	Time	Gender	Times of being bullied				
			Never <i>N</i> (%)	Once or twice <i>N</i> (%)	Twice or three times per month <i>N</i> (%)	Once per week <i>N</i> (%)	Several times per week <i>N</i> (%)
Being Spoken ill	1	Boys	300 (90.1)	25 (7.5)	4 (1.2)	3 (0.9)	1 (0.3)
		Girls	153 (89.0)	16 (9.3)		1 (0.6)	2 (1.2)
		Total	453 (89.7)	41 (8.1)	4 (0.8)	4 (0.8)	3 (0.6)
	2	Boys	239 (88.8)	22 (8.2)	2 (0.7)	3 (1.1)	3 (1.1)
		Girls	122 (92.4)	7 (5.3)	3 (2.3)		
		Total	361 (90.0)	29 (7.2)	5 (1.2)	3 (0.7)	3 (0.7)
Being Deprived possession	1	Boys	297 (89.2)	32 (9.6)	3(0.9)	1(0.3)	
		Girls	166 (96.5)	6 (3.5)			
		Total	463 (91.7)	38 (7.5)	3 (0.6)	1 (0.2)	
	2	Boys	243 (90.3)	20 (7.4)	2 (0.7)	3 (1.1)	1 (0.4)
		Girls	125 (94.7)	4 (3.0)	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)
		Total	368 (91.8)	24 (6.0)	3 (0.7)	4 (1.0)	2 (0.5)
Being Cursed about appearance	1	Boys	24 (7.3)	303 (92.7)			
		Girls	7 (4.1)	163 (95.9)			
		Total	31 (6.2)	466 (93.8)			
	2	Boys	232 (87.5)	28 (10.6)		2 (0.8)	3 (1.1)
		Girls	112 (86.8)	14 (10.9)		1 (0.8)	2 (1.6)
		Total	344 (87.3)	42 (10.7)		3 (0.8)	5 (1.3)

*Note:* 1= first measuring time, 2 = second measuring time

At the second measuring point, much fewer students reported the bullied experience in the semester than at the first measuring point. More students had not been bullied in the semester at all. Especially, the rate of students, who had been cursed about their appearance once or twice in the semester, decreased dramatically from 93.8% to 10.7%). However, Most students remained nonbullied at the point. However, girls and boys didn't show differences in the second semester. More boys than girls reported that they had been cursed (boys: 27.5%, girls: 18.2%,  $\chi^2(1) = 4.79, p < .05$ ), kicked and threatened (boys: 11.9%, girls: 6/1%,  $\chi^2(1) = 3.4, p < .05$ ). However, there was no significant difference of victim experience in other way between boys and girls.

#### *Experience of Reporting the Incidence of Being Bullied by Others to Adults*

##### *Experience of Reporting the Incidence of Being Bullied to Teachers*

Most of students have not experienced the Incidence of Being Bullied by others, but although they experienced it, very small number (2.8%) of students has reported it to the teacher. The result of the students' answer is presented in the Figure 5. There is no gender difference to report the Incidence of Being Bullied ( $\chi^2(2) = 1.50, p < .05$ ).




Figure 5. Experience of Reporting Incidence of Being Bullied to Teachers: Percentage according to Gender

More rejected students (19.5%) were been bullied than normal (7.2%) and 12.5% of popular students ( $\chi^2(4) = 9.77, p < .01$ ). However, most of them did not report about the Incidence of Being Bullied to their teacher. The result of comparing popularity groups is presented Table 18.

Table 18. Experience of Reporting Incidence of Being Bullied to Teachers: Frequencies and Percentages, Result of  $\chi^2$ -Test according to Popularity

Experience of the reporting the Incidence of Being Bullied to teachers			
	No experience of being bullied	No experience to report it	Have reported it
Popularity	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)
Popular	84 (87.5)	9 (9.4)	3 (3.1)
Normal	154 (92.8)	10 (6.0)	2 (1.2)
Rejected	99 (80.5)	19 (15.4)	5 (4.1)
Total	337 (87.5)	38 (9.9)	10 (2.6)

*Experience of the reporting the Incidence of Being Bullied by others to Parents*

Students tended to give the similar answer to the question about experience of reporting Incidence of Being Bullied from others to the teacher. Figure 6 presents the frequency of the reporting the Incidence of Being Bullied to the parents.

Most of the students answered that they had not experienced any Incidence of Being Bullied. Even if they were victimized, there were more students (6%), who had not reported it to their parents, than the students (2.2%), who had reported it to their parents. More girls (4.1%) answered the experience to report it than boys (1.2), but the difference is not significant ( $\chi^2(2)=4.53, p<.05$ ).




Figure 6. Experience of Reporting Incidence of Being Bullied by Peers to Parents: Percentage according to Gender

Table 19 reports the experience of reporting the Incidence of Being Bullied by peers to parents according to students' popularity. Most of students answered that they had not been bullied. Although rejected students had been more often bullied than popular or normal students, the rate of reporting it was not different among different popularity groups.

Table 19. Experience of Reporting Incidence of Being Bullied to Parents: Numbers, Percentages, and Result of Chi<sup>2</sup>-Test according to Popularity

Popularity	Experience of reporting Incidence of Being Bullied to parents		
	No Experience of being Bullied	No Experience to Report it	Have Reported it
	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)
Popular	91 (94.8)	3 (3.1)	2 (2.1)
Normal	158 (95.2)	6 (3.6)	2 (3.1)
Rejected	105 (84.7)	15 (12.1)	4 (3.2)
Total	354 (91.7)	24 (6.2)	8 (2.1)

Note: \* $p < .05$

Most of students have never been bullied in any method. However, when bullying occurs, then in the most of cases more than 6 perpetrator participate in the bullying behavior and there are some victims, who are very often be bullied at the end of the school year. Few students reported their Incidence of Being Bullied to the adults.

#### 4.2.2 Bullying experience

##### *First bullying Experience*

As Figure 7 presents, 15.8% of respondents reported that they had bullied others in elementary school for the first time.

Especially, significantly more girls (22.6%) began to bully others earlier than boys ( $\chi^2(2)=9.39, p < .01$ ).




Figure 7. First Bullying Experience: Percentage according to Gender

Like Table 20 presenting, rejected students tended to start to bully others earlier than popular or normal students, although most of students reported that they had not bullied others. However, the rates of starting to bully others in the middle school between popular students and rejected students were not different.

Table 20. First Bullying Experience: Numbers, Percentages, and Result of Chi<sup>2</sup>-Test according to Popularity

Popularity	First Bullying Experience			Chi <sup>2</sup> -Test	
	No experience N(%)	Elementary school N(%)	Middle school N(%)	df	$\chi^2$
Popular	70 (74.5)	13 (13.8)	11 (11.7)	4	10.47*
Normal	134 (81.7)	22 (13.4)	6 (3.7)		
Rejected	83 (69.2)	25 (20.8)	12 (10.0)		
Total	287 (75.9)	60 (15.9)	29 (7.7)		

Note: \* $p < .05$



### *Bullying Experience in this Semester*

At the beginning of the school year, most of students (88.3%) had not bullied others and most of them maintained the same states until the end of the school year like Figure 8 showing.

The students, who had bullied others once or twice each of issuing semesters, increased slightly from 9.9% to 12.7%. There are a few students (at the first measuring 1%, at the second measuring point 1.7%) who very often bully others.

There was no significant gender difference in bullying experience ( $\chi^2(1)=2.67, p<.05$ ).




Figure 8. Bullying Experience this Semester: Percentage according to Gender

Both of the measuring points, there was no difference among popular, normal, and rejected group (see Table 21).

Table 21. Frequency of Bullying others this Semester: Numbers, Percentages, and Results of Chi<sup>2</sup>-Tests according to Popularity

Time	Popularity	Frequencies of bullying				
		Never	Once or twice	Twice or three times per month	Once per week	Several times per week
		<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)
1 <sup>st</sup>	Popular	79 (87.4)	12 (12.8)		1 (1.1)	2 (2.1)
	Normal	149 (90.3)	13 (7.9)	1 (0.6)		2 (1.2)
	Rejected	104 (86.0)	16 (13.2)		1 (0.8)	
	Total	332 (87.4)	41 (10.8)	1 (0.3)	2 (0.5)	4 (1.1)
2 <sup>nd</sup>	Popular	20 (90.9)	2 (9.1)			
	Normal	41 (83.7)	7 (14.3)			1. (2.0)
	Rejected	35 (79.5)	7 (15.9)	1 (2.3)		1 (2.3)
	Total	96 (83.5)	16 (13.9)	1 (0.9)		2 (1.7)

### *Perpetrated Bullying Methods and Frequencies*

The same methods of experienced bullying methods were given to the students. Table 22 shows the methods of bullying and the perpetrated frequency. There were verbal aggressions (cursing and cursing about appearance), social aggression (ignoring and spreading rumor about others), and physical aggression (hitting and destroying other's possession).

Verbal aggression was most frequently used. Especially, most of students (93.4%) have cursed about others' appearance once or twice at the beginning of the school years. At the end of the school year, much fewer students (19.2%), however, reported that they had cursed about others' appearance. 37% students at the first measuring point and 28.4% students at the second measuring point answered that they had cursed and made fun others.

Students used the method of also social aggression; especially they frequently ignored others. The rates of students, who have ignored other students this semester, are 18.1% at the first measure and 21.1% at the second measure time.

Table 22. Perpetrated Bullying Methods and Frequencies

Method	Time	Gender	Frequencies of Bullying				
			Never N(%)	Once or twice	Twice or three times per month	Once per week	Several times per week
Curse	1 <sup>st</sup>	Boys	197(59.5)	111(33.5)	10(3.0)	8(1.2)	1(0.3)
		Girls	119(62.8)	48(27.9)	3(1.7)	1(0.6)	
		Total	316 (62.8)	159 (31.6)	13 (2.6)	5 (1.0)	9 (1.8)
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Boys	186 (69.7)	66 (24.7)	7 (2.6)	1 (0.4)	7 (2.6)
		Girls	99 (75.6)	29 (22.1)	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)
		Total	285 (71.6)	95 (23.9)	8 (2.0)	2 (0.5)	8 (2.0)
Ignore	1 <sup>st</sup>	Boys	271(81.9)	52(15.7)	1(0.3)	5(1.5)	2(0.6)
		Girls	141(82.0)	26(15.1)	5(2.9)		
		Total	412 (81.9)	78 (15.5)	6 (1.2)	5 (1.0)	2 (0.4)
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Boys	214 (80.1)	41 (15.4)	7 (2.6)	3 (1.1)	2 (0.7)
		Girls	100 (76.3)	27 (20.6)	2 (1.5)		2 (1.5)
		Total	314 (78.9)	68 (17.1)	9 (2.3)	3 (0.8)	4 (1.0)
Hit	1 <sup>st</sup>	Boys	276(83.6)	45(13.6)	2(0.6)	3(0.9)	4(1.2)
		Girls	168(97.7)	4(2.3)			
		Total	444 (88.4)	49 (9.8)	2 (0.4)	3 (0.6)	4 (0.8)
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Boys	234 (87.6)	18 (6.7)	7 (2.6)	6 (2.2)	2 (0.7)
		Girls	123 (93.9)	6 (4.6)	1 (0.8)		1 (0.8)
		Total	357 (89.7)	24 (6.0)	8 (2.0)	6 (1.5)	3 (0.8)
Spread Rumor	1 <sup>st</sup>	Boys	313(94.6)	10(3.0)	4(1.2)	2(0.6)	2(0.6)
		Girls	165(95.9)	6(3.5)	1(0.6)		
		Total	478 (95.0)	16 (3.2)	5 (1.0)	2 (0.4)	
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Boys	246 (92.5)	16 (6.0)	2 (0.8)		2 (0.8)
		Girls	126 (96.2)	4 (3.1)	1 (0.8)		
		Total	372 (93.7)	20 (5.0)	3 (0.8)		2 (0.5)
Destroy Other's Possession	1 <sup>st</sup>	Boys	315(95.7)	9(2.7)	2(0.6)	1(0.3)	2(0.6)
		Girls	171(99.4)	1(0.6)			
		Total	486 (97.0)	10 (2.0)	2 (0.4)	1 (0.2)	2 (0.4)
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Boys	252 (95.1)	9 (3.4)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	2 (0.8)
		Girls	126 (96.2)	3 (2.3)	2 (1.5)		
		Total	378 (95.5)	12 (3.0)	3 (0.8)	1 (0.3)	2 (0.5)
Curse appearance	1 <sup>st</sup>	Boys	24(7.4)	302(92.6)			
		Girls	9(5.3)	162(94.7)			
		Total	33 (6.6)	464 (93.4)			
	2 <sup>nd</sup>	Boys	215 (81.1)	41 (15.5)	5 (1.9)	2 (0.8)	2 (0.8)
		Girls	104 (80.0)	21 (16.2)	3 (2.3)	2 (1.5)	
		Total	319 (80.8)	62 (15.7)	8 (2.0)	4 (1.0)	2 (0.5)

The rate of boys, who have hit others once or twice, is higher than the rate of girls, who did it (Time1:  $\chi^2(1)=21.805$ ,  $p<.001$ , Time2:  $\chi^2(1)=3.72$ ,  $p<.05$ ). Also more boys (4.5%) destroyed other's possessions than girls at the first measure ( $\chi^2(1)=5.25$ ,  $p<.05$ ), but there was no significant gender difference in destroying other's possession ( $\chi^2(1)=.24$ ,  $p>.05$ )

Most of students have never bullied other students. However, 15.8% students have already bullied other students in elementary school. The Method of bullying, which the most of student use, is the verbal aggression (e.g. cursing others).

## 4.3 Reason of Bullying and Reactions to Bullying

### 4.3.1 Victim Perspective

Table 23 presents frequency of students' answers. To the question ' why were you bullied by other students', most of students answered that they had not been bullied. However, the most of victims (time 1=3%, time 2=1.5%) did not know the reason, why they are bullied. Some of students (time 1; 1.6%, time 2; 2.2%) thought that they had been victimized because 'I can not be in harmony with others'. 'I put on air importance' was pointed out by some other students as the reason of victimization (time 1=1.2%, time 2=2.2%) as the reason of their victimization. There is no significant difference between boys and girl to answer about the reason of their victimization.

As Table 23 presents, most of victims (time 1=4.2%, time 2=2.5%) did not react in any form. They behaved as if nothing had happened. In addition, even some of victims (time 1=2.2%, time 2=2.5%) have not talked with nobody. There is no gender difference in the reaction to the Incidence of Being Bullied.

Table 23. Reasons of Being Bullied, Reactions after Being Bullied and Trials Solve the Problem

		Time 1			Time 2		
		Boys N(%)	Girls N(%)	Total N(%)	Boys N(%)	Girls N(%)	Total N(%)
Reasons of being bullied	Because I put on an air importance	3 (0.9)	3 (1.8)	6 (1.2)	6 (2.2)	3 (2.3)	9 (2.2)
	Because I ignore them	3 (0.9)	1 (0.6)	4 (0.8)	1 (0.4)	2 (1.5)	3 (0.7)
	Because the teacher likes just me.	2 (0.6)		2 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.8)	2 (0.5)
	Because I am a well-heeled person.	1 (0.3)		1 (0.2)			
	Because my appearance is too attractive.	1 (0.3)	2 (1.2)	3 (0.6)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.8)	2 (0.5)
	Because my appearance is peculiar.	1 (0.3)	1 (0.6)	2 (0.4)	2 (0.7)		2 (0.5)
	Because I cannot be in harmony with others.	6 (1.8)	4 (2.3)	10 (2.0)	5 (1.9)	4 (3.0)	9 (2.2)
	Because there are bad students in my classroom.	6 (1.8)	2 (1.2)	8 (1.6)	3 (1.1)	2 (1.5)	5 (1.2)
I don't know, why they bully me.	8 (2.4)	7 (4.1)	15 (3.0)	3 (1.1)	3 (2.3)	6 (1.5)	
Reaction after being bullied	I am absent from school.				1 (0.4)		1 (0.3)
	I don't talk with nobody.	6 (1.8)	5 (2.9)	11 (2.2)	4 (1.5)	6 (4.6)	10 (2.5)
	I become enervated.	2 (0.6)	2 (1.2)	4 (0.8)	2 (0.7)	2 (1.5)	4 (1.0)
	I wonder playground alone.	2 (0.6)		2 (0.4)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.8)	2 (0.5)
	I have lunch alone.		1 (0.6)	1 (0.2)		2 (1.5)	2 (0.5)
	I walk with dropping my head down.				1 (0.4)		1 (0.3)
	I don't go the place, in which other students might bully me.	1 (0.3)	1 (0.6)	2 (0.4)		1 (0.8)	1 (0.3)
	I struggle against it.	3 (0.9)	2 (1.2)	5 (1.0)	4 (1.5)		4 (1.0)
I do in normal way as if nothing has been happened	12 (3.7)	9 (5.3)	21 (4.2)	6 (2.2)	4 (3.1)	10 (2.5)	
Trials solve the problem	I tell it my parents.	1 (0.3)	5 (2.9)	6 (1.2)		1 (0.8)	1 (0.3)
	I discuss with a teacher about it.	1 (0.3)	1 (0.6)	2 (0.4)	3 (1.1)	2 (1.5)	5 (1.3)
	I visit a counselor at school or a counseling center.						
	I go to the police and report it.	1 (0.3)		1 (0.2)		1 (0.8)	1 (0.3)
	I will change the school.				2 (0.7)		2 (0.5)
	I will do a temporary absence from school.	2 (0.6)		2 (0.4)		1 (0.8)	1 (0.3)
	I will resist bullying behavior.	2 (0.6)		2 (0.4)	2 (0.7)		2 (0.5)
	I ignore those students.	2 (0.6)	5 (2.9)	7 (1.4)	3 (1.1)	3 (2.3)	6 (1.5)
	I endure it without taking any action.	12 (3.6)	6 (3.5)	18 (3.6)	6 (2.2)	8 (6.2)	14 (3.5)
	I try to make myself agreeable.	4 (1.2)	1 (0.6)	5 (1.0)	1 (0.4)		1 (0.3)
I join in the group to prevent to be bullied.				2 (0.7)		2 (0.5)	
I will bully other students, too.				1 (0.4)		1 (0.3)	

Like Table 23 presenting, most of students have not been bullied. However, most of victims (time 1=3.6%, time 2=3.5%) have not attempted against bullies and have not carried out anything. There is no difference between the boys and the girls.

#### 4.3.2 Bully Perspective

Although most of students don't bully other students (c.f. Table 24), the most of bullies reported that they had bullied others because of the social skill problems: the person speaks and does with an air of importance (time 1=10.1%, time 2=12%), the person cannot be in harmony with others (time 1=5.8%, time 2=5.3%), or the person ignores other students (time 1=5.0%, time 2=7.3%). Especially, girls (time 1=8.8%, time 2=5.3%) bullied others when the person cannot be in harmony with others. However, some of bullies bullied other students because of victims' weakness: Their face or appearance looks peculiarly (time 1=4.8%, time 2=4.8%).

The person, who behaves in the eye-catching way or has social skill problems, can be easily a victim of bullying. The most of students (time 1=61.6%, time 2=60.9%) answered that the victim is a kind of person, who puts on airs and holds other students in contempt.

Table 24. Reasons of Bullying and Characteristics of the Victim

		Time 1			Time 2		
		Boys N(%)	Girls N(%)	Total N(%)	Boys N(%)	Girls N(%)	Total N(%)
Reasons of Bullying	I have never bullied others	268 (82.0)	131 (77.1)	399 (80.3)	219 (81.7)	98 (74.2)	317 (79.3)
	Because he/she puts on an air importance.	32 (9.8)	18 (10.6)	50 (10.1)	29 (10.8)	19 (14.4)	48 (12.0)
	Because he/she ignores friends.	16 (4.9)	9 (5.3)	25 (5.0)	18 (6.7)	11 (8.3)	29 (7.3)
	Because my teacher likes only him/her.	1 (0.3)	3 (1.8)	4 (0.8)	2 (0.7)		2 (0.5)
	Because he/she is a well-heeled person.						
	Because his/her appearance is too attractive.						
	Because his/her appearance is peculiar.	18 (5.5)	6 (3.5)	24 (4.8)	15 (5.6)	4 (3.0)	19 (4.8)
	Because he/she cannot be in harmony with others.	14 (4.3)	15 (8.8)	29 (5.8)	14 (5.2)	7 (5.3)	21 (5.3)
	Because there are bad students in my classroom.	4 (1.2)	2 (1.2)	6 (1.2)	2 (0.7)	3 (2.3)	5 (1.3)
	I don' t know the reason.	9 (2.8)	7 (4.1)	16 (3.2)	2 (0.7)	3 (2.3)	5 (1.3)
	Because he/she is too poor to play with.	2 (0.6)		2 (0.4)	2 (0.7)		2 (0.5)
	Because he/she always puts on air of a rich	2 (0.6)	4 (2.4)	6 (1.2)			
Characteris tics of the Victim	He/she looks foolish	89 (27.2)	42 (25.0)	131(26.5)	99 (37.1)	25 (18.9)	124 (31.1)
	He/she has handicap	41 (12.5)	20 (11.9)	61(12.3)	32 (12.0)	13 (9.8)	45 (11.3)
	He/she has a funny appearance and face	85 (26.0)	38 (22.6)	123(24.8)	70 (26.2)	23 (17.4)	93 (23.3)
	He/she looks naïve	23 (7.0)	5 (3.0)	28(5.7)	15 (5.6)	7 (5.3)	22 (5.5)
	He/she flatters	42 (12.8)	39 (23.2)	81(16.4)	41 (15.4)	30 (22.7)	71 (17.8)
	He/she shrewd	28 (8.6)	17 (10.1)	45(9.1)	24 (9.0)	23 (17.4)	47 (11.8)
	He/she is underhanded or sneaky	52 (15.9)	71 (42.3)	123(24.8)	51 (19.1)	50 (37.9)	101 (25.3)
	He/she puts on air of an important like as prince or princess	178 (54.4)	127 (75.6)	305(61.6)	146 (54.7)	97 (73.5)	243 (60.9)
	He -shegets the whole attention and love from the teacher	60 (18.3)	32 (19.0)	92(18.6)	59 (22.1)	38 (28.8)	97 (24.3)
	He/she always obeys what the teacher says	16 (4.9)	18 (10.7)	34(6.9)	16 (6.0)	5 (3.8)	21 (5.3)
	He/she carries tales to teachers other students.	104 (31.8)	61 (36.3)	165(33.3)	78 (29.2)	40 (30.3)	118 (29.6)
	He/she tells unsuitable situation	21 (6.4)	12 (7.1)	33(6.7)	27 (10.1)	9 (6.8)	36 (9.0)
	He/she gives inappropriate answers in the classes	17 (5.2)	2 (1.2)	19(3.8)	18 (6.7)	4 (3.0)	22 (5.5)
	He/she always endures, when other students pick up a quarrel with him/her	16 (4.9)	8 (4.8)	24(4.8)	14 (5.2)	7 (5.3)	21 (5.3)
	He/ looks weak	40 (12.2)	13 (7.7)	53(10.7)	32 (12.0)	5 (3.8)	37 (9.3)
	He bothers others	101 (30.9)	53 (31.5)	154(31.1)	67 (25.1)	42 (31.8)	109 (27.3)

Especially, more than 70% girls attribute the victimization to the victims' boast and vanity. 33.3% students at the first measuring point and 29.6% of them at the second measuring point thought that the victim is a kind of person, who carries tales to teachers other students. 31.1% students (time 1) and 27.3% students (time 2) pointed out that victims are those, who bother or annoy others in every situation. About one quarter of students (time 1=24.8%, time 2=23.3%) thought that the person, who has a peculiar face or appearance, could be a victim. 24.8% (time 1) and 25.3% (time 2) student reported that victims are those, who are underhanded. Some students answered that the person, who have physically disabled or weak, or who is a flatter, sometimes becomes a victim. The exact frequency of answer is presented in Table 24.

#### 4.3.3 Bystander Perspective

Most of students (time1=60%, time2=57%) answered that they would like to help the victim, even though they could not dare to help victims. 25.9% students (time1) and 29.9% students (time2) answered that they don't do anything, because it is not their own business or they don't want to get mixed up in such a business. It means that more than 85% students don't take any action for victims, only some of students (time1=14.1%, time2=12.8%) tried to help the victims in any way. The results is presented in the Figure 9.

At the first measuring point, more boys (29.3%) did not care about other' victimization than girls and more girls wanted to help the victim than boys, although they did not take any action against it ( $\chi^2(2)=8.09, p<.05$ ). However, at the second measuring point, there was no gender difference in the reaction to the situation when other students are bullied.






Figure 9. Reaction to Situation When Other Students Are Bullied: Percentages according to Gender in the Both of Measuring point

As Table 25 presents, there was no difference among different popularity groups in reaction to the situation, when others were victimized in the both of measuring points.

Table 25. Reaction to Situation When Others Are Bullied: Numbers, Percentages, and Result of Chi<sup>2</sup>-Test according to Students' Popularities

Time	Popularity	Reaction to others' bullied situation			Chi <sup>2</sup> -Test	
		Do Nothing and Don't Care	Do Nothing but Want to Help the Victim	Try to Help the Victim	df	$\chi^2$
		N(%)	N(%)	N(%)		
1	Popular	25 (26.0)	58 (60.0)	13 (13.5)	4	1.10
	Normal	39 (23.5)	103 (62.0)	24 (14.5)		
	Rejected	34 (27.4)	70 (56.5)	20 (16.1)		
	Total	98 (25.4)	231 (59.8)	57 (14.8)		
2	Popular	6 (27.3)	15 (68.2)	1 (4.5)	4	3.14
	Normal	14 (29.2)	26 (54.2)	8 (16.7)		
	Rejected	9 (20.5)	29 (65.9)	6 (13.6)		
	Total	29 (25.4)	70 (61.4)	15 (13.2)		

Most of students attribute the victimization to the problems of the victim's social skill and the victim's eye-catching characteristic. Especially, boastful and vainglorious characteristics of victims bring themselves to the dangerous situation. The victims didn't take any action instead that they try to find help from others or from adults or try to undertake any action against the bullying behavior. In addition, most of the bystander did not try to help the victim, although they felt sympathy for the victims.

#### 4.4 Bully Tendency and Victim Tendency

Students' bully tendency and victim tendency were generally low at both of the application times. The mean scores are lower than the middle of the scales.

Boys showed higher bully tendency as well as victim tendency than girls at the both of measuring point. The result is presented in table 26.

Table 26. Bully and Victims Tendency: Mean, Standardized Deviation, and Result of Independent t-Test according to Gender At the First and Second Measuring points.

Tendency	Boys		Girls		df	t
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)		
Time 1	Bully Tendency	2.08 (.06)	1.95 (.50)		503	2.62*
	Victim Tendency	2.05 (.59)	1.89 (.54)		503	3.14*
Time 2	Bully Tendency	2.12 (.51)	2.00 (.50)		351	2.11*
	Victim Tendency	2.20 (.61)	1.93 (.55)		393	4.36*

Note: \* $p < .05$

Rejected group tended to show significantly higher victim tendency than normal and popular group students at the first measuring points. There was no difference in the bully and victim tendency between normal group and popular group students. However, normal group tended to have significantly higher actor tendency than rejected group students at the end of the school year. There was no difference in bully and victim tendency between normal group and popular group and between popular group and rejected group (see Table 27).

Table 27. Bully and Victims Tendency: Mean, Standardized Deviation, and Result of ANOVA-Test according to Students' Popularity At the First and Second Measuring points.

Tendency	Popular	Normal	Rejected	df	F	
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)			
Time 1	Bully Tendency	2.00 (.48)	2.04 (.53)	2.12 (.55)	2, 385	1.51
	Victim Tendency	1.89 (.49)	2.00 (.58)	2.18 (.57)	2, 385	7.74**
Time 2	Bully Tendency	2.04 (.43)	2.18 (.47)	1.87 (.60)	2, 111	4.24*
	Victim Tendency	2.07 (.58)	2.14 (.58)	1.99 (.67)	2, 111	.674

Note: \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$

Students' bully tendency did not change significantly from the beginning of the school year to the end of the school year. However, students' victim tendency became significantly higher at the end of the school year. Table 28 presents the changes in students' bully and victim tendency.

Table 28. Bully and Victim Tendency: Mean, Standardized Deviation, and Result of Paired t-Test at the First and Second Measuring points

Tendency	Time 1	Time 2	df	t
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>		
Bully Tendency	2.05 (.53)	2.09 (.52)	400	0.999
Victim Tendency	2.04 (.57)	2.11 (.60)	399	1.879*

Note: \* $p < .05$

In order to build and compare bully, victim, normal, and bully-victim group were classified according to the bully and victim tendency, which was identified from 6 items of each of scales (see Table 29 for distributions).

Table 29. Group Distributes of Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-victim

		Bully Tendency					
		Time 1			Time 2		
		Below 3 Quartiles	Above 3 Quartiles	Total	Below 3 Quartiles	Above 3 Quartiles	Total
		<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N</i>
Victim Tendency	Below 3 quartiles	336(68)	62(13)	398	227 (69.1)	31 (7.7)	258
	Above 3 quartiles	57(12)	36(7)	93	62 (15.5)	31 (7.7)	93
Total		393	98	491	299	62	401

The students, who belonged to the below 1 quartile of both of the bully and the victim tendency, were classified as the normal group. The students, who belonged to the below 1 quartile of the bully tendency and to the above 3 quartiles of the victim tendency, were arranged to the victim group. The students, who were included above 3 quartiles of the bully tendency and below 3 quartiles of the victim tendency, were classified as the bully group. The students, who were included above 3 quartiles of the bully tendency and above 3 quartiles of the victim tendency, were arranged to the bully-victim group. The frequencies of each group are presented in Table 30.

Like Table 30 shows, the most of students (336, 68.4%) were classified to the normal group, 62(12.6%)students belonged to the bully group, 57(11.7%)students were assigned to the victim group, and 36(7.3%) student were classified as the bully-victim group in the first application. More girls

(77.1%) than boys (63.9%) belonged to the normal group and more boys than girls to the other groups.

In the second application of questionnaire, 69.2% students were arranged as the normal students. 15.5 % students are classified as victims. More boys (20.4%) than girls (5.3%) are sorted as victims. There were more girls than boys, who are neither a bully nor a victim.

Table 30. Numbers and Percentages of Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-Victim Group Members, and Result of Chi<sup>2</sup>-Test according to Gender

		Bully group				Total N	$\chi^2$
		Normal	Bully	Victim	Bully-victim		
		N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
Time 1	Boys	205(63.9)	45(14.0)	43(13.4)	28(8.7)	321	9.25*
	Girls	131(77.1)	17(10.0)	14(8.2)	8(4.7)		
	Total	336 (68.4)	62 (12.6)	57 (11.7)	36 (7.3)		
Time 2	Boys	170 (63.0)	21 (7.8)	55 (20.4)	24 (8.9)	270	18.79***
	Girls	107 (81.7)	10 (7.6)	7 (5.3)	7 (5.3)		
	Total	277 (69.2)	31 (7.7)	62 (15.5)	31 (7.7)		

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$

Although more rejected students (Time1: 16.1%, Time2: 20.9%) tended to be victims than popular (Time1: 8.3%, Time2: 4.5%) and normal students (Time1: 10.1%, Time2: 16.3%), there was no significant difference among three groups at the both of the measuring points like Table 31 showing.

Table 31. Numbers and Percentages of Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-Victim Group Members, and Result of Chi<sup>2</sup>-Test according to Popularity

		Bully group				Total N (%)	$\chi^2$
		Normal	Bully	Victim	Bully-victim		
Popularity		N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
Time 1	Popular	76 (79.2)	6 (6.3)	8 (8.3)	6 (6.3)	263 (67.3)	10.71
	Normal	110 (65.5)	17 (10.1)	17 (10.1)	24 (14.3)		
	Rejected	77 (62.1)	10 (8.1)	20 (16.1)	17 (13.7)		
	Total	263 (67.3)	33 (8.5)	45 (11.1)	47 (12.1)		
Time 2	Popular	17 (77.3)	2 (9.1)	1 (4.5)	2 (9.1)	78 (68.4)	4.83
	Normal	31 (63.3)	5 (10.2)	8 (16.3)	5 (10.2)		
	Rejected	30 (69.8)	2 (4.7)	9 (20.9)	2 (4.7)		
	Total	78 (68.4)	9 (7.9)	18 (15.8)	9 (7.9)		

Students bully and victim tendency changed very dynamically between first time and second time. Besides normal students, who stayed as the normal students, there are 16 (4%) students, who stayed in the same groups, with which they had affiliated first measuring point. Table 34 presents the changes in students' affiliated groups.

Table 32. Changes in Affiliated Groups

Groups Time 2	Groups Time 1				Total
	Normal <i>N</i> (%)	Bully <i>N</i> (%)	Victim <i>N</i> (%)	Bully-Victim <i>N</i> (%)	
<b>Normal</b>	194 (71.6)	20 (7.4)	34 (12.5)	23 (8.5)	271
<b>Bully</b>	24 (75.0)	1 (3.1)	6 (18.8)	1 (3.1)	32
<b>Victim</b>	29 (61.7)	5 (10.6)	11 (23.4)	2 (4.3)	47
<b>Bully-Victim</b>	30 (58.8)	5 (9.8)	11 (21.6)	5 (9.8)	51
<b>Total</b>	277 (69.1)	31 (7.7)	62 (15.5)	31 (7.7)	401

## 4.5 Factors influencing Bully and Victim tendencies

This chapter presents the effects of cognitive factors, e.g. attribution styles, social and environmental factors on the bully and victim tendency. In addition, the regression models, which predict the bully and victim tendency, are reported and also the Differences in each factors among normal, bully, victim, and bully-victim group students based on students affiliating group change are presented.

### 4.5.1 Attributions and Self-Perception

Table 33 presents the coefficients of the correlation between cognitive factors and the students' bully and victim tendencies. The correlations between cognitive factors and bully and victim tendency are low and moderate.

The intentionality of others' incentives associates positively students bully tendency. The student, who attributes other's provocation to the person's intention, tended to higher bully tendency. The students, who perceive other's

incentives uncontrollable, showed not also the lower bully tendency but also lower victim tendency. The attributional styles at the beginning of the school year correlated moderately students' bully and victim tendencies at the end of the school year still.

Table 33. Correlation Coefficients of Cognitive Factors and Bully-Victim Tendencies

		Bully tendency		Victim tendency	
		Time 1	Time 2	Time 1	Time 2
<b>Attributions</b>					
	Intentional	.12*	-.01	.09	-.07
	Uncontrollable	-.18**	-.15**	-.22**	-.18**
<b>Self-Perception</b>					
	Global self-worth	-.15**	-.05	-.21**	-.01
	Scholastic competence	-.10*	-.08	-.07*	-.03
	Social acceptance	-.08*	-.03	-.24**	-.03
	Physical appearance	-.09*	.00	-.12**	.06
	Global self-worth	-.20**	-.06	-.23**	-.03

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$

Self-perceptions correlated the bully and victim tendency negatively. The self-perception in general and global self-worth had moderate correlation with students' bully and victim tendency. Especially, perceived social acceptance showed a higher correlation with victim tendency than with bully tendency. Particularly, the students, who perceived themselves higher socially accepted and satisfied themselves as a human being, showed low victim tendency. However, students' self-perceptions of the beginning of the school year did not show significant correlations with the bully and victim tendency of the end of the school year.

### *Attributional style*

#### *Difference in the Attributional Styles among Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-Victim Groups*

According to the result of ANOVA test (c.f. Table 34), the bully group students showed the significantly higher tendency to attribute the others' incentive behavior to the person's intention than the normal group students. The normal group students perceived the other's provocation more uncontrollable than victim and bully-victim group student.

Table 34. Differences in Attribution Styles among Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-victim Groups

Groups	Attributional Styles	
	Intentional	Uncontrollable
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Normal	2.51 (1.06)	2.95 (.75)
Bully	3.03 (1.07)	2.88 (.74)
Victim	2.48 (1.23)	2.59 (.83)
Bully-victim	2.76 (1.20)	2.59 (.76)
<i>F (df)</i>	3.31* (3,479)	6.58*** (3,477)

*Note.* \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$

#### *The Predictability of the Attributional style Model on the Bully-Victim Tendency in the Application Time and in the Second Time*

In order to find out how much students' attributional style can predict students' bully and victim tendency, the regression analysis were conducted (see Table 35). Intentionality and uncontrollability were included in the model.



Table 35. Result of Regression Analysis: Relation Between Attributional Styles and Bully-victim Tendencies

	Bully Tendency			
	Time 1		Time 2	
	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
	$R^2 = .046$		$R^2 = .025$	
Attribution				
Intentional	.015	.162***		
Uncontrollable	.031	-.175***	.025	-.159**
	Victim Tendency			
	Time 1		Time 2	
	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
	$R^2 = .067$		$R^2 = .034$	
Attribution				
Intentional	.018	.137**		
Uncontrollable	.049	-.221***	.034	-.185***

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$

Table 35 presents regression coefficients and the significant level of the final regression model. The students' attributional style can predict bully tendency 4.6% and victim tendency 6.7% at the first measuring point and 2.5% bully tendency and 3.4% victim tendency at the second measuring point. Controllability predicts better both of bully tendency and victim tendency than intentionality. The Hostile or proposition attribution style predicts the bully tendency and also victim tendency. The nonhostile attribution predicts the lower bully-victim tendency.

### *Self-Perception*

#### *Differences in Self-perception among Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-victim Groups*

Table 36 presents group differences in self-perception among normal, bully, victim, and bully-victim groups.

Table 36. Differences in Self-perception among Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-victim Groups

Groups	Self-Perception				
	GS	SC	SA	PA	GW
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Normal	2.48 (.48)	2.32 (.56)	2.32 (.56)	2.28 (.65)	2.64 (.65)
Bully	2.37 (.49)	2.19 (.57)	2.19 (.57)	2.24 (.71)	2.41 (.64)
Victim	2.34 (.37)	2.27 (.45)	2.27 (.45)	2.15 (.52)	2.49 (.52)
Bully-victim	2.37 (.43)	2.30 (.50)	2.30 (.50)	2.26 (.57)	2.39 (.50)
Total	2.44 (.46)	2.30 (.54)	2.63 (.57)	2.26 (.63)	2.57 (.63)
<i>F (df)</i>	2.39 (3,501)	.85(3,501)	2.58* (3,501)	.70 (3,501)	4.24***(3,501)

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ ,

GS=Self-perception in General, SC=Scholastic Competence, SA= Social Acceptance, PA= Physical Appearance, GW=Global self-worth

According to Susan Harter (1999), each of the subscales of self-perception examines only the specific area and they are different from each other and even global self-worth is different from the sum of subscales. Therefore, the sum of the subscales was included with the analysis as a general self-perception. The self-concepts of students in general tended to be neither high nor low.

There was no difference on general self-perception, the perceived scholastic confidence, and the perceived attractiveness of their own physical appearance among groups. Most of students in every group thought that their performance at scholastic field is neither good nor bad.

However, there were group differences ( $F(3,501)=2.58$ ,  $p < .05$ ) in the social acceptance and global self-worth. Most of students thought that they were socially neither easily nor hardly accepted by their peers. The students of the normal group showed significantly stronger tendency than the victim group students to think that they were accepted by their friends. The bully-victim group students felt themselves as an acceptable person by their peers.

Students in every group evaluated themselves neither positively nor negatively. However, there was a main effect ( $F(3, 501)=4.24$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The normal group students showed significantly higher self-worth than the victim group students.

### *Predictability of Students' Self-perception on Bully-victim Tendencies*

In order to examine the predictability of students' self-concept on the bully and victim tendency, self-concepts in three specific domains (scholastic, social acceptance, and physical appearance) and global self-worth were included in the model. In Table 37 the coefficients and the significance levels of the final regression model is presented at the first measuring point. There was no significant regression model at the second measuring point. In hence, the result of the regression analysis of self-concept for the second measuring point is not presented. The global self-worth among self-concept can predict the bully tendency (3.9%) and the global self-worth and the social acceptance are moderately predictable factors for victim tendency ( $R^2=.07$ ). However, the self-concept at the beginning of the school years could not prognosticate students' bully and victim tendency a half year later.

Table 37. Result of Regression Analysis: Relation between Self-Perception and Bully-victim Tendencies

		Time 1			
		Bully tendency $R^2 = .039$		Victim tendency $R^2 = .073$	
		$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Self-concept					
	SC				
	SA			.056	-.236**
	PA				
	GW	.039	-.167***	.017	-.151**
	GS				

*Note:* \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ ,  
GS=Self-perception in General, SC=Scholastic Competence, SA= Social Acceptance, PA= Physical Appearance, GW=Global self-worth

Attributional style could not only predict the simultaneous bully and victim tendency but also their tendencies half a year later. However, though the model of self concept could explain the contemporary bully and victim tendency moderately, it was unable to predict their tendencies as time goes by.

#### 4.5.2 Attitudes toward Aggression and Cultural Beliefs

Students' attitude toward aggression and cultural beliefs correlate moderately or weakly with students' bully and victim tendencies in the negative way at the contemporary time.

Those, who took positive attitude toward using aggression at the beginning of the school year, displayed higher bully tendency at the beginning of the school year but not at the end of the school year. Table 38 reports the coefficients of the correlation between beliefs and bully and victim tendencies. It showed negative correlation with the victim tendency of the second measuring point but not with the tendency with first measuring point.

The cultural beliefs showed negative correlation with all of cultural beliefs, although the beliefs had totally different characteristics or sometimes they had opposite meaning each other. Vertical individualism did not display correlation with bully tendency, but it had weak and negative correlation with the victim tendency. All of the cultural beliefs had higher correlation with the victim tendency than the bully tendency and although the degree of correlation became weaker, it remained still a half of year later.

Table 38. Correlation Coefficients between Beliefs and Bully-Victim Tendencies

	Bully tendency		Victim tendency	
	Time 1	Time 2	Time 1	Time 2
Attitude toward Aggression	.14**	-.02	.07	-.10*
Cultural Beliefs				
HI	-.11**	-.09*	-.17**	-.12**
VI	-.03	-.05	-.11**	-.10*
HC	-.16**	-.09*	-.21**	-.14**
VC	-.18**	-.13**	-.23**	-.14**

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$

HI=Horizontal Individualism, VI=Vertical Individualism, HC=Horizontal Collectivism, VC=Vertical Collectivism

### *Attitude toward aggression*

#### *Differences in Attitude toward Aggression among Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-victim Groups*

Most of students had slightly negative attitudes toward aggression. There was the main effect of the comparing group differences among four groups. The bully- victim group students showed most positive attitude toward aggression. The group displayed significantly higher positive attitude toward using aggression than normal group students. Table 39 reports the means of positive attitude toward using aggression from each groups, the F-value and the level of significance.

Table 39. Differences in Attitude toward Aggression among Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-victim Groups

Groups	Positive attitude toward using aggression		
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Normal	2.54 (.83)	3,501	4.18**
Bully	3.00 (.93)		
Victim	2.70 (.88)		
Bully-victim	2.73 (.90)		
Total	2.62 (.86)		

Note: \*\* $p < .01$

#### *Predictability of the Attitude toward Aggression*

Attitude toward aggression factor showed very weak but significant predictability on the bully tendency (1.9%), but it doesn't predict the victim tendency at the first measuring point (c.f. Table 40). However, it did not predict the bully tendency after a half of year, but it could very weakly predict the victim tendency ( $R^2 = .01$ ).

Table 40. Result of Regression Analysis: the Predictability of Attitude toward Aggression on the Bully and Victim Tendency

	Bully tendency			
	Time 1		Time 2	
	$R^2=.019$		$R^2=.00$	
	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Attitude toward Aggression	.019	.137**		

	Victim tendency			
	Time 1		Time 2	
	$R^2=$		$R^2=.010$	
	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Attitude toward Aggression			.010	-.098*

Note. \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$

### Cultural Beliefs

#### Differences in Cultural Beliefs among Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-victim Groups

The students' cultural beliefs did not have large differences. They were inclined to have uncertain the cultural beliefs. All of the cultural beliefs were neither high nor low.

However, the mean of horizontal collectivism was most high, and there was a significant difference in horizontal collectivism between normal group students and victim group students. The normal group students showed higher horizontal collectivistic tendency than victim group students.

Normal students also displayed significantly higher vertical collectivistic tendency than bully-victim group students (c.f. Table 41).

Table 41. Differences in Cultural Beliefs Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-victim Groups

Groups	Cultural Beliefs			
	HI	VI	HC	VC
	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$	$M (SD)$
Normal	3.04 (.79)	3.07 (.79)	3.35 (.91)	3.32 (.90)
Bully	3.03 (.84)	2.91 (1.04)	3.16 (.77)	3.04 (.77)
Victim	2.84 (1.00)	2.91 (.93)	2.91 (1.04)	2.92 (1.17)
Bully-victim	2.76 (1.02)	2.92 (.76)	3.08 (1.09)	2.83 (1.08)
Total	3.01 (.83)	2.89 (.87)	3.28 (.91)	3.19 (.96)
$F (df)$	2.40 (3,501)	1.00 (3 501)	4.89**(3, 501)	7.21*** (3,501)

Note. \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$

### Predictability of Cultural Beliefs on Bully Tendency

According to result of regression analysis, vertical individualism could be weakly predictive of the positive bully tendency (1.1%) and vertical collectivism is negatively predictive of not only the bully tendency (3.1%)but also the victim tendency (5.1%). However, the predictability decreased as time went by (see table 49). The vertical collectivism is predictive of victim tendency ( $R^2=.05$ ) at the first measuring point. The predictability decreased to  $R^2=.02$  a half of year later.

Table 42. Results of the Regression Analysis: Predictability of Cultural Beliefs to the Bully and Victim Tendency

		Bully tendency			
		Time 1		Time 2	
		$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Cultural beliefs		$R^2=.042$		$R^2=.015$	
	HI				
	VI	.011	.141*		
	HC				
	VC	.031	-.175***	.015	-.124*
		Victim tendency			
		Time 1		Time 2	
		$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Cultural beliefs		$R^2=.051$		$R^2=.020$	
	HI				
	VI				
	HC				
	VC	.051	-.226***	.020	-.142**

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ ,

HI=Horizontal Individualism, VI=Vertical Individualism,

HC=Horizontal Collectivism, VC=Vertical Collectivism

### 4.5.3 Perceived Social Support and Bully and Victim Tendencies

Students' perceived social supports correlate highly students' bully and victim tendencies in the negative way at the contemporary time. Those, who thought high social support from others at the beginning of the school year, displayed lower bully and victim tendencies not only at the beginning of the school year but also at the end of the school year, even though the degree of correlation became lower.

Table 43 reports the coefficients of the correlation between perceived social supports and the bully and victim tendencies.

Table 43. Coefficients of the Correlation between Perceived Social Supports and the Bully and Victim tendencies.

		Bully Tendency		Victim Tendency	
		Time 1	Time 2	Time 1	Time 2
Social Support	Social Support in General	-.44**	-.12*	-.54**	-.15*
	Support from Parents	-.40**	-.12*	-.48**	-.18*
	Support from Classmates	-.29**	-.07	-.46**	-.12*
	Support from The Teacher	-.36**	-.12*	-.30**	-.08
	Support from Close Friends	-.32**	-.08	-.44**	-.10*

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$

### *Differences in Social Support among Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-Victim Groups*

Students' perceived social supports from important others were neither high nor low, but slightly lower than the median of the scale (see Table 44). Normal students tended to show the highest perceived social supports in general and from all of each important people.

Table 44. the Differences in the Social Support among Normal, Bully, Victim, and Bully-Victim Groups

Groups	General	Parents	Classmates	Teacher	Close Friends
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Normal	3.06 (.44)	3.01 (.59)	3.15 (.51)	2.81 (.62)	3.26 (.60)
Bully	2.69 (.42)	2.56 (.47)	2.83 (.61)	2.57 (.54)	2.81 (.69)
Victim	2.61 (.37)	2.58 (.50)	2.62 (.55)	2.49 (.52)	2.76 (.59)
Bully-victim	2.66 (.40)	2.57 (.48)	2.77 (.48)	2.49 (.49)	2.80 (.61)
Total	2.93 (.47)	2.87 (.59)	3.02 (.56)	2.72 (.60)	3.11 (.65)
<i>F (df)</i>	34.225*** (3, 501)	9.599*** (3, 501)	11.721*** (3, 501)	9.977*** (3, 501)	21.722*** (3, 501)

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$

The normal group student perceived higher parental support than any other group, then the bully group followed. The bully-victim group students perceived the lowest parental support. However, the normal group showed the



significantly higher perceived parental support than any other group and there were no significant difference among the other groups.

The normal group students perceived more support from their classmates than any other group and then, the bully group students followed them. The normal group students showed significant difference in perceived classmates' support from the bully-victim group and the victim group. In addition, the bully group showed higher perceived support of classmates than the victim group, who perceived the lowest classmates' support.

The normal group perceived most high degree of teacher support among groups, too. Therefore, their perceived support from teachers significantly higher than the victim group, who perceived lowest degree of teacher support.

The normal group perceived most high degree of support from close friends among four groups too. Therefore, they showed the significantly higher perceived close friends' support than the victim group, which perceived lowest degree of close friends.

#### *Predictability Of Social Support for Bully - Victim Tendencies*

The predictability of bully-victim tendency of social supports was examined through stepwise regression. Supports by parents, classmates, teacher, and close friends were included and tested in the model. The students' perceived social support at the beginning of the school year is highly predictive of contemporary bully tendency (20.9%) and victim tendency (31.5%).

Supports from parents, teacher and close friends predict less bully tendency and supports from parents, classmates and close friends can predict less victim tendency. The coefficients of regression model and the significance are presented in Table 45.

However, only the support from teacher shows the very weak predictability of the bully tendency a half of year later ( $R^2=.01$ ) and only the support from parents has the weak predictability of the victim tendency of the end of the school year ( $R^2=.03$ ).

Table 45. Results of Regression Analysis: Predictability of Social Support for Bully - Victim Tendencies

		Bully Tendency			
		Time 1		Time 2	
		$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
		$R^2 = .209$		$R^2 = .013$	
Social Supports	Parents	.162	-.402***		
	Classmates				
	Teacher	.0360	-.194***	.0130	-.115*
	Close friends	.0100	-.119*		
		Victim Tendency			
		Time 1		Time 2	
		$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
		$R^2 = .315$		$R^2 = .032$	
Social Supports	Parents	.227	-.477***	.032	-.179***
	Classmates	.081	-.316***		
	Teacher				
	Close friends	.007	-.117*		

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$

#### 4.5.4 Family Factors: Attitudes toward aggression, rearing style and cultural beliefs

Parental factors had moderate and low correlation with students' bully and victim tendency. Table 46 presents the coefficients of correlation between parental factors and students' bully and victim tendencies.

Parental positive attitude toward aggression correlated negatively with victim tendency, but there was no correlation between their attitude toward aggression and bully tendency.

The conflict between parents and victim had positive correlation. The higher conflict tendency between parents and students had, the higher victim tendency students displayed. However, there was no correlation between conflict between parent and students and the students' bully tendency. In the other hand, the parental acceptance correlated negatively the bully and the victim tendencies.

Most of parents' cultural beliefs correlated negatively with students' bully and victim tendencies. Horizontal individualistic beliefs showed most negative correlation with the victim tendency both of the measuring point. Then

horizontal collectivistic tendency followed as the next, especially it is the cultural beliefs, which correlated with bully tendency at most.

Table 46. Correlation Coefficient between Parental Variables and Bully - Victim Tendencies

		Bully Tendency		Victim Tendency	
		Time 1	Time 2	Time 1	Time 2
Attitude toward Aggression		-.03	.06	-.12*	.01
Relationship	Conflict	.07	.01	.12*	.01
	Acceptance	-.11*	-.08	-.18**	-.15**
Cultural Beliefs	HI	-.11*	-.12*	-.20**	-.20**
	VI	-.05	-.08	-.09	-.14**
	HC	-.16**	-.10*	-.17**	-.16**
	VC	-.11*	-.05	-.14*	-.11*

Note: \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ ,  
 HI=Horizontal Individualism, VI=Vertical Individualism,  
 HC=Horizontal Collectivism, VC=Vertical Collectivism

#### *Predictability of Parental Factors to students' Bully and Victim Tendency*

The regression analysis was conducted to examine three models. The first model was attitude toward aggression, the second one included conflicts between parents and students and parental acceptance, and the third one included four cultural beliefs. Table 47 reports the coefficients of regression analysis.

Attitude toward aggression and the parental Acceptance were very weakly predictive of students' victim tendency and they were not predictive of students' bully tendency at all.

Among cultural beliefs, horizontal collectivism was predictive of students' bully tendency ( $R^2=.025$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and horizontal collectivism was predictive students victim tendency ( $R^2= .042$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Table 47. Results of the Regression Analysis: Predictability of Parental Factors to the Student's Bully - Victim Tendencies

	Bully tendency	Victim tendency
	$R^2=.00$	$R^2=.013$

		$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
Attitude toward Aggression				.013	-.115*
Relationship					
Conflicts					
Acceptance				.033	-.182**
Cultural beliefs					
		$R^2 = .025$		$R^2 = .042$	
		$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$\beta$
HI				.042	-.205***
VI					
HC		.025	-.158**		
VC					

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \* $p < .05$ ,  
 HI=Horizontal Individualism, VI=Vertical Individualism,  
 HC=Horizontal Collectivism, VC=Vertical Collectivism

#### *Differences in parental factors*

Parents reported very low degree of positive attitude toward aggression and conflict with their child. However, they were inclined to be acceptant of their child. The parents displayed higher horizontal dimension than vertical dimension cultural beliefs. The vertical individualistic and vertical collectivistic tendencies were slightly higher than the median (3.00). However, there was no significant difference in parental factors among normal, bully, victim and bully-victim groups parents (Table 48). There was a main effect of horizontal individualism, but there was no distinguishable group difference.

Table 48. Mean Differences in Parental Factors among normal, bully, victim, and bully-victim Groups

Groups	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
--------	-----------	----------

	Normal	Bully	Victim	Bully- victim	Total		
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>		
Attitude toward Aggression	2.09 (0.77)	2.08 (0.80)	1.89 (0.60)	2.10 (0.71)	2.06 (.74)	303	.78
Conflict	2.37 (0.74)	2.41 (0.59)	2.47 (0.75)	2.62 (0.54)	2.40 (.71)	303	.68
Parents' Acceptance	3.72 (0.60)	3.75 (0.57)	3.52 (0.85)	3.45 (0.53)	3.68 (.64)	303	1.81
HI	3.62 (0.80)	3.55 (0.76)	3.40 (0.68)	3.11 (0.86)	3.57 (.79)	303	2.60*
VI	3.21 (0.66)	3.27 (0.68)	3.11 (0.64)	3.06 (0.51)	3.20 (.65)	301	.57
Cultural beliefs	3.82 (0.66)	3.85 (0.56)	3.69 (0.70)	3.38 (0.63)	3.79 (.66)	301	2.47
HC	3.94 (0.67)	3.91 (0.74)	3.87 (0.67)	3.59 (0.68)	3.20 (.68)	301	1.35

Note: \* $p < .05$ ,

HI=Horizontal Individualism, VI=Vertical Individualism,  
HC=Horizontal Collectivism, VC=Vertical Collectivism

#### 4.5.5 Most effective factor among the variables

Regression analysis was conducted in order to examine a model, which all of the psychological variables examined separately in the study were included in. Through the analysis the variable predicting bully and victim tendencies could be found out. Perceived parental support could predict students' bully and victim tendency most strongly. However, the power of the predictability of parental support became much weaker to the victim tendency and faded out to the bully tendency. Although attributional style to uncontrollable reason very weak, it still remained till a half of year later. Support by classmate could predict bully tendency a half of year later. On the other hand, support by teacher could predict students' bully tendency better than victim tendency. The result is presented in the Table 49.

Table 49. the

	Bully				Victim			
	T1		T2		T1		T2	
	$\Delta R^2=.257$		$\Delta R^2=.035$		$\Delta R^2=.336$		$\Delta R^2=.070$	
	$R^2$	$\beta$	$R^2$	$\beta$	$R^2$	$\beta$	$R^2$	$\beta$
Attribution								
Intention	.019	.049**			.007	.045		
Uncontrollable	.017	-.092*	.015	-.093**	.025	-.093**	.034	-.141***
Self-concept								
GS								
SC								
SA								
PA								
GSW								
Attitude toward aggression	.022	.098***						
Cultural beliefs								
HI								
VI								
HC								
VC								
Social support								
Parental	.160	-.357***			.223	-.457***	.020	-.143**
Classmates					.085	-.333***		
Teacher	.040	-.194***	.010	-.085*				
Close friend	.008	-.088*			.006	-.094*		
GSS								

## 4.6 Discriminant analysis

Discriminant analysis was used in order to identify how the set of 17 the cognitive and social variables differentiate changed group simultaneously. Discriminant analysis was conducted 4 times in order to find out which variables contribute to distinguish the changes in each group.

### 4.6.1 Changes in the Normal Group

There are three groups, who had changed from normal group and in addition, there is a group, who had remained as normal students. Therefore, four groups are included in the analysis.

The results of the procedure show in table 59 that two significant discriminative functions were indeed obtained. The first discriminant function

explains about 87.2% of the variance and the second accounts for only 12.5%. Standardized coefficients and structure coefficients of both discriminant functions are shown in Table 49

Table 49. Cononical Discriminant Functions

Function	Eigenvalue	Canonical Correlation	Wilk's $\lambda$	$\chi^2$	df
1	.350	.51	.705	88.94***	12
2	.051	.22	.951	12.76*	6

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \* $p < .05$

The standardized coefficients say the contribution and importance of each variable in determining the discriminant score, while the structure coefficients outline the relation between variables and discriminant function. For the first function, the highest contributions are provided by variables horizontal collectivistic belief, perceived support from classmates, and attribution to uncontrollable factors (see Table 60). The variables correlating the highest with the first function are horizontal collectivistic belief, attribution to uncontrollable factors, social support from classmates, and vertical collectivistic belief. The students, who reported relatively high attribution to uncontrollable factors, horizontal collectivistic tendency, and support from classmates, and moderate degree of positive attitude toward aggression, are typically the students, who remained at normal students. The students, who displayed relatively higher positive attitude toward aggression, moderate degree of attribution to uncontrollable factors, horizontal collectivistic tendency and support from classmates, are typically those, who became bullies. The students, who had relatively lower tendencies in the variables, are typically those who became victims or bully-victims. Attribution to uncontrollable factors, horizontal collectivistic tendency, and support from classmates, and attitude toward aggression contribute to the discrimination among those, who became victim and bully-victim, and others.

Table 50. Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients and Coefficients of Structure

Variables	Standardized coefficients		Coefficients of structure	
	Function 1	Function 2	Function 1	Function 2
AI			.199	.226*
AU	.374	.491	.729*	.264
GS			.250*	-.096
SC			.089	.032
SA			.363*	-.030
PA			.112	-.121*
GW			.208*	-.152
SGL			.633*	-.220
SP			.340*	-.282
SCM	.470	.052	.728*	-.087
ST			.308	-.179
SCF			.573	-.096
ATA	.109	.846	.097	.819*
HI			.579*	-.012
VI			.444*	.004
HC	.498	-.596	.801*	-.305
VC			.671*	-.249

*Note:* AI=Attributional Intentionality, AU=Attributional Uncontrollable, GS=Self-perception in General, SC=Scholastic Competence, SA=Social Acceptance, PA= Physical Appearance, GW= Global self-worth, SGL=Social Support in General, SCM=Support from Classmates, ST=Support from Teacher, SCF=Support from close friends, ATA=Attitude toward aggression, HI=Horizontal Individualism, VI=Vertical Individualism, HC=Horizontal Collectivism, VC=Vertical Collectivism

Attitude toward aggression, horizontal collectivistic belief, and attribution to uncontrollable factors contribute the highest to the second discriminant function. In addition, the variables correlating highest with the second function are attitude toward aggression, horizontal collectivistic beliefs.

Group centroids of the four groups on the two discriminant functions are shown in Table 51. The 70.6% of participants are correctly classified.

Table 51. Group Centroids on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
Normal	.318	-.069
Bully	.094	.748
Victim	-1.193	-.129
Bully-victim	-1.079	.112



#### 4.6.2 Changes in the Bulling Group

For the identifying the characteristics of bully group's changes, also 17 variables were included in the discriminant model simultaneously. The number of students was a few; therefore the group was in two groups divided according to the changes. One group is the students, who changed into normal students, and the other is the students group, who either remained as bullies or became victims or bully-victims. One discriminant function emerged as the result of the analysis. The result of procedure is presented in Table 52. The function explains 100% of the variance.

Table 52. Cononical Discriminant Functions

Function	Eigenvalue	Canonical Correlation	Wilk's $\lambda$	$\chi^2$	df
1	.251	.45	.799	85.47***	3

Note: \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Standardized coefficients and structure coefficients of the discriminant function are shown Table 53.

For the function, the highest contributions are provided by variable social support in general, horizontal collectivistic belief, and support from teacher. The variables correlating the highest with the function are horizontal collectivistic beliefs, social support in general, support from close friends, and support from classmates. Social support in general, support from teacher, and horizontal collectivistic beliefs are conclusive factor to discriminate between the students, who became normal students from bully, and those who remained as bully or became victims or bully-victims. The students, who reported relatively high social support in general, support from teacher, and horizontal collectivistic tendency, and are typically those, who became normal students from bully. However, the students, who reported relatively lower social support in general, support from teacher, and horizontal collectivistic belief, are either the students, who remained as bully, or the students, who became victim or bully-victim.

Table 53. Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients and Coefficients of Structure

Variables	Standardized coefficients	Coefficients of structure
	Function1	Function1
AI		.124
AU		.420
GS		.250
SC		.090
SA		.339
PA		.075
GW		.244
SGL	.852	.785
SP		.599
SCM		.736
ST	-.424	.271
SCF		.758
ATA		.026
HI		.556
VI		.447
HC	.560	.797
VC		.642

*Note:* AI=Attributional Intentionality, AU=Attributional Uncontrollable, GS=Self-perception in General, SC=Scholastic Competence, SA=Social Acceptance, PA= Physical Appearance, GW= Global self-worth, SGL=Social Support in General, SCM=Support by Classmates, ST=Support by Teacher, SCF=Support by close friends, ATA=Attitude toward aggression, HI=Horizontal Individualism, VI=Vertical Individualism, HC=Horizontal Collectivism, VC=Vertical Collectivism

According to a posteriori classification, 75.9% of students were correctly classified. The group centroids of the two groups on the discriminant function are shown in Table 54.

Table 54. Group Centroids on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function1
Normal	.332
Bully/Victim/Bully-victim	-.752

#### 4.6.3 Changes in the Victims Group

The number of students was a few; therefore the group was in three groups divided according to the changes. One group is the students, who changed into

normal students, the second group is the students group, who changed into bullies or bully-victims, and the third group is the students, who remained become victims or bully-victims.

Two discriminant functions emerged as the result of the analysis. The result of procedure is presented Table 55. The function 1 explains 77.4% of the variance and the function 2 explains 22.6% of variance.

Table 55. Cononical Discriminant Functions

Function	Eigenvalue	Canonical correlation	Wilk's $\lambda$	$\chi^2$	df
1	.535	.591	.563	24.409***	4
2	.157	.368	.865	6.185*	1

Note: \*\*\* $p < .001$ , \* $p < .05$

Variables social support in general and self-concept in physical appearance provide the highest contribution to function 1. The variables correlating the highest with the first function are social support in general, support by classmates, and support by close friends. For the second function, self-perception of physical appearance, and social support contribute mostly. The variables correlating highest with function two are self-perception of physical appearance, self-perception in general, and global self-worth. Table 56 shows standardized coefficients and coefficients of the structure of the two functions, Table 57 the group centroids. 72.3% of the group students were correctly classified. The students, who reported high degree of social support in general and moderate self-perception on the physical appearance, are the students, who became normal students from victims. The students, who reported moderate degree of social support in general and relatively negative perception on their physical appearance, are the people, who became bullies or bully-victims. In addition, the students, who reported lowest degree of social support in general and most positive perception on their appearance, are those, who remained as victims.

Table 56. Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients and Coefficients of Structure

Variables	Standardized coefficients		Coefficients of structure	
	Function1	Function2	Function1	Function2
AI			-.171	-.045
UI			.260	.034
GS			-.034	.774*
SC			-.033	.119
SA			.057	.374*
PA	.124	1.018	-.101	.995*
GW			-.017	.599*
SGL	1.020	.103	.993*	-.121
SP			.699*	-.124
SC			.818*	-.137
ST			.683*	.172
SCF			.799*	-.247
ATA			-.019	-.118*
HI			.327*	.044
VI			.390*	-.084
HC			.319*	.018
VC			.247*	-.031

*Note:* AI=Attributional Intentionality, AU=Attributional Uncontrollable, GS=Self-perception in General, SC=Scholastic Competence, SA=Social Acceptance, PA= Physical Appearance, GW= Global self-worth, SGL=Social Support in General, SCM=Support from Classmates, ST=Support from Teacher, SCF=Support from close friends, ATA=Attitude toward aggression, HI=Horizontal Individualism, VI=Vertical Individualism, HC=Horizontal Collectivism, VC=Vertical Collectivism

Table 57. Group Centroids on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function1	Function2
Normal	.500	.113
Bully/ Bully-victim	-.319	-.887
Victim	-1.227	.294

#### 4.6.4 Changes in the Bully-Victim Group

The number of students, who had belonged to the bully-victim group at the beginning of the school year, was a few; therefore the group was in two groups divided according to the changes. One group is the students, who changed into

normal students, and the other is the students group, who either became bullies or victims or remained as bully-victims. One discriminant function emerged as the result of the analysis. The result of procedure is presented Table 58. The function explains 100% of the variance.

Table 58. Cononical Discriminant Functions

Function	Eigenvalue	Canonical correlation	Wilk's $\lambda$	$\chi^2$	df
1	.212	.42	.825	8.752**	1

Note: \*\* $p < .01$

Table 59. Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients and Coefficients of Structure

Variables	Standardized coefficients	Coefficients of structure
	Function1	Function1
AI		.143
AU		.254
GS		.244
SC		.277
SA		.221
PA		.003
GW		.227
SGL	1.000	1.000
SP		.668
SC		.717
ST		.613
SCF		.819
ATA		.001
HI		.242
VI		.197
HC		.363
VC		.190

Note: AI=Attributional Intentionality, AU=Attributional Uncontrollable, GS=Self-perception in General, SC=Scholastic Competence, SA=Social Acceptance, PA= Physical Appearance, GW= Global self-worth, SGL=Social Support in General, SCM=Support from Classmates, ST=Support from Teacher, SCF=Support from close friends, ATA=Attitude toward aggression, HI=Horizontal Individualism, VI=Vertical Individualism, HC=Horizontal Collectivism, VC=Vertical Collectivism

The highest contribution is provided by social support in general for the function and the variables correlating highest with the function are social support in general, support from close friends, support from classmates, and

support from parents (for details see Table 59). The students, who became normal students from bully-victims, reported higher degree of social support in general than the students, who became bullies or victims, or remained as bully-victims.

Table 60 provides group centroids of the two groups on the function. 72.0% of the group students were correctly classified.

Table 60. Group Centroids on Discriminant Functions

<b>Group</b>	<b>Function1</b>
<b>Normal</b>	.381
<b>Bully/Victim/Bully-victim</b>	-.533

## 5 Summary and Discussion of the Results

The aim of the study was to gain a synthetic perspective on bully phenomenon by considering various aspects based on the attributes of participants and the environments in order to provide a theoretical and empirical reference for preventing and intervening bullying problems, which are worldwide spread problems and have physically, psychologically, and socially negative effects on participants, bystander, and the families of participants.

This study was conducted with questionnaires. There were two kinds of questionnaire. One was questionnaire for students, and the other was for caregiver (parents). In the students' questionnaire, students were asked about experience in bullying as a bully, a victim and, a bystander, attributional style, self-perception, attitude toward aggression, cultural beliefs, perceived social supports, and bully-victim tendencies. Caregivers' questionnaire consisted of the questions about attitude toward aggression, raring and relationship with their child, and cultural beliefs. The sample of this study consisted of 405 students in seventh and eighth grade at two middle school and 306 of their caregivers. The surveys were conducted twice in order to examine long-term effect of factors influencing students' bully and victim tendencies and changes in factors and groups. The first measurement took place at the beginning of June (beginning of the school year), the second in the middle of December (end of the school year). The parent's questionnaire applied once at the beginning of the school year.

First, students' experience in bullying was investigated in order to understand current situation of the phenomenon. Especially, differences in experience of being bullied, bullying and bystander behavior among different popularity groups as well as between boys and girls were compared. Then, In this longitudinal study, it was analyzed to what extend students' cognitive, social, and environmental factors predict bully and victim tendencies at a special point of time and half a year later, so that the factors influencing and the long-term effect of the factors could be examined. In addition, four groups (normal, bully,

victim, and bully-victim), which display distinctive dispositions, were built based on the bully and victim tendencies in order to contemplate the changes in different types of bully and victim groups and the changes in these factors and groups. Finally, discriminant analyses were calculated to find out the most conclusive variables to differentiate affiliating group changes.

## 5.1 Experience in Bullying

### 5.1.1 Number of Bullies and Victims

Although most students answered at both measuring points that there was no victim in their class, fewer students reported no victim at the end of the school year. Most students, who reported the existence of victims, answered that there was only one victim in their class at both measuring points. The rate of this answer increased during the school year. Whereas, the rate of answers that there were two or more than two victims in the class remained unchanged. The results of the second measuring point yielded a similar rate of victims as it is known from Kwak and Lee (1999), they reported a rate of 6.8% of students reported one or more than one victim and in the classes.

More than 60% of students answered that there was no bully in the class. Most students, who reported the existence of bullies in the class, answered that there were six or more than six bullies. This result is consistent with Kwak and Lee's (1999) study. In this study, 20.3% of the students reported that there were six or more than six bullies in the class, while 58.6% of the students reported no bully in the class.

According to the result of this study, most of students among the students, who believed the existence of victim and bully, answered existence of one victim and six and more than six bullies. The result is in accordance with hypothesis of the study.



### 5.1.2 Being Bullied Experience

Although more than 65% of the students answered that they had never been bullied, more girls reported having been bullied during elementary school than boys. The result is consistent with the Kwak and Lee's (1999) research, in which 19.5% of the girls started at least a first experience of being bullied in elementary school, compared to 10.3% of boys did it. More unpopular students than popular and than normal students reported that they had been bullied in elementary school for the first time.

Most students answered that they had not been bullied during the issuing questionnaire semester. There was no gender difference in the frequency of the experience to be bullied during the semester. This result is consistent with prior research (Hyde, 1984; Roland, 1987). More unpopular students than popular and normal students reported that they had been bullied during the semester at the first measuring point; however, there was no difference in the frequency of being bullied among different popularity groups at the second measuring point.

More boys than girls reported that they had been cursed, kicked and threatened, and deprived possession once or twice at the first measuring point. However, there was no gender difference in the experience of being bullied indirectly, e.g. being spoken ill. On the one hand, boys committed more overt and physical aggression than girls as expected, on the other hand, girls did not perpetrate indirect forms of bullying than boys. This finding is contrary to the expectation and prior research (Björkqvist, 1994; Crick, 1995), where girls reporting more indirect aggression than boys. Because the students, participating in the study, are in the beginning of the early adolescence, it is possible that girls have not developed their social demeanors than matured students yet.

However, most of the students reported that they had been cursed about their appearance once or twice. This finding shows that "making fun" about others' appearance is widespread and wasn't considered seriously.

Students showed a tendency not to report to parents or teachers that they had been victimized. Only about 3% of students reported an incidence to their parents or teachers. There is no gender difference. However, the rate of unpopular students' reporting the incidence to adults is as low as the rate of popular or normal students, although they were more often victimized than other group students. The low reporting rate can be explained because the victims are anxious about more hostile reaction by their peers after they report the incident to adults. When the students' answer to the question about victim's characteristics is concerned, then the preceding explanation would be more persuasive, because a high rate of students pointed out as a victims' characteristic to carry tales to teachers other students. In a study from Schaefer (1997) students did not consider reporting the bullying incidence to adults as good solution either on the contrary to teachers.

### 5.1.3 Bullying Experience

More than 90% of students reported that they had never bullied others. However, some of students answered that they had already bullied others for the first time during the elementary school. Especially, more girls than boys reported that they had bullied others in elementary school for the first time. This finding is similar to the result of the Kwak and Lee's(1999) study, in which more girls reported to have bulled others in elementary school for the first time than boys. Higher rate of unpopular students reported first bullying experience in elementary school than popular and normal students.

Although most students remained without bullying others during the school year, the rate of students, who had bullied others during questionnaire issuing semester, became higher at the end of the school year. At the beginning of school year, there had not been a gender difference in bullying experience, but more girls than boys answered that they had bullied others during the questionnaire issued semester. At both measuring points, there was

no difference in the bullying experience during the semester among popular, normal, and unpopular group students.

More boys than girls reported that they had ignored or hit others. About 2% of boys answered that they had ignored or hit others at least once per week. There is no gender difference in using indirect aggression. According to Roland (1993), girls tend to give more desirable answer than boys. Therefore, it is possible that the result did not show gender difference in using indirect aggression.

#### 5.1.4 Reason of Bullying and the Reaction

##### *Victim's Perspective*

Most victims reported that they did not know the reason why they had been bullied. Some of students answered 'I can not be in harmony with others' and 'I put on air importance' as the reason why they had been bullied by the peers. The result accords with the result of the Kwak and Lee's(1999) study. Most of the victims behave in a passive way after they had been bullied. Victims pretended behave as if nothing had happened or did not talk with nobody. There was no gender difference in the reaction after being bullied. In addition, most of the victims did not carry out any counteraction. There was no gender difference in the rate of answers that they do not undertake against bullying. This result is consistent with the result of the prior studies (Kwak & Lee, 1999; Noh, et al., 1999; Kim & Park, 1997). Although researchers consider passive reaction as maladjustment or avoidance, students thought it as an appropriated reaction (Schaefer, 1997). According to Gaudi (2000), adolescents thought the active counteraction may instigate bullies and bring more troubles with their peers. Therefore, they would be careful to take an action against bullying.

### *Bully's Perspective*

Most of the bullies selected 'the person speaks and does with an air of importance' as the reason of bullying. Bullies chose also as reason of bullying 'victims cannot be harmony with others' and 'victims ignore other students'. It means that bully attributed reason of bullying to the victim's eye-catching behavior or social skill problem. Although some of students selected victims' weakness and loneliness as bullying reasons, most bullies selected victim's eye-catching behavior and social skill problem as the reason why they bully the victim. This result is in accordance with the results of the prior research in which bullies attributed the reasons of bullying to the victim rather than to themselves (Kwak & Lee, 1999; Schaefer, 1996).

### *Bystander's Perspective*

Most students selected victim's eye-catching behaviors, e.g. putting on air important, as the characteristic of victim. Furthermore, students pointed out victim's underhanded behavior, e.g. carrying tales to teachers other students or being sneaky, and victim's appearance, e.g. looking foolish and having funny appearance as victim's characteristics. The results consist with prior study in Korea (Kwak & Lee, 1999; Noh, et al., 1999; Kim & Park, 1997), but the results are not consistent with the study from Schaefer (1997). In her study, a high rate of participants of the study answered victims' weakness as reason of bullying. Korean bystander's perspective would be more social or group oriented than perspectives of western's.

Most students reported that they did not take any action to help victims, although they thought that they should help the victims. However, about a quarter of students selected the answer 'they do not care about that others were bullied, because it is not their own business and a rate of the students, who chose the answer, become more at second measuring point. It is possible students become more indifferent during the school year one another. There is

neither gender difference nor popularity group difference in the responds of the question about what they .while other are bullied.

There is a tendency that only one victim is bullied by several bullies in the class. Students frequently use verbal aggression to victims, especially most students experienced 'cursing about appearance' as both a perpetrator and also as a victim as well. Boys committed more physical aggression than girls but girls experienced bullying earlier both as an aggressor and also as a victim than boys. Higher rate of unpopular students become a victim of bullying than normal or popular students. Most students and bullies except victims attribute the reason of bullying to the victims' eye-catching characteristics or social skill problem. Especially, most bystanders and victims do not take any action against bullying or bullies. Victims even do not report about the bullied incidence to adults.

## 5.2 Factors influencing bully and victim tendencies

In order to examine to which degree attributional styles, self-concepts, attitude toward aggression, parental factors, social supports, and cultural beliefs can predict students' bully and victim tendencies. In addition, the questions about students' bully tendency, stepwise multiple regression analysis were conducted.

### 5.2.1 Attributional style

Anger and its subsequent behavior are greater when a provocation is seen as intentional rather than unintentional, controllable rather than uncontrollable (Dyck & Rule, 1978; Ferguson & Rule, 1983; Greenwell & Dengerink, 1973, Weiner, 1992). The regression model of attributional styles in this study is comprised to two variables. In order to assess the actor's responsibility for

harm, the perceiver try to discern whether harm was intended or unintended by the actor on the one hand, and whether the action was controllable or uncontrollable. Counteraction or retaliation against actor is determined by the person's perception if the instigator is responsible for the incidence or not. Hudley (1994) found out that aggressive children showed a hostile attributional style than normal children.

In the study, students' bully tendency correlated moderately with intention attribution and controllability attribution. Attribution to intention was predictable of high bully and victim tendencies only at the measuring point, but it could predict neither bully tendency nor victim tendency half a year later. According to Regan & Totten (1975), observer can perceive more situational factor, when they attempt to think as the actor. At the beginning of the school year, students did not know each other well. So, they tended to attribute peers' instigation to the persons' harmful intention. Nevertheless, as time goes by, they would become familiar one another so that they would try to think the situation as the actor.

However, attribution to uncontrollable factors was predictable of bully and victim tendencies at first measuring point also one semester later. This finding is consistent with Weiner's (1992) argument that people become angry when they attribute the cause of incentives to the controllable factor. According to prior studies (Hudley, 2000; Shantz, 1994), the aggressors tend to show intention and controllability attribution styles. It is affirmed in this study, but according to the study, intention and controllability attribution predict victim tendency, too. It seems that hostile attributional styles could bring the students to aggressive behavior as a bully and a victim.

### 5.2.2 Self-concept

Self-concept correlated with both bully tendency also victim tendency negatively at the measuring point simultaneously but not a half year later. The students' self-concepts were predictable of victim tendency better than bully

tendency. The finding confirmed Leary's research (1999), which found out relationship between victimization.

Global self-worth predicted bully and victim tendencies and social acceptance was predictable of victim tendency. Especially, the perceived social acceptance are more predictable the victim tendency. Olweus (1997) reported that submissive victims suffer from low self-esteem, often consider themselves as a failure or a loser and feel stupid, ashamed and unattractive. Higher global self-worth students had, the lower bully and victim tendencies they showed. Perceived social acceptance influenced student's victim tendency, when the students perceived low social acceptance, they tended to be victims. The thinking about themselves as a human being could help constructing self-assurance and independence.

Self-concept was only predictable of bully and victim tendencies at the measuring point. The early adolescence is a time of changes. According to Rosenberg (1986), there are several developmental trends that they began to become more complex and multidimensional. Therefore, Harter (1999) argued that early adolescents start to integrate their self-facets, but have not organized those facets into coherent, internally consistent and realistic self-system. In hence, the self-evaluations fluctuate in this period. It is possible that the self-concepts could not predict the bully and victim tendencies half a year later because of the fluctuation of self-concept. Then, nobody dare to harm them and they don't need to harm others to acquire positive self-concept. Low social acceptance could bring children to have low self-esteem and their unassertive behaviors could make them a target of bullying.

### 5.2.3 Attitude toward aggression

After a person interpret the actor's responsibility of an incidence, he/she consider the reaction if he/she would undertake counterattack against the actor. In the process, beliefs or morals play an important role; especially, attitude toward aggression is decisive. Slaby and Guerr (1988) found out that

aggressive adolescents displayed higher tendencies to believe that aggressive reactions are acceptable than less aggressive adolescents. Passive victims, who a large rate of victims belong to tend to be withdrawn, less assertive and prohibit to use aggressive means (Schwartz et al., 1993).

However, there is no study, to what extent examined how much attitude toward aggression predict students' bully and victim tendency. This study examined to which degree the attitude toward aggression predict student's bully and victim tendencies.

In this research, the positive attitude toward aggression correlated with bully tendency positively at the first measuring point and showed a negative and low correlation with victim tendency half a year later.

Attitude toward aggression significantly predicted the bully tendency at the first measuring point and the victim tendency in a very low degree half a year later. Less assertive and the avoidance of aggressive means (Schwartz et al. 1993) might let victims easy to be a target of victim easily.

#### 5.2.4 Cultural Beliefs

However, the results showed rather the contrary phenomenon. In spite of the low degree of prediction and no long-term effect on the tendency, vertical individualism predicted the bully tendency, but not victim tendency. The higher vertical collectivism could predict significantly bully and victim tendencies at the measuring point and half a year later.

A vertical collectivistic person could become dominant when their status is higher than others, but when they are in the same status with others, they tend to be cooperative and try to be harmony with others. Peer relation in the class is horizontal, therefore the vertical collectivistic individual are inclined to show low bully tendency and low victim tendency as well, because they are not conspicuous in the situation. However, vertical individualistic people tend to be distinctive and want to dominate others at the same time. Therefore, they could bully someone, who is not very agreeable with their thinking. In



spite of the tendency, they are still individualistic; their individualistic tendency limits the dominative tendency. Therefore, the predictability of vertical individualism is very low and does not have long-term effect.

#### 5.2.5 Perceived Social Support

When children have a supportive relationship with their parents then they are better able to build supportive relationships with their peers (Helsen et al., 2000). The children, who build supportive relationships with others, are less at risk to be bullied and do not bully others. In this study, the social support displayed highly negative correlations with bully tendency and victim tendency. For tendencies parental support is most predictable at the second measuring point. However, the persons who have an affect on the tendencies are slightly different between bully and victim tendencies. Support from teachers predicted lower level of bully tendency, but not of victim tendency and support from classmates predicted lower level of victim tendency but not bully tendency. Also the persons, whose support continually influenced the tendencies from the first measuring point to the second measuring point, are different. In spite of a rather low degree, support from teacher at the beginning of the school year predicted the tendency of bully at the end of the school year but not victim tendency and support from parents at the first measuring point predicted the victim tendency at second measuring point but could not predict bully tendency. The support from close friends predict both bully and victim tendencies but the degree of predictability was weak and did not have an affect on the tendencies half a year later.

The support from parents is most important variable to predict students' bully and also victim tendencies at the first measuring point. Supportive relationships with parents is the basis of child's supportive relationship and the victims have more problems with their peers than the perpetrators. Therefore, the parental support is more predictable of victim tendency than bully tendency, which have less problems with the peers. In addition, the meaning of the

support from parents decreases over time (Youniss and Smollar, 1985), this might be the reason why the parental support at the beginning of the school year can not or only weakly predict students' bully and victim tendencies at the end of the school year.

The phenomenon, that a low level of support from teachers predict students' bullying tendency, might be explained by following reason. Most of bullying is committed in the classroom at school; the support from teachers includes the administration and attention from teachers at the class. Then the high degree of perceived teachers' administration could restrain the perceived possibility to commit bullying. In addition, bully tendency correlated with vertical individualism, which is dominant, disobedient, competitive, and distinctive. Because of the preceding characteristic, bullies could get even negative feedback from their teachers. Nevertheless, support from teachers does not have a meaningful affect on the victim tendency. Because the perspectives on a person as a teacher might differ from the perspectives on the person as a peer, it could be possible that the victims have negative relationship with their peers in spite of no negative feedback from teachers or even teachers' help.

#### 5.2.6 Family (Caregiver) Factor

##### *Parental raring style*

Parents' supportive raring style contributes to the development of children's positive social skills (Schaffer, 1994). However, a cold, rejecting, and conflictive raring style contributes to the children's aggressive behavior style (Schwartz, et al. 1997). In the study, parental conflictive and rejecting raring style could not predict both the bully and the victim tendencies. However, the parental acceptance predicted student's victim tendency. The students perceived higher parental support tended to show lower victim tendency. Although the result is different from the expectation, it can be explained with parental supportive raring style. The children, who have a supportive

relationship with their parents, can develop the supportive relationships with their peers. Therefore, the supportive relationship with the peers avoids the negative instigation from their peers. Therefore, parental acceptance is more important factor than the conflictive and rejecting rearing style for contributing to child's bullying behavior.

#### *Parental Attitude toward Aggression*

The child, whose parents favor aggressive solutions, reported a high degree of aggression (Guera & Slaby, 1988). Therefore, it was expected that the child, whose parents have positive attitudes toward aggression, would be inclined to higher bully tendency. However, the parental positive attitudes toward aggression did not predict students' bully tendency but the victim tendency at the measuring point. The children whose parents have lower positive attitude toward aggression showed lower victim tendency. Those children could develop less conflictive relationship with others, hence they might be inclined to show lower victim tendency.

#### *Parental cultural beliefs*

A high degree of vertical collectivistic belief has similar characteristic to the authoritarian rearing style. According to Dekovic and Janssens (1992), Children whose parents have authoritarian rearing style display a hostile attributional bias, are aggressive and disliked by their peers. Therefore it was expected that children whose parents show a higher degree of vertical collectivistic belief, might display a higher degree of bully and victim tendency. Nonetheless, the result of the study did not affirm the expectation. The parental vertical individualistic and vertical collectivistic tendency predicted neither bully nor victim tendencies. The parental horizontal collectivistic belief did not predict lower victim tendencies but lower bully tendencies. The parents with higher horizontal collectivistic belief are more supportive and

cooperative. Therefore, their children could developed the supportive and cooperative relationship with others and were not aggressive to others. Horizontal individualistic beliefs from parents predicted the victim tendency. The parents with higher horizontal individualistic tendency, seemed to foster their children's self-reliance and autonomy but not distinctive. Then the children did not easily become a target of bullying.

### 5.3 Suggestions

Most students and bullies attribute the bullying to the victims' eye-catching and unharmonious characteristics. Especially, most bystanders and victims do not take any action against bullying. Even victims do not report about the bullied incidence to adults. Therefore, it is very difficult for outsiders or for teachers to recognize the existence of a victim in the class. However, the careful observation of the interaction among students in the class would be useful to identify victims and bullies. Especially, students often speak slang or jargon for humiliating their peers; therefore, it is very difficult to understand it for outsider. It means that teachers have to pay more attention for catching up with the children's communication patterns. Especially, the person, who behave distinctively and often get critics or humiliation from others during the class and also during breaks, must be carefully observed. According to Olweus (1999), he reported the bullying problem was decreased through understanding the fundamental democratic right for human-being and justification. If student became sensitive for human right, they would bully others less, help the victims and report about the bullying incidence. A few victims were bullied because teachers had shown preference him/her to other students. Those behaviors make other students jealous and become to feel unjustified. They would think that they are treated partially by teachers. Therefore, teachers have to consciously pay attention to every students impartially, so that any students don't feel their teacher is indifferent to them.

The students, who had attributed other's instigation to the intention, showed higher bully and victim tendencies and the attribution style to attribute others' incentives to the uncontrollable factors predicted bully and victim tendencies. Attribution to the uncontrollable factors correlated negatively to the bully and victim tendencies. Therefore, attribution retraining could reduce the possibility of bullying (Hudley et al, 1998). It is useful to train students to observe carefully and to interpret accurately the situation, when they experience provocative situations. In addition, the role playing activities help to understand other's perspectives.

Perceptions of self-worth and social acceptance are predictors of students' victim tendency and the low self-worth can predict bully tendency, too. The students showing low self-worth feeling and perceived social acceptance showed higher victim tendency and the students reporting low self-worthy perception had higher bullying tendency. Therefore, it is helpful to improve students' global self-worth feeling and social acceptance feeling for investigation model during the class. Students can enhance their self-worthy feeling through the tasks, which are challenging but achievable. Especially, cooperative works with peers can enhance an attachment to the group and improve social skills, intimacy among groups and gain the social acceptance. According to the numerous prior studies, Jigsaw, STAD, and a group investigation foster students' communicating skill for mutual understanding, interdependent interaction. Hence, it could be helpful for teacher to apply those cooperative work during the class. Therefore, appropriate organizing students' work and take in class can help to prohibit students bullying (Gaudi, 1999). The attitude toward aggression predicts the bullying tendency and victim tendency. Attitude toward aggression correlated with the bully tendency positively, whereas with the victim tendency negatively. Therefore, the students can decrease their aggressive tendency through changing in the their attitude toward aggression. Therefore, it is important to make students recognize the maliciousness of bullying. To educate human right and freedom can limit students' impulse to perpetrate bullying behavior through the discussion and role-playing activities (Frey at al., 2000; Olweus, 1999). It can encourage

counteractions against aggression and help for victim from bystanders. The students, who tend to be weak and unassertive, can be easily targets of bullying. Assertiveness training and social skill training can help the student to prevent being a victim.

The study demonstrated that vertical collectivistic tendency predicts the victim tendency. The vertical individualistic tendency predicts the bully tendency. The students displayed higher vertical collectivistic tendency showed lower bully and victim tendencies. Their social attitude should change through the social norm; fairness. A vertical individualistic person is competitive and dominant (Triandis, 1995). They can change those peculiarities through cooperative works with peers. Through those activities, the competitive students would learn to share the responsibility and the results of the cooperative work with their peers.

Social support is most effective to influence students' bully tendency and victim tendency as well. Most of all, parental support is most predictable factor of students' bully and victim tendencies. Especially support from teachers predicts of bully tendency. Therefore the administration and careful attention on the all of students in class are important and keeping contact with the parents is helpful to understand students better and in turn, can undertake cooperative intervention with them. In addition, support from classmates predict victim tendency. The students perceived the high social support by their classmates showed the low victim tendency. Through cooperative activities, the understanding among students in class can be fostered.

Parents supportive rearing style predict the children's victim tendency too. The supportive relationship between parents and their children contribute the development of a children's social skill and supportive relationship with others.

Some factors, which were analyzed in the study, predict the students' bully and victim tendencies at a very low level. The small variances of the individual variables can explain the lower predictabilities. The problem could be solved through a large sample size. The results of this study are limited to generalize, because the study was conducted with data from two schools in a

city in Korea. In prospective studies, data from various regions in various cultures can improve the generality of study; also differences in the effectiveness of factor in various cultures could be compared. The interaction among the factors, which have affect on the students' bully and victim tendency could be analyzed.

Existing studies have reported only high correlations between aggressor and their hostile attribution styles. A finding of this study suggested higher correlation between victims and their hostile attribution styles, too. The result of study shows the possibility that victims' inadequate attributional style could bring them to a conflictive situation with their peers. Although the cultural beliefs as a belief and also as a environmental factor could play a important role to affect on the bullying, there have not been the study, which investigated the relationship between cultural beliefs and the students' bullying behavior. This study attempted to investigate the relationship between the cultural beliefs and students' bully and victim tendency for the first time. It is demonstrated that the vertical individualistic beliefs predict bully tendency and collectivistic beliefs predict victim tendency. This study provides not only some new results on individual factors influencing bullying phenomenon but also a synthetic perspective on bully phenomenon by considering various aspects simultaneously. The results could furnish in the theoretical field with new reference and in the practical field as well.

## 6 References

Andreou, E. (2001). Bully/victim problems and their association with copying behaviour in conflictual peer interactions among school-aged children. *Educational Psychology an International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology, 21(1)*, 59-66.

Arora, C. M. J. (1996). Defining bullying. toward a clearer general understanding and more effective intervention strategies. *School Psychology International, 17*, 317-329.

Arora, C. M. J. (1994). Measuring bullying with the life in School checklist, *Patoral Care in Education, 12*, 11-15.

Arora, C. M. J. & Tompson, D. A. (1987) Defining bullying for a secondary school. *Education and Child Psychology, 14*, 110-120.

Bacchini, D., Binino, S., Costabile, A., Fonzi, A., Genta, M. L., & Menesini, E. (1999). Italy. In R. Catalano, J. Junger-tas, Y. Morita, D. Olweus, P. Slee, & P. K. Smith (Eds.), *The Nature of School Bullying : a cross-national perspective* (pp141-145). London, UK: Routledge.

Bandura, A. (1983). Psychological mechanisms of aggression. In Geen, R. G., Donnerstein, E. I. (Eds.), *Aggression: Theoretical and Empirical Reviews* (pp 1-35). New York: Academic Press

Bandura, A., & Walter, R. (1959). Adolescent Aggression: a Study of the Influence of Child-Training Practices and Family Interrelationships. New York: Ronald Press Co.



Berkowitz, L. (1983). The experience of anger as a paralleled process in the display of impulsive "Angry" Aggression. In R. G. Geen & E. I. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Aggression: Theoretical and Empirical Reviews* (pp 103-131). New York: Academic Press.

Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., & Dasen, P. R. (1992). *Cross-cultural psychology, research and applications*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Björkqvist, K. (1994) Sex differences in physical, verbal, and indirect aggression: A review of recent research. *Sex Roles, 30*, 177-188.

Björkqvist, K., Ekman, K., & Lagerspetz, K. (1982). Bullies and their victims: Their ego picture, ideal ego picture and normal ego picture. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 23*, 307-313.

Blatchford, S. (1991). A study of black students' perceptions of racism in initial teacher education. *British Educational Research Journal, 17*, 35-58.

Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and Loss. Vol.2: Seperation*. New York: Basic Books.

Bosworth, K., Espelage, D., DuBay, T., Daytner, G., & Karageorge, K (2000). Preliminary evaluation of a multimedia violence prevention program for adolescents. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 24*, 268-280.

Bryne. B (1999). Ireland. In R. Catalano, J. Junger-tas, Y. Morita, D. Olweus, P. Slee, & P. K. Smith (Eds.), *The Nature of School Bullying : a cross-national perspective* (pp141-145). London, UK: Routledge.

Buss, A. H. (1961). *The Psychology of Aggression*. New York: Wiley.

Cairns, R. B. & Cairns, B. D. (1986). The developmental-interactional view of social behavior: four issues of adolescent aggression. In D. Olewus, J. Block, & M. Radke-Yarrow (Eds.), *Development of antisocial and prosocial behavior*.

Carlo, G., Roesch, S. C., & Melby, J. (1998). The multiplicative relations of parenting and temperament to prosocial and antisocial behaviors in adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 18*, 266-290.

Coie, J. D. & Dodge, K. A. (1998). Aggression and antisocial behavior. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 779-862). New York: Wiley.

Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., Terry, R., & Wright, V. (1991). *The role of aggression in peer relationship: an analysis of aggression episodes in boys' play groups*.

Coleman, P. K., & Byrd, C. P. (2003). International correlates of peer victimization among young adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 32*, 301-314.

Craig, W. M., Henderson, K., & Murphy, J. G. (2000). Prospective teachers attitudes toward bullying and victimization. *School Psychology International, 21*, 5-21.

Craig, W. M., Pepler, D. & Atlas, R. (2000). Observations of Bullying in the Playground and in the Classroom. *School Psychology International, 21*, 22-36.

Crick, N. R. (1995). Relational aggression: the role of intent attributions, feelings of distress, and provocation type. *Development and Psychopathology, 7*, 313-322.

Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development, 66*, 710-722.

Cummings, E. M. & Waxler, Z. (1992). Emotions and the socialization of aggression: adult's angry behavior and children's arousal and aggression. In A. Frączek & H. Zumkley (Eds), *Socialization and Aggression* (pp61-84). Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag.

Derzon, J. H. (2001). Antisocial Behavior and the Prediction of Violence: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychology in the School, 38*, 93-106.

Dollard, J., Doob, L. W., Miller, N. E., Mowrer, O. H. and Sears, R. R. (1939). *Frustration and Aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Edens, J. F., Cavell, T. A., & Hughes, J. N. (1999). The self- systems of aggressive children: a cluster-analytic investigation. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and allied disciplines, 40*, 441-453.

Edwards, C. H. (2001). Student violence and the moral dimensions of education. *Psychology in the Schools, 38*, 249-257.

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

Fabes, R. A. & Eisenberg, N (1992). Young children's emotional arousal and anger/aggressive behaviors. In A. Frączek & H. Zumkley (Eds). *Socialization and Aggression* (pp 85-102). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Ferguson, T. J., Rule, B. G. (1983). An attributional perspective on anger and aggression. In R. G. Geen, & E. L. Donnerstein (Eds.). *Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews* (pp 41-69). New York: Academic Press.

Ferguson, T. J., & Cillessen, A. H. (1992). Individual and peer group factors in the stability of social status, antisocial, and prosocial behaviors. In A. Frączek & H. Zumkley (Eds). *Socialization and aggression* (pp. 104-115). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Ferstl, R., Niebel, G., & Hanewinkel, R. (1993). *Gutacherliche Stellungnahme zur Verbreitung von Gewalt und Aggression an Schulen*. In Schleswig-Holstein, Kiel: Ministerin fuer Bildung, Wissenschaft, Kultur und Sport des Landes Schleswig-Holstein.

Fiske, A. P (1991). *Structures of Social Life: The Four Elementary Forms of Human Relations: Communal Sharing, Authority Ranking, Equality Matching, Market Pricing*. New York: NY, US: Free Press.

Frączek, A. & Kirwil, L. (1992). Family life and child aggression: studies on some socialization conditions for development of aggression. In A. Frączek & H. Zumkley (Eds), *Socialization and aggression* (pp153-170). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M. K., & Guzzo, B. A. (2000). Second step: Preventing aggression by promoting social competence. *Journal of emotional and behavioral disorders, 8*, 101-112.

Fuchs, M., Lamnek, S., & Luedtke, J. (1996). *Schule und Gewalt. Realitaet und Wahrnehmung eines sozialen Problems*. Opladen, Germany: Leske & Buderich.

Funk, W. (1995). *Nuernberger Schueler-Studie*. Regensburg, Germany: Roderer.

Furlong, M. & Morrison, G. (2000). The School in School Violence: Definition and Facts. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 8*, 71-82.

Galbo J. J., & Demetrulias D. M. (1996). Recollections of nonparental significant adults during childhood and adolescence. *Youth & Society, 27*, 403-420.

Galen, B. R. & Underwood, M. K. (1997). A developmental investigation of social aggression among children. *Developmental psychology, 33*, 589-600.

Hart, C. H., Yang, C., Nelson, D. A., Robinson, C.C., Jin, S., & Wu, P. (2001). Subtype of aggression in Chinese and U.S. preschoolers: Sex and peer status linkages. Manuscript in preparation.

Hanewinkel, R., & Knaack, R. (1997). Mobbing: Eine Fragebogenstudie zum Ausmaß von Aggression und Gewalt an Schulen. *Empirische Paedagogik, 11*, 405-422.

[Http://www.hani.co.kr/section-0051006/2003/08/005100006200308191613832.html](http://www.hani.co.kr/section-0051006/2003/08/005100006200308191613832.html)

Hay, D. (2000). Which way to the good life? The social policy implication of child and family well-being. *Education Canada, 39(4)*, 32-35.

Heider, F. (1958). *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. New York: Wiley. p. 82.

Helsen, M., Wilma, V., & Wim, M. (2000). Social support from parents and friends and emotional problems in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 29*, 319-335.

Hinde, R.A. (1992). Some complexities in aggressive behavior. In A. Frańczek & H. Zumkley (Eds), *Socialization and aggression* (pp3-10). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Hoover, J. & Hazler, R. J. (1991). Bullies and Victims. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 25*, 212-219.

Hudley, C., Britsch, B. Wakefield, W. D., Smith, T. Demorat, M., & Cho, S.-J. (1998). An attribution retraining program to reduce aggression in elementary school students. *Psychology in the school, 35*, 271-281.

Hudley, C. A. (1994). Attribution retraining and behavior change among highly aggressive and nonaggressive African American boys. *Paper Presentated at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-6)*, 35

Hudley, C. A. (1990). Attributions for pride, anger, and guilt among incarcerated minority adolescents. *Research Report, 143*, 1-26.

Huesmann, K., R., Guerra, N. G., Miller, L. S., & Zelli, A. (1992). The role of social norms in the development of aggressive behavior. In A. Frączek & H. Zumkley (Eds.), *Socialization and aggression* (pp. 139-152). New York: Springer.

Hyde, J. S. (1984). How large are gender differences in aggression? A developmental meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 20*, 722-36.

Institute of Mental Health of Samsung Health Insurance (1997). *Effects of bullying on maladjustment*. In school research report Seoul: Institute of Mental Health of Samsung Health Insurance.

Kalliotis, P. (2000), Bullying as a Special Case of Aggression. *School Psychology International, 21*, 47-64.

Kelly, E. & Cohn, T. (1988). Racism in schools: new research evidence. In B. Tremtham & Lowenstein, L. F. (Eds.), *Violent and disruptive behavior in schools*. NAS: Hempstead.

Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kagitcibasi, C., Choi, S., & Yoon, G.(1994). *Individualism and Collectivism Theory, Method, and Application, 18*, Cross-Cultural Research and Methodology Series, London: Sage Publications.

Kim, Y., Park, H., & Cho, U. (1997). *Bullies and victims*. Research report 29 Seoul: Conversation Plaza of Adolescents.

Kingery, P. M., Coggeshall, M. B. & Alford, A. A. (1998). Violence at School: Recent Evidence from Four National Surveys. *Psychology in the Schools, 35*, 247-258.

Kornadt, Hands-Joachim (1984). Motivation theory of aggression and its relation to social psychological approaches. In A. Mummendey. (Ed.). *Social psychology of aggression* (pp21-31). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Ku, B (1997). *Reasons of adolescents' bullying and intervention*. Research report 29 Seoul: Conversation Plaza of Adolescents.

Kurdek, L. & Krile, D. (1982). A developmental analysis of the relationship between peer acceptance and both interpersonal understanding and perceived social self-competence. *Child Development, 53*, 1485-1491.

Kwak, K. & Lee, C. (1999). *Bullying at School: Situation and Characteristics*. Seoul: A-San Foundation Press.

Ladd, G. W. & Burgess, K. B. (2001). Do relational risks and protective factors moderate the linkages between childhood aggression and early psychological and school adjustment? *Child Development, 72*, 1579-1601.

Lagerspetz, K. M., Björkqvist, K., Berts, M., & King, E. (1982). Group aggression among school children in three schools. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 23*, 45-52.

Lee, C. & Kwak, K. (2000). Social concept and social support according to bullying types. *Korean Journal of Psychology: Development, 13(1)*, 65-80.

Loesel, F., Averbek, M. & Bliesener, M. (1997) Gewalt zwischen Schuelern der Sekundarstufe: Eine Untersuchung zur Praevalenz und Beziehung zu allgemeiner Aggressivitaet und Delinquenz. *Zeitschrift fuer Empirische Padagogik, 11*, 327-349.

Lorenz, K. (1966). *On aggression*. New York: Harcourt.

Newman, R. S., Murray, B., & Lussier, C. (2001). Confrontation with aggressive peers at school: Students' reluctance to seek help from the teacher. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*, 398-410.

Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Martin, L. R. (1999). Violence in german schools - what school counselors can do. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 21*, 301-313.

Melzer, W. & Rostampour, P. (1996). Schulische Gewaltformen and Taeter-Opfer- Problematik. In W. Schubarth, F.U. Kolb & H. Willems (Hrsg.) *Gewalt an Schulen* (pp. 121-148). Opladen, Germany: Leske & Budrich.



Menesini, E., Argentieri, M., Baroni, L., Lazzari, R. And Spadoni, E. (1996). Le prepotenze tra ragazzi a scuola . Un'esperienza di ricerca intervento condotta con alunni di scuola media. *Scuola e Didattica*, 4, 29-34.

Mohr, A. & Becker, P. (1997). Strategien von Schülerinnen und Schülern im Umgang mit Gewalt in der Schule. *Empirische Pädagogik. Zeitschrift zu Theorie und Praxis erziehungswissenschaftlicher Forschung*, 11, 351-367.

Niebel, G., Handwinkel, R., & Ferstl, R. (1993). Gewalt und Aggression in Schleswig-Holsteinischen Schulen. *Zeitschrift fuer Paedagogik*, 39, 775-798.

Nolting, H.-P. (1983). *Lernfall Aggression: Wie sie entsteht - Wie sie zu vermindern ist. Theorie und Empirie aggressiven Verhaltens und seiner Alternativen*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Noh, S., Kim, S., Lee, D., & Kim, J. (1999). *A research for adolescents' bullying behavior*. Seoul: Crime Policy Institution.

Olweus, D. (1996) Bullying at school: Knowledge base and an effective intervention program. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 794, 265-276.

Olweus, D. (1999). Sweden. In R. Catalano, J. Junger-tas, Y. Morita, D. Olweus, P. Slee, & P. K. Smith (Eds.). *The nature of school bullying: a cross-national perspective* (pp141-145). London, UK: Routledge.

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

Olweus, D. (1993) Understanding and preventing bullying. In M. Torny (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research*. Chicago: University Press.

Olweus, D. (1992) Bullying among school children: Intervention and prevention. In R. D. Peters, R. J. McMahon, & V. L. Quincy (Eds.). *Aggression and violence throughout the life span*. Newbury: Sage.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully-victim problems among school children: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. In K. Rubin & D. Pepler (Eds.), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression* (pp. 85-128). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Olweus, D. (1984) Aggressors and their Victims: Bullying at School. In N. Frude & G. Gault (Eds.), *Disruptive behavior in Schools*. New York: John Wiley.

Olweus, D. (1981). Bullying among school-boys. In N. Cantwell (Ed.) *Children and violence*. Stockholm: Akademilitteratur.

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools. Bullies and whipping boys*. Washington, D. C.: Hemisphere Press.

Owens, L., Slee, P., & Shute, R. (2000). It hurts a hell of a lot..." The effect of indirect aggression on teenage girls. *School Psychology International*, 21, 359-376.

O'Moore, A. M., Kirkham, C. & Smith, M. (1997) Bullying behavior in Irish schools in Ireland: a nationwide study. *Irish Journal of Psychology*, 18, 141-169.

O'Moore, A. M., & Hillery, B. (1989) Bullying in Dublin schools. *The Irish Journal of Psychology*, 10, 30, 426-441.

Parke, R. D., & Slaby, R. G. (1983). The development of aggression. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol. 4. Socialization, Personality, and Social Development, 4<sup>th</sup> ed.* New York: Wiley.

Patterson, G. R. (1974). *Coercive family process.* Eugene, OR: Castilia Press.

Peake, P. K. & Rodriguez, M. (2000). Regulating the interpersonal self: Strategic self-regulation for coping with rejection sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 776-792.

Pellegrini, A. D. & Blatchford, P. (2000). *The Child at School.* London, UK: Arnold publisher.

Pellegrini, A. D., Bartini, M., & Brooks, F. (1999). School bullies, victims, and aggressive victims: factors relating to group affiliation and victimization in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*, 216-224.

Pellegrini, A. D. (1985). The relations between symbolic play and Literate Behaviour: A review and critique of the empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research, 55*(1), 107-121.

Pepler, D., Craig, W. M., & Roberts, W. L. (1998). Observations of aggressive and non aggressive children on the school playground. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 44*, 255-76.

Perry, D. G., Kusel, S. J., & Perry, L. C. (1988). Victims of Peer Aggression. *Developmental Psychology, 24*, 807-814.

Perry, D. G., Perry, L. C. & Kennedy, E. (1992). Conflict and the development of antisocial behavior. In C. U. Shantz and W. W. Hartup (eds.)

*Conflict in Child and Adolescent Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pope, A. W. & Bierman, K. L. (1999). Predicting adolescent peer problems and antisocial activities: the relative roles of aggression and dysregulation. *Developmental Psychology*, *35*, 335-346.

Petterson. G. R., Littman, R. A., & Bricker, W.(1967). Assertive behavior in children: a setup toward a theory of aggression. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *32(5)*, Serial No. 113.

Poulin, F., & Boivin, M. (1999). Proactive and reactive aggression and boys' friendship quality in mainstream classrooms. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, *7*,168-177.

Prinstein, M. J. & Cillessen, A. H. (2003). Forms and functions of adolescent peer aggression associated with high levels of peer status. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *49*, 310-342.

Pulkkinen, L. & Tremblay, R. E. (1992). Patterns of boys' social adjustment in two cultures and at different ages: A longitudinal perspective. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *15*, 527-553.

Rigby K. (2000). Effects of peer victimization in schools and perceived social support on adolescent well-being. *Journal of Adolescence*, *23*, 57-68.

Rigby K. (1997). *Bullying in Australian schools-and what to do about it*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Roland E. (1989) Bullying: the Scandinavian research tradition. In D. Tattum (Ed.), *Bullying in School*.

Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K.M.J., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status in the group. *Aggressive Behavior, 22*, 1-15.

Schäfer, M. (1998). Gruppenzwang als Ursache für Bullying?, *Report Psychologie, 11/12*, 914-927.

Schaffer, D. R. (1994) *Social and personality development*. Belmont: Wadworth.

Schwartz, D. (2000). Subtypes of Victims and Aggressors in Children's Peer Groups. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 28*, 181-192.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J.E. (1997). The early socialization of aggressive victims of bullying. *Child Development, 68*, 665-675.

Shantz, D. V. (1983). Correlates of Fighting in First and Second Grade Children: A Naturalistic Study. *Paper Presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (Detroit, MI, April 21-24)*, 16

Shechtman, Z. (2000). An innovative intervention for treatment of child and adolescent aggression: an outcome study. *Psychology in the school, 37*, 157-167.

Skinner, E. A., & Schindler, A., & Tschechne, M. (1990). Self-other differences in children's perceptions about the causes of important events. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 58*, 144-155.

Smetana, J. (1982). *Concepts of Self and Morality: Women's Reasoning about Abortion*. New York: Praeger.

Smith, P. K., Cowie, H., Olafsson, R. F. & Liefoghe, A. P. D. (2002). Definitions of Bullying: A Comparison of Terms Used, and Age and Gender Differences, in a Fourteen-Country International Comparison. *Society for Research in Child Development*, 73, 1119-1133.

Smith, P. K. (1999). England and Wales. In R. Catalano, J. Junger-tas, Y. Morita, D. Olweus, P. Slee, & P. K. Smith (Eds.). *The nature of school bullying: a cross-national perspective* (pp141-145). London, UK: Routledge.

So, S. (1999). Effects of social relation improvement program on the attitude toward social relationship and on the self-efficacy. *Journal of Student Guidance and Counseling*.

Stevens, V., Oost, Van P., & De Bourdeaudhuij, De I. (2001). Implementation process of the flemish antibullying intervention and relation with program effectiveness. *Journal of school psychology*, 39, 303-317.

Talmi, A., & Harter, S. (1998). The role of social support provided by parents and nonparental significant adults in the lives of young adolescents. Unpublished manuscript, University of Denver, Denver, CO.

Tedeschi, J. T. (1983). Social influence theory and aggression. In R. G. Geen & E. I. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews* (pp. 136-161). New York: Academic Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1993). Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 27, 155-180.

Wells, L. E. & Rankin, J. (1983). Self-concept as a mediating factor in delinquency. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 46 (March, 1). 11-22.

Whitney, I. & Smith, P. K. (1993). A Survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Educational Research*, 35, 3-25.

Xie, H., Swift, D. J., Cairns, B. D., & Cairns, R. B. (2002). Aggressive behaviors in social interaction and developmental adaptation: A narrative analysis of interpersonal conflicts during early adolescence. *Social Development*, 11, 205-224.

Yohji, M., Haruo, S., Kumiko, S., Mitsuru, T. (1999). Japan. In R. Catalano, J. Junger-tas, Y. Morita, D. Olweus, P. Slee, & P. K. Smith (Eds.), *The nature of school bullying: a cross-national perspective* (pp141-145). London, UK: Routledge.

Zillman, D (1983). Arousal and aggression. In R. G. Geen, & E. I. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Aggression: Theoretical and empirical reviews* (pp 75-97). New York: Academic Press.

Zumkley, H. (1992). Stability of individual differences in aggression. In A. Frączek & H. Zumkley (Eds), *Socialization and aggression*. (pp. 45-60). Berlin: Springer.

Zumkley, H. (1984). Individual differences and aggressive interactions. A. Mummendey (Ed.), *Social psychology of aggression* (pp33-49). Berlin: Springer.

## 7 Appendix



# Student Questionnaire

These questions are about school life. Please give just one answer to each question. Please, circle the number, which is applicable for your situation.

LMU Kim, Su-jeong

## Part I

Middle school 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( )

Gender male \_\_\_\_\_ female \_\_\_\_\_

Birthday and Birth year \_\_\_\_\_

## Part II

How many close friends do you have in your class?

I have a close friend in my class.

I have 2-3 close friends in my class.

I have 4-5 close friends in my class.

I have more than 6 close friends in my class.

What is group bullying?

It is the group bullying that a student is annoyed from other friend(s) with following method.

- Other friend(s) tell vulgar expression, tease a student, or curse a student.
- Other friend(s) ignore a student, or don't give the student any role, when they do any activity.
- Other friend(s) hit, kick, push, bother, or threaten a student.
- Other friend(s) spread false rumor about a student, therefore make another friends hate the student.
- Other friend(s) make a fun a student in the way, which hurts the student.

These cases can often take place, and the student, who is alienated from others, cannot defend him/herself.

However, it is not bullying, when close friends make fun each other for pleasure. In addition, it is not bullying, that the students, who have similar abilities, fight each other for competing physical strength.

- **You think how many students, who are bullied by other students, are there in your class (include you)?**
  - Nobody
  - 1 student
  - 2 students
  - 3 students
  - 4 students
  - 5 students
  - More than 6

- **How many students have participated in the bullying activity in your class in this semester (include you)?**

- Nobody
- 1 student
- 2 students
- 3 students
- 4 students
- 5 students
- More than 6

- **When have you been bullied first time?<sup>1</sup>**

- 1) I have never been bullied.
- 2) In elementary school.
- 3) In middle school.

The others \_\_\_\_\_

4)

	Never	Once or twice	Twice or three times per month	Once per week	Several times per week
How many times have you been alienated from other friends this semester?					
Other students cursed me and made me fun.					
Other students ignored and excluded me from plays or cooperative works.					
Other students pushed, hit, threatened, and kicked me.					
Other students spread false rumor about me and made friends hate me					
Other students destroyed my possession and deprived my money					
Other students cursed characteristics of my body and appearance.					

---

<sup>1</sup> Only used at the first measuring point

• **Why do other students bully you? (Circle all applicable items)**

- I have never been bullied.
- Because I put on an air importance
- Because I ignore them
- Because the teacher likes just me.
- Because I am a well-heeled person.
- Because my appearance is too attractive.
- Because my appearance is peculiar.
- Because I can not be in harmony with others.
- Because there are bad students in my classroom.
- I don't know, why they bully me.

• **What did you do after being bullied? (Circle all applicable items)**

- I have never been bullied
- I am absent from school.
- I don't talk with nobody.
- I become enervated.
- I wonder playground alone.
- I have lunch alone.
- I walk with dropping my head down.
- I don't go the place, in which other students might bully me.
- I argue against it.
- I do in normal way like nothing is happened

• **Which kind of method do you use to solve the problem after being bullied?**

- I have never been bullied.
- I tell it my parents.
- I discuss with a teacher about it.
- I visit a counselor at school or a counseling center.
- I go to the police and report it.
- I will change the school.
- I will do a temporary absence from school.
- I will resist bullying behavior.
- I ignore those students.
- I endure it without taking any action.
- I try to make myself agreeable.
- I join in the group to prevent to be bullied.
- I will bully other students, too.

- **What do you do, when a student, who is in the similar age to you, is being bullied?**
  - I do nothing, because it is not my business.
  - I do nothing, but feel that I should help him/her.
  - I try to help him/her in any way.
  
- **Have you ever told your teacher the fact that you were bullied?**
  - I have never been bullied in my class in this semester.
  - No, I did not tell it to my teacher.
  - Yes, I did.
  
- **Have you ever told your parents the fact that you were bullied?**
  - I have never been bullied in my class in this semester.
  - No, I did not tell it to my parents.
  - Yes, I did.

The problems, that the person bullies other students.

- **When did you bully other students first?**
  - I have never bullied other students.
  - I have bullied others in elementary school first time.
  - I have bullied others in middle school first time.
  - Others
  
- **Have you ever bullied other students in this semester?**
  - I have never bullied other students in this semester.
  - I bullied other students once or twice.
  - I bullied other students twice or three times per month
  - I bullied other students once per week.
  - I bullied other students several time per week.

Please think about this semester.

- **How often have you bullied other students on the way to school or home?**
  - I have never bullied others on the way to school or home.
  - I bullied others once or twice on the way to school or home.
  - I bullied others twice or three times per month on the way to school or home.
  - I bullied others once per week on the way to school or home.
  - I bullied others several times per week on the way to school or home.
  
- **Do you think that you could participate in the bullying activity, if you would hate the victim?**
  - Yes, I do
  - I might do it.
  - I don't know
  - I might not do it.
  - No
  - I won't do absolutely

Have you ever alienated other students with following methods in this semester?

	Never	Once or twice	Twice or three times per month	Once per week	Several times per week
I cursed other students and made fun of them.					
I ignored them and excluded them from plays or cooperative works.					
I pushed, hit, threatened, and kicked them.					
I spread false rumor about them and made friends hate them.					
I destroyed other's possession and deprived my money.					
I cursed characteristics of other students' body and appearance.					

- **Do you bully alone or with others?**
  - I have never bullied other students in this semester.
  - I do it normally alone.
  - I do it with one or two other students.
  - I do it with between 3-8 students.
  - I do it with more than 8 students.
  
- **Why did you bully other students (Please, circle all of applicable items)?**
  - I have never bullied others
  - Because he/she puts on an air importance.
  - Because he/she ignores friends.
  - Because my teacher likes only him/her.
  - Because he/she is a well-heeled person.
  - Because his/her appearance is too attractive.
  - Because his/her appearance is peculiar.
  - Because he/she can not be in harmony with others.
  - Because there are bad students in my classroom.
  - I don' t know the reason.
  - Because he/she is too poor to play with.
  - Because he/she always puts on air of a rich.
  
- **Do you know which kind of characteristics do the victim has (Please, circle all of the applicable items)?**
  - He/she looks foolish
  - He/she has handicap
  - He/she has a peculiar appearance and face
  - He/she looks naïve
  - He/she flatters
  - He/she who is shrewd
  - He/she is underhanded or sneaky
  - He/she puts on an air of importance like as prince or princess
  - He/she gets the hole attention and love from the teacher.
  - He/she always obeys what the teacher says
  - He/she carries tales to teacher other students
  - He/she tells unsuitable situation
  - He/she gives inappropriate answers in classes
  - He/she always endures, when other students pick up a quarrel with him/her
  - He/she looks weak
  - He/she bothers others



Please, think about yourself, then, answer to questions. Please, circle the applicable items to you.  
 Read the example questions, then please choose one from (A) or (B). Then, choose and circle one from the person is  
 "really true for me" or "sort of true for me". Please read it careful, and choose just an alternative.

Really true for me	Sort of true for me	(A)	But	(B)	Sort of true for me	Really true for me
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Some kids like to do fun things with a lot of other people		Other kids like to do fun things with just a few people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids feel that they are very good at their school work		Other kids worry about whether they can do the school work assigned to them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids find it hard to make friends		Other kids find it's pretty easy to make friends.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are happy with the way they look		Other kids are not happy with the way they look	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are often unhappy with themselves		Other kids are pretty pleased with themselves.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids feel like they are just as smart as other kids their age		Other kids aren't so sure and wonder if they are as smart	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have a lot of friends		Other kids don't have very many friends.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are happy with their height and weight		Other kids wish their height or weight were different.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids don't like the way they are leading their life		Other kids do like the way they are leading their life.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are pretty slow in finishing their school work		Other kids can do their school work quickly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids would like to have a lot more friends		Other kids have as many friends as they want.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids wish their body was different		Other kid like their body the way it is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are happy with themselves as a		Other kids are often not happy with themselves.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		person				
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are often forget what they learn	But	Other kids can remember things easily.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are always doing thing with a lot of kids	But	Other kids usually do things by themselves.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids wish their physical appearance (how they look) was different	But	Other kids like their physical appearance the way it is.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids like the kind of person they are	But	Other kids often wish they were someone else.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids do well at their class work	But	Other kids don't do very well at their class work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids wish that more people their age liked them	But	Other kids feel that most people their age do like them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids wish something about their face or hair looked different	But	Other kids like their face and hair the way they are.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are very happy being the way they are	But	Other kids wish they were different.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have trouble figuring out the answers in school	But	Other kids always almost can figure out the answers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are popular with others their age	But	Other kids are not very popular.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids think that they are good looking	But	Other kids think that they are not very good looking.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids are not very happy with the way they do a lot of things	But	Other kids think the way they do things is fine.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please, think about yourself, then answer to questions. Please, circle the applicable items to you.

Read the example questions, then please choose one from (A) or (B). Then, choose and circle one from the person is "very similar to me" or "a little bit similar to me". Please read it careful, and choose just an alternative.

Really true for me	Sort of true for me	(A)	But	(B)	Sort of true for me	Really true for me
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Some kids like to do fun things with a lot of other people		Other kids like to do fun things with just a few people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Really true for me	Sort of true for me		But		Sort of true for me	Really true for me
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have parents who don't really understand them		Other kids have parents who really do understand them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have classmates who like them the way they are		Other kids have classmates who wish they were different.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have a teacher who helps them if they are upset and have a problem		Other kids don't have a teacher who helps them if they are upset and have a problem.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have a close friend who they can tell problems to		Other kids don't have a close friend who they can tell problems to.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have parents who don't seem to want to hear about their children's problems		Other kids have parents who do want to listen to their children's problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids don't have a teacher who helps them to do their very best		Other kids do have a teacher who helps them to do their very best.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have a close friend who really understands them		Other kids don't have a close friend who understands them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have parents who care about their feelings		Other kids have parents who don't seem to care very much about their children's feelings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have classmates who		Other kids don't have classmates who	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		sometimes make fun of them		make fun of them.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids do have a teacher who cares about them	But	Other kids don't have a teacher who cares about them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have a close friend who they can talk to about things that bother them	But	Other kids don't have a close friend who they can talk to about things that bother them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have parents who treat their children like a person who really matters	But	Other kids have parents who don't usually treat their children like a person who matters.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have classmates who pay attention to what they say	But	Other kids have classmates who usually don't pay attention to what they say.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Some kids don't have a teacher who is fair to them	But	Other kids do have a teacher who is fair to them.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids don't have a close friend who they like to spend time with	But	Other kids do have a close friend who they like to spend time with.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have parents who like them the way they are	But	Other kids have parents who wish their children were different.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids don't get asked to play in games with classmates very often	But	Other kids often get asked to play in games by their classmates.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids don't have a teacher who cares if they feel bad	But	Other kids do have a teacher who cares if they feel bad.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids don't have a close friend who really listens to what they say	But	Other kids do have a close friend who really listens to what they say.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have parents who don't act like what their children do is important	But	Other kids have parents who do act like what their children do is important.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids often	But	Other kids spend	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		spend recess being alone		recess playing with their classmates.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids have a teacher who treats them like a person	But	Other kids don't have a teacher who treats them like a person.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some kids don't have a close friend who cares about their feelings	But	Other kids do have a close friend who cares about their feelings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please, think about yourself, then answer to questions. Please, circle the applicable items to you.

Read the example questions, then please choose one from (A) or (B). Then, choose and circle one from the person is "very similar to me" or "a little bit similar to me". Please read it careful, and choose just an alternative.

<Example>

Really true for me	Sort of true for me	(A)	But	(B)	Sort of true for me	Really true for me
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Some kids like to do fun things with a lot of other people		Other kids like to do fun things with just a few people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students don't hit and annoy other students	but	Others hit and annoy other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students are sometimes needed by other students	but	Others are not needed by other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students threaten other students	But	Others don't threaten other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students are threatened by other students	But	Others aren't threatened by other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students don't laugh at other students	But	Others laugh at other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students are not called nickname by others	But	Others are called nickname by others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students bother other students	But	Others don't bother other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students are bothered by other students	But	Others are not bothered by other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students needle other students	But	Others don't needle other students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Some students are	But	Others are not hit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

□	□	hit and annoyed by others		and annoyed by others	□	□
		Some students don't call other students nickname	But	Others call others nickname		
□	□	Some students are laughed at by other students	But	Others are not laughed at by other students	□	□

Please, circle the number, which is applicable for your situation. Please read it careful, and choose just a alternative.

	strongly disagree	Little bit disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Little bit agree	strongly agree
It is necessary to use aggression to maintain the public order					
If the result is good, in that case the aggression isn't bad.					
You can use aggression against aggression.					
In any case you must not use aggression.					
There are no problems, which you can not solve with discussion and reason.					
If the problem is a light and trifling matter, then it is more effective to use aggression to invoke the power of the law					
There are many cases, which can not be solved by the law but by aggression.					

Please, circle the number, which is applicable for your situation. Please read it careful, and choose just a alternative.

	strongly disagree	Little bit disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Little bit agree	strongly agree
I'd rather depend on myself than others					
It is important that I do my job better than others					
If a classmate gets a prize, I would feel proud					
Being a unique individual is important to me					
It annoys me when other pupils perform better than I do					
My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me					
I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group					
Parents and children must stay together as much as possible					
It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want					
I rely on myself most of the time; I rarely rely on others					
Winning is everything					
I enjoy working in situations involving competition					
The well-being of my coworkers is important to me					
It is important to me to maintain harmony in my group					
Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society					
To me, pleasure is spending time with others					
I often do 'my own thing'					
I like sharing little things with my neighbors					
Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure					
Family members should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required					
When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused					
I feel good when I cooperate with others					
It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my groups					

If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means					
Some people emphasize winning; I am not one of them(R)					
My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me					
Competition is the law of nature					

The person next of you is so interrupting the class consistently during your physics experiment. Do you know why he does like that?

	strongly disagree	Little bit disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Little bit agree	strongly agree
He or she is always the same, ever chance he gets he is rude to other people, even when there is no reason.					
I know that he did it without any intention. He is normally very friendly.					
He always tries to disturb other person. It is his only hobby.					
He does it intentionally. When he doesn't interrupt other person, it means that he is absent.					
It's natural physics experiment makes people very nervous and sensitive, because they should be very careful with experiment instrument.					
Nobody likes Physics class. The teacher's instruction is boring.					
He has problems with experimental instrument therefore he just wants to ask how to use it.					

A classmate looks very unclean and ragged today. Do you know, why he is like that?

	strongly disagree	Little bit disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Little bit agree	Strongly agree
It's normal. It's not just for today. He is always unclean					
He fell on the dirty water on the way of school, but he didn't have time to change his cloths					



His mother is sick nowadays. Therefore it is very difficult for him to change his cloths everyday.					
He often plays the soccer. Although he comes in a fresh cloth everyday, he becomes dirty.					
He sat on the muddy place, although he knew that his cloths would be dirty.					
He was a little bit careless, therefore he sat on the muddy place unconsciously					

# Parent Questionnaire

Please, read the questions carefully, and circle the alternatives, which is applicable for your situation

What is your relationship to the child?

- I am the mother
- I am the father
- I am the grandmother
- I am the grandfather
- Other relationship

What is group alienating?

It is the group alienating that a student is annoyed from other friend(s) with following method.

- Other friend(s) tell vulgar expression, tease a student, or curse a student.
- Other friend(s) ignore a student, or don't give the student any role, when they do any activity.
- Other friend(s) hit, kick, push, bother, or threaten a student.
- Other friend(s) spread false rumour about a student, therefore make another friends hate the student.
- Other friend(s) make a fun a student in the way, which hurts the student.

These cases can often take place, and the student, who is alienated from others, can not defend him/herself.

However, it is not alienating, when close friends make fun each other for pleasure. In addition, it is not alienating, that the students, who have similar abilities, fight each other for competing physical strength.

	strongly disagree	Little bit disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Little bit agree	strongly agree
It is necessary to use aggression to maintain the public order					
If the result is good, in that case the aggression isn't bad.					
You can use aggression against aggression.					
In any case you must not use aggression.					
There are no problems, which you can not solve with discussion and reason.					
There are many cases, which can not be solved by the law nut by aggression.					

	strongly disagree	Little bit disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Little bit agree	strongly agree
I show my appreciation clearly when my child does something for me					
There are many conflicts between my child and me which we cannot solve					
I am often dissatisfied with my child					
I am very proud of my child					
I don't feel like listening to what my child has been doing					
My child listens when I explain something					
When I spend the whole day with my child, he/she starts to get on my nerve					
I compliment my child					
I take my time to listen to my child					
I like to listen to my child's stories					
When my child and I differ in opinion, I shout at him/her					
I don't accept criticism from my child					
My child really trusts me					
My child breaks our house rules almost everyday					
I decide which friend my child can see					
I enjoy physical contact with my child					
When my child is upset it is often unclear to me what is going on					

	strongly disagree	Little bit disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Little bit agree	strongly agree
I'd rather depend on myself than others					
It is important that I do my job better than others					
It annoys me when other people perform better than I do					
My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me					
I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group					
Parents and children must stay together as much as possible					
It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want					
I rely on myself most of the time; I rarely rely on others					
I enjoy working in situations involving competition					
The well-being of my coworkers is important to me					
I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group					
It is important to me to maintain harmony in my group					
Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society					
To me, pleasure is spending time with others					
I like sharing little things with my neighbors					
Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure					
Family members should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required					
When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused					
I feel good when I cooperate with others					
It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my groups					
Some people emphasize winning; I am not one of them(R)					
My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me					

## Abstract

This study aims to find out the differences in the bullying experience between boys and girls in different perspectives and to find out the predictive power of cognitive, social and environmental factors on students' bully and victim tendencies. At last, through this research, this study aims to gain a synthetic perspective on bully phenomenon by considering various aspects in order to provide a theoretical and empirical reference for preventing and intervening bullying problem. The sample size of students used in the analysis was 405 (271 boys and 134 girls) between 12 and 14 years. They were in seventh and eighth grade at two middle schools in Mokpo Korea. 306 caregivers of the students participated in the survey. As the results of this study, there was no difference in perpetrating bullying or being bullied between boys and girls. Most students and bullies attribute the reason of bullying to the victims' eye-catching characteristics or social skill problems. On the other hand, most victims did not know reason of bullying. Social support, self-concept, attributional style, and cultural beliefs could predict bully tendency and victim tendency. Above all, the most important factor, that relates to bully and victim tendency, is perceived social supports, especially parental supports. Parents concerning about their child can be most strongest prevention of students bullying problems.

## Lebenslauf

Angaben zur Person Familienname : Kim

Vorname : Su-Jeong

Geboren am : 10. 09. 1972

in Mokpo, Republik Korea

Staatsangehörigkeit : Koreanisch

Familienstand : ledig

Schulbildung 1979 – 1985 Kwangjupaedagogikhochschulezugehörige

Grundschule in Mokpo

1985 – 1988 Jungmyong Mädchen-middleschool in Mokpo

1988 – 1991 Mokpo Mädchen-highschool in Mokpo

Studium 1991 - 1995 Studium der Paedagogik an der Mokpo National

University (Abschluß: Bachelor of Arts)

1995 - 1997 Fortstudium der Paedagogik an der Mokpo

National University (Abschluß: master of

Arts)

1998 - 2000 Fortstudium der Paedagogik an der LMU

(Abschluß: master of Arts)

2000 - 2004 Promotion der Psychologie an der LMU

Berufstaetigkeit 1997–1998 Assistentin an der Mokpo National Universität

2004-2006 Lecturer an der Mokpo National Universitaet

Mokpo, den 06, Sep. 2006