

Motivation Behind Bullying Among Slovenian Primary School Bullies

Prejeto 24.08.2019 / Sprejeto 12.05.2020

Znanstveni članek

UDK 364.63:373.3-053.5(497.4)

KLJUČNE BESEDE: medvrstniško nasilje, motivi za medvrstniško nasilje, tradicionalno nasilje, spletno nasilje

POVZETEK – Medvrstniško nasilje je postalo eden izmed izstopajočih problemov v šolah, zato ga je nujno potrebno učinkovito preprečevati in primerno ukrepati ob prekrških. Cilj raziskave je bil raziskati stališča storilcev medvrstniškega nasilja o njihovih motivih za izvajanje različnih vrst medvrstniškega nasilja. Odgovori izhajajo iz resničnih življenjskih situacij, v katerih so bili udeleženi kot storilci medvrstniškega nasilja. V tej deskriptivni, neeksperimentalni raziskavi je vprašalnik reševalo 782 slovenskih osnovnošolcev iz 21 naključno izbranih šol in 7 statističnih regij Slovenije. V nadaljnjo obravnavo je bilo vključenih 286 učencev, storilcev medvrstniškega nasilja. Izmed teh je bilo več fantov (185 ali 64,7%) kot deklet (101 ali 35,5%) in več osmošolcev (162 ali 56,6%) kot šestošolcev (124 ali 43,4%). Rezultati so pokazali, da sta maščevanje in povrnitev glavna motiva za medvrstniško nasilje, in potrdili soobstoje tradicionalnega in spletnega medvrstniškega nasilja. Poznavanje motivov za medvrstniško nasilje, in sicer z vidika storilcev nasilja, je pomemben korak k razumevanju posebnosti in dinamike medvrstniškega nasilja ter nam lahko pomaga pri načrtovanju preventivnih in intervencijskih strategij v šolskem prostoru.

Received 24.08.2019 / Accepted 12.05.2020

Scientific paper

UDC 364.63:373.3-053.5(497.4)

KEYWORDS: bullying, motives for bullying, traditional bullying, cyberbullying

ABSTRACT – Bullying has become one of the most urgent problems in schools. Therefore, effective prevention and appropriate intervention are imperative. The objective of the study was to investigate bullies' perceptions of the motives behind different types of bullying. Students' answers were based on their own real-life experiences in which they participated as bullies. In this descriptive non-experimental study, a questionnaire was applied to 782 Slovenian primary school students from 21 randomly chosen schools from 7 statistical regions of Slovenia. 286 of them were included in the further survey as bullies, more boys (185 or 64.7%) than girls (101 or 35.3%) and more eighth-graders (162 or 56.6%) than sixth-graders (124 or 43.4%). The results showed that revenge and reciprocation were the main motives for bullying, and confirm co-occurrence among traditional bullying and cyberbullying. Knowing the motives for bullying from the bully perspective is an important step towards understanding the specifics and dynamics of bullying and can help in planning the prevention and intervention strategies in schools.

1 Introduction

Bullying has become one of the most urgent problems in schools. School is no longer only an educational institution but also a place for upbringing and socialization; at the same time, the consequences of bullying can be long lasting and extensive (Lereya et al., 2015). Therefore, effective prevention and appropriate intervention are imperative. Identifying the motives associated with bullying reported by students who bully themselves is essential to implement intervention and prevention in public primary schools.

Dan Olweus, the first systematic researcher of bullying, defined it as repeated aggression or harassment directed at targets who are deprived or less powerful compared with the bully or bullies (1993). This power is used intentionally to obtain benefits and domination over the victim and lasts over a longer period of time (Rigby, 2002). Although the authors are unanimous in defining the basic criteria for bullying, their definitions differ in some specifics (Pogorevc Merčnik, 2014).

There are different classifications of bullying. We have taken into account those of Berger (2007) and Cheng, Chen, Liu & Chen (2011). They defined four types of bullying: physical, verbal, relational and cyberbullying. Physical bullying represents behaviour in the form of hitting, pinching, pushing, destroying goods, taking others' belongings, etc. Harsh words, threats, laughing at someone, saying curse words, etc. are forms of verbal bullying. Relational bullying is understood as spreading malicious rumours, unfairly excluding someone from the group, repetitively rejecting communication to show that someone is unwelcome, etc. These three types of bullying are in this paper termed as "traditional bullying". Any activity that is oriented towards terrorizing or harming someone via technology (Li, 2007; Kowalski, Limber & Agatston, 2008; Erdur-Baker, 2010) is defined as cyberbullying, where different forms require different difficulty levels of computer knowledge. Cyberbullying includes a range of behaviours such as harassment, denigration, impersonation, exclusion, outing and trickery, etc. (Rigby, 2002; Cheng et al., 2011; Fluck, 2017; Kozmus & Pšunder, 2018).

Although cyberbullying can be understood as a type of psychological bullying, as for example relational bullying (Smith et al., 2008; König, Gollwitzer & Steffgen, 2010), some of its specifics should be pointed out to make a distinction from the traditional bullying (Pšunder & Kozmus, 2018). The specifics of cyberbullying include the increased potential for a large audience, increased potential for anonymous bullying, lower levels of direct feedback of the victim, changed power ratio, decreased time and space limits and lower levels of supervision, easier avoidance of penalties due to lack of control (Beran & Li, 2007; Slonje & Smith, 2008; Sticca & Parren, 2013). It is worth pointing out that traditional bullying and cyberbullying are common occurrences around the world, and many studies confirm the co-occurrence and overlap of these two types of bullying and victimisation (Li, 2007; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007; Smith et al., 2008; Kowalski, Morgan & Limber, 2012; Tural Hesapçioğlu & Ercan, 2017; Pšunder & Kozmus, 2018).

The most general classification of motives for the traditional types of bullying can be: *instrumental* motives (e.g. the bully wanting someone's lunch/money) and *psychological* motives (e.g. the bully feels better about him or herself if others feel bad) (Bosacki, Marini & Dane, 2006). The motives for the traditional types of bullying can also be divided into the following main categories: *internal reasons* (student's insecurity, family problems, not performing well in school, feelings of loss and confusion) and *social pressure* (provocation) (Pister, 2014). Frisén, Jonsson & Persson (2007) similarly listed the most frequent motives of the bully as an individual: low self-esteem, feeling *cool*, having his own problems. Other less frequent answers included: peer pressure, the bully is annoyed with the victim, the bully is jealous of the victim, lack of respect and the bully is also a victim. In Thornberg & Knutsen's (2011) study, the stated motives behind the traditional types of bullying were divided into five main categories: *bully* attributing, *victim* attributing, *peer* attributing, *school* attributing and *human/nature/*

society attributing. Further research (Thornberg, Rosenquist & Johansson, 2012) summarized the motives into three main categories: *bully* attributing, *victim* attributing and *social context* attributing.

Baas, de Jong & Drossaert (2013) tried to prove there may have been different motives behind cyberbullying. Three categories of motives for cyberbullying were mentioned. The first is an *internally felt drive* to cyberbullying (e.g. children bully other children out of boredom, for pleasure, to reduce stress or to compensate for being (cyber) bullied themselves). The second is *trying to fit in* or *trying to belong*, and is based on negative experience with the victim and includes a row, jealousy or breaking up a friendship or relationship. The third category is based on *the characteristics of the victim* and includes appearance, socially related characteristics and personality. Verjas, Talley, Meyers, Parris & Cutts (2010) found that high school students reported a range of *internal motivations* (e.g. redirect feelings, revenge, making themselves feel better, boredom, instigation, protection, jealousy, approval seeking, trying a new persona, anonymity/disinhibition) and *external motivations* (e.g. lack of consequences, non-confrontational situations and target difference for cyberbullying). They also confirmed that respondents more often identified themselves as internally motivated for cyberbullying rather than externally. This is surprising, because the external motivations are actually defining cyberbullying as different from the traditional bullying.

2 Methods

Research problem

In the empirical part, the authors were interested in why some students engage in bullying and others do not and which are the reasons that lead students toward aggressive behaviour – bullying namely represents a subcategory or subtype of aggressive behaviour (Salmivalli, 2010). They wanted to determine if the bully uses more than one type of bullying and, if so, which types, and if the motives behind the different types of bullying differ, as stated by some authors (Wilton & Cambell, 2011). The authors also wanted to answer the question whether there are differences in bullies' motives for engaging in traditional bullying versus cyberbullying (Compton, Campbell & Mergler, 2014).

Students' answers were based on their own real-life experiences in which they participated as bullies. We believe that knowing the motives for bullying from the bully perspective is an important step towards understanding the specifics and dynamics of bullying.

Methodology of research

Sample of Research. We contacted 39 schools, randomly chosen from all 12 statistical regions of Slovenia. 21 of 24 schools from seven statistical regions of Slovenia returned completed questionnaires. From these schools, one class of sixth graders and one

of eighth graders were included in the survey. The questionnaire was answered by 782 students. Since the main aim of the research was to understand the violent acts by the bullies, they were the only ones included in further analysis (see *Instrument in Procedures*).

Instrument and procedures

Our study is based on a descriptive non-experimental method of empirical pedagogical research (Sagadin, 2003).

Data was collected with a questionnaire. The questionnaires were sent by regular mail to primary schools after having received the headmaster's consent to participate in the study. Before distributing the questionnaires, students were assured complete anonymity. The questionnaires were completed during school time. There were many parts to the questionnaire. In the following section, we present the parts relevant for this research. The first part of the questionnaire comprises general student data (e.g. grade, gender, grades). The second part of the questionnaire contains the School Bullying Scales (Cheng et al., 2011). The scale, as introduced in the previous chapter, was translated and adapted for Slovenian research by Jakin and Pečjak (2012, cited in Pečjak 2014). The bullying scale showed good reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.85$).

Students who bullied were asked why they were occasionally violent towards others. Based on the literature and the answers given by students during informal conversation, ten possible answers were formulated. The bullies had to choose up to three options. If they chose, their own answer could be written; they could choose the option "I don't know" or "I haven't been violent in the last six months" if they thought their acts had not been violent.

In order to make a clear distinction between bullies and non-bullies, the School Bullying Scale (Cheng et al., 2011) was used. The scale is a self-assessment measurement instrument that measures four types of school bullying, verbal, physical, relational and cyber bullying, from the bully's point of view. Each student reported how many times he or she was in the position of a bully for each type of bullying in the last six months. Each statement could be answered on a five-level Likert scale: 0 – never, 1 – once or twice, 2 – two or three times a month, 3 – once a week, 4 – several times a week. The authors of the scale converted the raw results into percentile norms, separating those who typically appear in the bully role from the others. Higher results for a role indicate the most representative one for this role.

The majority of students (496 or 63.4%) scored up to 5 points on the bullying scale; these students are the non-bullies. The minority is represented by the bullies (68 or 8.7%). Students from the middle group and the group of bullies (286 students in total) were included in the further survey. The final sample included more boys (185 or 64.7%) than girls (101 or 35.3%) and more eighth-graders (162 or 56.6%) than sixth-graders (124 or 43.4%).

Data analysis

The collected data was analysed by the statistical programming equipment SPSS.

3 Results and discussion

The bullies were classified into four groups based on the type of bullying: physical, verbal, relational or cyberbullying. Each student was classified into one group after reporting having performed a corresponding violent act at least once. From a total of 286 student bullies, the verbal bullying group included 284 (99.3 %) students; the physical bullying group included 243 (85.0 %) students; the relational bullying group included 213 (74.5 %) students, and the cyberbullying group included 34 (11.9 %) students. Each student could be placed in more than one group at the same time if he or she reported being bully in various types of bullying. The data are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Number (f) and structural percentage (f%) of students based on participation in various types of bullying

<i>Student bullies in various types of bullying</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>f%</i>
Verbal, physical and relational	149	52.1
Verbal and physical	64	22.4
Verbal and relational bullying	28	9.8
Verbal, physical, relational and cyber	28	9.8
Verbal bullying	9	3.1
Verbal, relational and cyber	6	2.1
Physical and relational bullying	2	0.7
Total	286	100.0

Table 1 shows that about a tenth of students (9.8 %) took part in all types of bullying in the last six month. More than half the students (52.1 %) participated in all three types of traditional bullying at the same time. About one-fifth of students (22.4 %) participated in verbal and physical bullying at the same time, and a little less than one-tenth of students (9.8 %) participated in verbal and relational bullying. No one participated in cyberbullying alone; all students were part of at least one type of traditional bullying.

Although the original purpose of the present research was to examine the motives behind traditional and cyberbullying from the bully perspective, it turned out that this would not be meaningful since all bullies were at the same time involved in traditional bullying and some of them also in cyberbullying. On the basis of the above findings that in the last six months student bullies were simultaneously involved in several types of bullying, we decided to examine the motives for bullying in general, stated by the bullies themselves. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Percentage of students reporting motives behind bullying

<i>Rang</i>	<i>Motives</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>f%</i>
1	Reciprocation, revenge	158	55.2
2	Showing dislike	44	15.4
3	Enjoyment	29	10.1
4	Boredom	23	8.0
5	To join others	21	7.3
6	Jealousy	12	4.2
7–8	Craving for admiration	10	3.5
7–8	Harming the victim	10	3.5
9–10	Causing fear	8	2.8
9–10	Being better than the victim	8	2.8
11	Other*	1	0.3
/	I do not know	47	16.4
/	I was not aggressive	41	14.3
	Total	286	100.0

Remark: * The student's answer was "Because it was self-defence."

Table 2 shows that the most common motive behind bullying is reciprocation or revenge, followed by showing dislike for the victim and enjoyment. Some students did not know why they were bullying and some claimed they did not behave aggressively.

In the present study, the importance is given to the motives behind bullying from the bullies' perspectives. By knowing bullying from the bully perspective can help in planning the prevention and intervention strategies in schools. The study showed that, in the last six months, the bullies took part in various types of bullying. Thus, there is a high probability that a student who bullies in school will also be a cyberbully, and vice versa. This was also confirmed by other studies (Li, 2007; Kowalski & Limber, 2007; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007; Smith et al., 2008; Kowalski et al., 2012; Tural Hesapçioğlu & Ercan, 2017; Pšunder & Kozmus, 2018). Therefore, we decided to examine the motives for bullying in general (not separately for traditional and cyberbullying), stated by the bullies themselves.

The study showed that the most common motive behind bullying is reciprocation or revenge, followed by showing dislike for the victim and enjoyment. The motive of reciprocation indicates the possibility that the bully was the victim in the past. Positive correlations among the bully and victim roles were confirmed in previous research (e.g. Solberg, Olweus & Endresen, 2007; Cheng et al., 2011). They indicate that it is not enough to focus only on the bullies; we must also focus on the victims of bullying, since they may become bullies in the future (Solberg, Olweus, & Endresen, 2007). Pečjak in Pirc (2014) point out that it is also reasonable to focus on students observers of bullying, who have great potential for reducing bullying. School life and its whole operation

should send a clear message against bullying and violence – it is not acceptable, not even when its goal is reciprocation. It is also important to pay attention not only to violent situations, but also to those situations which may lead to violence (Pogorevc Merčnik, 2014).

Reciprocation for bullying or revenge is a handy motive, allowing bullies to excuse their inappropriate behaviour and pin the responsibility on someone in a he/she-did-it-first-I-returned-the-blow way. School staff should encourage students to make a critical review of bullying, think about the possible consequences for bullies and victims and, most of all, to reflect upon alternative behaviour in the future. Encouraging active participation and practising constructive conflict-solving skills for bullies can be beneficial in making them more conscious of their inappropriate behaviour, recognizing the negative consequences of bullying and learning to take responsibility for their own behaviour. Pogorevc Merčnik (2014) points out that, in addition to secondary prevention activities, the school must also carry out primary prevention activities, which reduce the risk factors for violence.

In the end, some limitations of our research need to be mentioned. Although a high number of respondents was initially included in our study, only some were categorized as bullies, and a small percentage of these appeared to be cyberbullies. Moreover, the representative sample is applicable only to Slovenian schools, and care should be taken when and if applying it to any other school. Furthermore, the majority of the respondents were bullies in various types of bullying at the same time, and it was therefore hard to distinguish between the motives for different types of bullying. Quantitative research methods should be combined with qualitative ones in the future (e.g. when interviewing a student, an explanation of specific motives for specific types of bullying could be provided). Finally, the focus of the research was on the bully's motives; however, bullies may not be aware of all the motives for bullying as they can be subconscious as well. This might be a subject for future research.

4 Conclusions

The purpose of the survey was to research the bullies' perception of their motives for bullying and if the motives behind different types of bullying differ. Based on the bullies' answers, the majority of the motives behind bullying are classified similarly. The most common motive for bullying is reciprocation or revenge, followed by showing dislike for the victim. According to the research results, students who bully usually use various types of bullying. No one participated in cyberbullying alone. Students who practice a certain type of bullying also use other types of bullying more often. The study emphasises the importance of raising the awareness among students that aggressive behaviour is not a proper way to solve problems and dislikes.

Dr. Mateja Pšunder, dr. Andreja Kozmus

Motivi za medvrstniško nasilje med slovenskimi osnovnošolskimi storilci

Medvrstniško nasilje (v nadaljevanju: MN) je postalo eden izmed izstopajočih problemov v osnovni šoli. Problem je še resnejši, če vemo, da šola vse bolj postaja mesto postavljanja meja in socializacije učencev ter da so posledice medvrstniškega nasilja pogosto dolgotrajne in obsežne (Lereya et al., 2015). Poznavanje medvrstniškega nasilja s perspektive storilcev nasilja lahko pomaga pri načrtovanju preventivnih in intervencijskih strategij v šolskem prostoru. Prispevek poudarja pomembnost ozaveščanja učencev, da nasilje ni primeren način neodobravanja drugih in reševanja konfliktov.

MN je definirano kot ponavljajoče se agresivno vedenje, usmerjeno proti posameznikom, ki so deprivilegirani ali šibkejši v primerjavi s storilcem ali storilci (Olweus, 1993). Slednji svojo moč uporabljajo z namenom doseganja koristi ali prevlade nad žrtvijo, in to daljše časovno obdobje (Rigby, 2002). Čeprav so avtorji pri opredeljevanju temeljnih kriterijev medvrstniškega nasilja enotni, se njihove opredelitve razlikujejo v nekaterih posebnostih (Pogorevc Merčnik, 2014).

Vrste MN so: fizično, besedno, odnosno in spletno (Berger, 2007; Cheng et al., 2011). Prve tri vrste označujejo tradicionalno nasilje v primerjavi s spletnim nasiljem, ki predvideva izvajanje agresivnih dejanj s pomočjo tehnologije (Li, 2007; Kowalski, Limber in Agatston, 2008; Erdur-Baker, 2010). Veliko študij je potrdilo soobstoj in prepletanje tradicionalnega in spletnega nasilja (Li, 2007; Raskauskas in Stoltz, 2007; Smith et al., 2008; Kowalski, Morgan in Limber, 2012; Tural Hesapçioğlu in Ercan, 2017; Pšunder in Kozmus, 2018).

Bosacki, Marini in Dane (2006) delijo motive za tradicionalne oblike MN na instrumentalne in psihološke. Pister (2014) loči notranje motive (negotovost študentov, družinske težave, neuspeh v šoli ali občutek izgube in zmede) in socialni pritisk (provokacija). Thornberg, Rosenquist in Johansson (2012) povzemajo motive v tri glavne kategorije, ki se nanašajo na storilca, žrtev ali socialni kontekst.

Prav tako Baas, de Jong in Drossaert (2013) omenjajo tri kategorije motivov za spletno obliko MN. Ti so:

- notranji motivi (npr. dolgčas, užitek, zmanjšanje stresa ali kompenzacija za tradicionalno MN),
- želja po vključenosti in pripadnosti (npr. negativne izkušnje z žrtvijo, ljubosumje ali prekinitev prijateljstva ali odnosa) in c) značilnosti žrtev (npr. videz, družbeno povezane značilnosti in osebnost).

Verjas, Talley, Meyers, Parris in Cutts (2010) so ugotovili, da so bili dijaki pogostejše notranje (in ne zunanje) motivirani za spletno MN, kar je presenetljivo, saj zunanja motivacija dejansko opredeljuje spletno nasilje za drugačno od tradicionalnega (npr. pomikanje posledic za svoja dejanja, ni soočenja z žrtvijo, izbiranje tudi močnejših žrtev).

Cilj raziskave je bil raziskati prepričanja učencev storilcev in njihove motive za vpletenost v različne vrste MN v slovenskih osnovnih šolah. Avtorici je zanimalo, ali obstajajo razlike v motivih učencev storilcev pri vpletenosti v tradicionalno oz. spletno

nasilje, kot so potrdili nekateri avtorji (Compton, Campbell in Mergler, 2014). Prepoznavanje motivov, povezanih z MN, kot jih navajajo učenci sami, je namreč bistveno pri načrtovanju intervencij in preventive v slovenskih javnih osnovnih šolah.

V empiričnem delu je avtorici natančneje zanimalo:

- zakaj so nekateri učenci vpleteni v MN in drugi ne,
- kateri so motivi, ki učence vodijo k agresivnemu vedenju (Salmivalli, 2010),
- ali storilci MN hkrati izvajajo več vrst MN,
- če da, katere vrste, in
- ali se motivi za različne vrste MN medsebojno razlikujejo (Wilton in Campbell, 2011).

Predvidevali sta, da različne vrste nasilja soobstajajo ter da so motivi zanje podobni. V raziskavi sta uporabili opisno in neeksperimentalno metodo pedagoškega raziskovanja (Sagadin, 2003). Zbrane podatke sta analizirali z ustreznimi multivariantnimi statističnimi metodami.

Podatki so bili zbrani s pomočjo vprašalnika in analizirani s statističnim programom SPSS. Prvi del vprašalnika je vseboval splošne podatke o učencih (npr. razred, spol, ocene), drugi del pa lestvice šolskega MN (Cheng et al., 2011), prevedene in prilagojene za Slovenijo (Jakin in Pečjak, 2012; navedeno v Pečjak, 2014; Cronbach's Alpha = 0,85).

Učence smo vprašali, zakaj so bili občasno nasilni do drugih. Na podlagi literature in neformalnih pogovorov je bilo formuliranih 10 možnih odgovorov, lahko so zapisali svoj odgovor ali možnosti "ne vem" in "nisem bil nasilen". Učenci so lahko izbrali do 3 odgovore. Za jasno razlikovanje med storilci MN in tistimi, ki to niso, smo uporabili Lestvico medvrstniškega nasilja (Cheng et al., 2011). Vprašalnik meri štiri vrste šolskega MN: verbalno, fizično, odnosno in spletno nasilje, in sicer z vidika storilca MN. Vsak učenec je poročal, kolikokrat je bil v vlogi storilca MN, kolikokrat je izvajal posamezno vrsto nasilja in kolikokrat v zadnjih šestih mesecih. Na vsako trditev so lahko odgovorili na petstopenjski Likertovi lestvici: 0 – nikoli, 1 – enkrat ali dvakrat, 2 – dvakrat ali trikrat mesečno, 3 – enkrat tedensko, 4 – večkrat tedensko. Avtorji lestvice so grobe rezultate pretvorili v percentilne norme, s katerimi so ločili tiste, ki tipično nastopajo v vlogi storilca MN, od ostalih. Višji rezultat določa, da je posameznik bolj reprezentativen predstavnik te skupine učencev.

Večina učencev (496 ali 63,4%) je z odgovori dosegla do 5 točk na lestvici storilcev MN – ti ga niso izvajali. Manjšino predstavljajo učenci storilci MN (68 ali 8,7%). Učenci srednje skupine in učenci skupine storilcev MN (skupaj 286) so bili vključeni v nadaljnjo raziskavo. Končni vzorec je vključeval več dečkov (185 ali 64,7%) kot deklic (101 ali 35,3%) in več osmošolcev (162 ali 56,6%) kot šestošolcev (124 ali 43,4%).

Učenci storilci MN so bili razdeljeni v štiri skupine glede na vrsto nasilja, ki so ga storili: fizično, verbalno, odnosno in spletno nasilje. Vsak učenec je bil razvrščen v posamezno skupino, če je zapisal, da je določeno vrsto nasilja izvedel vsaj enkrat. Od skupno 286 učencev storilcev je bilo v skupino verbalno nasilnih vključenih 284 (99,3%) učencev; skupina fizično nasilnih je vključevala 243 (85%) učencev; skupina odnosno nasilnih je vključevala 213 (74,5%) učencev in skupina spletno nasilnih je vsebovala

34 (11,9%) učencev. Vsak učenec je lahko bil vključen v več kot eno skupino hkrati, če je poročal, da je izvajal več vrst nasilja.

Približno desetina učencev (9,8%) navaja vpetost v vse (4) vrste MN v zadnjih 6 mesecih. Več kot polovica vključenih (52,1%) navaja vpetost v 3 vrste tradicionalnega nasilja hkrati. Približno petina učencev (22,4%) je sodelovala v verbalnem in fizičnem nasilju in nekaj manj kot desetina (9,8%) v verbalnem in odnosnem nasilju. Nobeden izmed učencev ni sodeloval le v spletnem nasilju; vsi so izvajali vsaj eno vrsto tradicionalnega nasilja.

Osnovni namen raziskave je bil raziskati motive za tradicionalno in spletno nasilje. Izkazalo se je, da so učenci storilci hkrati izvajali več vrst MN, nekateri izmed njih tudi spletno nasilje. Zaradi tega smo se odločili proučiti motive za MN na splošno.

Najpogostejši motiv za MN je povrnitev ali maščevanje (55,2%), ki mu sledijo odklonilen odnos do žrtve (15,4%), užitek (10,1%), dolgčas (8%), pridružiti se ostalim (7,3%), ljubosumje (4,2%), hrepenenje po pozornosti in želja poškodovati žrtev (oba 3,5%) ter ustrahovanje in kazanje premoči nad žrtvijo (oba 2,8%), en učenec (0,3%) je odgovoril, da je šlo za samoobrambo. Kar 16,4% učencev ni vedelo, zakaj so bili nasilni, 14,3% pa jih meni, da se niso vedli agresivno.

Na podlagi odgovorov učencev, ki smo jih predhodno klasificirali za storilce MN, smo ugotovili, da učenci storilci običajno izvajajo več vrst MN hkrati. Tisti, ki so bili pogostejše storilci dejanj ene vrste MN, so bili pogostejše storilci tudi druge vrste MN.

Ker obstaja velika verjetnost, da bo učenec, ki je nasilen v šoli, udeležen tudi v spletnem nasilju, smo se odločili, da proučimo motive za MN na splošno (ne ločeno za tradicionalno in spletno nasilje). Najpogostejši motiv za MN je povrnitev ali maščevanje, kar kaže na možnost, da so bili storilci sami v preteklosti žrtve. Pozitivne povezave med vlogo storilca in žrtve so bile potrjene že v predhodnih raziskavah (npr. Solberg, Olweus in Endresen, 2007; Cheng et al., 2011). Kažejo nam, da ni dovolj, da se osredotočimo le na storilce, temveč tudi na žrtve MN, saj lahko te v prihodnosti postanejo storilci MN (Solberg, Olweus in Endresen, 2007). Pečjak in Pirc (2014) pa opozarjata, da je smiselno pozornost usmeriti tudi na učence opazovalce medvrstniškega nasilja, ki imajo veliko potencialno moč za zmanjšanje tovrstnega nasilja.

Šolsko življenje in njegovo celotno delovanje morata poslati jasno sporočilo proti nasilju, ki ni sprejemljivo, tudi če je njegov cilj povračilo. Slednje je priročen motiv, ki storilcem nasilnih dejanj omogoči opravičilo za svoje neprimerno vedenje in prenese odgovornost zanj na drugega. Šolski strokovni delavci bi morali učence spodbujati h kritičnemu pogledu na nasilje, poudariti možne posledice ter prikazati primere alternativnega vedenja v prihodnosti. Spodbujanje aktivne udeležbe in spretnosti nenasilnega reševanja konfliktov je lahko koristen način ozaveščanja neprimernega vedenja, prepoznavanja posledic in prevzemanja odgovornosti za svoja dejanja. Prav tako je pomembno, da pozornosti ne namenjamo le situacijam, ki so nasilne, ampak tudi tistim, ki lahko vodijo v nasilje. Pogorevc Merčnik (2014) opozarja, da mora šola poleg sekundarne preventivne dejavnosti nujno izvajati tudi primarno preventivno dejavnost, s katero zmanjšujemo dejavnike tveganja za nastanek nasilja.

Na koncu je potrebno omeniti nekatere omejitve naše raziskave. Kljub velikemu številu vključenih v raziskavo jih je le manjši delež ustrezal pogojem za nadaljnje proučevanje. Vzorec je reprezentativen samo za slovenske šole. Ker je bil velik delež sto-

rilcev MN udeleženi v različnih vrstah MN hkrati, je bilo težko razlikovati med motivi za različne vrste MN. Kvantitativne raziskovalne metode bi bilo v prihodnje potrebno kombinirati s kvalitativnimi, ki bi omogočile dodatno razlago motivov pri posameznih vrstah MN. Prav tako je mogoče, da se učenci ne zavedajo vseh motivov za MN, le-ti so lahko tudi nezavedni. To je lahko predmet prihodnjih raziskav.

REFERENCES

1. Baas, N., de Jong, M.D.T., Drossaert, C.H.C. (2013). Children's Perspectives on Cyberbullying: Insights Based on Participatory Research. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, Vol. 16, No. 4, p. 246–253.
2. Beran, T., Li, Q. (2007). The Relationship between Cyber-bullying and School Bullying. *Journal of Student Wellbeing*, Vol. 1, No. 2, p. 15–33.
3. Berger, K. (2007). Update on bullying at school: Science forgotten? *Developmental Review*, Vol. 27, Iss. 1, p. 90–126.
4. Bosacki, S.L., Marini, Z.A., Dane, A. V. (2006). Voices from classroom: Pictorial and narrative representations of children's bullying experiences. *Journal of Moral Education*, Vol. 35, Iss. 2, p. 231–245.
5. Cheng, Y.Y., Chen, L.M., Liu, K.S., Chen, Y.L. (2011). Development and Psychometric Evaluation of the School Bullying Scales: A Rasch Measurement Approach. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 71, Iss. 1, p. 200–216.
6. Compton, L., Campbell, M.A., Mergler, A.G. (2014). Teacher, Parent and Student Perceptions of the Motives of Cyberbullies. *Social Psychology of Education*, vol. 17, p. 383–400.
7. Erdur-Baker, Ö. (2010). Cyberbullying and its Correlation to Traditional Bullying, Gender and Frequent and Risky Usage of Internet-Mediated Communication Tools. *New media & society*, Vol. 12, Iss. 1, p. 109–125.
8. Fluck, J. (2017). Why Do Students Bully? An Analysis of Motives behind Violence in Schools. *Youth & Society*, Vol. 49, Iss. 5, p. 567–587.
9. Frisén, A., Jonsson, A. K., Persson, C. (2007). Adolescents' Perception of Bullying: Who is the Victim? Who is the Bully? What can be Done to Stop Bullying? *Adolescence*, Vol. 42, No. 168, p. 749–761.
10. König, A., Gollwitzer, M., Steffgen, G. (2010). Cyberbullying as an Act of Revenge? *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, Vol. 20, No. 2, p. 210–224.
11. Kowalski, R.M., Morgan, S.A., Limber, S.P. (2012). Traditional bullying as a potential warning sign of cyberbullying. *School Psychology International*, Vol. 33, Iss. 5, p. 505–519.
12. Kowalski, R., Limber, S., Agatston, P. (2008). *Cyber bullying: Bullying in the digital age*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
13. Kozmus, A., Pšunder, M. (2018). Problemi in dileme povezane s spletnim nasiljem. [Problems and Dilemmas Connected to Cyberbullying]. In *Oblikovanje inovativnih učnih okolij [Constructing innovative learning environments]*. Koper: Založba Univerze na Primorskem, p. 125–138.
14. Leraya, S.T., Copeland, W.E., Costello, E.J., Wolke, D. (2015). Adult Mental Health Consequences of Peer Bullying and Maltreatment in Childhood: Two Cohorts in Two Countries. *Lancet Psychiatry*, Vol. 2, Iss. 6, p. 524–531.
15. Li, Q. (2007). New Bottle but Old Wine: A Research of Cyberbullying in Schools. *Computers in Human Behavior*, Vol. 23, Iss. 4, p. 1777–1791.
16. Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at School: What We Know and What We Can Do*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
17. Pečjak, S. (2014). Medvrstniško nasilje v šoli [Peer bullying in a school]. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba filozofske fakultete.
18. Pečjak, S., Pirc, T. (2014). Sem opazovalec medvrstniškega nasilja: kaj lahko naredim? *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, Vol 29, No. 1, p. 155–168.

19. Pister, R. (2014). Understanding Bullying Through the Eyes of Youth. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research*, Vol. 9, No. 1, p. 27–43.
20. Pogorevc Merčnik, Jovita (2014). Konfliktne situacije kot pokazatelj nasilja med učenci ter njihovo preprečevanje. *Didactica Slovenica – Pedagoška obzorja*, Vol. 29, No. 3–4, p. 98–112.
21. Pšunder, M., Kozmus, A. (2018). Bullying Behaviour and Victimization Experience among Primary School Students: The Role of Gender and Grade. In: R. Celec (ed.). *Challenges of society* (Schriftenreihe Erziehung – Unterricht – Bildung). Hamburg: Dr. Kovač, p. 319–346.
22. Raskauskas, J., Stoltz, A.D. (2007). Involvement in Traditional and Electronic Bullying Among Adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 43, No. 3, p. 564–575.
23. Rigby, K. (2002). *New Perspectives on Bullying*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
24. Sagadin, J. (2003). Statistične metode za pedagoge [Statistical Methods for Pedagogues]. Maribor: Obzorja.
25. Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the Peer Group: A review. *Aggression & Violent Behavior*, Vol. 15, Iss. 2, p. 112–120.
26. Slonje, R., Smith, P.K. (2008). Cyber bullying: Another Main-type of Bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 49, Iss. 2, p. 147–154.
27. Smith, P.K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its Nature and Impact in Secondary School Pupils. *Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, Vol. 49, No. 4, p. 376–385.
28. Solberg, M., Olweus, D., Endresen, I.M. (2007). Bullies and Victims at School: Are They the Same Pupils? *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 77, No. 2, p. 441–464.
29. Sticca, F., Perren, S. (2013). Is Cyberbullying Worse than Traditional Bullying? Examining the Differential Roles of Medium, Publicity, and Anonymity for the Perceived Severity of Bullying. *Youth Adolescence*, Vol. 42, No. 5, p. 739–750.
30. Thornberg, R., Knutsen, S. (2011). Teenagers' Explanations of Bullying. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, Vol. 40, No. 3, p. 177–192.
31. Thornberg, R., Rosenquist, R., Johansson, P. (2012). Older Teenagers' Explanations of Bullying. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, Vol. 41, No. 4, p. 327–342.
32. Tural Hesapçioğlu, S., Ercan, F. (2017). Traditional and Cyberbullying Co-occurrence and its Relationship to Psychiatric Symptoms. *Pediatrics International*, Vol. 59, No. 1, p. 16–22.
33. Verjas, K., Talley, J., Meyers, J., Parris, L., Cutts, H. (2010). High School Students' Perceptions of Motivations for Cyberbullying: An Exploratory Study. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*, Vol. XI, No. 3, p. 269–273.
34. Wilton, C., Campbell, M. (2011). *Reasons Why Adolescents Bully*. Queensland: University of Technology. Retrieved on 29.03.2019 from the World Wide Web: <https://eprints.qut.edu.au/47912/1/47912A.pdf>.

*Mateja Pšunder, PhD (1971), Full Professor, Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor, Slovenia.
Address: Koroška cesta 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia; Telephone: (+386) 02 229 38 27
E-mail: mateja.psunder@um.si*

*Andreja Kozmus, PhD (1977), Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor, Slovenia.
Address: Pilštanj 62, 3261 Lesično, Slovenia; Telephone: (+386) 031 604 509
E-mail: andreja.kozmus@gmail.com*