Perception of Turkish Primary- Schoolchildren Regarding the Subject of "Violence"

Sayime ERBEN KEÇİCİ

Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Education, Necmettin Erbakan University.
sayime_erben@yahoo.de

Abstract: Purpose of this study is to ask opinions of the Turkish Elementary Education Students related to the phenomenon of violence. Therefore, focal point of study is the subjective perceptions of the Turkish Elementary Education Students. It was determined by the means of qualitative interview that children have several knowledge related to the phenomenon of violence and that they have information about different forms of violence–physical and mental- since the Grade 4 of Elementary Schools. Besides that, students also said that psychological violence and bullying as well as physical violence are experienced in school, but oral violence was little mentioned. This shows that they entirely do not or cannot perceive oral violence as violence. Hence this determination shows that the violence must be discussed in schools effectively and that children must be sensitized to this subject, because if this form of violence could be perceived as a problem, people can be motivated to prevent it.

1. Violence Among Children in turkey- A Research Gab

Worldwide millions of children experience violence in their schools. Also in Turkey violence reaches children and adolescents at a frightening scale. The Ministry of Education announced that in the school year 2009/10 six pupils were murdered and 77 were hurt on the school grounds. For the first half-year 2008/09 it mentions two killed pupils. The teacher's trade union Eğitim-Sen thinks that these numbers are understated. They contained only those cases which were also reported by the press. The undetected number is considerably higher. Eğitim-Sen is the only institution which regularly takes up the issue of violence in school. In the year 2010 trade unionists visited 250 schools, compiled a major study and presented it to the Turkish parliament. The study ascertained that there were physical assaults to pupils or teachers in 48 percent of the schools.

An important cause of child and youth violence in Turkey could lie in the Turkish family culture. On one hand there were and are very high firm family structures that actually counteract violence. On the other hand violence is often used in Turkish families as a means of education. The children pass on this violence as soon as the firm family structures have begun to dissolve. And this tendency of loosening family structures is a characteristic of the social change in Turkey; Violence keeps on being traditionally used in the families whose consequences are devastating.

The familial violence experiences play a central role in the life-historical learning context. It sets out that the experience of violence demonstrated in the upbringing of children in a model way how conflicts with violence are to be solved (Bandura, 1979; Bussman, 1995), whereas parents serve as a primary model of childlike behaviour. Largely homogeneous discoveries show that children having experienced violence at home are more frequently aggressive toward those of same age than those children not having experienced violence. Also violence approving attitudes are clearly stronger distinct with children having experienced family violence than for those without any experience of violence, whereas this context proves to be stronger once again for masculine and adolescents than for feminine children.

It is assumed in this case that at home victimized children perceive themselves rather rejected or threatened by the interpersonal exchange of actions by others rather hostilely or provocatively interpreted and feel rather forced, to have to forestall the assumed threat with counter-attacks. Learned violent patterns, so the summarized interpretation, are repeated in similar biographic contexts. Furthermore meta-analyses show for instance depressiveness, suicidal tendencies and self-esteem (Gershoff, 2002), evidenced (negative) connections between parental corporal punishment and variables of youthful well-being.

Both the prevalence as well as the development of violent behaviour must however, not be considered independently of the educational background. That applies both for intra-cultural as well as for intercultural variations of violence characteristic. So on the one hand it is to be assumed that in particular inefficient pupils, pupil with learning-difficulties, concentration difficulties etc., that they counter with aggression in turn that are possibly conditional due to their noticeably differing social behaviour, being

exposed to higher psychological pressure. Violence can form a type of how children and adolescents cope with, to reduce the school frustration overcome and in an attempt to achieve violence, influence and recognition that are not to be attained by other means.

Preventive measures should already be applied in the primary school, because „ the acquisition of abilities and skills for the organization of a low level of violence, satisfactory dealing with each other and the development of an own, self-accounted competence of action [...] is" an essential part of basic education and upbringing" (Schunk 2008, p. 97). Although consensus exists, that preventive measure should be applied as early as possible for children growing up (cf. Cierpka 2005, p. 20), there are no studies in the Turkish speaking area, which deal with the phenomenon of violence of children. Consequently, the primary educational science discourse in the field of the primary school does not direct its emphasis into the exploration of the phenomenon of violence but into the prevention as well as the evaluation of violence. It is striking that programs were strongly developed for the prevention of violence in the primary school while in relation to the well-founded empirical findings for the adolescent children comparably few preventive approaches, but rather intervention terms are to be found. This recognition illustrates with regard to own work how essential it is to set the focus onto the analysis of primary school didactic terms and offers, among other things also exemplary violence prevention terms for the primary school. The research subject of this investigation, therefore, is the perception of Turkish primary schoolchildren on the phenomenon of violence. Consequently, the survey of the subjective viewpoints of the children stands in the focus of the methodical orientation of the research design for the learning subject.

More to be added; however, that outside of this scientific discourse of educational upbringing, from a psychological perspective single more refined findings about the conflict behaviour of pre- and primary school children as well as the phenomena of bullying in primary schools in the German-speaking area are to be found of so that a non-consideration of these studies would not meet the own research subjective.

An important contribution is the article „Unsuccessful Negotiations: Violence and other ruthlessness among children in the primary school age" from a study by Krappmann/ Oswald from the year 1995. Observed were the interactions of pupils of the same age during lessons as well as in the pauses. The term violence in this case was understood very far reaching so that many scenes could be analytically closer considered and

inferences of violent behaviour of primary school children are also possible today. Nevertheless, it should be considered, that this study is made on the observation of only 40 children in the school educational context and the more indirect forms of violence, such as bullying remain mostly hidden within the peer relationships and consequently are harder to be observed for external parties (cf. Marées/ Petermann 2008, p. 162 for.)

Two more empirically closer defined investigations by Ferstl et al. (1993) and on the other hand, by Schwind et al. (1995) considered the primary school in their random sample survey. It was the subjective of both studies to give a detailed positional reference on the present situation of violence in the federal state of Schleswig-Holstein and/or the city of Bochum. Quantitative as well as qualitative aspects of the violence found observance next to approaches for possible preventive measures. Subjective impressions were reflected; however, in these investigations so that the authors already point out in the own summary that their data „[...] is not a substitute for subjective profile investigations (Ferstl et al. 1993, p. 39), which are entirely missing in the empirical of violence in primary schools (cf. Fuchs 2009, p. 21).

Furthermore to be mentioned here are the German language research results in Psychology for Conflict Behaviour for Children in the Primary School Age by Schmidt-Denter (1994) and Roth (2006). For the bullying phenomenon, primarily orientated on the studies from Olweus, presenting the studies by Alsakar (2003) in the preschool field as well as in the primary school field by Scheithauer et al. (2003); Schäfer/ Albrecht (2003); Marées (2009); Hörmann/Schäfer (2009). Furthermore, a comparison study is to be mentioned by English and German primary school children from the age of six to eight years by Wolke et al. (2001). Subsequently, these insights, as well as the study by Krappmann/ Oswald, will find this study's observation in the context of discussing the own results.

2. Theories about the origin of Violence and Empirical Evidences

How can you explain to yourself the origin of violence with children? The great theory, explaining all psychological aspects of the violence has not yet been found. Nevertheless, considerable progress has been realized in psychology in the last years after regarding the declaration of violence and their causes, and progress indeed that is well secured by empirical investigations. Natural we cannot mention all theories here, because it would go beyond the scope of this study. However, we can examine, whether some of the available theories and

explanatory approaches of psychology at least be able to answer these questions partially and indeed as economically as possible and in an empirically testable manner. I would like to illustrate four psychological approaches for the explanation of violent behaviour in the following with the appropriate briefness:

The *Drive* and *Instinct Teachings by Freud* and *Lorenz* supply the most popular explanation for violent behaviour. How popular this explanation also still today shows the following passage that appeared in the renowned weekly newspaper Die Weltwoche: *"*Concerning the human being it is indisputable that there is an inherent killer instinct [...] that is why it is hopeless, to eliminate aggressive behaviour from his nature, but it is important, to learn how to master it" *(Löbsack 1991)* "it. The human aggression is, according to *Freud (1920/1975)*, an expression of a fundamental drive, the death drive. The animal researcher *Lorenz (1963)*, who presumed an innate aggression instinct argued similarly, which stands in the service of the fight for survival of its kind, The social psychologist McDougall has also in the twenties described the effect of this instinct, as "hydraulic model": The instinct therefore continuously establishes an urge for aggression which if it reaches people at a certain quantity breaks out in a behaviour of violence. Aggression and violence, according to the drive and instinct theoreticians are natural and unalterable. Fights, killing and war are accordingly inevitable.

Lorenz has later, as already Freud, also added that violence can be reduced or rendered harmless if it is from time to time drained into certain situations, e.g. in sporting competitions, and directed to unproblematic subjects. Experimental studies, however, did not confirm this hydraulic perception. For violence inclined persons this "work-off" of violence in many cases does not lead to a decrease of their aggressivity, but, on the contrary, to a further increase (*Selg 1978; Kempf 1983*). Regardless of the fact, that drive and instinct theories are so vaguely formulated, so that they often do not imply any precise hypotheses. When and under which circumstances violent behaviour breaks out and/or calms down, can due to these theories hardly be predicted.

The *Frustration-Aggression-Hypothesis* of *Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer & Sears* from the year 1939 attempted to cancel the shortcoming of the lacking accuracy. In its clearest and most austere version, this hypothesis states that:

a) for every hindrance to meet the needs, referring to every frustration, the human being reacts with aggression and

b) every aggressive, violent behaviour has its cause in an experience of frustration.

The advantages of this theory are obvious: Firstly, it clearly names the activating situations. Secondly, it is very precise and meaningful since it determines exactly with which observations it is incompatible. It excludes that frustrations activate other than violent behaviours, or that violence can have its roots in other causes than in frustrations. The Frustration-Aggression-Theory did not persist, however, as Zimbardo and Ruch stated even if it is still often quoted: Every frustration doesn´t, not even most frustrations lead a human being to violence, and every type of violence does not have its reason in frustrations. People could not exist in the everyday life if they always reacted to frustrations with violence. Furthermore, many wishes cannot be satisfied without frustrating other own wishes. The frustration aggression theory, therefore, hardly does not offer a sufficient explanation for violent behaviour and therefore neither a good gateway for the decrease of violence.

Such an explanation is partially offered by the *attribution theory*. It also declares, why in certain, physiologically in each other very similar states of excitement can under certain circumstances possibly lead to completely different reactions _ of aggression, rage, from indifference up to humorous behaviour. The proof of this theory is worthy of a closer consideration.

In an experiment by *Dodge (1980)* two extreme groups of pupils that were described by their teachers as very aggressive and/or non-aggressive, were confronted with other young adolescents in three situations, whose behaviour was either (1) aggressive, (2) ambiguous or (3) good-natured. Result: In the situation in which the other person was aggressive or ambiguous, the very aggressive experimental persons behaved most violent. In the situation, however, in which the other person behaved good-naturedly, the aggressive called pupils showed the greater readiness to help! And: The differences in the aggressive behaviour were shown most obviously when the situation was ambiguous. In clearly hostile situations those as a non-aggressively mentioned pupil reacted almost just as violent. In a second experiment, *Dodge* proved that in fact different ascriptions or attributions represent an explanation for these phenomena. The very aggressive known young adolescents implied to their communication partners that they are much more often aggressive, than the non-aggressive mentioned pupils. They also believed more strongly that their partners in future would be aggressive and that they are not to be trusted. That is, children who are regarded as aggressive are apparent as Dodge finds,

caught in a cycle of hostile connotations, violent behaviour and social labelling.

The aggression attribution theory can be considered as a good explanation for the psychological processes that participate _ in interaction with social processes _ that people are caught in a spiral of the violence, from which they can hardly escape.

There are already first pedagogic approaches for the aggression decrease based on this theory that aims at a change of the attribution styles, so e.g. the Konstanzer Training Model (KTM) by *Dann, Tennstädt, Humpert and Krause* (1986). In this training, teachers are attempted to be put into the situation, to recognize violence-escalating misattributions of their own and in this way to break aggressive pupil- teacher communications. With the KTM as the authors reports in the good successes are achieved in overcoming of aggressive behaviours (*Tennstädt et al., 1986*).

As a proof for the relevance of the principle "learning through success" *Selg* refers *(1978)* to the fact that it is often the easiest way for a child to attract attention from its parents through violent behaviour to receive what it needs to meet its satisfaction. Already the small child learns, according to Selg, by hitting the parents, depending on their mood, friendly attention or annoyed reactions, in any case, however, receives a contribution. If it always has success with its aggression, then this discovery is intensified by the child that only violence leads to success. Other types of behaviour are then not maintained or not even learned in first place.

The experimental research revealed only weak proofs, however, for the explanation of violent behaviour. If the corporal punishment that a child gets through its aggressive behaviour can be referred to as "success" and in this way amplifying, must be doubted. Therefore, also some advice must be considered for parents who follow this theory with scepticism. If a child screams, then parents should, so teaching-therapists say disregard it, in order not to intensify it's screaming through increased consideration. But, however, how can parents know whether the screaming of the child is not caused by other things e.g. through hunger, gastro spasms, toothache or a swallowed nail, if they do not turn to the child?

Children beyond doubt need learning models. They learn much new behaviour through their observing the behaviour of other people in their daily environment and by imitating the behaviour of other people. It is therefore not amazing that violent children come in an above average way frequently from families in which there is an aggressive environment. The theory of the model learning by

Bandura (1972; 1977) explains also the connection of strong consumption of violence in television, videos and motion picture films with the aggressive behaviour of children, a connection, which, as the longitudinal study by *Eron et al. (1972)* shows, is still detectable after 10 years.

3. Methodology
3.1. Question Formulation and Methodical Access

The didactic relevance of this field of research is the investigation on the perceptions of basic school pupils for the learning-topic violence. Consequently, the survey of the subjective viewpoints of the children is in the focus of the methodical orientation of the research design to the learning-topic. The issue to be examined is in this case Reference for the selection of methods and not reversed. The design of this empirical investigation refers to the findings gained in the primary school didactic professional clarification on the learning topic of violence.

„ The method of the qualitative interview [...] enables qualitative research to scientifically understand the views of children regarding their lives, wishes, interests, learning processes, problems and fears, in familiar and friendly relationships, in school, living-environment and leisure time" (Heinzel 2003, p. 396).

According to Becher (2009), children should thus be seen as reporters of their experiences and interpretations so that, for example in interviews they should be addressed as informants and experts. The Child is held qualified, to communicate, to explain its viewpoint about the world and to illustrate the own interpretation of its world" (Heinzel 2003, p. 408).

Taking into account Becher (2009) half way standardized focused interview guides are suitable to gather the subjective viewpoints a by pupils regarding the learning-topic violence. The half way standardized interview facilitates both a reconstruction of subjective theories of the test persons and the survey of explicitly available as well as implicit assumptions of the stock of knowledge. This form of interview is based on a guideline which is constructed for thematic fields.

The set-up of the interview structure orientates itself on superordinate thematic fields that can be derived from the findings gained in the primary school didactic professional clarification. Correspondingly possible perceptions of the children are in the focus of the individual interviews to the overriding topic units being related with each other:

- Situational understandingPhysical violencePsychological violenceCompetences in dealing with angerGender differentiationPersonal attitudes and fears

By means of the defined thematic fields for the phenomenon of violence, first of all, questions are formulated in age-appropriate language whereas these questions as well as the topic units should be usable in variable form in the concrete interview situation. In the sense of the specificity, the interview process is not supposed to be confined to only general-purpose statements, but also to focus on significance or importance of an event for the interviewed subject. In this context, the introduction into the conversation situation occurs via individual drawings by the children regarding the phenomenon violence. With the aid of drawings, the subjective experiences and perceptions can be surveyed for the basic pupils. Questions in the interview process - in particular, in reference to the children's drawings - should be formulated therefore, also with regard to a possible individual involvement of the children to be interviewed. In this context, emotional impressions of the test persons should be explicitly asked, whereas affective reactions should go beyond simple evaluations in the interview „possibly as »pleasant« or »unpleasant« should. A „focus of feelings" (ibid) is to be striven in this connection.

The defined questions, consequently „ cannot be asked about the particular topic units in the sense of a one-to-one-transfer during the interview [applied, but] it [depends] rather on an individual attitude towards the interview partner, and [it can] be increasingly be expressed in this sense as „ad hoc-questions" " (Becher 2009, p. 101). Nevertheless, a certain spectrum of defined questions in half way structured and structured questions can be determined towards the individual contents-related topic units regarding the research subject based on Becher (cf. ibid, p. 101)

- *What did you paint in your picture?* – concerning the individual drawings of the children and their personal experiences and/or experiences with the phenomenon of violence; situational understanding can be observed, leading to aspects of the physical and psychological violence, vandalism, gender differentiation, etc.

- *Where does violence begin for you?* - leading to perceptions to thematic fields of the physical but also psychological violence*Do you think that you can also hurt somebody with words?* – concerning verbal violence as a form of the psychological violence; leading to other forms of emotional violence as well as to different forms of the bullying

- *How do you deal with strong anger?* – concerning the competence of the children in dealing with own feelings, such as anger, etc.

- *How do you behave in a quarrel? and/or how do you behave, if somebody scolds you?* –

concerning to the conflict solving-behaviour and the competence of the children in dealing with violent situations; leading to the perceptions to the topic units of physical violence psychological violence, gender difference etc.

- *Is there a difference for you for violence between girls or boys?* –concerning the aspect of the gender difference in conflict situations; leading onto the contents-related topic units of physical violence, psychological violence, competences in dealing with etc.

The interviews are rounded off with the following half way structured and structured transfer questions:

- *Do you know some more?* – with reference to possibly non-considered aspects on the part of the test person; can lead back to already addressed topic units and to a further differentiation of mentioned aspects

- *How do you know so much?* – with reference to the determination of the information sources of the children

The use of this defined question catalogue is set in a variable form. It ensures, however, a comparability of the survey discussions and structures the procedure in the thematic field of investigation.

3.2. The Sample

For the selection of the samplings, attention was paid to select a class from a school environment as heterogeneous as possible. A class should be selected therefore from a school district for the investigation, of a catchment area to which with both middle-class families and also socially weak families belong to.

Consequently, in the district Karatay from the city of Konya in Turkey which consists of 19 basic pupils (8 girls and 11 boys) in the range of 9-11 years were selected for this investigation. The planned drawings of the phenomenon violence were carried out in the first part of the empirical investigation with the whole class association.

The selection of the test persons for the individual interviews was decided after evaluation of the drawings with regard to a most possible broad range of subjective starting points for the interview process. Three girls as well as three boys were extracted for the single interviews; in particular their drawings as well as the respective interview will be taken into account in the evaluation. The individual interviews were carried out in a familiar room of the school building for the children, the „library". Provisionally a pleasant and trusting atmosphere in which an open conversation should be possible was created in the room.

Every survey conversation started with the same words in which it was explained to the pupils that there would not be any wrong or correct answers in this conversation, and they would not be marked. Furthermore, the function of the speech dictation device that they were allowed to try out was explained to them in order to take away any fear of the unknown.

The survey conversations orientated themselves on the already introduced interview guide whereas this was used in variable form and very characteristic conversation process with the individual test person. The children's drawings at the beginning of the interviews facilitated an introduction into the conduct of the conversation, since the test persons concentrated, first of all, on their drawings and then discussed this as experts so that further questions could be referred to at this point. The pupils behaved very differently in the individual conversations. Whereas at the beginning all were very excited, the nervousness with most of the children disappeared rather quickly. Certain uncertainties, however, always arose in some survey conversations whereas other test persons answered very careful and considerate. The pupils partially took a lot of time with their answers and also asked specific questions if they did not understand something. The length of the conversations varied between 30 to 50 minutes whereas the female test persons talked more in average.

3.3. Analyses

With regard to own survey, an analysis method is suitable, that opens up and classifies the text material with the aid of codes for structured content, in order to be able to identify the term of perceptions of the pupils regarding the phenomenon of violence. Therefore, follows a "contents-related structuring" (Mayring, 2002, p.89) of the data material, because, consequently, "certain content fields can be extracted and summarized" (ibid, p. 59). Depending upon the type of procedure both deductive and inductive category creating steps can be used (cf. ibid, 74 et seq.; 89), where with respect to this investigation, the category creating steps was made inductive-deductively. „With the procedure of a structuring analysis under defined organizational principles (deductive) sets a cross-sectional view of the statements of the pupils, to be able to make structural statements about the perceptions" (Becher 2009, p. 87), it is furthermore, essential to construct the categories even from the available text material (inductive) in order to meet the raised perceptions of the children. Accordingly, the overriding topic units and/or key questions "were brought to the material

and allowed a coding developed from the data" (ibid, p. 120).

Their transcription is the initial starting point for the evaluation of the data gained in the interviews. The transcription was carried out with the transcription software „f4" (Dr. Dresing & Pehl GmbH) which simplified the written description of the data material through the simple handling as well as the use of several key combinations. Two steps preceded the actual transcription. On the one hand, the individual interviews were equipped with a transcript heading, which contained general information about the interview - date, duration, place, name and/or pseudonym of the test person - and on the other hand; transcription rules had to be defined. After the transcription, the interviews were translated correspondingly into German and controlled by a linguist in order not to lose any nuances of linguistic expression.

The „contents-related structuring" (cf. Mayring 2008, p. 89) followed after the transcription. For that, the especially for this evaluation method developed text analysis software „MAXqda2 "(VERBI GmbH 2004) was resorted to since this facilitated a clear use of the data material with regard to creating category.

With reference to the own research interest, it can be observed that all six present individual interviews served as a basis for the evaluation process. This sampling was already generated during the research process, by the children's drawings that were carried out throughout the whole class. Every interview was taken into account since only in this manner the heterogeneous perceptions of the children could be identified for the phenomenon of violence in the sense of the research interest. All interview passages in which the pupil's perception terms in the context of the learning-subject expressed violence were analysed, as well as those in which explicit questions of the researcher were asked about the topic complex in which the children did not have any perceptions and/or could articulate these difficultly. Comments by the children on their drawings were also included in the analysis steps as perceptions to be understood subjectively to the learning-subject. Furthermore, the passages find observation, in which the children gave information about their information sources or moments of the perspective taking, and empathy became recognizable. Textual passages in which personal feelings, such as rage or fear, became clear, also found consideration in the evaluation.

Meanwhile, the passages in which general organizational circumstances were reviewed or disturbances from outside of the course of the conversation remained unconsidered. The applied research design laid down in this case "an integrated consideration of the data that implied a multiple

coding of text passages" (Becher 2009, p. 122). Consequently, some passages were to be considered from different viewpoints so that these were accordingly repeatedly coded, as is exemplarily documented in the following passage:

„S: Yes (,) because my brother has also told me (,)) that there are only very few Kurds (.) And he said (,) they do not offend me (,) because he is well-liked in school (.) Even so, he also always repeatedly tells me (,) that some of them always offend and annoy him or so (.) And then I get more and more afraid (.)

This test passage could be both assigned to the Sub-Subcategory „Insult, the subcategory „Information source – family" as well as the category "Fears", since the pupil adds comments concerning the verbal violence in the form of insults - racist expressions - and mentions her brother as an information source in this case, furthermore, however, also describes her thus combined fears.

The inductive-deductively laid down category allotments and/or code designations were „in and through their application, gradually extended, compared, modified, etc. - in all differentiated and sharpened" (Becher 2009, p. 123). This category system as well as the coding-plan were broadened or revised in a review phase, whereas the basic structure was maintained.

Following the process model of contents-related structuring in the last step the before extracted in paraphrases data material is, according to Mayring (2008) rules of summary content analysis in relation formulated set in relation and both the lower categories and definitively the main categories (cf. ibid, 89) joined together.

In conclusion, it can be stated that the represented analysis procedure facilitated a contents-related structuring of the surveyed children's statements as well as a subsequent assembly of the paraphrased material by the constructed inductive-deductive category system so that orderly statements could be generated.

4. Representation of the Results
4.1. Situational understanding - evaluation of the children´s drawings

In this presentation of results, the individual children´s drawings serving as an introduction into the interview situations are taken into account as a situation regarded perception terms of the children. At the beginning, the test persons, first of all, commented their drawings, without adding any explicit questions on the part of the interviewer. Throughout the interview, the respective drawing of the child was referred to where appropriate in order to explain situations or to arouse a possible personal involvement.

Noticeable when considering the drawings of the six test persons was that three children - a girl and two boys - showed situations and described situations, which resulted in physically violent quarrels. These were based on types of physical violence, from kicking, beating, pulling hair up to choking someone, as it can be seen from Ayşe´s drawing (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Violent representation of Ayşe

Meanwhile, studies prove that in school primarily types of psychological violence are resorted to; however, obviously physical quarrels indeed do occur but do not determine the school day, (cf. Krappmann/ Oswald 1995, p. 126 et seq.). This could draw the conclusion, that the test persons of this investigation encounter an especially high number of physical violence situations in common life, which rather clarifies the evaluation of the drawings in this case according to my opinion the difficult types of psychological violence - in particular, non-verbal - to perceive in everyday life. Obstacles while gathering psychological types of violence or of bullying result from, which, on the one hand, the offenders can hide their behaviour well and on the other hand, the victims are silent, for fear of revenge attacks (cf. Marées/ Peterman 2009b, p. 98).

Mustafa, for example, declared his drawing in that a human being hit a board against the nose whereupon the nose starts to bleed (Figure 2).

Figure. 2. Violent representation of Mustafa

While Mustafa drew an explicit situation that he combines with violence, whereas Levent (Figure 3)

differentiated his drawing, in which he showed two situations of physical violence.

Figure. 3. Violent representation of Levent

He explained the difference of intensity and readiness to use violence:

,,I: What do you think is worse (?)

L: This here (.) (shows to the right drawn picture)

I: Why (?)

L: Because he cannot defend himself () and because he can run away (.) He does not have any kind of chance (.) Because I have also seen that (points at the left picture) (.) That has ahem () that a boy has done with a smaller boy (.) He, however, was also in his class () but is only a little shorter (.) And then they hit each other (.)

I: Oh (,) but that hurts (,) doesn´t it (?)

L: Yes (,) but because in school (,) they don´t really hit each other (.) Because here he is only giving him a slap in the face (shows to the left picture) and here he is really hitting him (shows to the right picture) (.)

I: Is that then also violence for you (?)

L: Yes, sure (,) but that h u r t s more (.) (shows to the right picture) but I find that this here is worse (!) Because in the other one he can´t defend himself (.) and he can´t run away (.) I drew him a bit too small (.) (laughs) ".

Physical types of violence are slightly more perceptible, especially since they draw more attention in the media. This explains, in my opinion, the increasing presentation of physical violence in the drawings of the primary school children since they refer to them in especially in situations affecting these in their situational understanding of the phenomenon. Non-verbal types of violence are furthermore, graphically harder to display for primary school children than physical types of violence, which can be represented in a direct communication between two persons and are primarily perceptible in the everyday life of the children.

Sevgi meanwhile showed a constellation of her drawing (Figure 4) in which both kicking as a physical type of violence as well as insults and ,,stupid fool" as a form of verbal violence become clear.

Figure. 4. Violent representation of Sevgi

Yasin illustrated his situational perception as the only one with the picture of exclusively verbal type of violence (Figure 5), while Leyla drew a situation in which a non-verbal type of violence, the blackmail and/or threat, was shown (Figure 6).

Figure. 5. Violent representation of Yasin

Figure 6. Violent representation of Yasin

In summary, it can be stated - also with regard to the drawings of all 19 primary school children of

the class - that more than half of the children visualized physical types of violence in different intensity (10 drawings) while a quarter presented both physical and verbal types of violence in their drawings (6 drawings). Two pupils' illustrated non-verbal types of violence in their drawings, and only Yasin showed a situation in which verbal violence became clear. Consequently the selected sampling can be regarded as exemplary with respect to the situational perception of the phenomenon of violence for the class.

4.2. Perceptions of the children regarding physical and psychological types of violence

In comparison with the children's drawings primary comments in the field of physical violence would have been expected; nevertheless, it could be recorded, that the pupils in frequency indicated almost identical physical as well as psychological types of violence in the conversational interview.

The types of physical violence in this case let it be subdivided into the subcategories of physical violence as well as material damage, following the professional clarification. The statements of the children regarding physical violence occurred primarily intuitively by the drawings as well as the explanation of their own understanding of violence. For the illustration of different aspects of the learning subject violence the test persons referred occasionally on situations of physical violence explanatory according to their opinion. Furthermore, in the context of the question about their information sources physical quarrels with siblings were frequently referred to. It was also, noticeable that Mustafa and Levent differentiated between scuffing's with their friends in the school and violent quarrels, although they both were conscious of their faulty behaviour:

„L: (Yes) (.) ((2)) But in school, there already were a few quarrels (,) I was also there (.) There I also (,) however, not really so (.)

I: No (?)

L: That is then only a little bit pushed and so (.)

I: Yes (?) Then that is for you also violence (?)

L: Sure () a little bit (.) "

„M: When hitting (,) well, "hitting for fun" and then sometimes that gets out of control (.) "

These scuffing's could already be observed by Krappmann/ Oswald (cf. 1994, p. 127 et seq.) in their study, in which children – frequently more the boys than girls - poke, kick or wrestle with each other. For these incidents, the children make rules among each other. „ Because many of these actions are „actually" unacceptable, the children must be capable, of not crossing borders and to safeguard understanding and/or. to reconstruct, because some of these scuffing's get derailed through thoughtlessness or infringements [...] (ibid, p. 128). This escalation of the game practically staged as fun among the children can lead to violent communications, as clearly stated by Mustafa. Mustafa knows that the fun considered rough game allows actions, which otherwise would not be tolerated without rules between the children. He although is conscious of the fact that these scuffings imply a specific wrong behaviour which under certain circumstances can end in unintentional obvious quarrels.

Through a process of de-escalation, the children can, however, succeed; in getting the interaction back again to the game side (Oswald 1999, p. 194). To Schmidt-Denter (1994) primary school children regard an agreement as a precondition for a conflict solution between both conflict parties. They do not consider the origin of a conflict as mutual actions in this case, but they rather see it as a problem coming from the outside.

The aspect of the material damage was integrated through introducing questions by the interviewer during the interview. The test persons in this case had difficulties in clarifying the term and in seeing this as a partial aspect of physical violence. None of the test persons raised this subject in the drawings or spoke of this by themselves in the interview. Based on the introducing questions the children themselves independently cleared, to what extent material damage belongs to the issue of violence, or if you can actually speak of violence. Levent himself reflects that it is also a form of violence if property is damaged by a person; Sevgi clarifies, that even in the case of a broken windowpane it cannot compellingly be spoken of violence:

„L: (Laughs) Well now it is ahem (,) I find that it already is violence (.) ((.))

I: Yes (.) ((.)) Although no one is hurt (,) isn´t it so (?)

L: Yes (.) ((.)) But when someone marks the table with an Edding (,) then it is really hard to clean it (.) Because then it really is violence for the person (,) to whom the table belongs (.) "

„I: Yes (.) And if for example children throw stones at a window and it breaks (.) Is that violence for you (?)

S: That is really very bad (.)

I: That is very bad (.)

S: Well I find it is a little bit bad (,) however I find it simply not so bad (,) so that you can call it violence (,) I think so (.)

It can be stated that all six primary school children had considerable difficulties to understand

the term property damage and to assign this in addition the term violence as Ayşe´s statement underlines:

„A: It is only drawing on the table (.) Therefore, that is not real violence (,) that is if so property damage ()) but not so completely violence for me (.) "

Ayşe's statement, that now, in fact, it is not violence if somebody paints a table but if at all property damage, clearly notes the problem of allocating the term and the object. It is in her view a wrong behaviour which is described as property damage, but in the context of the phenomenon violence, she cannot classify this. Meanwhile only Levent succeeds in reflecting, that it can be spoken of violence if for example, the table is marked because that person to whom the table belongs is „hurt" with the action while for the others, property damage cannot be understood as a partial aspect of violence.

With regard to the types of psychological violence, two subcategories - non-verbal and verbal types of violence – whereas it is to be mentioned that only Sevgi and Leyla both made an issue of verbal and non-verbal forms violence, while the other test persons stayed in the field of the verbal violence.

All children thought that in the term violence, verbal types of violence are implied which Ayşe declared why words are hurting and consequently, to be assigned to the learning-subject violence:

I: It is then also for you violence () when somebody is scolded (.)

A: Yes (.)

I: Why (?)

A: Well () because that also hurts (.) Only somewhere else (,) that is inside where it hurts (.) And if someone hits (,) that also hurts (.) "

Also a statement that is to be mentioned in this context by Sevgi who felt exposed to discriminating comments due to her Kurdish origin and worded her fears in particular with regard to her continuing school concern in this respect as :

„S: Yes (,) because my brother also told me (,)) that there only very few Kurds (.) And he said (,) that they don´t offend him (,) because he is well liked in school (.)But he also always tells me (,) that some always offend and annoy or so (.) And then I get more and more afraid (.)

I: (Approval) Is your brother already older (?)

S: Yes (,) he is already 16 (.)

I: And is it already something like that () (,) is that violence for you (?)

S: Yes () actually is (.) Because there you get hurt inside (.)

I: Yes (,) in every case (.) Do you think (,) that the children or the adolescents are getting

increasingly meaner (?) Or why do you now have such doubts (,) because your brother told you that (?)

S: Yes () and that they will insult me then (.) That is what I am afraid of (.) "

Yasin and Leyla described examples of blackmail while Ayşe added an example of threat in the educational context:

„A: Well now () ahem (,) ((2)) how I mean that (?) ((3)) I mean it this way (,) if now somebody()ahem- If now, for example, a test is written in school and then there is somebody who always has the solution and also knows very much and then another one attempts to violently get the solutions out of him (.) ((.))"

Leyla and Sevgi furthermore, due to their personal experiences, refer to the issue of non-verbal violence. Sevgi spoke of experienced malicious gossip, meanwhile Leyla attempted to word the feeling of suppression to find and spoke in this case from „to be knocked over":

„L: Yes () if you want to knock someone down () so ((2))

I: What you mean with knock down (?)

L: Yes () if someone always says (,) I am the greatest () I am super.)

I: Hmm (.)

L: And he lowers others down (.) ((2))

I: Meaning that so to say the other one doesn´t have a chance (.)

L: Yes (.) But always representing others lower and the other one increasingly wants to get stronger (.) "

It is to be recognized that only two girls spoke of the non-verbal psychological types of violence in the interview. If the aspect finds consideration that in particular non-verbal types of violence are hardly perceptible for outsiders, for the non-verbal psychological violence through the more detailed explanations of these two girl test persons intensify the impression, that they must have already had personal experiences in this regard and accordingly girls are stronger imperilled to these types of violence than boys, since none of the boys expressed themselves such a way.

4.3. Gender difference in the context of the phenomenon of violence?

It appertains to the oldest and most consistent discoveries that boys are more aggressive than girls (Schmidt-Denter 1994, p. 297). It must be said that in referring studies that the term aggression is synonymously used for physical aggression. Newer studies that distinguish between physical and psychological violence come to the conclusion, that girls show aggression just as often as boys (cf. Roth 2006, p. 14). Girls in light of the foregoing rather

tend to the indirect form, for example, through manipulating strategies against a peer relationship, through intrigues or verbal offensive comments, to exclude their victims socially, while boys prefer a direct, sometimes also physical violence (cf. Schmidt-Denter 1994, p. 297 et seq.).

Concerning the results of own evaluation, it can be noted that the test persons took very controversial positions concerning a possible gender difference in the conflict behaviour. While four test persons were convinced of gender-specific differences in the violent action, the other two children refused any differentiation. Mustafa, Levent, Leyla and Ayşe were of the opinion that there are clear differences in violent quarrels between girls and boys, whereas they restricted this to physical types of violence. All four test persons referred this to the aspect; that girls pinch or pull hair and boys would rather hit:

„A: Yes (,) well girls I think (,) rather more pull hair (.) And boys I think (,) that they ahem beat each other more (,) well more kicking (.) ((.))"

Meanwhile Yasin and Sevgi were of the fixed conviction that there would not be any recognizable differences in the gender-specific conflict behaviour:

„S: That doesn´t make a difference (.) If girls for example are in a quarrel and some girls also beat more often (.) I also often see that (,) often times. Yes (,) I don´t find that nice either (.) ((.)) That is (,) that is yes (,) and girls can also do that with boys or girls with girls or something like that (.)"

In conclusion it can be noted that the interviewed children took very different positions concerning a supposed gender-specific difference of the learning-subject violence. It must be said, however, that the primary school children in this case did not make any distinction between physical and psychological types of violence, but only referred to the distinction of physical quarrels between girls and boys.

4.4. Conception of ideas of the children to offender and victim characteristics

In their drawings, the children tended to show situations, in which a direct juxtaposition of offender and victim occurred whereas group processes in the drawings remained without consideration. Some of the test persons drew depictions of violence in which it is to be recognized how two children exercise violence against another child together. Interestingly the victims were shown in these three drawings (see figure) - physical as well as psychological violence – smaller, so that the conclusion can be drawn that a victim characteristic is physical inferiority for the test persons. Furthermore, in all six drawings the victims were represented defenceless - surrounded by two offenders, holding their hands up and/or down or

crying- so that as a further victim characteristic the defencelessness can be stated. The two characteristics of physical inferiority as well as the defencelessness of a victim identified in the drawings are also found in the statements of the test persons. Sevgi mentioned in this process her idea concerning the external appearance of an offender:

„I: Hmm (.) And there is a reason (,) why the boy is wearing a hood (?)

S: I don´t know (,) so that it looks more threatening (.)"

Meanwhile, Leyla and Ayşe worded their ideas concerning offender and victim behaviour and in particular, Ayşe attempted to find an explanation for their positions:

„I: Why did you draw that one as a victim and also once again emphasized () that he is an eager beaver (?)

A: Because he has a good knowledge about school and so and constantly plays the cool one (,) they don´t really interest themselves for school and so (.) (.) And ahem () therefore () and they are always a little bit bigger (,)) and play the cool ones and the eager beavers are always a little bit smaller (,) and that is why they always grab these small eager beavers (.) ((2))

Other studies confirm these perceptions of the basic school pupils which state that younger, anxious and physically weaker children are preferred to become victims of violence (cf. Schmidt-Denter 1994, p. 299). Children in this case also implied that are in a weak position within the same age group since they are refused or ignored by the other ones, have no or find few friends (Alasker 2003, p. 133 fet seq.). Victims accordingly are preferred, „ where there is a little risk of resistance, it is not a question of measuring fair strength for the offenders (Marées/Peterman 2009a, p. 152f.). The test persons of this investigation certified the offenders a clear superiority accordingly in their drawings, both physical as well as also in the application of resources, so that there is no juxtaposition of offender and victim at an eye level recognizable. Only Yasin drew offender and victim almost identically, whereas the victim of verbal violence becomes visible through the crying face, whose violability and so that also the superiority of the offender becomes clear. Offenders are quite popular in the same age group and do not have any effort in making friendships (Alasker 2003, p. 143).

Ayşe for herself draws the comparison of a victim with her mental picture of an „eager-beaver":

I: Where would you rather picture yourself (?) on the side of the boy or rather on the side of both these (?)

A: Of the boy (,) because it´s his life, and he can determine it and it is also good (,) that he is interested in schooling and then he in addition has many job possibilities and a good life (.)

I: And you mean the other two; do not have so much luck in life (?)

A: (Approval)

I: So you think that is why they start beating (.)

A: Yes (.) However mostly the ahem people (,) that play it cool also have problems in the families (.) "

It is interesting that Ayşe would ascribe herself to the victim role since she thinks that offenders must have problems in the familiar environment and the „eager beaver" who resumes the classical role of a victim would have better future chances. Nevertheless, for her the term „eager beaver" implies physical weakness of a victim of violence and simultaneously expresses the negatively afflicted characteristic of an eager beaver. She, furthermore, certifies with this comparison the victim a weak position within the same age group since the term „eager beaver" as is generally known is used for the exclusion of a child within a peer relationship. Offenders are according to her opinion physically superior and „cooler". An interpretation of the adjective „cooler "repeatedly mentioned by her in the context of the description of the offender characteristics" could suggest the supposition that she ascribes a clearly more popular role to this within the peer group. As a possible explanation for the violence-prone behaviour of offenders, she adds problems in the familiar environment and attempts to see this as a justification for the wrong behaviour.

4.5. Competence and/or strategies of the children in dealing with violence In accordance with Schmidt-Denter (1994) boys prevail in conflicts, while girls rather tend to retreat. Boys would in addition „focus on threats, physical strength and other direct aggressive behaviour (Roth 2006, p. 14). Furthermore, boys would tend to in hypothetical conflict situations more frequently recommend hostile strategies to other children (cf. ibid). In comparison with the own investigation when taking into account the statements of the test persons would have to be revised, since on the one hand in particular, the boys would prefer to choose a withdrawal as a conflict solution strategy, and on the other hand, both one girl and one boy illustrated, that they would refer to violent strategies where appropriate in the conflict. An answer tendency could be a possible cause for that in the sense of social desirability since primary school children already know how they should actually behave and violent

action is - also in defence reactions - socially unacceptable (cf. Marées/ Peter man 2009b, p. 106).

The children´s conception of ideas ranged from physical defence up to the learned violence-avoiding strategies. Interestingly most test persons differentiated their behaviour between the family and the educational environment, in the conflict with those of the same age:

L: Yes that is different (,) when I am in school or here (,) in the street (.) In the street I would simply start in (.) And in school (,) then I sometimes ahem (,) I simply say nothing (,) when the other one insults me and sometimes I also insult him (.) But then sometimes I say nothing and go somewhere else (.)

I: Aha (.) That is then more difficult in school than at home, somewhere in the street (?)

L: Yes (.) Because in school you are more and let me say such a smaller room (.) ((.))"

If most of the children feel attacked through words, they behave very differently. While some would not even react, but instead attempt to ignore it, others prefer a verbal quarrel:

„I: Would you then also talk back or insult them (?)

S: That doesn´t help in any way (.) "

L: Yes (?) ((3()) and (,) if somebody hurts you with words (,) what do you do then (?)

I: Yes (,) then I sometimes say (:) "Back to you (!)And then (,) ((.))then it goes back and forth (.)

I: And what can happen then (?)

L: Yes (,) then sometimes it gets into a quarrel (.) Yes () however, I mostly go away (.) "

Very different strategies of the primary school children could be recognized in the behaviour of conflict situations. Mustafa and Yasin tended to get out of the situation:

I: And how is it (,) when you argue with somebody (?) ((5))

M: Then I go simply go away () because that nerves me (.) "

Meanwhile Sevgi and Leyla would intervene and attempt to settle the conflict:

„S: Yes (.) Well then I would not go against them and beat them up () or so (.) That wouldn´t really help me any further (.) Then I would first of all ask (,) why did they do that ()) because that isn´t nice or so (.)

I: Hmm (.) Then you would first of all attempt to talk with them (.)

S: Yes () well sometimes sure (.) Then they also apologize (.) Up to now it has not happened again (.) I would rather like to clarify that than to start offending them or to beat them up (.) That does not help me any bit (.) ((.)) That only makes the situation worse (.) "

In contrast Ayşe´s opinion was that she must try to defend herself in order not to be branded as "intimidated" while Levent searched a middle course:

„I: How do you behave in a quarrel (?)

L: If it is a very bad quarrel (,) then I also push the other one a few times and if sometimes not (,) then I rather also go to a teacher or so (.)

I: (Yes) (.)

L: Or I simply go away (.) ((.))"

The children also reacted very differently to the question as to how they would deal with upcoming anger. First of all, they would all attempt to suppress their anger, at which they would choose different strategies from „throwing pillows" up to „going away ". In the family environment, every child tended to go into its room, and try to find another „receptor for their anger ":

Aşye: Then I am in a very bad mood or let my steam off (.) Shout into my pillow (,) beat my toys (.) (giggles) I try to suppress my anger and during a break I let it out (.) I either run around a lot ((.)) or I stamp my feet on the floor very hard (,) well I jump on the floor (,) and let my anger out (.) ((.))"

Mustafa: I simply go into my room and kill the pillow (.) "

Yasin: A h h (.) (2) Then I go outside and shout out loud (.) "

In the educational context, there is no possibility of gaining control over anger so that the primary school children must resort to other strategies.

4.6. The children's information sources

The answers of the pupils to the transfer question which directed out of the interview „How do you know so much?" referred to unlike the topic-focused question to their information sources.

As information sources, the primary school children of the learning-subject possessed a broad range of data media. Primary information sources were in this case the own family, those of same age as well as the media. The six test persons of these investigations all referred to the family environment as data media. In particular, younger as well as older siblings gave a primary source, where on the one hand they not rarely did act as a conflict person and on the other hand in conversations spoke on the issue of contents-related aspects of the phenomenon of violence.

Interestingly enough almost all test persons at the beginning of the interviews declared not to possess any experience about the learning subject of violence:

„I: Ok (.) ((.)) Ahem () have you then already experienced that (?) That you have seen or heard of that (?)

A: No (,) not actually (.)

I: In the schoolyard or so(?)

A: (Refusal) ((.)) "

It became evident; however, throughout the interview that own experiences acted as a primary information source as some of the test persons themselves reflected:

I: Yes (,) and all that what you told me (,) how do know all that so exactly (?)

L: Yes (,) actually that ((.)) from others and from my own experiences (.)

Furthermore, the own family served the pupils as an information source, in particular older as well as younger siblings acted as data media, both through physical quarrels and in conversations about contents-related aspects of the phenomenon of violence:

„I: From where do you actually know so much (?)

M: I know that from my sister (.) (giggles)

I: Aha (.)

M: Because my sister always pinches, bites () and hits me every day (.) "

The Mustafa´s statement that his little sister pinches, bites and hits him every day refers to the fact that conflicts occurring between siblings occur almost daily, beginning from verbal insults up to physical violence. These processes of negotiation among siblings belong to the children´s environment and they do not refer by any means to a violent family, but they rather clarify the commonplace of conflict situations.

Quarrels with those of the same age are part of the everyday life of the children. The test persons got their information through active participation in conflict situations with those of same age or by observing their social environment:

S.: Yes. In my street there are sometimes children who are fighting around or so (.) "

As a further information source four children referred to the television in which they specified this partially in cartoons and crime stories or to television in general as a source:

A: Yes already saw it on television or so (.)

It is recognizable that the test persons are confronted with the phenomenon of violence through the media. In cartoons in which not seldom violence-glorifying scenes are pictured for children the pupils are exposed non-reflected to medial violence. Accordingly, it is often impossible for the children to process what they have seen and heard in an appropriate form so that a media competence that is to be learned moves into the foreground.

The test persons mentioned again and again quarrels in the educational context, spoke partially also of intervening measures on the part of the

teaching person, only Sevgi indicated already in the context of educational facilities - in the kindergarten - to have had the phenomenon of violence as an issue:

„I: And from where do you know so much (?)

S: I don´t know (.) We spoke about that once in kindergarten () (.) In the kindergarten we also once learned about violence (.) There we also had to draw something () how somebody annoys someone (.) "

5. Discussion

Conceptions in the field of violence prevention „placing primary on strengthening the personality of the pupils, so that they learn to self-confidently say ”No”, able to resist or in problem cases seek help from their teachers [...]" (Richter 2009, p. 186). That prevention must exceed these aspects in the classroom is illustrated in this investigation. Children have diverse imaginations about the phenomenon of violence and can already in the fourth grad give information about the different types of violence - both physical and psychological. Due to the manifold information sources of the pupils, this is not surprising, but rather clarifies the didactic relevance of this learning subject matter for the classroom.

Psychological types of violence and also bullying occur in school clearly more often than the rather perceptible physical types of violence. The statements of the test persons illustrate this observation, because they equally expressed both the physical as well as psychological types of violence, however, non-verbal violence only insignificantly became to be an issue.

This shows the necessity to take up the issue of these types of violence in classroom and to sensitize the children, because, on the other hand, only those who perceive this problem as such, is also motivated to do something against it (cf. Alasker 2003, p. 193). This aspect in the same way applies to the term of property damage that is hard to be understood by the primary school children. To intentionally destroy someone else´s property - even if it is „only drawing on it -" means damage to his property. To mediate to the children in the sense of empathy, as to how they would feel as a harmed person and from that to draw inferences to the hurting aspect of material damage, illustrates that concerned preventive approach.

„For the discussion of increasing violence in schools too often not enough is differentiated between the very different actions, of violence, that is regarded as violence" (Oswald 1999, p. 19). Violence is mostly perceived from the outside, belonging to the children´s environment and by no means regarded as violence-oriented interaction (cf. ibid p. 179). This so-called „ beating-for-fun" as defined by one of the

test persons in this investigation follows its own by the primary school children negotiated rules. The children in this case practice „within a scope" to create and to simultaneously test the limits of the game "in a playful manner" for situations, that can entirely lead to the escalation of the situation (cf. ibid, p. 197). This, however, represents an important negation process, for the children in the communication with children of the same age and should not be declared by any means as violence, but rather more be regarded as a starting point for de-escalating conflict solving-strategies. Gender differences could indeed be stated in this investigation, nevertheless, I think that no gender-specific prevention approaches are necessary, but in contrary, the heterogeneity of the learning-group is preventively beneficial. Because through a discourse the primary school children can exchange, reflect and their subjective viewpoints and where appropriate further develop in the sense of adopting a perspective.

Basic school children time and again search for their standing in the group structure so that quarrels are necessary for the social orientation. In this case body language and mimicry, besides communication, play a central role (cf. Büttner/ Buhbe 2006, p. 51 et seq.). The way of finding a solution can in this case occur on a peaceful level, but can also end in violent quarrels. Constructive conflict solution must therefore be one of the main points of violence prevention, at which the willingness to compromise takes a supporting role (Gugel 2009, p. 232f.). The children must subsequently learn to find appropriate conflict solution strategies and if given to demand for assistance from the outside. Conflict situations between primary school children are very often emotional quarrels in which negative feelings become recognizable. The ability for the empathy represents an aspect of the constructive acting in conflict situations. The pupils and pupils should accordingly learn to understand and to reflect their own feelings, such as anger but also fear, to deal appropriately and again to perceive the feelings of others (Gugel 2009, p. 148 et seq.).

Friendship relationships and a strong class community are also highly significant in the prevention of violence. Common activities as well as social recognition among those of the same age provides for social relationships. In particular, the reflection about adequate behaviour is strengthened through this solidarity with others facilitates adapting to a perspective (et seq. Krappmann/ Oswald 1995, p. 137). When the children are involved in friendship bonds, they rather are more willing to compromise and endeavoured to commonly find a violent-free conflict solution, so that they achieve acceptable

solutions more frequently for both sides (cf. Salic 1991, p. 17 et seq.). Individual friendships indeed cannot be created on part of the teacher; however, it is possible to integrate children into cooperative connections, to give mutual help offers and to prevent exclusions within a class community.

The conclusions spell out to which degree the generated imaginations of the primary school children refer to a didactic relevance of the learning subject matter about violence. It should be the objective of the school lesson beyond decreasing violence in schools to create it as a place where the children can learn to shape their lives free from violence also outside of the primary school.

Corresponding Author:
Sayime ERBEN KEÇİCİ
Necmettin Erbakan University Faculty of Education
Department of Educational Science
Konya 42090, Turkey
Telephone: 0090-507-2532210
Cellular phone: 0090-332-3238220-5905
Emails: sayime_erben@yahoo.de

References
1. Alsaker, F. (2003). Quälgeister und ihre Opfer. Mobbing unter Kindern – und wie man damit umgeht, 1. Auflage. Bern: Verlag Hans Huber.
2. Bandura, A. (1972). Modeling theory: Some traditions, trends, and disputes. In Parke,R. D. Hrg, *Recent trends in social learning theory*, p. 35-61. New York: Academic Press.
3. Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
4. Bandura, A. (1979). Aggression. Eine sozial-theoretische Analyse. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
5. Becher, Andrea (2009). Die Zeit des Holocaust in Vorstellungen von Grundschulkindern. Eine empirische Untersuchung im Kontext von Holocaust Education, 1. Auflage. Oldenburg: Didaktisches Zentrum Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg.
6. Bussmann, K. (1995). Changes in family sanctioning styles and the impact of abolishing corporal punishment. In Frehsee, D. et.al., Family violence against children (p.39-61). Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
7. Büttner, C. & Buhbe, A. (2006). Kinderkonflikte und die Einmischung Erwachsener. Ein Plädoyer für die Kompetenz der Kinder, TPS, 3: 50-54.
8. Cierpka, M. (2005). Faustlos – Wie Kinder Konflikte gewaltfrei lösen lernen, 2. Auflage. Freiburg: Verlag Herder.
9. Dann, H.-D. et. al. (1986). Das Konstanzer Trainings-Modell (KTM). Bern: Huber.
10. Dodge, K. (1980). Social cognition and children's aggressive behavior. Child Development 51 (1):162-170.
11. Eron, L. (1972). Does television violence cause aggression? American Psychologists, 52 (2): 253-263.
12. Freud, S. (1975/1920). Jenseits des Lustprinzips. Freud-Studienausgabe, Band III, p. 213-272. Frankfurt: S. Fischer.
13. Ferstl, R. et. al. (1993). Gutachterliche Stellungnahme zur Verbreitung von Gewalt und Aggression an Schulen in Schleswig- Holstein, 1. Auflage. Kiel: Die Ministerin für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Kultur und Sport des Landes Schleswig-Holstein.
14. Fuchs, M. et. al. (2009). Gewalt an Schulen, 2. Auflage. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
15. Gershoff, E. (2002). Corporal punishment by parents and sssociated child behaviors and experiences: a meta-analytic and theoretical review. Psychological Bulletin, 128 (1): 539-579.
16. Gugel, G. (2009). Handbuch Gewaltprävention. Für die Grundschule und die Arbeit mit Kindern. Grundlagen – Lernfelder – Handlungsmöglichkeiten, 2. Auflage. Tübingen: Institut für Friedenspädagogik.
17. Heinzel, F. (2003). Qualitative Interviews mit Kindern. In: Friebertshäuser, Barbara/ Prengel, Annedore (Hrsg.). Handbuch Qualitative Forschungsmethoden in der Erziehungswissenschaft, 1. Auflage. Weinheim, München : Juventa Verlag, p. 396-413.
18. Hörmann, C. & Schäfer, M. (2009). Bullying im Grundschulalter. Mitschülerrollen und ihre transkontextuelle Stabilität, Praxis der Kinderpsychologie und Kinderpsychiatrie, 58 (3): 111-124.
19. Kempf, W. (1983). Aggression. In: Lippert, E. & Wakenhut, R. (Hrsg.), Handwörterbuch der Politischen Psychologie, p. 19-26. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
20. Krappmann, L. & Oswald, H. (1995). Alltag der Schulkinder. Beobachtungen und Analysen von Interaktionen und Sozialbeziehungen, 1. Auflage. München: Juventa Verlag.
21. Lorenz, K. (1963). *Das sogenannte Böse*. Wien.
22. Löbsack, T. (1991). Nächstenliebe ist keine Exklusivität des Menschen. Die Weltwoche, 46: 35. Zürich.
23. Marées, N. (2009). Der Bullying- und Viktimisierungsfragebogen: Konstruktion und Analyse von Instrumenten zur Erfassung von Bullying im Vor- und Grundschulalter. Bremen: Dissertation.

24. Marées, N. & Petermann, F. (2009a). Bullying an Grundschulen. Formen, Geschlechtsunterschiede und psychosoziale Korrelate, Psychologische Rundschau, 60 (1): 152-162.

25. Marées, N. & Petermann, F. (2009b). Der Bullying- und Viktimisierungsfragebogen für Kinder (BVF-K): Konstruktion und Analyse eines Verfahrens zur Erhebung von Bullying im Vor- und Grundschulalter, Praxis der Kinderpsychologie und Kinderpsychiatrie, 58 (2): 96-109.

26. Mayring, P. (2002). Einführung in die qualitative Sozialforschung, 5. Auflage. Weinheim: Beltz Verlag.

27. Mayring, P. (2008). Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken. 10. Auflage. Weinheim: Beltz Verlag.

28. Oswald, H. (1999). Jenseits der Grenze zur Gewalt: Sanktionen und rauhe Spiele. In: Schäfer, M. & Frey, D. (Hrsg.). Aggression und Gewalt unter Kinder und Jugendlichen, 1. Auflage. Göttingen: Hogrefe-Verlag, p. 179-197.

29. Richter, D. (2009). Sachunterricht – Ziele und Inhalte. Ein Lehr- und Studienbuch zur Didaktik, 3. Auflage. Hohengehren: Schneider Verlag.

30. Roth, I. (2006). Förderung prosozialer Verhaltensweisen und konstruktiver Konfliktlösestrategien bei Kindern im Grundschulalter: „Ich bleibe cool" – Konzeption, Implementation und Evaluation eines Trainingsprogramms zur Prävention aggressiven Verhaltens, Trier: Dissertation.

31. Salisch, M. (1991). Kinderfreundschaften, 1. Auflage. Göttingen: Hogrefe Verlag für Psychologie.

32. Scheithauer, H. et. al. (2003). Bullying unter Schülern. Erscheinungsformen, Risikobedingungen und Interventionskonzepte, Band 8. 1. Auflage. Göttingen: Hogrefe Verlag für Psychologie.

33. Schmidt-Denter, U. (1994). Prosoziale und aggressives Verhalten. In: Birbaumer, N. et. al. (Hrsg.). Enzyklopädie der Psychologie. Serie 1 Pädagogische Psychologie. Band 1 Psychologie der Erziehung und Sozialisation, 1. Auflage. Göttingen: Hogrefe Verlag für Psychologie.

34. Schäfer, M. & Albrecht, A. (2004). „Wie du mir, so ich dir?" Prävalenz und Stabilität von Bullying in Grundschulklassen, Psychologie in Erziehung und Unterricht, 51 (1): 136-149.

35. Schunk, M. (2008). Konfliktlösung bei Grundschulkindern, 1. Auflage. Marburg: Tectum Verlag.

36. Schwind, H.-D. et. al. (1995). Gewalt in der Schule – am Beispiel Bochum. In: Lamnek, S. (Hrsg.). Jugend und Gewalt. Devianz und Kriminalität in Ost und West, 1. Auflage. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, p. 99-118.

37. Selg, H. (1978). *Zur Aggression verdammt?* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

38. Tennstädt, K.-C. & Dann, H.-D. (1987). Das Konstanzer Trainingsmodell (KTM): Ein integratives Selbsthilfeprogramm für Lehrkräfte zur Bewältigung von Aggressionen und Störungen im Unterricht. Bd. 3, *Evaluation des Trainingserfolgs im empirischen Vergleich.* Bern: Huber.

39. Wolke, D. et.al. (2001). Bullying and victimisation in primary school children in South England and South Germany: Prevalence and school factors, British Journal of Psychology, 92 (2) 673-696.

8/27/2013