



Cognitive Constructs of School Administrators Regarding Peer Victimization and Their Behavioural Attitudes towards Bullying

Fuat TANHAN*^a

Article Info

DOI:

Article History:

Received: 19 Sep. 2021

Accepted: 20 Dec. 2021

Published: 31 Dec. 2021

Keywords:

School administrator,
Peer victimization,
Cognitive construct

Article Type:

ORIGINAL

Abstract

This article analyzes the cognitive constructs and behavioral attitudes of primary and secondary-level school administrators regarding peer victimization. The research's working group consists of 10 voluntaries, demographically different school administrators. The study is designed with repertory grid interview technique which is a structured interview technique among the qualitative research methods under the phenomenological pattern. This technique aims to reveal each individual's inner stored cognitive constructs regarding specific issue. The research was conducted in two stages and participants produced 200 cognitive constructs in total. During the first stage, the cognitive constructs produced were grouped by their similarities such as Psychological, Verbal and Physical Bullying. Then, the constructs were examined in terms of genders. Correlatively, at the second stage, 100 cognitive constructs which the school administrators produced related to their behavioral attitudes towards bullying were grouped under ten headings. These are "Referring to Counseling Services, Verbal Warning, Meeting with Students, refer to Disciplinary Committee, Make the bully Apologize/ Reconcile, Ignore, Giving Advice, Meeting with Student, Meeting with the Class Teacher, Directing to/Excluding from the Social Activities". At the end of the research, the findings are discussed according to the literature. Finally, some recommendations have been developed. This study provides a concrete example of a reflective practice approach that is both theoretically grounded and tied to bottom-up issues that are of interest to school administrators and researchers on peer victimization.

*Corresponding Author: fuattanhan@yyu.edu.tr

^aProf. Dr., Van Yuzuncu Yil University, Van/TURKEY, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1990-4988>

Introduction

Bullying (Olweus, 1993), which is characterized as the realization of interpersonal power imbalances over a period of time is a major disciplinary problem for schools. How bullying is perceived by school administrators, which types of behaviours are included in the bullying category and which are not, what practices exist against these problematic behaviours are crucial for developing a solution for this problem. Bullying is a type of continuous violence that has physical or psychological consequences and is perpetrated by an individual or group against a person who is unable to protect her/himself (Roland & Idsoe, 2001). Bullying is a subset of aggressive behaviour that results in the bully's intentional inflicting physical or psychological pain on the victim; need not be provoked, it is repeated, the bully is stronger than the victim or perceived as stronger (Sharp & Smith, 1991). According to Benbenishty and Astor (2005), society and school environment cannot be considered independently and what happens in the society affects the school environment, and what happens in schools affects the society. When the incidents of aggression in schools are examined, it is seen that bullying behaviours, which are a type of violence and aggression among students, are quite common. In studies about bullying, it is seen that students other than the bully and the victim in bullying events are classified into five types. First, bully-victims are individuals who both exhibit bullying behaviour and are exposed to bullying. The reinforces in the second group provoke the bully in various ways in the role of active audience, while the passive audience in the third group act as if they do not see what is going on. Assistant type participants, classified as the fourth type, help the bully physically and take on a kind of assistant role. Defenders in the last group, on the other hand, try to help the victim and face the bully (McKinnon, 2001). This research seeks to examine whether school administrators see the undesirable behaviours they encounter at school as peer bullying or not, and what attitudes they display toward the behaviour they perceive as bullying.

Peer Victimization

Bullying is the repeated physical or mental violence of an individual who cannot defend himself or herself (Roland & Idsoe, 2001). Although this term is synonymous with peer bullying, peer harassment, peer abuse, (Vitoroulis & Vaillancourt, 2015), the most common use in literature is "peer victimisation". American politicians, educators, parents, and education stakeholders state that peer victimisation is a vital disciplinary problem in today's schools (Notar & Padgett, 2013). 14% of school-age children in Norway, 15% of primary school students in Japan, and 17% of students in Australia and Spain state that they were bullied; this rate is %29 in the UK. Bullying is also a major problem for the younger population in Nigeria (Fareo, 2015).

Peer victimisation includes different concepts such as inequality, abuse, and injustice, and it can be difficult to conceptualize or define because it includes multiple aspects of violence. Therefore, it is quite arduous to classify bullying in a simple way (Rigby, 2002). Although the most common types of classification are physical, verbal, direct, or relational (Slonje, Robert & Smith, Peter. (2008), Wong (2009) discusses bullying in three groups: physical, verbal, and social exclusion. Canadian educator and researcher Bill Belsey, who introduced the concept of cyberbullying, states that 14-23% of adolescents send aggressive, pornographic, abusive, or threatening messages via their mobile phones, and that cyberbullying is a great danger.

In reviewing the literature on the subject, it can be seen that 30% of students in the world are exposed to bullying (Craig, Henderson & Murphy, 2000; Robert, Loft, Long; 2020), while in Turkey this rate is higher at 35% (Pişkin, 2005). Yen et al. (2013) found that low socio-economic status triggers bullying. Also, studies show that children of inconsistent, hostile, warm, and overly controlling parents are more likely to commit peer bullying (Pontzer, 2010). Teacher and parent reports obtained from the literature reflect the lack of full adult observation in schools and insufficient teacher control during breaks as additional reasons for peer bullying (Vaillancourt, Brittain, et al., 2010). Therefore, bullying interventions should be designed in a way so as to cover all of these elements (Smith, Scchneider, et al., 2004).

Peer Bullying Prevention, Intervention and Evaluation Strategies

Crothers and Levinson (2004) argue that studies for the prevention of peer victimisation should be comprehensive to include evaluation, prevention, and intervention sections. School administrators should use their leadership power and authority to create a positive climate in schools, examine the nature and impact areas of bullying within their institutions, and evaluate the frequency and locations of bullying acts. Also, they can talk to the students involved, provide bullying awareness training to their staff, and identify which behaviors

constitute victimization (Bullying Prevention and Intervention, 2018). Besides, the school administration can make effective disciplinary decisions by talking to witnesses of these incidents and acquiring details from third party perspectives (Creating Safe School, 2019, pp.56). Nassau City New York City Bullying Prevention and Intervention Center (2009, issue 21) suggests that school administrators should listen to those concerned, fill in the necessary forms, and provide follow-up actions without mediating directly between the bully and the victim. On the other hand, the Massachusetts Bullying Prevention Center (2017) states that administrators should investigate the situation in the face of acts of bullying, interview families after meeting with students, take the necessary disciplinary measures, and inform the authorized police units in the event of a criminal offense. Elinoff, Chafouleas, and Sassau in additionally recommend the imposition of controllable sanctions such as not resenting the bully, teaching the use of reflective thinking skills like empathy, and creating activities that include conflict management, human rights, and respect (2004). Also, teaching the "person-first language" to the victim plays a crucial role. Moreover, literature suggests that creating support groups to solve possible problems in line with the goals of school anti-bullying policies (Fekkes, Fijpers & Verloove, 2005), providing friendlier and healthier behavior development conditions for bullies (Neto, 2005), training bullies' social skills (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005); tracking the bullying events with a peer mentoring system (Young et al., 2006).

Evaluations of peer victimisation can be generated by methods such as observation, interview, sociometric measurements, questionnaires, teacher opinions, and self-evaluations of bullies (Atik, 2009). Personal interviews and reports with bullies and victims make it easier for us to hear the voices of both bullies and victims. By asking students to address their thoughts before the bullying incident, the evaluation process can be performed with the reflective thinking technique by teaching them to express their feelings and utilize appropriate conflict resolution strategies (Principal Leadership, 2013). When Farrington and Ttofi (2009) examined past studies and data, they found that peer bullying prevention programs are generally effective and reduce bullying by approximately 20-23%. Therefore, in bullying interventions, the "evaluation" phase is vital (Jung, 2018).

School Administrators' Perceptions of Victimisation and Their Sanctions Against Bullying

School administrators should perceive and define these concepts correctly to prevent all kinds of cruelty, including bullying (Collier, 2012). According to a study by the Australian Student Welfare System, school administrators view bullying as a part of growing up and argue that children should solve problems among themselves. As reported by Pepler and Craig (2000), school staff do not know which actions are covered under bullying. In a study conducted in Turkey, it was found that 94.53% of teachers act individually while 46.88% of them ask school administrators for help. The same study states that when the bullying incidents happen, "Verbal Warning" is made in the first place with a rate of 67.97%, and warning, condemnation, and suspension from school penalties are given by the administrators when necessary (Çinkır & Kepenekçi, 2003).

Purpose of the Study

Peer victimisation constitutes a crucial part of the problems seen in schools. School administrators should deal with these problems using age-appropriate strategies with a scientific and humanistic approach that takes individual needs into account and develops interventions through scientific data. This requires both recognizing and knowing the effects of peer bullying behaviours and choosing the appropriate intervention method. Otherwise, it causes failure and damages educational environments. Our study aims to reveal the cognitive constructs of school administrators regarding peer victimisation, examine the sanctions they apply in case of bullying, and understand whether there is a difference between the cognitive construct-behavioural attitudes of female and male administrators depending on gender. In this study, which is based on the qualitative research method, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What are the cognitive constructs of school administrators regarding peer victimisation?
2. How does gender change the cognitive constructs of school administrators against peer victimisation?
3. What kind of sanctions do school administrators apply against bullying?

Method

Research Design

This study, which aims to examine school administrators' cognitive constructs and behavioral attitudes toward peer victimisation and reveal whether there is a difference between administrators of different genders with regards to the aforementioned. The research was planned and conducted in qualitative research methods by the phenomenological pattern. Qualitative research designs are utilized to obtain comprehensive information on a specified subject (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Phenomenological patterns, on the other hand, aim to reveal the cognitive structures in the mind by examining the experiences and interpretations of individuals in depth (Creswell, 2014; Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2006, p.270).

Participants

The statistical population of the research included 5 female and 5 male school administrators who were working in 10 different schools for the Turkish Ministry of Education in Edremit, İpekyolu, and Tusba districts of Van province during the 2019-2020 academic year, and who had at least 5 years of management experience. Also, all participants of this study were answered the data collection tool voluntarily.

Data Collection Tools

The data was collected with the Repertory Grid Technique (RGT), using Kelly's Personal Structure Theory. This technique was utilised because the cognitive constructs obtained from individuals can be identified and analyzed by the cognitive mapping method. Personal structure theory, a personality theory, together with RGT, reveal the ways of thinking about the phenomena experienced by the research participants based on their unique experiences through individual commentary. The aim is to interpret a situation in question and predict future events. While people try to make sense of the actions that take place in their lives, they unconsciously create personal fictions. In this way, they begin to make sense of the world they live in with individual interpretation systems developed on the basis of experiences. The theory is based on the proposition that "a person's lives, thoughts, feelings and behaviors are channeled through that person's expectation of events." (Kelly, 1991). The research method and the reasoning behind it should be included in this section. The literature about the research method should be stated. Moreover, the design of the study should be stated.

Table 1. Sample Repertory Grid Evaluation Form

STUDENTS						YOUR GENDER:			
Bully Students			Non-bully students			Bullying behavior	Sanctions	Sanction Score	Total
Ali	Veli	Can	Dila	Eda	Oya				
▲ 4	▲ 4	5	▲ 1	1	3	Insulting	Refer to disciplinary	5	18x10=180
3	▲ 1	▲ 4	5	▲ 1	1	Beating	Meeting with parents	1	15x9=135
▲		▲			▲	Threatening	Referring to ConsultingService	2	15x8=120
▲	▲			▲		-	-	-	-
▲	▲	▲	▲		▲	-	-	-	-
	▲	▲	▲			-	-	-	-
▲		▲			▲	-	-	-	-
▲	▲				▲	-	-	-	-
	▲	▲		▲		-	-	-	-

EXPLANATIONS

Please start filling after you are sure you have understood the form correctly.

Write the names of the 3 students who have committed the most peer bullying during your management life.

Write the names of 3 students who have been the least bully during your management life.

Write the first concept / cognitive construct that comes to your mind in the first row and the last one in the tenth row.

The data collection tools used in the study should be indicated here. Every tool should be introduced with an explanation of the reason behind the choice, its reliability and validity, and features. If needed, data collection tools can be introduced under subheadings. Subheadings should be written in sentences, italicised, starting with paragraph and the name of the measurement tool should be given in full. As an example;

The Repertory Grid Measurement Form (RGF) consists of different processing steps (Fransella, Bell & Bannister, 2004). In the first stage, administrators were invited to think about the students they know about the given subject. Administrators choose six students among the students they consider, three being the most bully and three being the least bully. In the second stage, the determined students were shown on a chart in ten different forms in the triple combination. In the third stage, the participants were asked to find concepts that differentiate the bully and least bully students determined in the previous stage in terms of bullying and to write these concepts in the specified area. The notions obtained led the researcher to cognitive constructs. In the fourth stage, scoring was made by the cognitive constructs produced on the chart. The first concepts that came to mind about students were the characteristics that administrators consider to be prominent/primary aspects of bullying. Less attention was paid to later concepts. Therefore, in the last stage, the final scores of the cognitive constructs were obtained by multiplying the first produced fiction by 10 and the last produced fiction by 1, taking into account the order of writing the cognitive concepts scored in the table (Fransella, Bell & Bannister, 2004). Thus, the researcher reaches these cognitive variables. The same process steps were followed when examining "Managers' Behavioral Attitudes Against Peer Bullying." An example of an applied "repertory grid" form that determines participants' cognitive constructs and behavioral attitudes towards bullying is given in Table 1 by the above-mentioned stages.

Data Analysis

While analyzing data, first of all, the grouping of the obtained cognitive constructs is applied (Fransella, Bell & Bannister, 2004). At this stage, 200 cognitive constructs were obtained in the interview form we applied to the managers. The fictions produced by 5 female and 5 male school administrators through RGÖF were analyzed considering their similarities and related features. The second stage is the creation of cognitive construct groups. At this point, it is necessary to create new categories that can frame and explain the data in a more comprehensive and general sense in the light of the constructs obtained. Cognitive constructs obtained about the administrators' cognitive constructs on peer victimization and their behavioral attitudes towards bullying were divided into different groups to include Verbal, Physical and Psychological bullying. In the third phase, the created groups were matched. To be more precise, the cognitive constructs produced by the participants were distributed according to their similarities and supergroups. In the last stage, the data were statistically solved.

Quantitative research should include methods used in analysis procedure(s) and their suitability for the research questions and hypotheses. The data analysis procedures should be discussed extensively. Quantitative research should include methods used in analysis procedure(s) and their suitability for the research questions and hypotheses. The data analysis procedures should be discussed extensively.

Findings

The findings obtained from the data analysis were given in line with the purpose of the study. Tables and figures were used to indicate the analysis result. This section was concerned with the presentation of the results.

Table 2. Cognitive constructs of all managers

PSYCHOLOGICAL / EMOTIONAL BULLYING		
1F (Peer pressure) 4,119	5M (Intimidation) 2,144	10F (Impose ideas) 3,160
3M (Intimidation) 4,119	5M(Intimidation) 6,85	6M (Take advantage of smb) 2,162
4M(Intimidation) 4,112	9F (Menacing) 7,64	6M (Play off) 5,90
5M (Teasing) 4,105	10F (Uncontrolled anger) 1,160	10F (Platonic love) 5,108
7M(Intimidation) 4,105	3M (Excluding) 8,45	8F (Grudge) 7,76
1F(Intimidation) 6,95	4M (Excluding) 9,32	6M (Forcing) 3,128
1F (Menacing) 7,84	8F (Excluding) 1,160	5M (Menacing) 8,48
3M (Menacing) 10,18	10F (Cyber bullying) 9,42	2F (Excluding) 6,115
VERBAL BULLYING		
7M (Verbal violence) 1,170	3M (Nicknaming) 9,26	7M (Ridicule) 10,14

2F (Swearing) 2,153	9F (Nicknaming) 3,122	9F(Humiliate) 1,160
3M(Verbal violence) 2,153	6M (Gossip) 10,16	8F (Criticise) 5,102
2F (Slanging) 3,168	9F (Gossip) 9,24	9F (Humiliate) 5,190
4M(Verbal violence) 3,144	4M (Defamation) 7,68	7M(Psych. pressure) 7,56
6M(Verbal violence) 6,80	6M (Defamation) 4,112	5M(Psych. pressure) 5,102
7M (Insulting) 6,75	8F (Defamation) 9,32	6M (Dissimulation) 9,36
2F(Insulting) 8,72	8F (Lie) 2,144	9F (Slander) 8,54
2F(Verbal violence) 9,50	2F (Mock) 1,170	10F (Grudge) 8,51
5M(Insulting) 8,72	3M (Ridicule) 1,140	8F (Ridicule) 10,17
10F (Slanging) 2,135	3M (Mock) 3,120	9F (Grudge) 10,15
10F(Insulting) 4,126	5M (Mock) 7,160	6M(Psych. Pressure) 1,120
10F (Catcall) 6,90	4M (Ridicule) 8,48	3M (Irritate) 5,96
7M (Nicknaming) 3,112	7M (Mock) 8,42	5M (Irritate) 9,30
2F (Nicknaming) 7,64	1F (Mock) 9,30	7M (Irritate) 9,28
6M (Nicknaming) 8,51	4M (Yell) 10,16	1F (Disrespect) 2,144
10F (Provoke) 7,80		
PHYSICAL BULLYING		
2F (Threaten with body lang)5,102	3M (Beating) 7,72	2F (Walk up to someone) 4,126
1F (Beating) 1,140	6M (Breaking things) 7,56	4M (Extort) 2,144
4M (Physical Violence) 1,150	1F (Physical attack) 8,48	1F (Starting a gang) 10,15
5M (Physical Violence) 1,170	2F (Beating) 10,18	1F (Stealing) 5,108
7M (Physical Violence) 2,135	9F (Physical attack) 2,135	8F (Extort) 3,96
5M (Beating) 3,144	8F (Writing slangs around) 4,91	1F (Sexual harassment) 3,120
4M (Beating) 5,108	9F (Kick) 4,105	10F (Stealing) 10,14
3M (Physical Violence) 6,85	8F (inappropriate jokes) 6,60	7M (Being rude) 5,96
4M (Damaging personal belongings) 6,90	8F (Imitation) 8,51	9F (Take things away by force) 6,50

NOTE: The meaning of the items in the cognitive constructs: The first number indicates the participant's rank and the letter next to it indicates his gender. Subsequently, the concepts in parentheses indicate the form of bullying, the first digit after the parenthesis indicates the ordinal value of the cognitive construct, and the second number indicates the participant subjective evaluation of the cognitive construct. For example, 5M (Hitting) 3,4, represents the order of 5 participants, M represents the gender of the participant, the bullying construct, 3 the rank value of the cognitive constructs, and 44 the cognitive construct score.

Table 2 shows three main construct groups produced by all managers participating in the research. Each of the 10 (ten) administrators produced 10 (ten) cognitive constructs. Thus, the 100 cognitive constructs created by school administrators regarding peer bullying were divided into three different groups and shown in Table 2. The first three cognitive constructs which are the most dominant of all cognitive constructs produced by the participants regarding peer bullying are (1) Mocking his appearance (5,190); (2) using verbal violence, respectively, with equal scores (1,170); Fooling (1,170); Physical violence (1,170); (3) Slang speaking (3,168). Besides, the least accepted cognitive construct was determined as (1) Mocking (10,14) and Stealing. Below are the main editing groups and the dominant cognitive constructs.

Table 3. Relative Importance of Cognitive Constructs Belonging to All Administrators

PARTICIPANTS	PSYCH. B.		VERBAL B.		PHYSICAL B.		TOTAL	
	CC	CCP	CC	CCP	CC	CCP	CC	CCP
1F	3	308	2	174	5	431	10	913
2F	1	115	6	677	3	246	10	1038
3M	3	182	5	535	2	157	10	874
4M	2	144	4	276	4	492	10	912
5M	4	382	4	364	2	314	10	1060
6M	3	380	6	415	1	56	10	851
7M	1	105	7	497	2	231	10	833
8F	2	236	4	295	4	298	10	829
9F	1	64	6	565	3	290	10	919
10F	4	470	5	482	1	14	10	966
TOTAL	24	2386	49	4280	27	2529	100	9195

A.A. (X)	99.41	87.34	93.66	91.95
NOTE: CC= Cognitive Construct		CCP= Cognitive Construct Point	AA= Arithmetic Average	

Table 3 includes findings that have been analyzed in two different ways. First of all, the relative importance scores of the cognitive constructs formed by each male and female school principal on the line they are located, divided into cognitive construct groups, were expressed. Accordingly, school administrators considered the "Psychological Bullying" group in the first place important in terms of handling peer bullying (X = 99.41). They found the cognitive construct groups named "Physical Bullying" (93.66) in the second place and "Verbal Bullying" (87.43) as important in the third place.

Table 4. Relative Importance of Cognitive Constructions of Female Administrators

PARTICIPANTS	PSYCH. B.		VERBAL B.		PHYSICAL B.		TOTAL	
	CC	CCP	CC	CCP	CC	CCP	CC	CCP
1F	3	308	2	174	5	431	10	913
2F	1	115	6	677	3	246	10	1038
8F	2	236	4	295	4	298	10	829
9F	1	64	6	565	3	290	10	919
10F	4	470	5	482	1	14	10	966
TOTAL	11	1193	23	2193	16	1279	50	4665
A.A.(X)	108.45		95.34		79.93		93.3	

The relative importance level of cognitive constructs of female managers can be seen in Table 4. Accordingly, in terms of relative importance order of cognitive perceptions against peer victimisation, female administrators considered the cognitive construct group named "Psychological Bullying" most important and at least the cognitive construct group "Physical Bullying (X = 79.3)".

Table 5. The Relative Importance of Cognitive Constructs of Male School Administrator

PARTICIPANTS	PSYCH. B.		VERBAL B.		PHYSICAL B.		TOTAL	
	CC	CCP	CC	CCP	CC	CCP	CC	CCP
3M	3	182	5	535	2	157	10	874
4M	2	144	4	276	4	492	10	912
5M	4	382	4	364	2	314	10	1060
6M	3	380	6	415	1	56	10	851
7M	1	105	7	497	2	231	10	833
TOTAL	13	1193	26	2087	11	1250	50	4530
A.A. (X)	91.76		80.26		113.63		90.6	

Table 5 shows the cognitive constructs of male managers and the relative importance of these constructs. Male managers considered "Physical Bullying" (X = 113.63) as the most important type, and "Psychological Bullying" (X = 91.76) as the next one, "Verbal Bullying (X = 80.26) cognitive construct group as the least one.

Table 6. Attitudes of All Participants towards Bullying Behaviours

	1F	2F	3M	4M	5M	6M	7M	8F	9F	10F
Referring to counselling services	1,50; 4,35	2,9; 10,3	7,12;	1,30; 3,40; 5,18; 7,16	10,4	-	6,10	6,25	1,20; 2,9; 6,25	3,24; 5,24; 9,6; 10,4
Verbal Warning	-	1,30; 3,24;	4,7;	-	2,36; 4,28; 6,20; 9,8;	2,18; 9,2; 10,4	-	2,9; 5,6;	-	-
Meeting with parents	2,27	9,6	2,45; 6,25; 10,5	2,45; 6,20	5,24; 8,12	-	7,12	-	7,12; 8,9; 9,6	2,27; 4,21

Refer to disciplinary committee	3,32; 7,12; 10,3	4,35; 8,15	-	-	3,32	7,4	2,45; 5,18; 10,5	3,8; 4,28	-	7,16
Meeting with the Student	5,30; 6,25; 8,15; 9,10	6,20	1, 30	4,28; 10,3	1,50	5,30	1,40	9,10	3,24	-
Make the bully apologize/ reconcile	-	7,16	8,6; 9,10	-	-	1,20	3,16	8,12	-	6,25
Giving Advice	-	-	3,8	-	7,16	3,24; 4,35; 6,15; 8,6	4,21; 8,6; 9,4	1,50	5,12	1,50; 18,15
Meeting with the Class teacher	-	-	5,24	8,6; 9,6	-	-	-	10,3	-	-
Ignoring	-	5,12	-	-	-	-	-	7,8	-	-
Directing to/Excluding from the social activities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,35; 10,5	-
1F- 1,50 1=Participant order F = Female 1 = Question order 50 = Cognitive Construct Point M= Male										

Table 6 shows the sanctions of all male and female school administrators against peer bullying. Literature was taken into account while creating fiction groups.

Table 7. Relative Importance Table of Behavioral Attitudes Against Bullying Belong to All Participants

Participants:		1F	2F	3M	4M	5M	6M	7M	8F	9F	10F	TP	X
Referring to counselling services	CC	2	2	1	4	1	0	1	1	3	4	19	19.15
	CCP	85	12	12	104	4	0	10	25	54	58	364	
Verbal Warning	CC	0	2	1	0	4	3	0	2	0	0	12	16
	CCP	0	54	7	0	92	24	0	15	0	0	192	
Meeting with students	CC	1	1	3	2	2	0	1	0	3	2	15	19.73
	CCP	27	6	75	65	36	0	12	0	27	48	296	
Refer to disciplinary committee	CC	3	2	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	1	13	19.46
	CCP	47	50	0	0	32	4	68	36	0	16	253	
Make the bully apologize/ Reconcile	CC	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	7	15
	CCP	0	16	16	0	0	20	16	12	0	25	105	
Ignore	CC	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	10
	CCP	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	20	
Giving Advice	CC	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	1	1	2	13	20.15
	CCP	0	0	8	0	16	80	31	50	12	65	262	
Meeting with student	CC	4	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	13	24.23
	CCP	80	20	30	31	50	30	40	10	24	0	315	
Meeting with the class teacher	CC	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	9.75
	CCP	0	0	24	12	0	0	0	3	0	0	39	
Directing to/Excluding from the social activities	CC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	20
	CCP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	40	
TOTAL	CC	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	100	18.86
	CCP	239	170	172	212	230	158	177	159	157	212	1886	

Considering the total scores (TP) and averages (X) of the cognitive construct groups, the sanctions regarding peer bullying are listed as follows. (1) Meeting with the student (X = 24.23); (2) Advice (20.15); (3) Directing or excluding from social activities (20). As the results demonstrate, in the case of bullying in schools, administrators mostly seek solutions by meeting with students one-on-one, giving advice to the student, and either directing the student to social activities or removing him from social activities to solve the problem. The least common sanction editing group was determined as "Interview with the classroom teacher (9.75)".

Table 8. Behavioral Attitudes Against Bullying Relative Importance Table of All Female Participants

Participants:		1F	2F	8F	9F	10F	TP	AA(X)
Referring to counselling services	CC	2	2	1	3	4	12	19.05
	CCP	85	12	25	54	58	234	
Verbal Warning	CC	0	2	2	0	0	4	17.25
	CCP	0	54	15	0	0	69	
Meeting with students	CC	1	1	0	3	2	7	15.42
	CCP	27	6	0	27	48	108	
Refer to disciplinary committee	CC	3	2	2	0	1	8	18.62
	CCP	47	50	36	0	16	149	
Make the bully apologize/ Reconcile	CC	0	1	1	0	1	3	17.66
	CCP	0	16	12	0	25	53	
Ignore	CC	0	1	1	0	0	2	10
	CCP	0	12	8	0	0	20	
Giving Advice	CC	0	0	1	1	2	4	31.75
	CCP	0	0	50	12	65	127	
Meeting with student	CC	4	1	1	1	0	7	19.14
	CCP	80	20	10	24	0	134	
Meeting with the class teacher	CC	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
	CCP	0	0	3	0	0	3	
Directing to/Excluding from the social activities	CC	0	0	0	2	0	2	20
	CCP	0	0	0	40	0	40	
TOTAL	CC	10	10	10	10	10	50	18.74
	CCP	239	170	159	157	212	937	

The relative importance level of female school administrators' attitudes towards peer bullying, cognitive constructs in total and total score are shown in Table 11 (BKP = 934, BK = 50). Considering the total scores (TP) and averages (X) of the cognitive construct groups, the sanctions regarding peer bullying are listed as follows. (1) Advice (TP = 127, X = 31.75); (2) Orientation to Social Activities or Dismissal from Social Activities (TP = 40, X = 20); (3) Meeting with the student (TP = 134, X = 19.14).

Table 9. Behavioral Attitudes Against Bullying Relative Significance Table of All Male Participants

Participants:		3M	4M	5M	6M	7M	TP	AA(X)
Referring to counselling services	CC	1	4	1	0	1	7	18.57
	CCP	12	104	4	0	10	130	
Verbal Warning	CC	1	0	4	3	0	8	15.37
	CCP	7	0	92	24	0	123	
Meeting with students	CC	3	2	2	0	1	8	23.5
	CCP	75	65	36	0	12	188	
Refer to disciplinary committee	CC	0	0	1	1	3	5	20.8
	CCP	0	0	32	4	68	104	
Make the bully apologize/ Reconcile	CC	2	0	0	1	1	4	13
	CCP	16	0	0	20	16	52	
Ignore	CC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CCP	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Giving Advice	CC	1	0	1	4	3	9	15
	CCP	8	0	16	80	31	135	
Meeting with student	CC	1	2	1	1	1	6	30.16
	CCP	30	31	50	30	40	181	
Meeting with the class teacher	CC	1	2	0	0	0	3	12
	CCP	24	12	0	0	0	36	
Directing to/Excluding from the social activities	CC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	CCP	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL	CC	10	10	10	10	10	50	18.98
	CCP	172	212	230	158	177	949	

In Table 9, the relative importance level of behavioral attitudes of male school administrators towards peer bullying, cognitive constructs formed in total, total score arithmetic average scores are shown (BKP = 949, BK = 50 X = 18.98). Considering the data, the main fictional groups of sanctions for male school administrators' peer bullying are listed as follows: (1) Interview with the student (TP = 181, X = 30.16), (2) Interview with family (TP = 188, X = 23.5); (3) Referral to the disciplinary board (TP = 104, X = 20.8).

Discussion and Conclusion

Based on the Repertory Grid Interview Technique, 10 school administrators produced a total of 200 cognitive constructs in this study, which was conducted on the determination and comparison of school administrators' cognitive constructs regarding peer victimisation and their behavioral attitudes towards bullying. The relative importance order of cognitive constructs and cognitive construct groups was obtained from the scores obtained by converting qualitative study data into quantitative values. In the stage of determining the Cognitive Constructions of School Administrators about peer victimisation, school administrators considered bullying as physical, verbal, and psychological bullying. The administrators participating in the research paid more attention to the category of "Psychological Bullying" and less to the constructs of the Verbal Bullying category.

Cognitive constructs obtained from school administrators in the study show the feature of being gathered under different groups due to their structure. For example, while "exclusion" can be handled in the "Social or Relational Bullying" group, it can also be included in the "Psychological/Emotional Bullying" group. This is because school administrators' cognitive constructs about peer victimization are not clear, but because bullying includes different concepts such as inequality, abuse, and injustice, and it can be difficult to conceptualize or define as it consists of multiple aspects of violence (Rigby, 2002). However, while creating construct groups, the classifications were made on peer bullying based on the literature (Pace, 2001; Rigby, 2007; Wong, 2009; Ma, Zhang, Zou, Wei & Shen, 2001). Comparing the dominant construct groups in the first part of the study in terms of demographics, female administrators mostly construct peer bullying in the "psychological bullying" group and the least in "the physical bullying" group. Therefore, it can be stated that male administrators construct the peer bullying they encounter in schools mostly in "physical bullying" and least in "the verbal bullying" group.

The second part of the study is handled within the framework of "Behavioral Attitudes of School Administrators Against Bullying." Managers produced ten main construct groups. When the literature is reviewed, it can be seen that in the acts of bullying, school administrators first interviewed the victim and learned the details of the incident by building trust (CPI, 2011), then they interviewed the bullies and witnesses (Creating Safe School, 2019), and the bully and the victim's families (Elinoff, Chafouleas & Sassau, 2004; Ontario Policy, 2020), that mediation between the bully and the victim was not attempted in the short term (Nassau Bullying Prevention and Response Center, 2009), that the bully publicly apologized to the victim (Pearce & Thompson, 1998), and that in case of a criminal offense, the police units were informed. (Bullying Prevention and Intervention Center, 2017). In addition, implementing programs which focus on empathy and respect that will support the social and emotional development of students (Renda, Vassallo & Edward, 2011), providing students with conflict management training, and teaching the victim to use "I" language during the act of bullying are important in combating this issue. In addition, approaching the event with cooperation between teachers, administrators, students, parents, school health workers, and authorized specialists (Fekkes et al., 2006; Pepler et al., 2010), and examining the reasons underlying the 'bullying' action (including the student in extracurricular social activities or excluding them from these activities, not ignoring bullying, and providing a verbal warning to the student (Özkan & Gökçearsan, 2010) among the practices of administrators in the literature. In this study, administrators applied three dominant sanctions, namely having one-on-one meeting with the student, giving advice to the student, directing the student to social activities, or removing them from social activities when bullying occurs. The least dominant sanctions according to application of construct groups were with the classroom teacher, ignoring, and apologizing/reconciling. The order of importance reveals that administrators' behavioral attitudes towards bullying in school are in line with the literature.

When the behavioral attitudes of school administrators are examined in terms of gender variables, it is possible to state that in cases of bullying, female administrators mostly prefer to solve the problem by giving advice to the bully and the victim and making them empathize with each other, directing students toward or away from certain social activities. On the other hand, male administrators both meet with the students and their parents and refer the bully student to the disciplinary committee. From this point of view, it can be concluded that the sanctions of male school administrators for acts of bullying are more authoritarian, while female administrators approach such events more emotionally.

Research displays significant differences between male and female managers' cognitive constructs regarding peer bullying. This study reveals that female managers consider the acts of psychological bullying more important while male managers consider physical bullying more important. It can be considered that the

difference in question is due to both anatomical and cultural-environmental factors. Indeed, Dökmen (2014, p.11) revealed that being a woman versus a man has a social meaning apart from anatomical and physiological features and environmental factors shape how each gender perceives the World.

At this point, the meanings attributed to individuals by "gender" and "sex" rather than innate gender affect the perceptions of bullying by male and female managers. Nevertheless, it is not possible to specify whether the difference between both the perception and behavior of men and women is biological or cultural (Dökmen, 2014, pp 20).

When we look at the data of female and male managers' behavioral attitudes towards bullying, it is clear that female managers mostly advise students against bullying, encourage them to empathize, and direct them to social activities. This situation can be associated with the democratic and participatory structures of women leaders (Onay, 2014). On the other hand, it was found that male administrators met with the student and their family in the face of bullying acts and generally referred the bully student to the disciplinary board. The data obtained parallels the sentence of Onay's (2014), "Male leaders are authoritarian and directive." Although the perceptions of protecting, embracing, and showing compassion are attributed to women, society attributes to men the perceptions of acting with logic and not showing their emotions (Topuz & Erkanlı, 2016). Also, it is included in the studies of Brizendine (2012) that women give more emotional and sensitive reactions than men. Besides, Miler, Worthington, and McDaniel, in their meta-analysis study of 70 studies examining the differences between men and women, show that women are more compassionate and forgiving than men (2008). The female managers who participated in the research we conducted tried to solve the acts of bullying by giving advice and teaching empathy, while male managers' search for solutions by engaging the disciplinary committee; this is parallel with the literature.

Expert researchers have been debating for many years whether the differences between male and female behaviors are caused by socio-cultural factors or biological factors. Contrary to Topuz, Erkanlı, Dökmen, and Onay (2016, 2014, 2014), studies provide evidence that these differences are innate (Brizendine, 2012; Amen, 2010; Pasterski et al., 2005). It is possible to state that the perception of bullying and behavioral attitudes of male and female managers towards bullying actions may arise from anatomical, physiological and neurohumoral differences. Likewise, Moir and Jessel explained that different perceptions, attitudes and behaviors between men and women are due to hormonal effects (2002). It is possible to encounter similar results in Paglia's (2004) studies; because these biological differences between the two sexes affect their perceptions, attitudes, feelings and behaviors (Ersoy, 2009).

Suggestions

This study revealed that male and female managers perceive peer victimisation differently, and thus apply almost completely different sanctions. For this reason, it is essential to train school administrators on which behaviors will be handled within the scope of peer victimisation in cooperation with provincial directorates of national education and universities to deal with bullying from a more objective perspective. To overcome this difference, managers need to receive training on how to perceive peer victimisation properly, how to intervene when it occurs and how to manage the pre-and post-bullying processes along with the evaluation phase. In this study, conducted with 10 school administrators, it was observed that none of the school administrators had a School Policy for Bullying Prevention or Intervention; rather, they solved the bullying problems simultaneously. It is crucial to provide in-service training to school managers in which the perceived acts of bullying and the applied sanctions are taught more professionally. Also, they should be informed about the stages in which the school's other stakeholders are involved. At this point, Gökkaya (2017) stated that the most widely used school-based bullying prevention programs in the world and which yield successful results are Olweus's Bullying Prevention Program (BPP), Creating a peaceful school learning environment (CAPSLE), Learning to respect, and Preventing bullying with positive behavioral interventions and supports. (BP-PBIS) refers to Kiusaamista Vastaa: Against Bullying: KiVa. In addition, the Cool School Program (2000), implemented by the Regional Child and Family Center Agency in Dublin, Ireland, highlights the importance of covert surveys, bullying sociograms, classroom observation, and interviews in the prevention of peer victimisation. In the light of this information and the proposed programs, it may be beneficial to establish Bullying Prevention and Intervention centers in provinces and districts within the framework of the inspection of the Ministry of National Education, and provide the necessary training to school administrators there. Also, teaching managers how to create a

positive school culture in schools, providing them with on bullying prevention strategies (awareness-raising activities, empathy and respect training), increasing adult supervision in schools at noon, evaluating these anti-bullying programs, and providing effective leadership training to school administrators can mitigate this problem (Irish Education and Skills Authority, 2013).

References

- Akpan, J. (2016). Is bullying a global problem or just in American? A comparative meta-analysis of research findings. *International Journal of Education and Social Science*, Vol. 3 No. 9, Retrieved from www.ijessnet.com.
- Amen, D. G. (2010). *Aşık beyin*. İstanbul: Pegasus Yayınları.
- Atik, Gökhan. (2009). Hope as a predictor of bullying. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*. 42. 53-68. 10.1501/Egifak_0000001137.
- Belsey, B. (2007). Cyberbullying: A real and growing threat. *ATA Magazine*, 88(1). Ontario Ministry of Education (2017,2018), Bullying Prevention and Intervention.
- Belsey, B. (2005). Cyberbullying: An emerging threat to the “always on” generation. Retrieved Jan. 16, 2007 from http://www.cyberbullying.ca/pdf/feature_dec2005.pdf
- Benbenishty, R. ve Astor, R. A. (2005). School violence in context: culture, neighborhood, family, school, and gender. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brizendine, L. (2012). *Kadın beyni*. İstanbul: Say yayınları.
- Collier, K. L., Van Beusekom, G., Bos, H. M. W., & Sandfort, T. G. M. (2013). Sexual orientation and gender identity/expression related peer victimization in adolescence: asystematic review of associated psychosocial and health outcomes. *Journal of Sex Research*, 50(3–4), 299–317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2012.750639>.
- Department of Education and Skills (2013). Anti-bullying procedures for primary and post-primary schools, September, Ireland.
- Craig, W.M., Henderson, K., & Murphy, J.G. (2000). Prospective teachers' attitudes toward bullying and victimization. *School Psychology International*, 21(-), 5-21.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Crothers, L.C. and Levinson, E.M. (Fall-2004). Assessment of bullying: A review of methods and Instruments. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 82, 496-503.
- Dökmen, Z. Y. (2015). *Toplumsal cinsiyet: Sosyal psikolojik açıklamalar*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Elinoff, M. J., Chafouleas, S. M., & Sassu, K. A. (2004). Bullying: Considerations for defining and intervening in school settings. *Psychology in the Schools*, 41(8), 887–897.
- Ersoy, E. (2009). Cinsiyet kültürü içerisinde kadın ve erkek kimliği Malatya örneği. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Cilt: 19, Sayı: 2, Sayfa: 209-230
- Fareo, O. (2015). Bullying in Nigerian secondary schools: Strategies for counseling intervention. *Educational Research and Reviews*. 10. 435-443. 10.5897/ERR2012.239.
- Farrington, D. P. & Ttofi, M. M. (2009). School-based programs to reduce bullying and victimization. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 2009, 6. doi: 10.4073/csr.2009.6
- Fekkes M, Pijpers FI, Verloove-Vanhorick SP. (2005). Bullying: who does what, when and where? Involvement of children, teachers and parents in bullying behavior. *Health Education Research*, 20, 81-91.
- Fekkes, M., Pijpers, I. M. F., Fredriks, M. A., Vogels, T., & Verloove-Vanhorick, P. S. (2006). Do bullied children get ill or do ill children get bullied? A prospective cohort study on the relationship between bullying and health-related symptoms. *Pediatrics*, 117, 1568-1574.
- Fransella, F., Bell, R. & Bannister, D. (2004). *A manual for repertory and technique* (2nd edn).
- Gökkaya, F. (2017). Peer bullying in schools: A cognitive behavioral intervention.

- Jung, Youn. (2018). What makes bullying happen in school? Reviewing contextual characteristics surrounding individual and intervention programs on bullying. *İlköğretim Online*, 17, 1-6. 10.17051/ilkonline.2018.413817.
- Kelly, GA (1991). *The psychology of personal constructs: Clinical Diagnosis and Psychotherapy* (Volume two, 2nd Edition). New York: Routledge.
- Kepekçi, Y. Çinkır, D. (2003). Öğrenciler arası zorbalık. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 34 (34), 236-253. <https://dergipark.org.Tr/Tr/Pub/Kuey/Issue/10363/126858>.
- Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtler, K. H. (2006). *Methods in educational research: From theory to practice*. USA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ma, L., Zhang, J., Wei, S., & Shen, L. (2001). Correlates of being bullied among school teenagers in China. *Chinese Journal of School Health*, 22, 249-250.
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousands Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Massachusetts Bullying Prevention and Intervention Center (2017, 2018)
- McKinnon, R. I. (2001). After the crisis, the East Asian dollar standard resurrected: An interpretation of high-frequency exchange rate pegging. *Rethinking the East Asian Miracle*, 197-246.
- Moir, A., & Jessel, D. (1989). *Brain sex: The real difference between men and women*. New York: Dell.
- Miller, A. J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & McDaniel, M. A. (2008). Gender and forgiveness: A meta-analytic review and research agenda. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 27(8), 843-876. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2008.27.8.843>
- Neto, Aramis. (2005). Bullying - Aggressive behavior among students. *Jornal de pediatria*, 81. S164-72. 10.2223/JPED.1403.
- New York Nassau Şehri Okul Zorbalığı Öneleme ve Müdahale Etme Merkezi, 2009, sayı 21
- Notar, Charles E.; Sharon Padget ve Jessica Roden (2013). Cyberbullying: A review of the literature. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 1(1): 1-9.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. (Available from AIDC, P.O. Box 20, Williston, VT 05495; (800) 216-2522)
- Onay, M, Heptazeler, O. (2014). Kadın ve erkek yöneticilerin liderlik davranışları arasındaki farklılıklar. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6 (2), 73-85 . Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/oybd/issue/16344/171161>
- Ontario Teachers' Federation (OTF) and Le Centre Ontarien de prévention des agressions (COPA), *Creating Safe Schools*, January 2012, page 56
- Pace, B. (2001). Bullying. *JAMA*, 285(16), 2158-2159.
- Pasterski, V. L., Geffner, M., Brain, C., Hindmarsh, P., Brook, C., & Hines, M. (2005). Prenatal hormones versus postnatal socialization by parents as determinants of male-typical toy play in girls with congenital adrenal hyperplasia. *Child Development*, 76, 264-278.
- Pearce, J. B. & Thompson, A. E. (1998). Practical approaches to reduce the impact of bullying. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 79(6), 528-531.
- Pepler, D., Craig, W., & O'Connell, P. (2010). Peer processes in bullying: Informing prevention and intervention strategies. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.). *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (p. 469-479). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Pepler, D. & Craig, W. (2000). Making a difference in bullying.

- Pişkin, M. (2005). Okulda akran zorbalığı. Ankara Valiliği İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü Özel Eğitim Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışma Hizmetleri Bölümü “Okullarda Şiddet” Paneli. Ankara:
- Pontzer, D. (2010). A theoretical test of bullying behavior: Parenting, personality, and the bully/victim relationship. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(3), 259–273. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-009-9289-5>
- Renda, J. & Vassallo, S. & Edwards, B. (2011). Bullying in early adolescence and its association with anti-social behaviour, criminality and violence 6 and 10 years later. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health: CBMH*, 21. 117-27. 10.1002/cbm.805.
- Rigby, K. (2002). *New perspectives on bullying*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Rigby, K. (2007). Bullying in schools: And what to do about it?. *Australian Council for Education Research*, Melbourne, AU.
- Roland, E. & Idsoe, T. (2001). Aggression and bullying. *Aggressive Behavior*, 27. 446 - 462. 10.1002/ab.1029.
- Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2000, Cool School Anti-Bullying Programme, Dublin, Ireland
- Sharp, S., & Smith, P. K. (1991). Bullying in UK schools: The DES Sheffield bullying project. *Early Child Development and Care*, 77(1), 47-55.
- Slonje, Robert & Smith, Peter. (2008). Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying? *Scandinavian journal of psychology*. 49. 147-54. 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2007.00611.x.
- Smith, J. D., Schneider, B., Smith, P., Ananiadou, K. (2004). The Effectiveness of whole-school antibullying programs: A synthesis of evaluation research. *School Psychology Review*, 33.
- Smokowski, P. R., & Kopasz, K. H. (2005). Bullying in school: An overview of types, effects, family characteristics, and intervention strategies. *Children & Schools*, 27(2), 101–110. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/27.2.101>
- Topuz, S. K., & Erkanli, H. (2016). Metaphor analysis of meanings attributed to women and men in the context gender. *Alternatif Politika*, 8(2), 300-321.
- Vaillancourt, T., Brittain, H., McDougall, P. & Duku, E. (2013). Longitudinal Links Between Childhood Peer Victimization, Internalizing and Externalizing Problems, and Academic Functioning: Developmental Cascades. *Journal Of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 41. 10.1007/s10802-013-9781-5.
- Vitoroulis, I., & Vaillancourt, T. (2015). Meta-analytic results of ethnic group differences in peer victimization. *Aggressive Behavior*, 41(2), 149–170.
- Yen, CF, Huang, MF, Kim, YS, Wang, PW, Tang, TC, Yeh, YC, Lin, HC, Liu, TL, Wu, YY & Yang P (2013). Association between types of involvement in school bullying and different dimensions of anxiety symptoms and the moderating effects of age and gender in Taiwanese adolescents. *Child Abuse Negl*, 37, (4), 263-272.
- Young, E. & Boye, A. & Nelson, D. (2006). Relational aggression: Understanding, identifying, and responding in schools. *Psychology in the Schools*. 43. 297-312. 10.1002/pits.20148.
- Wong, J. S. (2009). No bullies allowed understanding peer victimization, the impacts on delinquency and the effectiveness of prevention programs [thesis]. Pardee RAND Graduate School.

Fuat Tanhan is a professor as the head of the Guidance and Psychological Counselling Department at Van Yuzuncu Yil University. He is the founding director of the Institute of Educational Sciences. He has researches and publications on many topics such as Grief Counselling, Communication, and Death Education. He took part in many national and international projects.