

Full Length Research

Personality patterns and achievement motivation as predictors of bullying in second cycle primary schools students of Woldia town, North Wollo ,Amhara National Regional State

Kifle kassaw Mulatu

Department Of Educational Psychology, Woldia College Of Teacher Education, North Wollo, Amhara, Ethiopia
Corresponding author: Kifle Kassaw E.mail.negedekifle@gmail.com

Accepted 27 August 2020

The study attempted to examine forms of bullying behavior and the relationship among personality patterns, achievement motivation and bullying behavior of students. The study followed mainly a correlation design and was conducted on 204 students drawn from three randomly selected primary schools in Woldia town, Amhara National Regional State, Ethiopia. These 204 students were identified as perpetrators of bullying with different roles (bullies, assistants, and reinforcers) based on nominations from peers. Data on respondents' personality, achievement motivation and level of bullying were collected using close ended questionnaires. Multiple linear regressions were conducted to assess the combined, the independent, and the interactive effect of achievement and personality on bullying. Forms of bullying behavior in the study area were physical-verbal (P+V), physical-relational (P+R), verbal-relational (V+R) and physical-verbal-relational (P+V+R) forms of bullying. Results of the multiple linear regression revealed that personality and achievement motivation their interaction taken together explained 43.1% of the variance in bullying. Thus, based on the findings it can be concluded that achievement motivation and personality are important precursors of bullying. Following the conclusion several recommendations were forwarded among which is initiating conversations with students about the nature of bullying, its consequences, and how to tackle bullying behavior.

Keywords: Assistants, big five, bullies, reinforcers

Cite This Article As: Kifle, K.M (2020). Personality patterns and achievement motivation as predictors of bullying in second cycle primary schools students of Woldia town, North Wollo ,Amhara National Regional State. Acad. Res. J. Psychol. Counsel. 8(1): 6-16

INTRODUCTION

Omoteso (2010) as cited by Obafemi Wolowo University Journal of International Social Research, bullying among school children is certainly a very old phenomenon. Despite many strategies put in places to

curb it, the problem persists. School is perceived to be a place where students should feel safe and secure but the opposite is often the case. The reality is that a significant number of students are the target of bullying. Bullying though old is a widespread and worldwide problem. Most adults can remember incidents of bullying in which they

were either bullies or bullied. In fact, until recently the common perception had been that bullying was a relatively harmless experience that many children experience during their school years. However, over the past two decades, an extensive body of research has documented that bullying is a potentially damaging form of violence among children and youth. So, while bullying is not a new phenomenon, what is new is the growing awareness that bullying has serious damaging effects on bullies, victims, schools and communities.

Consequently, concerns of parents, policy makers, educators and the public have escalated in countries around the world with the rise in the reported incidents of violence and the links that have been established between violence and bullying. In the western world much attention has been devoted to stemming the act of bullying but in Ethiopia this act goes on in many schools unnoticed and it becomes a serious problem in enhancing dropouts (attrition) leave emotional and Psychological impact on students (Arefanie,2009).

Asamu (2006) in her study found that, of the students she studied 22.5% of the students in Ibadan, Nigeria both victims and bullies were below 15 years of age; bullying behavior was peculiar to junior secondary school (22.5%) and 21% of male students had bullied other students. Various reports and studies in Canada and abroad over the past decade have consistently established that approximately 10-15% of children attending school are either bullied regularly or were initiators of bullying behavior (Olweus, 1993; Pepler et al; 2001). Research using the National Longitudinal Study for Children and Youth found that a significant proportion of school-aged children in Canada were either bullies (14%) or victims (5%). Data from the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Scandinavian countries, Ireland and England, were quite similar to those reported in Canadian studies.

Generally, students who get bullied can be regarded as being passive or being submissive victims. They are usually quiet, careful, and sensitive and may start crying easily. They are unsure of themselves and have poor self-confidence or negative self-image. Boys in this group do not like to fight, and they are often physically weaker than their classmates, especially the bullies, and they have few or no friends (Omoteso, 2010).

As the awareness of bullying has increased, there has been increased interest in the potential long term effects of bullying. Authors have reported a number of negative psychological and physical effects of school bullying including reduced self-esteem, poor physical health, decreased school attendance and achievement motivation and academic performance and increased depression and anxiety (Leymann and Gustafsson, 1996; Smith, 1997; Lyzinicki et al, 2004; Tehrani, 2004). The risk for these negative outcomes is increased if the bullying is severe, prolonged and the victim lacks

adequate social support (Leymann & Gustafsson, 1996; Rigby, 2003).

It is the researcher's argument, based on studies done in United States, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Scandinavian countries, Ireland and England that, in my country-Ethiopia bullying becomes a serious problem in increasing the number of dropouts (attrition) from schools, has an emotional and psychological impact on victims and results in failure achievement motivation and academic achievement for bullies and victims. The researcher also had taken similar evidence obtained by a study sponsored by plan Ethiopia (Plan Ethiopia, 2008) where predominantly boys were found to be perpetrators of bullying. This result is in line with the Ethiopian culture that tends to encourage girls to be passive and submissive. On the contrary, boys are expected to be more active, and aggression by boys is tolerated if not encouraged.

Thus, the major concern of this study was investigate the relationship between personality patterns, achievement motivation and bullying behaviors in the second cycle elementary schools of Woldia town.

Scholars' observations of children on playground and in classrooms confirmed that bullying occurs frequently: once every seven minutes on the playground and once every 25 minutes in the class (Craig & Pepler, 1997). Despite these numbers, bullying behavior is rarely detected by teachers. Bullying seems to increase through the elementary years, peak in middle/junior high school years, and decline through the high school years. Boys engage in bullying behavior and are victims of bullies more frequently than girls. Those who are bullied show higher levels of insecurity, anxiety, depression, loneliness, physical and mental symptoms and low self-esteem. Boys report more physical forms of bullying; girls tend to bully in indirect ways, such as gossiping and excluding (Craig & Pepler, 1997). Bullying is pervasive and terribly harmful for bullies, victims, schools and communities. The consequences of bullying are far-reaching, ranging from lower attendance and lower student achievement motivation to increased violence and juvenile crime; and not only does it harm victims and perpetrators, it affects the climate of schools, morale of teachers, and indirectly, the ability of all students to learn to the best of their abilities. Repeated bullying leads to anxiety, low self-esteem, low achievement motivation, and depression – problems (Olweus, 1991; Pepler & Craig, 2000). Students who are targeted by bullies often have difficulty concentrating on their school work and their academic performance tends to be "marginal to poor" (Ballard et al., 1999). Typically bullied students feel anxious, and this anxiety may in turn produce a variety of physical or emotional ailments. Nansel et al. (2001) opined that youths who are bullied generally show higher levels of insecurity, anxiety, depression, loneliness, unhappiness, physical and mental symptoms and low

self-esteem. The psychological scars left by bullying often endure for years. Evidence indicates that “feelings of isolation and the loss of self-esteem that victims experience seem to last into adulthood” (Clarke & Kiselica, 1997).

Numerous research reports document the relationship between bullying and achievement motivation, personality patterns, social and mental health issues. Related to this, Eisenberg and Neumark Sztainer (2003) found that peer harassment, i.e. bullying, is negatively related to connection to school and achievement motivation. With regard to the relationship between personality patterns and bullying behavior in an Ethiopian context Arefaine (2009) has reported that there is a great relationship between personality patterns and bullying behavior of students. There has, to the researcher’s knowledge, been only one study on the relationship between personality patterns and bullying behavior of students in Gondar town by Arefanie (2009). In addition to this, there is no local study that explored the relations among personality patterns, achievement motivation and bullying behavior of junior primary schools particularly in Woldia town.

So, this study was investigating the relationship between personality patterns and achievement motivation on bullying behavior and forms of bullying. Accordingly, the study attempts to answer the following basic questions.

1. What are the forms of bullying behavior observed in the study?
2. Is there a relationship between personality patterns, achievement motivation and bullying behavior?

Methods Population, samples, and sampling

The participants of the study were 204 eighth grade students (whose age ranged from 13 to 15) identified as perpetrators of bullying in Woldia Town, Amhara National Regional State Ethiopia.

The procedure in Table 1 selecting the participants is described as follows. From the six public schools located in urban centers of Woldia town, three of them were selected using a lottery method. These schools had 16 sections with a total of 888 students. In all the sections, to identify students involved in bullying, the researcher read aloud to the 888 students Olweus (2011) definition of bullying and the characteristics of different roles in bullying (bullies, reinforcers, and assistants) as described by Salmivalli et al., (1996). Then, the students wrote on a piece of paper the names of students in their classes whom they think are bullies, reinforcers, and assistants. Using this procedure the total number of students nominated was 312. Considering the frequency of nominations, a student was categorized into the bullying roles (bully, reinforcer, assistant) when their Z score on the roles is greater or equal to 1 ($Z \geq 1$). Because 108 students had Z values of less than one the researchers identified only 204 (118 males and 86 females) as being involved in bullying among whom 74 were bullies, 80 reinforcers and 50 assistants. This role assignment method was adopted from Tani, Greenman, Schneider, and Fregoso,

(2003) and Sutton, Smith, and Sweetenham (1999). Among the participants of this study, 75 were from Segno geba primary school, 65 from Woldia primary school, and 64 from Salmeni primary school. Table 1 presents the characteristics of respondents.

Table 1. Bullying roles identified from different schools across sex

Sample School	Total Number of Students			Nominated students from each school as :											
				Bullies			Reinforcers			Assistants			Total		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Segno gebeya	163	161	324	18	11	29	17	13	30	9	7	16	44	31	75
Woldia	123	131	254	12	9	21	15	9	24	13	7	20	40	25	65
Salmeni	157	153	310	16	8	24	13	13	26	5	9	14	34	30	64
Total	443	445	888	46	28	74	45	35	80	27	23	50	118	86	204

Legend: M=male F=Female T=Total

Tools of data collection

In the present study three questionnaires were used. The first questionnaire consisting of nine items that measure the role of students in bullying behavior was adapted from Salmivalli et al. (1996) Bullying Participant Role Scale which is popular measure of bullying behavior. The questionnaire had five alternative responses: “Always,” “Frequently,” “Sometimes,” “Rarely,” and “Never” scored 4, 3, 2, 1, and 0 respectively. This scale had five subscales: bully, reinforcer,

assistant, defender and outsider. For the present study, however, the first three subscales were used because people involved only in these roles perpetrate victimization. Sample items in the scale include *I start bullying* (from bully sub-scale), *I assist the bully* (from assistant sub-scale), and *I laugh at the bullied child* (from reinforcer sub-scale). Salmivalli et al. (1996) found reliability indices of the subscales as estimated by Cronbach alpha for bully, assistant, and reinforcer respectively .93, .81, and .91. The second questionnaire, measure of personality, was adapted from John, Caspi, Robins, Moffitt, and Stouthamer-Loeber (1994) NEO's personality scale for children and consisted of 29 items. The questionnaire taps data on five dimensions of personality: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness. Sample items in this scale are *I am energetic and full of life* (from extraversion sub-scale), *I get along well with other people* (from agreeableness sub-scale), *I find ways to make things happen and get things done* (from conscientiousness sub-scale), *I am nervous and fearful* (from neuroticism sub-scale), and *I am curious and exploring; I like to learn and experience new things* (from openness sub-scale). This questionnaire had five alternative response: "strongly agree", "agree", "partially agree", "disagree", and "strongly disagree" scored 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 respectively. John et al. (1994) reported the reliabilities of the subscales as $\alpha = .73$ for extraversion, $\alpha = .83$ for agreeableness, $\alpha = .78$ for conscientiousness, $\alpha = .71$ for neuroticism and $\alpha = .53$ for openness. Deo-Mohan Achievement Motivation Scale $\alpha = 0.70$ (20 items) which do have 20 items was also used to measure the achievement motivation of bullies. The scale has five options (Always, Frequently, Sometimes, Rarely and never)

In order to minimize language barrier on the part of respondents, in the present study, the items in all the questionnaires were originally prepared in English and then translated into Amharic. Forward and backward translation procedures were followed in the translation.

Validation and Piloting of the instruments

Before they were administered for data collection the scales were evaluated for ambiguity and content validity by five educational psychology instructors. Then based on their evaluations the statements in the scales were modified and the final scales were developed and administered to 65 (nominated by 250 randomly selected students) from jemanigus primary school, a school at Woldia, which was not included in the main study. Among the 65 respondents 20 were bullies, 25 reinforcers, and 20 assistants. The Cronbach alpha reliability indices for personality dimensions, neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness subscales, respectively were .77, .80, .79, .75 and .69. Whereas, the bully, assistant, and reinforcer subscales respectively were found to have an alpha coefficient reliability of .77, .88, and .84 which are all satisfactory. In this study, the reliability of the achievement motivation scale was $\alpha = 0.77$. In studies of Deo-Mohan Achievement Motivation Scale has $\alpha = 0.70$

Data collection procedures

Before administering the finalized forms of the questionnaires a short orientation was given to two data collectors on how to conduct the questionnaire survey. After they were informed about the purpose of the study and how to complete the questionnaire, respondents agreed to fill the questionnaire.

Methods of Data Analysis

Correlations were computed to examine the interrelationship between personality, achievement motivation and bullying. Multiple linear regression analysis was also conducted to assess the combined, the independent, and the interactive effect of achievement and personality on bullying.

Forms of bullying

The first objective of this study was to examine forms of bullying. Thus, frequency count was computed to examine forms of bullying. The results are presented in Table 2

Table 2. Forms of bullying

character	forms of bullying													
	physical		verbal		relational		P+V		P+R		V+R		P+V+R	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Male	33	3.72	39	4.39	35	3.94	8	0.9	3	0.3	6	0.68	2	0.23
Female	17	1.91	30	3.38	50	5.63	4	0.45	2	0.2	4	0.45	-	-
Total	50	5.63	69	7.77	85	9.57	12	1.35	5	0.56	10	1.13	2	0.23

To investigate the forms of bullying in the study area, two questions were administered to 16 sections of grade 8 students to know the role of students in bullying behavior and the extent to which girls and boys were bullying others i.e. whether this took the form of physical, verbal, and relational bullying. The data collected from the students on the forms of bullying they had been involved in was categorized into physical, verbal, relational, physical-verbal, physical relational, verbal-relational and physical verbal-relational forms of bullying. However, though most students have been grouped in one of under the above three forms of bullying but some who have got the same number of nomination vote of forms of bullying have been grouped by combining the forms of bullying behavior like physical-verbal (P+V), physical relational (P+R), verbal-relational (V+R) and physical-verbal-relational (P+V+R) forms of bullying. Finally, the data was subjected to frequency and percentage.

As presented in table 1, among 888 students 204 (22.97%), of students were engaged in bullying of others. The number of students who involved in physical, verbal and relational forms of bullying was 50 (5.63 %), 69 (7.77%) and 85(9.57%) respectively/table 2/. The number of students who involved in physical-verbal, physical-relational, verbal relational and physical-verbal-relational forms of bullying was 12 (1.35 %), 5(0.56%), 10(1.13 %) and 2 (0.23%) respectively.

With regard to sex differences, 33 (3.72%) males and 17 (1.91%) females demonstrated physical bullying.39 (4.39%) males and 30 (3.38%) females showed verbal bullying. 35 (3.94%) males and 50 (5.63%) females demonstrated relational bullying.

Research question 2: Is there a relationship among personality, achievement motivation and bullying behavior?

In order to answer this question, the responses of the students on the variables were analyzed using multiple linear regressions.

Table 3. Results of regression of bullies bullying behavior on the independent variables

Multiple R= .656 ^a R square= .431 Adjusted R square=.370					
Analysis of variance					
	Df	sum of squares	mean square	F	sig.
Regression	7	1178.605	168.372	7.130	.000
Residual	66	1558.489	23.613		
Total	73	2737.095			

Table 4 shows that the impact of the independent variable combined is significant ($F_{7, 66} = 7.130, P < 0.05$). The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .431$) shows that 43.1 % of the variance in bullying is explained by the combined impact of the independent variables.

Table 4. Regressions weight of the independent variables

Variable	Regression weight	Standard error	Beta coefficient	t	Sig.
Extraversion (x1)	-.055	.206	-.026	-.265	.792
Agreeableness (X2)	.442	.320	.141	1.383	.171
Conscientiousness (X3)	-.900	.276	-.326	-3.259	.002
Neuroticism (X4)	.308	.157	.215	1.961	.054
Openness (X5)	-.035	.282	-.015	-.123	.902
Achievement motivation(x6)	.291	.101	.324	2.892	.005

When bullying behavior was regressed on all of the independent variables the multiple correlation coefficient was $R = 0.656$ and the coefficient of determination was $R^2 = 0.431$

The multiple correlations ($R_{y, 123...7}$) show a significant relationship among bullies students bullying behavior (y) and the combination of the independent variables ($F_{7, 66} = 7.130, P < 0.05$). The coefficient of determination ($R^2_{y, 123...7}$) shows that 43.1% of the variability in bullying behavior was accounted for by the linear combination of the independent variables.

Table 5 .Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression on the Regression of Bullying behavior on the Independent Variables

Step	Variable entered	R	R ²	F	Δ R ²	F(Δ R ²)
1	X3	.584 ^a	.341	37.261	-	-
2	X6	.620 ^b	.384	21.467	0.043	-

$P < 0.05$).

As shown in Table 5, when all the variables were entered into the regression equation, Conscientiousness was found to be the variable that relatively accounted for the highest variation in students' bullying behavior. This variable explained 34.1% of the total variance in bullying behavior. This was statistically significant ($F_{1, 72} = 37.261, P < 0.05$). Achievement motivation was the next best predictor that was entered to the regression equation. Its inclusion raised the coefficient of determination by 4.3%, which is a statistically significant increase ($F_{2, 71} = 21.467, P < 0.05$). Sex was also another predictor that was entered to the regression equation. Its inclusion raised the coefficient of determination by 2.9%, which is a statistically significant increase ($F_{3, 70} = 9.056, P < 0.05$).

As compared to sex, Conscientiousness and Achievement motivation contributed more to the variation in bullying behavior. The contribution of the remaining independent variables was very little. The increase in the coefficient of determination when all other independent variables were entered was 1.8% which is not statistically significant ($F_{4, 69} = 1.106, P > 0.05$). This indicates that there was little or no relationship between Extraversion, Agreeableness, Neuroticism, and Openness of students.

Table 6. Results of regression of assistants bullying behavior on the independent variables

Multiple R = .588 ^a R square = .346 Adjusted R square = .237					
Analysis of variance					
	Df	sum of squares	mean square	F	sig.
Regression	7	445.357	63.622	3.172	.009 ^b
Residual	42	842.323	20.055		

Table 6 shows that the impact of the independent variable combined is significant ($F_{7, 42} = 3.172, P < 0.05$). The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .346$) shows that 34.6 % of the variance in bullying is explained by the combined impact of the independent variables.

Table 7. Regressions weight of the independent variables

Variable	Regression weight	Standard error	Beta coefficient	t	Sig.
Extraversion (x1)	-.221	.262	-.108	-.847	.402
Agreeableness (X2)	.045	.271	.021	.165	.870
Conscientiousness (X3)	.199	.416	.074	.479	.634
Neuroticism (X4)	.276	.231	.171	1.194	.239
Openness (X5)	.623	.211	.480	2.958	.005
Achievement motivation(x6)	.008	.141	.008	.059	.954

The coefficient of determination ($R^2_{y, 123...7}$) shows that 34.6% of the variability in bullying behavior was accounted for by the linear combination of the independent variables.

Table 7 indicated that among the independent variables, it was only openness, and sex that significantly impact on bullying behavior whereas the rest variables were not having significant impact.

Table 8. Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression on the Regression of Bullying behavior on the Independent Variables

Step	Variable entered	R	R ²	F	ΔR^2	F(ΔR^2)
1	X5	.481 ^a	.231	14.441	-	-

As shown in Table 8, when all the variables were entered into the regression equation, openness was found to be the variable that relatively accounted for the highest variation in students' bullying behavior. This variable explained 23.1 % of the total variance in bullying behavior. This was statistically significant ($F_{1, 48} = 14.441, P < 0.05$). The increase in the coefficient of determination when all other independent variables were entered was 4.6% which is not statistically significant ($F_{5, 41} = .867, P > 0.05$). This indicates that there was little or no relationship between Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism and Achievement motivation of students.

Table 9. A result of regressions of reinforces bullying behavior on the independent Variables

Multiple R= .510 R square= .260 Adjusted R square=.188

Analysis of variance

Df	sum of squares	mean square	F	sig.
Regression 7	423.846	60.549	3.616	.002 ^b
Residual 72	1205.704	16.746		

Table 9 shows that the impact of the independent variable combined is significant ($F_{7, 72} = 3.616, P < 0.05$). The coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .260$) shows that 26 % of the variance in bullying is explained by the combined impact of the independent variables.

When bullying behavior was regressed on all of the independent variables the multiple correlation coefficient was $R = 0.510$ and the coefficient of determination was $R^2 = 0.260$

The multiple correlations ($R_{y.123...7}$) show a significant relationship among reinforces students bullying behavior (y) and the combination of the independent variables ($F_{7,72}=3.616, p < 0.05$). The coefficient of determination ($R^2_{y.123...7}$) shows that 26% of the variability in bullying behavior was accounted for by the linear combination of Table 10 indicated that among the independent variables, it was only Neuroticism and Openness that significantly impacts on bullying behavior whereas the rest variables were not having significant impact

As shown in Table 10, when all the variables were entered into the regression equation, neuroticism was found to be the variable that relatively accounted for the highest variation in In Table 10, when all the variables were entered into the regression equation, neuroticism was found to be the variable that relatively accounted for the highest variation in students' bullying behavior. students' bullying behavior.

Table 10. Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression on the Regression of Bullying behavior on the Independent Variables

Step	Variable entered	R	R ²	F	Δ R ²	F(Δ R ²)
1	X4	.394 ^a	.155	14.339	-	-
2	X5	.479 ^b	.23	14.300	0.075	7.900

P* < 0.05

This variable explained 15.5 % of the total variance in bullying behavior. This was statistically significant ($F_{1,72} = 14.339, P < 0.05$). Openness was the next best predictor that was entered to the regression equation. Its inclusion raised the coefficient of determination by 3%, which is a statistically significant increase ($F_{2,77} = 7.900, P < 0.05$).

As compared to openness, neuroticism contributed more to the variation in bullying behavior. The contribution of the remaining independent variables was very little. The increase in the coefficient of determination when all other independent variables were entered was 7.5% which is not statistically significant ($F_{4,75} = .928, P > 0.05$). This indicates that there was little or no relationship between Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Achievement motivation and sex of students.

DISCUSSION

The discussion is made first about descriptive statistics and the results obtained with regard to forms of bullying behavior. Discussions is also be made with regard to relationship of personality and an achievement motivation and bullying behavior.

The results obtained in the present study showed that there is significant difference between males and females in physical, verbal and relational bullying. According to the result males showed more physical bullying behavior than females. This finding confirms the report of one study of Olweus (1996) which reported that Boys are more likely to employ direct bullying.

Furthermore, the finding of this research also supported by Eron, Huesmann, Dubow, Romanoff, &Yamel (1987) result who reported that the type of bullying varies according to gender as well. Boy bullies are three to four times more likely to inflict physical assaults than girl bullies, whereas girls use more ridicule and teasing (Hoover, Oliver, &Hazler, 1996).

Likewise other research also explained the forms of bullying behavior of male and female students. This means that the types of bullying the male students get involved in are different from that of girls. The present finding supported by one study of Salimvalli et al. (1998)

who reported that male bullying tends to be physical while that of female is relational or indirect.

There is significant difference between males and females in verbal bullying. According to the result males showed more verbal bullying than females. This finding is inconsistent with (smith and sharp, 1994: Gumpel and mead an, 2000) in that the rate of bullying being very similar for both males and females. However, the result of this study is supported by Taylor(2003) as cited by International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education which reported that boys were more involved in direct physical and direct verbal forms of bullying behavior than their female peers,

On the other hand, as presented in the above table there is significant difference between males and females, in relational bullying. According to the result females showed more relational bullying than males and this is consistent with olweus (1993) and Tulloch(1995) who reported that bullying of girls tends to be more psychological and indirect and is often perpetrated by groups employing methods such as social exclusion and spreading rumors. The result of this study also supported by Sampson(2009) that girls value social relationships more than boys do, so girl bullies set out to disrupt social relationships with gossip, isolation, silent treatment, and exclusion.

Salimvalli et al. (1998) finding also consistent with the present finding who reported that Female students get involved in less physical violence as a result they tend to use subtle method like spreading rumors and manipulations and manipulations of friendship while boys can be involved in hitting and kicking. Similarly the finding is supported by Taylor H. (2003) that explained Boys are more likely to experience direct forms of bullying such as physical aggression or intimidation whereas girls are more likely to experience indirect forms of bullying such as social exclusion. In the view of the researcher the finding might be due to cultural discouraging of the society to involve females in to physical bullying, hence females are found to be more bullies in indirect bullying, moreover, there are groups of students who support their peers and sometimes participate in teasing and spreading rumors for other students.

The other possible suggestions that might be boys involved in physical bullying is family personality that come into view to be the most serious in the development of bullying behaviors include a lack of affection and warmth from the child's primary caregivers. The result of multiple linear regressions showed both personality patterns and achievement motivation had significant contribution for bullying behavior of bullies, assistants and reinforces.

In bullies multiple linear regressions result only achievement motivation, and conscientiousness contributed significantly to bullying behavior of bullies. But others personality traits were not significant of their behavior. For assistants only openness and sex had contributed significantly for bullying behavior whereas neuroticism and openness contributed significantly for reinforces bullying behavior. In general, all categories of bully had scored highest mean score value in neuroticism as compared to others personality patterns. In the rest variables they had scored low mean values. This finding is consistent with Ehrler, Evans, and McGhee (1999) who reported that children with low scores on agreeableness and conscientiousness exhibited social problems, conduct problems, attention deficits, and hyperactivity. Children with low scores on openness exhibited problems in social behavior, conduct, and attention, whereas neuroticism was associated with anxiety and depression.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As one of the most persistent and destructive forms of aggression in the continuum of violence, bullying deserves the attention of everyone.

It can be stated that personality appears to play a role in causing bullying behavior. A variety of suggested solutions have to be offered in order to reduce and prevent bullying behavior by the joint efforts of the

CONCLUSION

Bullying is a global problem and it can be found in every school all over the world. It is too often Seen a way of life for young people in any society. When nothing is done about bullying, it has a lot of negative consequences on the children. The children suffer torments and harassments. It can cause life-long damage to the bullied and the bullies. If a school fails to deal with bullying, it can endanger the safety of all the students and teachers. Consequently, bullying should be seen as the responsibility of everyone including the government, educators, policymakers, police, parents, community organizations, religious organizations and students themselves.

From the findings, therefore one may possibly arrive at the following conclusions.

➤ Among 888 students 204 (22.97%), of students were engaged in bullying of others. The number of students who involved in physical, verbal and relational forms of bullying was 50 (5.63 %), 69 (7.77%) and 85(9.57%) respectively/table 2/. The number of students who involved in physical-verbal, physical-relational, verbal relational and physical-verbal-relational forms of bullying was 12 (1.35 %), 5(0.56%), 10(1.13 %) and 2 (0.23%) respectively. The results obtained in the above showed that there is significant difference between males and females in physical, verbal and relational bullying. According to the result males showed more physical bullying behavior than females.

➤ When all the variables were entered into the regression equation, Conscientiousness was found to be the variable that relatively accounted for the highest variation in students' bullying behavior. This variable explained 34.1% of the total variance in bullying behavior. This was statistically significant ($F_{1, 72} = 37.261$, $P < 0.05$). Achievement motivation was the next best predictor that was entered to the regression equation. Its inclusion raised the coefficient of determination by 4.3%, which is a statistically significant increase ($F_{2, 71} = 21.467$, $P < 0.05$). This finding showed that both personality and achievement motivations are important determinants of bullying.

administrators of schools, teachers, students, parents and community members of the

school. Thus, on the basis of the findings obtained and conclusions reached at, the following suggestions are forwarded, for bullying to be reduced to its barest minimum level.

1. Initiate conversations with students about the nature and characteristics of bullying, its consequences and how to tackle the bullying behavior.
2. The schools and home should work collaboratively to

instill good values in their children/students by providing awareness about bullying behavior to teachers, parents, administration workers and the community. Invite parents to involve in the program planning, implementation and evaluation to reduce bullying behavior.

3. Schools should provide increased supervision in places on school grounds during break and lunch times where bullying is more likely to occur and work with the school staff by attentively following each activity of the students to ensure adequate supervision in order to minimize bullying activities.

4. Schools must encourage bullied students to report incidents of bullying and took non-violent means of resolving conflicts by avoiding physical forms of discipline.

5. Initiate a reward to the children's acceptable behavior more positively to counter bullying behavior.

6. The schools should provide counseling and support for students at risk of being involved in bullying.

7. The parents and teachers must recognize the danger of violent films and discourage their Children/ students from watching them.

8. This investing can't claim to be perfect and lasting answer to the bullying behavior under treatment. Therefore, further depth research with different types of tools should follow to the present study.

REFERENCES

- Book, A. S., Volk, A. A., & Hoske, A. (2012). Adolescent bullying and personality: An adaptive approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 218–223
- Clarke, E. A. & Kiselica, M. S. (1997). A systematic counseling to the problem of bullying. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, 31, 310-324.
- Čolović, P., Kodžopeljić, J., Mitrović, D. Dinić, B. & Smederevac, Z. S. (2015). Roles in violent interactions in early adolescence: Relations with personality traits, friendship and gender, *PSIHOLOGIJA*, 48(2), 119–133.
- Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (1998). Observations of bullying and victimization in the school yard. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 13(2), 41–59. doi: 10.1177/082957359801300205
- Ehrler, D.J., Evans, J.G. & McGhee, R.L. (1999). Extending Big-Five Theory into Childhood: A Preliminary Investigation into the Relationship between Big-Five Personality Traits and Behavior Problems in Children. *Psychology in the Schools*, 36, 451–58.
- Eysenck, H. (1977). *Crime and Personality*. London: Routledge and Kegan Pau.
- Heaven, P.C.L. (1996) Personality and self-reported delinquency: Analysis of the 'Big Five' personality dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 20, 47–54.
- Hokoda, A., Lu, H. A. & Angeles, M. (2006). School Bullying in Taiwanese Adolescents, *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 6:4, 69-90
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (eds.). *Handbook of personality: theory and research* (pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.
- John, O. P., Caspi, A., Robins, R. W., Moffitt, T. E., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1994). The "Little Five": Exploring the nomological network of the five-factor model of personality in adolescent boys. *Child Development*, 65, 160-178.
- Juvonen, J. & Graham, S. (Eds). *Peer Harassment in School: The Plight of the Vulnerable and Victimized*. New York: Guilford.
- Khamis, V. (2015). Bullying among school-age children in the greater Beirut area: Risk and protective factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 39, 137–146
- Menesini, E., Camodeca, M., & Nocentini, A. (2010). Bullying among siblings: the role of personality and relational variables. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 28, 921-939. doi: 10.1348/026151009X479402
- Mynard, H. & Joseph, S. (1997). Bully/victim problems and their association with Eysenck's personality dimensions in 8 to 13 year-olds. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67, 51-54
- Nansel, T. R. Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Schdild, P. (2001). Bullying Behaviour among U.S youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of American Medical Association*, 285(16), 2094-2100.
- Olweus, D. (1991) Bully/victim problems among school children: basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. In: Pepler D and Rubin K (eds.), *The Development and Treatment of Childhood Aggression* (pp 441–448). Erlbaum, Hillsdale, NJ.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at School. What we know and what we can do?* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school: basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*, 35, 1171–90.
- Olweus, D. (2011). Bullying at school and later criminality: Findings from three Swedish community samples of males. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 21, 151–156. DOI: 10.1002/cbm.806
- Pearce, J.B., Thompson, A. E. (1998). Practical approaches to reduce the impact of bullying. *Arch Dis Child*, 79, 528–31.
- Raskauskas, J. L., Gregory, J., Harvey, S.T., Rifshana, F. & Evans, I. M. (2010): Bullying among primary school children in New Zealand: relationships with prosocial behaviour and classroom climate. *Educational Research*, 52(1), 1-13.
- Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K. Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K.

- and Kaukiainen, A (1996). Bullying as a Group Process: Participant Roles and Their Relations to Social Status Within the Group. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22, 1-15
- Seigne, E., Coyne, I., Randall, P. & Parker, J. (2007). Personality traits of bullies as a contributory factor in workplace bullying: an exploratory study. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 10 (1), 118-132
- Sutton, J., Smith, P.K. & Swettenham, J. (1999) 'Social Cognition and Bullying: Social Inadequacy or Skilled Manipulation?' *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 17, 435–50.
- Tani, F., Greenman, P. S., Schneider, B.H. & Fregoso, M. (2003). A study of childhood personality and participant roles in bullying incidents. *The Journal of School Psychology International*, 24(2), 131-135.
- Terefe, D. & Mengistu, D. (1997). Violence in Ethiopian schools: A study of some schools in Addis Ababa. In T. Ohsako (ed). *Violence at school: Global issues and interventions* (pp 34-56). Paris: UNESCO, International Bureau of Education
- Twemlow, S. W., Fogarty, P., Sacco, F.C., Gies, M.L., Evans, R. & Ewbank, R.(2001). Creating a peaceful school learning environment: a controlled study of an elementary school intervention to reduce violence. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 158, 808–810.
- Whitney, R. & Smith, P. K.(1993). A survey of the nature and extent of school bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Educational Research*, 35(1), 3-25
- Wu, J., He, Y., Lu, C., Deng, X., Gao, X., Guo, L., ... Zhou, Y. (2015). Bullying behaviors among Chinese school-aged youth: A prevalence and Correlates Study in Guangdong Province. *Psychiatry Research*, 225, 716–722.

