

**Jelena Maksimović,
and Dragana Dimitrijević**

Meta-analysis of Peer Violence: Family and Peers as the Factors that Induce Violent Behaviour

Abstract: Peer violence is an issue that is widely manifested and investigated around the world. This study uses meta-analysis to investigate the problem of peer violence, with the purpose of systematising the data regarding family and peers as the factors that have a significant impact on the expression of violent behaviour. An analysis of 43 primary studies was used to determine the final sample consisting of 10 studies that were in accordance with the stated criteria and were included in the meta-analysis. All the studies are quantitative in character, realised on the basis of primary school children's self-assessment. The total sample from all 10 studies is 10,500 respondents. The average pondered correlation is 0.4914 and can be described as moderate. The meta-analysis results show that family and peers are the factors that have a significant influence on violent behaviour and that the negative influence of peers is more striking when an individual lacks family warmth or supervision. The obtained results prove that family has significant effects on an individual's behaviour and indicate that violence prevention programmes should be directed towards family and creating positive relationships between family members, which will ultimately reduce the negative influence of peers.

Keywords: peer violence, meta-analysis, correlation, family, peers

UDC: 376

Scientific article

Jelena Maksimović, PhD., associate professor, University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Pedagogy, 18000 Niš, Serbia; e-mail: jelena.maksimovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

Dragana Dimitrijević, PhD. candidate, University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Pedagogy, 18000 Niš, Serbia; e-mail: dimitrijevic.d.93@gmail.com

Introduction

Peer violence is a phenomenon that has been widely studied as relatively prevalent in our society. One of the first authors to examine the issue of peer violence was Olweus in the early 1970s. It was at that time that the interest in this problem became evident. This phenomenon was studied in countries around the world during the 1980s and 1990s. This paper is based on the definition of peer violence postulated by Olweus (1994), which states that peer violence is any form of physical, verbal or psychological harassment or abuse committed with the purpose of inflicting damage or harm to another person. The repetition of violent behaviour in the context of a striking power imbalance is defined as oppression.

It is important to emphasise terminological differences regarding the phenomenon of peer violence, as stated by Smith et al. (2002), who believe that the problem arises from various translations of the term “bullying” as the most frequently used term in this field. The second problem, also indicated by the aforementioned authors, is children’s perception of violence. Research has proven that children aged 8 do know the difference between aggressive and non-aggressive behaviour, whereas children aged 14 can differentiate between direct and indirect aggression, as well as instances of social exclusion.

Physical violence has been the term most frequently used in relation to peer violence. However, besides physical violence, psychological violence is evident in schools, in both verbal and non-verbal forms, which means that there is direct and indirect violence (Baldry 2003). Indirect violence encompasses the following forms of behaviour: teasing, gossip and rumours about certain individuals, and the isolation of the victim. These forms of violent behaviour may be regarded as forms of social violence (Smith et al. 2002). The advent of modern media has contributed to violence being moved from the real world into the world of electronic technologies, which has led to the phenomenon of electronic violence or “cyberbullying” – a new form of violence appearing among schoolchildren (Smith et al. 2008; Corcoran et al. 2015).

School is a common environment for children to express violent behaviour. All the mentioned types of violence occur, but verbal, social and physical violence are more frequent (Fekkes et al. 2005; Rivers and Smith 1994; Smith et al. 2002).

Most of the research in this area concludes that about 60% of students are not involved in any type of peer violence, but the percent of involvement is not harmless. Efforts to decrease the frequency of peer violence are seen in different types of school programmes which focus on decreasing children's aggression and developing their social-emotional skills and prosocial behaviour (Olweus 1994; Olweus and Limber 2010; Schonert-Reichl et al. 2012; Smith and Brain 2000) perspective taking, caring for others, and infant development. The study included a quasi-experimental control-group pretest-posttest, multi-informant design with 585 4th- to 7th-grade children from 28 classrooms. Outcome measures included self-reports of understanding of infant distress, empathy, and perspective taking, and peer and teacher reports of prosocial and aggressive behaviors. Measures assessing implementation were also included. Children in the ROE intervention classrooms showed significant improvement across several of the domains assessed: self-reports of causes for infant crying, peer nominations of prosocial behaviors, and teacher reports of proactive and relational aggression. Self-reported empathy and perspective taking showed no significant changes. According to ROE instructors' diaries assessing implementation, students in the experimental condition were exposed to all or most of the ROE curriculum. These findings support and extend recent research examining the positive impacts of classroom-based social and emotional learning (SEL).

Researchers have confirmed the correlation between children's emotional development and their position in peer violence. In this context, we emphasise results which show that low empathy often indicates more violent behaviour (Jolliffe and Farrington 2006), and that victims are emotionally distressed and socially marginalised, while bullies are psychologically stronger (Juvonen et al. 2003). Smith and Brain (2000) state the fundamental characteristics of peer violence or bullying, adding that victims of this type of violence are usually afraid to report violence and consequently develop certain conditions, such as very low self-esteem and depression. Health conditions in children caused by violence are indicated by the meta-analysis (Gini and Pozzoli 2009), which summarises the results obtained from 11 studies that confirm the correlation between peer violence and the development of psychosomatic conditions. The fact that the negative consequences of violence have been studied from the point of view of medicine indicates how important it is to reduce the frequency of expression of this global phenomenon and simultaneously provides the basis on which to found further, more comprehensive research.

Greater interest of scholars and experts in this phenomenon and the efforts of authorities at the national and local level aimed at preventing violence have not yielded the expected results, since peer violence is still present both inside and outside schools. Although this phenomenon is nothing new, the changes related to education, the position of teachers and students and the characteristics of contemporary families all require that the approach to this phenomenon be altered and that new ways of prevention be continually searched for. Moreover, it is also important to detect violent individuals and their real victims so that they can be made more aware of their behaviour and can potentially be instructed in the ways of nonviolent and prosocial behaviour. This is the reason why numerous studies of particular types of violence have been conducted, examining their frequency

(Solberg and Olweus 2003), factors that have an impact on the expression of various forms of violence (Sušac et al. 2016; O'connell et al. 1999), the connection between media violence and violent behaviour (Olson et al. 2007; Huesmann 2007; Hopf et al. 2008) the efficiency of preventative programmes (Olweus and Limber 2010). The purpose of all these studies is to gain a comprehensive understanding of the real state of affairs in schools. However, the vast research on this phenomenon has contributed to the creation of a large pool of data, which complicates the selection, integration and use of the data. This was the starting point of this research, which initiated the decision to apply the meta-analysis in the study of peer violence.

In light of the discussion presented above, as well as the influence of family and peers on the behaviour of young children (especially aggressive and violent behaviour), these factors were chosen for our research. As the research problem, we single out the connection between family and peer influences and forms of violent and aggressive behaviour among peers. This was inspired by the fact that peer violence has been widely examined and there are meta-analyses that summarise the results of these studies. In addition, family and peers are essential resources for the prevention and reduction of peer violence and should thus be included in preventative programmes.

Methodology

This research analyses primary studies with the purpose of realising the similarities and differences between obtained results and the established analysis criteria, which will enable conclusions about the studied aspects of peer violence. Meta-analysis is applied as a synthetic and analytical approach that represents the basis for the integration of the results obtained by inter-independent studies into one common result. The goal of this research is to analyse the results of primary studies of peer violence with a particular focus on family and peers as the factors that significantly affect aggressive and violent behaviour among peers.

Review of relevant literature and selection criteria

A search for relevant literature accessible in electronic databases using the keywords 'bullying', 'family influence', 'children violent behaviour' and 'peer influence' resulted in 43 primary studies. These studies were analysed to examine the connection between peer violence and some family, friend and peer factors. The criteria for selecting the studies to be included in the meta-analysis were defined in relation to the postulated research goal:

- the research was conducted with primary school students (aged 8 to 16);
- the research was conducted after the year 2000;
- the research used respondents' self-assessment;
- the research contained exact statistical data; and

- the research was published in a scholarly paper.

Ten studies satisfied all these criteria and were included in the meta-analysis. The most common reason for the exclusion of certain studies from the analysis was the method of data collection (Bowes et al. 2009), such as data collected through interviewing one or both parents regarding children's behaviour with their peers or family factors, rather than through respondents' self-assessment. The second most common reason for the exclusion of certain primary studies from the meta-analysis was an insufficient amount of statistical data, which prevented an evaluation of the effect size and a comparison of the obtained results.

Statistical data analysis

The effect was determined by means of the Wilson formula (2011), using the available data from the statistical analyses performed in the primary studies. The sizes of the effects from all of the analysed studies were translated into the correlation effect size using the aforementioned formula. The obtained values of the effect sizes were observed and analysed with reference to Cohen's classification (Cohen 1992) and the defined criteria, with three levels of strength: 0.20 to 0.46 = low, 0.50 to 0.79 = medium and 0.80 = high. The pondered effect sizes were presented using the sample size in each study. The average pondered effect size, presented as the Pearson correlation coefficient, was 0.4914. The data dispersion around the pondered effect size obtained in individual studies was presented using the Hunter and Schmidt method (2004), which operates with correlations and suppositions about coincidental effects. Keeping in mind this method and the goal of discovering the variability in the effect size between the samples of each study, the total variance (VAR) of each study was calculated using the formula $VAR = \sum(n * (r - \bar{r})^2) / \sum n$, in which \bar{r} is the average effect size. Then, the variance of the sample error (VARse) was calculated using the formula $VARse = ((1 - \bar{r}^2)^2) / (Mn - 1)$, in which Mn represents the average number of respondents in each study. Table 1 shows the results of the effect size and the variance. Using the values obtained from the aforementioned formula, the sample error was calculated as 0.00005.

Analysis and discussion of the results

Table 1 presents all the studies that satisfied the established criteria and were therefore included in the meta-analysis, as well as the statistical values that enabled a comparison of the results obtained in these studies and appropriate conclusions.

Authors	Resource	Effect size (r)	95% CI	Respondents' average age	Number of respondents	Country	Moderator variable - factor	VAR
1. Baldry 2003	Child Abuse and Neglect	0.4984	0.4517 to 0.5423	11.2	1,059	Italy	Domestic violence	0.0007
2. Sušac et al. 2016	Psihologijske Temе	0.2790	0.2472 to 0.3102	13.3	3,470	Croatia	Domestic violence	0.0702
3. Espelage et al. 2014	Journal of Research on Adolescence	0.6900	0.6596 to 0.7182	13.9	1,232	USA	Domestic violence	0.0233
4. Laeheem et al. 2014	Asian Social Science	0.4103	0.2717 to 0.5322	10 (from 1 st to 6 th grade, primary school)	1,440	Thailand	Domestic violence	0.0111
5. Connolly and O'moore 2003	Personality and Individual Differences	0.3924	0.3085 to 0.4703	11	228	Ireland	Family – negative emotions	0.0022
6. Henneberger et al. 2013	Journal of youth and adolescence	0.9851 0.8944	0.9731 to 0.9918 0.8663 to 0.9169	12.40	364	USA	Family – parents' control Peer popularity	0.0171 0.0140
7. Georgiuis and Stavrinides 2008	School Psychology International	0.2316	0.1337 to 0.3250	11.6	377	Greece	Peer acceptance	0.0093
8. Smith et al. 2004	British Journal of Educational Psychology	0.2148	0.1211 to 0.3048	14.5	413	Great Britain	Peers – number of friends	number of 0.0108
9. Mazefsky and Farrell 2005	Journal of Child and Family Studies	0.5000	0.4915 to 0.5421	15 (ninth grade)	1,153	USA	Peer provocations	0.0009
10. Erath et al. 2008	Social Development	0.3100	0.2184 to 0.3962	12.8	398	USA	Peer friendly support	0.0068

Table 1: Effect size, moderator variables and variance

Based on the data shown in Table 1, the results obtained in the presented studies were subjected to a qualitative analysis with regard to the gender of the respondents and the factors that had an impact on various forms of peer violence.

Peer violence – gender differences

This part of the paper analyses the primary studies included in the meta-analysis which demonstrated not only modal variables, but also results referring to the frequency of peer violence in relation to the gender of the respondents. Although this is not the primary goal of this research, it is important to designate these data as the starting point for understanding and analysing the data about various effects of family or peers on the expression of violent behaviour.

The research conducted in Thailand (Laeheem et al. 2014) demonstrated that the method of self-assessment identified 20.90% of the respondents as belonging to a group that committed violence against other people. There was a statistically significant difference in relation to gender ($p = 0.001$): boys committed violence more frequently than girls. The results of the research conducted in Italy, which examined a group of bullies and a group of victims (Baldry 2003) showed that 48.30% of the respondents said that they had bullied other children in the course of the previous three months. There was also a statistically significant difference regarding the gender of the bullies: male respondents demonstrated violent behaviour more frequently than female ones. The most significant difference was found in the demonstration of physical violence. Regarding perceptions of peer violence from the victims' point of view, 59.00% of the respondents stated that they had been victims of peer violence several times over the past three months. In terms of gender, direct victimisation was determined in male respondents and indirect victimisation was evident in female respondents. Similar results were provided by the research conducted in the USA (Erath et al. 2008), which determined a statistically significant difference between genders regarding self-assessment: $M = 1.69$ and $SD = 0.68$ among boys, and $M = 1.53$ and $SD = 0.56$ among girls, which proves that boys were identified as victims more frequently. The aforementioned results show that boys were identified as belonging to a group of bullies more often than girls. Regarding victims of peer violence, there was a difference in the obtained results. The second mentioned research examined instances of direct aggression, the victims of which were predominantly boys, and instances of indirect aggression, where girls were victims more frequently. The third mentioned research did not study direct and indirect aggression separately. However, taking into account the structure of the used instrument and small differences in replies provided by the respondents ($p < 0.1000$), it can be assumed that girls were identified as victims of indirect aggression more frequently.

Out of 413 respondents aged 13 to 16 from Great Britain (Smith et al. 2004), 55 respondents were identified as persistent victims, whereas 27 were identified as new victims, regardless of gender differences in relation to the studied victim-bully groups. Gender differences were found in the quality of friendships and number

of friends, which was the second moderator variable in this meta-analysis. The research conducted by Mazefsky and Farrell (2005) confirmed that boys participated considerably in peer violence, demonstrating aggressive behaviour and both direct and indirect aggression, with $M = 25.10$ and $SD = 13.20$, with a statistically significant gender difference.

Similar research was conducted in neighbouring countries. A sample of 3,470 school children was analysed in the research conducted in Croatia (Sušac et al. 2016). It was determined that 14.80% of the respondents were identified as victims, 6.30% as bullies, while 61.40% were uninvolved. Also, both genders participated in peer violence, but girls were more often identified as victims.

The analysis of the presented results shows that gender differences were evident in the research that identified victims as well as in the research that identified bullies. Generally speaking, boys were more frequently identified as bullies and those who demonstrated direct aggression, whereas girls were more frequently identified as victims, usually of indirect aggression. It is important to note that despite the fact that the presented studies were conducted in various countries, the obtained results were similar, which proves that children of that age behave similarly regardless of their environment and country of origin.

Factors that induce violent behaviour

The analysis of the primary research, shown in Table 1, with the factors that affect violent behaviour as the moderator variable, particularly family and peers, is shown below.

Family and exposure to domestic violence is the first factor that has a significant impact on violent behaviour. One of the analysed studies (Baldry 2003) confirmed that exposure to domestic violence, even though the child was not the victim of that violence but rather a witness of intimate partner violence, was related to that child's participation in peer violence and to the child being both a victim and a bully. The aforementioned research indicated the gender differences by emphasising that girls exposed to their parents' violence were more frequently identified as those who committed peer violence. The most significant result of this research is the fact that the children whose families were characterised by domestic violence committed by both parents were mostly identified as those prone to peer violence. The effect size is 0.4984, which borders on moderate according to Cohen's model. Similar results were obtained from the research conducted in Asia (Laeheem et al. 2014), which examined the effects of several factors on the violent behaviour of children. It was shown that exposure to domestic violence was the most significant factor in children's violent behaviour ($p = 0.000$). Therefore, the effect size of this factor was calculated as 0.4103, which represented the basis for the comparison of the results of these studies. The research conducted in the USA (Espelage et al. 2014) confirmed the gender differences regarding the impact of domestic violence on children. Namely, boys who had witnessed domestic violence demonstrated violent behaviour in peer relationships more frequently than girls, who expressed

internalised problems in their behaviour. The results obtained proved a statistically significant difference between the genders in determining the difference between family conflicts and peer violence: the correlation coefficient was 0.69.

Although these three studies that examined the same aspect of family as a factor – witnessing intimate partner violence – were conducted on different continents, analysis proves a great similarity in the obtained results. This demonstrates the importance of family as a factor regardless of particular social and situational conditions. As previously mentioned, children who witness domestic violence often demonstrate the same forms of violent behaviour themselves. This is not surprising considering the fact that children form their first social relationships and patterns of behaviour in their families. The gender differences, confirmed by one study, indicated the gender characteristics and affective bonds between children of different genders and their parents. It was shown that boys assumed forms of violent behaviour more readily than girls did, who, for their part, reacted by internalising the problems. This finding is in accordance with the data presented previously in the paper on gender differences in relation to the frequency of violent behaviour and the identification of bullies and victims, which revealed that girls are identified as victims of forms of indirect violence more frequently than boys.

The research conducted in Croatia examined instances of children being victims of domestic violence. This research determined a significant difference between the children who were victims of domestic violence and children who were not involved in peer for all the categories of the studied domestic violence: psychological aggression ($\chi^2=229.40^{**}$), psychological abuse ($\chi^2=270.17^{**}$), corporal punishment ($\chi^2=155.98^{**}$) and physical abuse ($\chi^2=164.94^{**}$) (Sušac et al. 2016, p. 212). Compared to the total sample, it was determined that victims of peer violence were most frequently victims of domestic violence. Table 1 shows the effect size for the experience of psychological domestic violence, with the most significant results obtained.

The impact of family on peer violence was also proven by the research conducted by Connolly and O'Moore (2003) in Ireland. They examined positive and negative emotions of all family members on the basis of the students' responses. The obtained results confirmed a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between the test group and the group identified as the one demonstrating peer violence. It was found that the students who did not demonstrate any form of peer violence identified positive emotions in all family members very frequently, whereas the students who demonstrated peer violence identified negative emotions in their family members. Mothers received more negative outgoing items from the bully group ($M = 1.37$; $SD = 2.06$) than from the control group ($M = 0.74$; $SD = 1.60$), although the bully group also attributed more positive statements to mothers. For this relationship, the effect size was determined as shown in Table 1 (Connolly and O'moore 2003, p. 365). The results obtained in the aforementioned research lead to the conclusion that the students identified as those demonstrating peer violence had fewer positive emotions towards their mothers, which can be related to the previously analysed data on observing violent behaviour in the family.

One more study, conducted in the USA (Henneberger et al. 2013), had similar results. The obtained results indicated a statistically significant correlation between delinquent behaviour, expressed as peer violence, and parents' control. The effect size of 0.9846 is presented in Table 1. This size is large, judging by Cohen's model. The presented results also indicated an indirect family influence. Namely, it was established that insufficient family control was connected to peer violence and delinquent behaviour. Another result worth mentioning is the conclusion that insufficient or very low family control is correlated to peer popularity as factors influencing peer violence. The presented results contributed to the selection of the second factor to be analysed in the meta-analysis: the choice of friends among peers. Peer groups and friendships with peers are very important to adolescents. Family also has a significant impact on the relationships that a child has with friends and on the effects of these friends on the child's behaviour. Based on the interpretation of the similarities and differences of the presented results related to the impact of family, this paper also analyses those primary studies that examined the impact of peers and friends on peer violence.

Peers as a factor in peer violence

Besides domestic violence, another factor considered in the meta-analysis was the characteristics of peer and friendship relationships and their relatedness to the expression of violent behaviour and the relationship between a bully and a victim. The research conducted by Georgiou and Stavrinides (2008) determined a statistically significant difference between violent behaviour and number of school friends. This research showed that the group of respondents denoted as the bully-victim group was more socially isolated than the other two groups of respondents, whereas the group denoted as bullies was accepted by their peers and had more friends than other groups. However, another study conducted in Great Britain (Smith et al. 2004) presented somewhat different results. The group of respondents denoted as permanent victims had fewer school friends than other studied groups of respondents, and the difference was statistically significant at 0.004. The same research confirmed the participation of peers in violence and aggression: 28.60% of the permanent victims and 26.90% of the victims said that bullies were accompanied by their friends in committing violence against others. The research conducted in the USA (Erath et al. 2008, p. 860), which examined the connection between victimisation of students and various variables, confirmed a statistically significant negative correlation ($r = -.31^{***}$, $p > 0.001$) between friends' support and students' self-evaluation about victimisation. This indicates that the students with good support from friends were rarely identified as victims. Although these two studies examined different aspects of peer impact, their results may be compared. The effect size, presented in Table 1, is not very large, but still proves the significance of the obtained results. Despite the fact that the first of the aforementioned studies examined number of friends and victimisation, while the second one studied friends' support, it is important that both variables are significantly

correlated with victimisation. The latter research did not examine the number of friends that victims had, which implies that friends' support is more important for the reduction of victimisation than the number of friends. This result is not surprising and indicates the possibility of encouraging friendly relationships and including friends in prevention programmes to reduce victimisation.

Another study, also conducted in the USA (Henneberger et al. 2013), confirmed the connection of peer popularity to the demonstration of violent and delinquent behaviour: popularity increased the frequency of violent behaviour. It also emphasised that negative peer influence increased in those cases where family control was very low.

Yet another research conducted in the USA (Mazefsky and Farrell 2005, p.76) confirmed the connection between peer violence and characteristics of peers and their relationships. This research studied numerous factors: family support, exposure to violence, peer provocations and aggressive behaviour, as well as their correlation. The results showed the highest statistically significant correlation between aggressive behaviour and peer provocations ($r = 0.5000^{**}$; $p < .001$). These results prove that aggressive behaviour increases with the increase of provocations. Another result worth mentioning is the correlation between aggression and exposure to violence ($r = 0.4300^{**}$; $p < .001$), which indicates that students witnessing any form of violent behaviour are more prone to violent behaviour against their peers. Another study (Erath et al. 2008) researched numerous factors impacting peer violence. Its results showed that number of friends was not a factor with a statistically significant correlation to violent behaviour. This is the reason why these results were not used for determining the effect size, nor were they compared to the aforementioned results. However, these results are mentioned because the number of friends ranged from 2 to more than 6. The authors of this paper used these results to confirm previously stated observations that the quality of friendships proved to be a more significant variable influencing violent behaviour than the number of friends.

Concluding remarks

The meta-analysis was applied to the sample of 10 primary studies conducted in various countries. This analysis led to a general conclusion that family and peers are the factors that significantly influence peer violence. Family was identified as the factor that had a greater and more important impact on the expression of various forms of peer violence. Regarding peers and friendship, the comparison of the results of the primary studies proved that the number of friends was not a considerably important variable in comparison to the quality of friendships. This implies that even though some children had only a few friends, their behaviour was positive if those friendships were of high quality. Respondents belonging to the group of bullies were commonly male respondents who had a lot of friends and were popular among their peers. Considering family as a factor that has an impact on violent behaviour, the primary studies analysed the aspect of witnessing domestic violence,

participation in domestic violence and family control. The research results proved that children who witnessed domestic violence, had negative emotions regarding their parents and insufficient parental control were identified as violent more frequently than other respondents who did not have these experiences. This result confirms the assumption of this paper: family has various effects on children from a young age. Within their families, children form their first models and patterns of behaviour in society, which they later transfer to their own social relationships and real-life situations.

This paper aims to analyse the influence that two different factors have on peer violence. It should be emphasised that family somewhat determines whether peers can have a negative impact on a child. The analysis of the primary studies showed that insufficient parental control causes an increase in peers' negative influence and violent behaviour, which is evident in those instances in which children predominantly demonstrate and adopt negative emotions in their own families. In addition, gender differences should be mentioned. The results of the analysed studies showed that boys adopted negative emotions and forms of behaviour in their families more frequently than girls, and that they demonstrated peer violence more readily, especially direct aggression. This observation supports a previously postulated assumption related to the important role of family in the demonstration of violent behaviour. This result can be applied in further pedagogical work with children and in the creation of preventative programmes against peer violence. These should be based on family to raise public awareness of the importance of parents in the lives of their children and the potential consequences of family conditions regarding the behaviour of children, which might contribute to peers' negative influence.

References

- Baldry, A. C. (2003). Bullying in schools and exposure to domestic violence. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 27, issue 7, pp. 713–732.
- Bartholow, B. D. and Anderson, C. A. (2002). Effects of violent video games on aggressive behavior: Potential sex differences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, issue 3, pp. 283–290.
- Bowes, L., Arseneault, L., Maughan, B., Taylor, A., Caspi, A. and Moffitt, T. E. (2009). School, Neighborhood, and Family Factors Are Associated With Children's Bullying Involvement: A Nationally Representative Longitudinal Study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*, 48, issue 5, pp. 545–553.
- Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative Methods in Psychology: A Power Primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, issue 1, pp. 155–159.
- Connolly, I. and O'moore, M. (2003). Personality and family relations of children who bully. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, issue 3, pp. 559–567.
- Corcoran, L., Guckin, M. and Prentice, G. (2015). Cyberbullying or Cyber Aggression? A Review of Existing Definitions of Cyber-Based Peer-to-Peer Aggression, 5, issue 2, pp. 245–255.

- Erath, S. A., Flanagan, K. S. and Bierman, K. L. (2008). Early adolescent school adjustment: Associations with friendship and peer victimization. *Social Development*, 17, issue 4, pp. 853–870.
- Espelage, D. L., Low, S., Sung Hong, J. and Little, T. D. (2014). Family Violence, Bullying, Fighting, and Substance Use Among Adolescents: A Longitudinal Mediation Model SEE PROFILE SEE PROFILE. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 24, issue 2, pp. 337–349.
- Fekkes, M., Pijpers, F. I. and Verloove-Vanhorick, S. P. (2005). Bullying: Who does what, when and where? Involvement of children, teachers and parents in bullying behavior. *Health Education Research*, 20, issue 1, pp. 81–91.
- Georgiou, S. N. and Stavrinides, P. (2008). Bullies, victims and bully-victims: Psychosocial profiles and attribution styles. *School Psychology International*, 29, issue 5, pp. 574–589.
- Gini, G. and Pozzoli, T. (2009). Association between bullying and psychosomatic problems: A meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*, 123, issue 3, pp. 1059–1065.
- Henneberger, A. K., Durkee, M. I., Truong, N., Atkins, A. and Tolan, P.H. (2013). The Longitudinal Relationship between Peer Violence and Popularity and Delinquency in Adolescent Boys: Examining Effects by Family Functioning. *J Youth Adolesc*, 42, issue 11, pp. 1651–1660.
- Hopf, W. H., Huber, G. L. and Weiß, R. H. (2008). Media Violence and Youth Violence: A 2-Year Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Media Psychology*, 20, issue 3, pp. 79–96.
- Huesmann, L. R. (2007). The Impact of Electronic Media Violence: Scientific Theory and Research. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41, issue 6, pp. 6–13.
- Hunter, J. and Schmidt, F. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings*. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=sr&lr=&id=IHSBTHEmYNgC&oi=fnd&pg=PR15&dq=hunter+%26+smidtdh+methods+in+metaanalysis&ots=487mi18KSN&sig=8etP_0n_jluH-vjIiamJ3KoQ8YHM (accessed on 3. 5. 2020).
- Jolliffe, D. and Farrington, D. P. (2006). Examining the Relationship Between Low Empathy and Bullying. *AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR*, 32, pp. 540–550.
- Juvonen, J., Graham, S., and Schuster, M. A. (2003). Bullying among Young Adolescents: The Strong, the Weak, and the Troubled. *Pediatrics*, 112, issue 6, pp. 1231–1237.
- Laeheem, K., Mcneil, N. and Kuning, M. (2014). Bullying: Risk Factors Becoming “Bullies” Asian Social Science 50 Bullying: Risk Factors Becoming “Bullies.” *Asian Social Science*, 5, issue 5, pp. 50–57.
- Mazefsky, C. A. and Farrell, A. (2005). The Role of Witnessing Violence, Peer Provocation, Family Support, and Parenting Practices in the Aggressive Behavior of Rural Adolescents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 14, issue 1, pp. 71–85.
- Möbke, T., Kliem, S. and Rehbein, F. (2014). Longitudinal Effects of Violent Media Usage on Aggressive Behavior—The Significance of Empathy. *Societies*, 4, issue 1, pp. 105–124.
- O’connell, P., Pepler, D. and Craig, W. (1999). Peer involvement in bullying: insights and challenges for intervention. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22, issue 4, pp. 437–452.
- Olson, C. K., Kutner, L. A., Warner, D. E., Almerigi, J. B., Baer, L., Nicholi, A. M. and Beresin, E. V. (2007). Factors Correlated with Violent Video Game Use by Adolescent Boys and Girls. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 41, issue 1, pp. 77–83.
- Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at School: Basic Facts and Effects of a School Based Intervention Program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 35, issue 7, pp. 1171–1190.
- Olweus, D. A. and S. P. Limber (2010). The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: Implementation and evaluation over two decades Elevundersokelsen View project. In: S. R. Jimer-son, S. M. Swearer and D. L. Espelage (eds.). *The Handbook od Bullying in Schools: An International Pespective*. New York: Routledge, pp. 377-401

- Rivers, I. and Smith, P. K. (1994). Types of bullying behaviour and their correlates. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20, issue 5, pp. 359–368.
- Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Smith, V., Zaidman-Zait, A. and Hertzman, C. (2012). Promoting Children's Prosocial Behaviors in School: Impact of the "Roots of Empathy" Program on the Social and Emotional Competence of School-Aged Children. *School Mental Health*, 4, issue 1, pp. 1–21.
- Smith, P. K. and Brain, P. (2000). Bullying in schools: Lessons from two decades of research. *Aggressive Behavior*, 26, issue 1, pp. 1–9.
- Smith, P. K., Cowie, H., Olafsson, R. F., Liefvooghe, A. P. D., Almeida, A., Araki, H., ... Wenxin, Z. (2002). Definitions of bullying: A comparison of terms used, and age and gender differences, in a fourteen-country international comparison. *Child Development*, 73, issue 4, pp. 1119–1133.
- Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S. and Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, 49, issue 4, pp. 376–385.
- Smith, P. K., Talamelli, L., Cowie, H., Naylor, P. and Chauhan, P. (2004). Profiles of non-victims, escaped victims, continuing victims and new victims of school bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, issue 4, pp. 565–581.
- Solberg, M. E. and Olweus, D. (2003). Prevalence Estimation of School Bullying with the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior*, 29, issue 3, pp. 239–268.
- Sušac, N., Ajduković, M. and Rimac, I. (2016). Učestalost vršnjačkog nasilja s obzirom na obilježja adolescenata i doživljeno nasilje u obitelji. *Psihologijske Teme*, 25, issue 2, pp. 197–221.
- Wilson, D. B. (2011). *Calculating Effect-Sizes The Heart and Soul of Meta-analysis: The Effect Size*. Retrieved from www.campbellcollaboration.org (accessed on 3. 4. 2020).

Jelena MAKSIMOVIĆ in Dragana DIMITRIJEVIĆ (Univerza v Nišu, Srbija).

METAANALIZA RAZISKAV O VRSTNIŠKEM NASILJU: DRUŽINA IN VRSTNIKI KOT DEJAVNIKI NASILNEGA VEDENJA

Povzetek: Vrstniško nasilje je problem, ki je prisoten in deležen raziskovanja povsod po svetu. V tem prispevku s pomočjo metaanalize obravnavamo problematiko vrstniškega nasilja in skušamo sistematizirati podatke o tem, kako družina in vrstniki kot dejavnika vrstniškega nasilja vplivata na njegovo pojavnost. Analizirali smo 43 primarnih raziskav in na tej podlagi izbrali vzorec 10 raziskav, ki so bile skladne s postavljenimi kriteriji in vključene v metaanalizo. Vse vključene raziskave so kvantitativne in so temeljile na samoocenah učencev nižje stropnje osnovnošolskega izobraževanja. V vseh 10 raziskav je bilo skupno vključenih 10.500 respondentov. Povprečna ponderirana korelacija je znašala 0.4914 in jo lahko označimo kot zmerno. Rezultati metaanalize kažejo, da sta tako družina kot vrstniki dejavnika, ki pomembno vplivata na nasilno vedenje. Prav tako je negativni vpliv vrstnikov močnejši, ko otroku družinsko okolje ne zagotavlja potrebne sprejetosti. Družina ima torej pomembne učinke na posameznikovo vedenje, zato bi morali biti tudi programi za preprečevanje nasilja usmerjeni k družinam in si prizadevati za ustvarjanje pozitivnih odnosov med družinskimi člani, kar lahko prispeva k redukciji negativnih vrstniških vplivov.

Ključne besede: vrstniško nasilje, metaanaliza, korelacija, družina, vrstniki

E-naslov: jelena.maksimovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs