



## PEER BULLYING IN THE PRE-SCHOOL PERIOD STUDIES IN TURKEY<sup>1</sup>

Zeynep Bilge KOÇAK

Ministry of Education, İstanbul, Turkey

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-3260-3409>

[zeynepbilgekocak@gmail.com](mailto:zeynepbilgekocak@gmail.com)

Hülya GÜLAY OGELMAN

Prof.Dr., Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4245-0208>

[ogelman@sinop.edu.tr](mailto:ogelman@sinop.edu.tr)

**Received:** January 7, 2024

**Accepted:** May 17, 2024

**Published:** June 30, 2024

### Suggested Citation:

Koçak, Z. B., & Gülay Ogelman, H. (2024). Peer bullying in the pre-school period studies in Turkey. *Turkish International Journal of Special Education and Guidance & Counselling (TIJSEG)*, 13(1), 10-29.



Copyright © 2024 by author(s). This is an open access article under the [CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

### Abstract

This research aims to examine the studies on peer bullying in the preschool period completed between 2000 and 2020 in Turkey. The sample of the research consists of 32 studies, including 18 theses and 14 articles. According to the findings, it was determined that master's theses were more than doctoral theses. In the distribution by years, it is seen that the most theses were prepared in 2017 and 2019, and the most articles were prepared in 2019 and 2020. While the quantitative research approach is preferred the most in theses and articles; qualitative approach was not found in doctoral theses, and the mixed approach was not found in master's theses and articles. Descriptive and correlational survey model were used the most in theses, correlational survey model was used most in articles. The most common sample group in theses and articles is "preschool children". In theses and articles, three measurement tools are used the most frequently; and the data collection tool is the most frequently used scale. The cross-sectional method was used in all theses and most of the articles. It has been determined that the most preferred topic in theses and articles is demographic variables.

**Keywords:** Preschool period, peer bullying, bullied children, victim children, peer relations.

### INTRODUCTION

Preschool education institutions are responsible for providing children the opportunity of experiencing positive social relationships. Staff working in these institutions, especially teachers, the institution's physical conditions and applied educational program all have a critical role in children's peer relationships. Teachers should find the correct strategies concerning unwanted preschool period behaviours. They should apply the strategy set through classroom management by taking individual differences into consideration. Eventually, unwanted behaviours will decrease or not even occur (Şahin and Arslan, 2014). One negative behaviour that can be observed in preschool education institutions is peer bullying. Bullying is defined by Olweus (1978) as offensive and purposeful actions displayed repeatedly by a group or person on a victim who has a difficulty in defending himself or herself. When the criteria based on the definitions of bullying made by researchers are taken into consideration, it is evident that these are; deliberate intention (intention to harm), repeating and power imbalance (Taner Derman, 2022). When children who bully are examined, it is observed that they like being popular, looking powerful and attach importance to social standing and communication. Some bully children were stated to prefer loneliness and little number of friends (Gülay, 2008). It is observed that children who are exposed to bullying are more introvert in social settings, have difficulty in interpreting the behaviours they encounter, are more passive in social settings and are easily affected by negative actions. One of the important roles in the peer bullying process is the bully-victim role. The bully and victim roles can change during the process (Wolke & Lereya, 2015). Various studies show that children who

<sup>1</sup> This article was produced from the first author's master's thesis.



are both bully and victimized undergo more psychological problems than children who are only a bully or only a victim (Korkut, 2019). When compared with children who have never experienced peer bullying, bully-victim children feel abandoned and lonely more, display negative peer relationships in the classroom and have lower academic achievement (Pekel-Uludağlı and Uçanok, 2005). It is observed that when bullying behaviours are perpetual and interventions are insufficient, they can cause serious outcomes and negative results of preschool period bullying behaviours can continue during future years of life (Ergül Topçu, 2018). It is considered that preschool teachers have a big role in the child becoming aware of the role he or she is undergoing and assisting them to the solution (Yoon & Barton, 2008).

Today, the importance attached to peer bullying studies is more common. In order to support studies on peer bullying, it is important to examine the results of studies in the literature. When the related literature is considered, Korkmaz, Erkin and Atbaşı (2021) underline that the preschool period is the least examined educational stage with respect to peer bullying. This research aims at drawing attention to the subject by examining studies conducted between 2000-2020 on peer bullying during the preschool period. Thus, it is considered that it can guide future studies on the subject. A twenty-year time interval starting from the recent past was preferred in order to examine current studies. Examining master's and doctoral theses and articles on peer bullying during preschool period within the stated twenty years through various aspects is thought to contribute to developing a framework about the subject. With this respect, it is considered that researchers' attentions can be drawn on peer bullying during preschool period and offer guidance to future studies on the subject.

The purpose of this study is to conduct content analyses of master's and doctoral theses and articles on peer bullying during preschool period completed between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey.

1. How is the distribution according to types and years of the master's and doctoral theses and articles completed between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey on peer bullying during preschool period?
2. How is the distribution according to the universities where the master's and doctoral theses and articles were carried out completed between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey on peer bullying during the preschool period?
3. How is the distribution according to the cities of the master's and doctoral theses and articles completed between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey on peer bullying during preschool period?
4. How is the distribution according to the language of the master's and doctoral theses and articles completed between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey on peer bullying during preschool period?
5. How is the distribution according to the keywords of the master's and doctoral theses and articles completed between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey on peer bullying during preschool period?
6. How is the distribution according to the research approach of the master's and doctoral theses and articles completed between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey on peer bullying during preschool period?
7. How is the distribution according to the research design of the master's and doctoral theses and articles completed between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey on peer bullying during preschool period?
8. How is the distribution according to the sample group variables (who the sample group consists of, number range of the sample group, selection method of the sample group) of the master's and doctoral theses and articles completed between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey on peer bullying during preschool period?
9. How is the distribution according to the data collection tool variables (number and type of the data collection tools, data collection time frames) of the master's and doctoral theses and articles completed between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey on peer bullying during preschool period?
10. How is the distribution according to the subjects of the master's and doctoral theses and articles completed between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey on peer bullying during preschool period?



## METHOD

### Research Model

In this study, where theses and articles conducted between years 2000 - 2020 in Turkey on peer bullying during preschool period, the descriptive screening design, which is among the qualitative research method designs, was used. The descriptive screening design refers to defining how a past or present state is without making changes in the data (Karasar, 2020).

### Sample

The research population consists of theses on preschool period peer bullying available at the Council of Higher Education (CoHE) National Thesis Centre and articles available at the Index of Turkish Education, Acarindeks, TR Dizin and GOOGLE Scholar indexes. The research sample consists of theses on peer bullying conducted between the years 2000-2020 in the field of preschool education available at the Council of Higher Education (CoHE) National Thesis Centre and articles conducted between the years 2000-2020 in the field of preschool education available at the Index of Turkish Education, Acarindeks, TR Dizin and GOOGLE Scholar.

The purposeful sampling method was preferred while selecting the research sample. The purposeful sampling method refers to identifying the sample based on the aim of the research without considering any probabilities (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016).

### Data Collection Process

In the data collection process, a search was carried out on keywords “peer bullying, bullying, peer violence, preschool peer bullying, peer bullying victimization” at the Council of Higher Education (CoHE) National Thesis Centre and Index of Turkish Education, Acarindeks, TR Dizin and GOOGLE Scholar. The keywords were determined after resorting to the opinions of three field experts with a doctoral degree for studies on preschool period peer bullying. The time range was identified as 2000-2020 while conducting the screening. Theses and articles found appropriate for the subject were recorded by the researcher. When the same study was found more than once, it was included in the sample group based on the keyword it was initially identified with. When the articles of the theses in the sample group were found, it was not included in the article group but only included in the thesis group. Peer bullying theses which don't include preschool period children, parents with preschool aged children, preschool teachers and teacher candidates were not included in the study. In addition, studies carried out on preschool period along with primary, secondary and high school students; preschool teachers along with teachers from other branches, preschool teacher candidates and undergraduate students from other fields; and preschool period children's parents along with families with elder aged children were not included in the study. Data were collected between 30<sup>th</sup> of June - 15<sup>th</sup> of December 2022.

Five keywords were identified in the research. In the Council of National Education (CoHE) National Thesis Centre, there were 179 theses observed with the keyword “peer bullying”, 345 theses with the keyword “bullying”, 4 with the keyword “peer violence”, 1 with the keyword “peer bullying in preschool” and 13 with the keyword “peer bullying victimization”. The theses were screened according to the research and theses dwelling on preschool period peer bullying were identified. The screening and control processes were carried out by a supervisor and the result was confirmed. At the end of the screening, 18 theses were included in the research.

In the GOOGLE Scholar article screening, there were 14 articles observed with the keyword “peer bullying”, 35 theses with the keyword “bullying”, 59 with the term “peer violence”, 9 with the keyword “peer bullying in preschool” and 14 with the keyword “peer bullying victimization”. The articles were screened according to the research and articles dwelling on peer bullying were identified. The screening and control processes were carried out by a thesis supervisor and the result was confirmed. 5 articles were included in the study after the screening.

In the Index of Turkish Education article screening, there were 7 articles observed with the keyword



“peer bullying”, 68 theses with the keyword “bullying”, 2 with the keyword “peer violence”, however, there were no articles with the keywords “peer bullying in preschool” and “peer bullying victimization”. The articles were screened according to the research and articles dwelling on peer bullying were identified. The screening and control processes were carried out by a thesis supervisor and the result was confirmed. 1 article was included in the study after the screening.

In the TR Dizin article screening, there were 72 articles observed with the keyword “peer bullying”, 256 theses with the keyword “bullying”, 11 with the keyword “peer violence”, 6 with the keyword “peer bullying in preschool” and 8 with the keyword “peer bullying victimization”. The articles were screened according to the research and articles dwelling on peer bullying were identified. The screening and control processes were carried out by a thesis supervisor and the result was confirmed. 3 articles were included in the study after the screening. In the Acarindeks article screening, there were 244 articles observed with the keyword “peer bullying”, 74 theses with the keyword “bullying”, 477 with the keyword “peer violence”, 3937 with the keyword “peer bullying in preschool” and 707 with the keyword “peer bullying victimization”. All the articles were screened according to the research and articles dwelling on peer bullying were identified. The screening and control processes were carried out by a thesis supervisor and the result was confirmed. 5 articles were included in the study after the screening.

### Data Collection Tool

In the research, theses and articles on preschool period peer bullying carried out in Turkey between 2000-2020 were examined based on various criteria (type, year, university, province, language written in, keywords, research approach, research design, sample group, sample group number range, sample selection, number of data collection tools, type of data collection tool, data collection time frames and subjects). Thus, the descriptive content analysis examination was carried out in the research.

In the research, the Content Analysis Form was conducted by the researcher on the theses and articles on peer bullying. Theses and articles were stated on Microsoft Excel program with respect to the study criteria (type, year, university, province, language written in, keywords, research approach, research design, sample group, sample group number range, sample selection, number of data collection tools, type of data collection tool, data collection time frames and subjects).

### Data Analysis

Analysis of the data that were collected according to the study purposes was conducted through a descriptive analysis. A Content Analysis Form was developed through Microsoft Excel to analyse the research data. Theses and articles and the themes were analysed based on their titles; findings are presented together with frequency and percentage values.

## RESULTS

**Table 1.** Distribution according to the types and years of the theses.

Year	Master’s thesis		Doctoral dissertation	
	n	%	n	%
2000	0	0.0	0	0.0
2001	0	0.0	0	0.0
2002	0	0.0	0	0.0
2003	0	0.0	0	0.0
2004	0	0.0	0	0.0
2005	0	0.0	0	0.0
2006	0	0.0	0	0.0
2007	0	0.0	0	0.0
2008	0	0.0	0	0.0
2009	0	0.0	0	0.0
2010	0	0.0	0	0.0
2011	1	6.3	0	0.0
2012	0	0.0	0	0.0
2013	0	0.0	1	50.0
2014	0	0.0	0	0.0

**Table 1 (Continued).** Distribution according to the types and years of the theses.

Year	Master's thesis		Doctoral dissertation	
	n	%	n	%
2015	1	6.3	0	0.0
2016	1	6.3	0	0.0
2017	4	25.0	0	0.0
2018	2	12.5	0	0.0
2019	4	25.0	0	0.0
2020	3	18.8	1	50.0
Total	16	100.0	2	100.0

According to Table 1, 16 master's theses were carried out between 2000-2020 on peer bullying during the preschool period. Within the stated twenty years, two doctoral theses, 1 in 2013 and 1 in 2020, were conducted.

**Table 2.** Distribution according to the universities the theses were prepared.

University	Master's thesis		Doctoral dissertation	
	n	%	n	%
Ankara University	1	6.3	0	0.0
Atatürk University	1	6.3	0	0.0
Ege University	1	6.3	0	0.0
Gazi University	4	25.0	1	50.0
Gaziantep University	1	6.3	0	0.0
İstanbul Medipol University	1	6.3	0	0.0
Hacettepe University	0	0.0	1	50.0
Karabük University	1	6.3	0	0.0
Kastamonu University	1	6.3	0	0.0
Mehmet Akif Ersoy University	2	12.5	0	0.0
Trakya University	1	6.3	0	0.0
Toros University	1	6.3	0	0.0
Uludağ University	1	6.3	0	0.0
Total	16	100.0	2	100.0

It is evident on Table 2 that the number of theses conducted in Ankara University is 1, Atatürk University is 1, Ege University is 1, Gazi University are 4, Gaziantep University is 1, İstanbul Medipol University is 1, Karabük University is 1, Kastamonu University is 1, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University are 2, Trakya University is 1, Toros University is 1 and Uludağ University is 1. The same table indicates that 1 doctoral thesis was carried out in Gazi University and 1 in Hacettepe University.

**Table 3.** Distribution according to the provinces the theses were conducted.

Province	Master's thesis		Doctoral dissertation	
	n	%	n	%
Ağrı	1	5.6	0	0.0
Ankara	5	27.8	1	50.0
Antalya	1	5.6	0	0.0
Burdur	1	5.6	0	0.0
Bursa	1	5.6	0	0.0
Edirne	1	5.6	0	0.0
Gaziantep	1	5.6	0	0.0
Isparta	1	5.6	0	0.0
İstanbul	1	5.6	1	50.0
İzmir	1	5.6	0	0.0
Karabük	1	5.6	0	0.0
Kastamonu	1	5.6	0	0.0
Manisa	1	5.6	0	0.0
Mersin	1	5.6	0	0.0
Total	18	100.0	2	100.0

According to Table 3, the number of master's theses conducted on the subject was 1 in Ağrı 5 in Ankara,



1 in Antalya, 1 in Burdur, 1 in Bursa, 1 in Edirne, 1 in Gaziantep, 1 in Isparta, 1 in Istanbul, 1 in İzmir, 1 in Karabük, 1 in Kastamonu, 1 in Manisa and 1 in Mersin. It was observed that 1 doctoral thesis was carried out in Ankara and 1 in Istanbul.

**Table 4.** Percentage and frequency distribution according to the language the theses were written in.

Language of the theses	Master's thesis		Doctoral dissertation	
	n	%	n	%
Turkish	16	100.0	2	100.0
Total	16	100.0	2	100.0

Table 4 indicates that all the master's and doctoral theses were written in Turkish.

**Table 5.** Distribution according to the keywords used in the screening of the theses.

Keywords	Master's thesis		Doctoral dissertation	
	n	%	n	%
Peer Violence	3	18.8	1	50.0
Peer Bullying	4	25.0	0	0.0
Peer Bullying Victimization	1	6.3	0	0.0
Preschool Peer Bullying	1	6.3	0	0.0
Bullying	7	43.8	1	50.0
Total	16	100.0	2	100.0

Table 5 displays that among the master's theses, 3 were screened for the keyword "peer violence", 4 for the keyword "peer bullying", 1 for the keyword "peer bullying victimization", 1 for the keyword "preschool peer bullying" and 7 for the keyword "bullying". 1 doctoral thesis was screened for the term "peer violence" and 1 for the keyword "bullying".

**Table 6.** Distribution according to the research approach of the theses.

Research Approaches	Master's thesis		Doctoral dissertation	
	n	%	n	%
Quantitative	9	56.3	1	50.0
Qualitative	4	25.0	0	0.0
Mixed	3	18.8	1	50.0
Total	16	100.0	2	100.0

According to Table 6, among the master's theses, 9 were conducted through the quantitative, 4 through the qualitative and 3 through the mixed approach. 1 doctoral thesis was conducted through the quantitative and 1 was through the mixed research approach.

**Table 7.** Distribution according to the research design of the theses.

Research Design	Master's thesis						Doctoral dissertation					
	Quantitative		Qualitative		Mixed		Quantitative		Qualitative		Mixed	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Explanatory Design	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Descriptive Model	4	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Descriptive Screening Model	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Experimental Design	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0



Table 7 (Continued). Distribution according to the research design of the theses.

Research Design	Master's thesis						Doctoral dissertation					
	Quantitative		Qualitative		Mixed		Quantitative		Qualitative		Mixed	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Document Analysis	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Case Study	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Interview	0	0.0	2	40.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Correlational Screening Model	3	30.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Exploratory Sequential	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Phenomenology	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Screening Model	1	10.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Convergent Parallel	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	10	100.0	5	100.0	2	100.0	1	100.0	0	100.0	1	100.0

Table 7 indicates that among the master's theses, 1 was conducted through the explanatory design, 4 through the descriptive model, 1 through the descriptive screening model, 1 through the experimental design, 1 through document analysis, 1 through case study, 2 through the interview, 3 through the correlational screening, 1 through the phenomenology, 1 through the screening model, 1 through the convergent parallel design. 1 doctoral thesis was carried out through the correlational screening model and the other through the exploratory sequential design.

Table 8. Distribution according to the sample groups of the theses.

Sample Group	Master's thesis		Doctoral dissertation	
	n	%	n	%
Preschool Period Children	7	43.8	1	50.0
Preschool Teachers	3	18.8	0	0.0
Preschool Period Children's Parents	1	6.3	0	0.0
Children With Special Needs and Children with Normal Development Attending Preschool Education	1	6.3	0	0.0
Children in Need of Protection and Children Living with their Family	1	6.3	0	0.0
Illustrated Children's Books	1	6.3	0	0.0
Preschool Period Children and Teachers	1	6.3	1	50.0
Preschool Teachers, Institution Principals and Parents	1	6.3	0	0.0
Total	16	100.0	2	100.0

According to the sample groups indicated in Table 8, there are preschool period children in seven master's theses, preschool teachers in 3 theses, preschool period children and their parents in 1 thesis, children with special needs and children with normal development and attending preschool education in 1 thesis, children in need of protection and children living with their family in 1 thesis, illustrated children's books in 1 thesis, preschool teachers, institution principals and parents in 1 thesis. In addition, there are preschool period children in the sample group of 1 doctoral thesis and preschool period children and teachers in 1 thesis.

Table 9. Distribution according to the number range of the sample group.

Sample Group Number Range	Master's thesis		Doctoral dissertation	
	n	%	n	%
0 - 50	4	25.0	0	0.0
51 - 100	2	12.5	2	100.0
101 - 150	4	25.0	0	0.0
151 - 200	1	6.3	0	0.0
201 - 250	1	6.3	0	0.0
251 - 300	1	6.3	0	0.0
301 - 350	0	0.0	0	0.0
Over 351	3	18.8	0	0.0
Total	16	100.0	2	100.0



According to Table 9, the sample group number range of 4 master’s theses is 0-50, 2 master’s theses are 51-100, 4 master’s theses are 101-150, 1 master’s thesis is 151-200, 1 master’s thesis is 201-250, 1 master’s these is 251-300 and 3 master’s theses is over 351. It was observed that the sample group number ranges of the doctoral theses are 51-100

**Table 10.** Distribution according to the sample selection of the theses.

Sample Selection Method	Master’s thesis		Doctoral dissertation	
	n	%	n	%
Purposeful Sampling	4	23.5	1	50.0
Simple Random Sampling	3	17.6	0	0.0
Convenience Sampling	2	11.8	1	50.0
Cluster Sampling	1	5.9	0	0.0
Criterion Sampling	1	5.9	0	0.0
Non-Random Sampling	1	5.9	0	0.0
Convenience Sampling	3	17.6	0	0.0
Unstated	2	11.8	0	0.0
Total	17	100.0	2	100.0

Table 10 displays that 4 master’s theses were conducted through the purposeful sampling, 3 through the simple random sampling, 2 through the convenience sampling, 1 through the cluster sampling, 1 through the criterion sampling, 1 through the non-random sampling, 3 through the convenience sampling methods and the sampling method of 2 theses were unstated. 1 doctoral theses was conducted through the purposeful sampling and 1 was conducted through the convenience sampling method.

**Table 11.** Distribution according to the number of data collection tools of the theses.

Number of Data Collection Tools	Master’s thesis						Doctoral dissertation					
	Quantitative		Qualitative		Mixed		Quantitative		Qualitative		Mixed	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
1	0	0.0	3	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	2	22.2	1	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	4	44.4	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
4	2	22.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	9	100.0	4	100.0	3	100.0	1	100.0	0	0.0	1	100.0

According to Table 11, in 3 master’s theses there is 1 data collection tool, 2 data collection tools in 3 theses, 3 data collection tools in 6 theses, 4 data collection tools in 2 theses, 6 data collection tools in 1 thesis and 9 tools in 1 thesis. In addition, it is evident that there are 3 data collection tools in two doctoral theses.





Table 12. Distribution according to the data collection instrument type of the theses.

Table with 13 columns: Data Collection Instruments, Master's thesis (Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed), and Doctoral dissertation (Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed). Rows include various instruments like Anecdotal Record, Survey, Interview Form, etc.

According to Table 12, anecdotal record was used in 1 master's thesis, survey in 1 thesis, simple attendance chart in 1 thesis, information form in 11 theses, form in 7 theses, interview form in 5 theses, control list in 1 thesis, case sampling in 1 thesis, scale in 20 theses, time record in 1 thesis and time sampling in 1 thesis. It is also evident that information forms were used in all doctoral theses, form was used in 1 thesis, interview form in 1 thesis, observation in 1 thesis and scales in 1 thesis.

Table 13. Distribution according to the data collection time frames of the theses.

Table with 13 columns: Data Collection Time Frames, Master's thesis (Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed), and Doctoral dissertation (Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed). Rows include Longitudinal, Cross Sectional, and Total.

Table 13 indicates that all the master's and doctoral theses were conducted through the cross sectional time frame method.

Table 14. Distribution according to the subjects of the theses.

Table with 5 columns: Variables examined in theses on peer bullying during preschool period, Master's thesis (n, %), and Doctoral dissertation (n, %). Rows include Peer relationships, Children's bullying perceptions, Demographic variables, etc.



Table 14 displays that the subject of 2 master’s theses is children’s bullying perceptions, coping with bullying strategies, 1 master’s thesis is children’s bully, bully-victim and victim roles and bullying types/behaviours they display/encounter, 8 master’s theses is demographic variables (age, gender, sibling variables, birth order, parents’ ages, parents’ educational background, body mass index, parents’ professions, family type, preschool education experience, socio-economic state, parents’ marital status, family structure, teachers’ professional experience), 1 master’s thesis is emotional intelligence, 1 thesis is temperament and empathy, 2 theses is teacher opinions, perceptions and attitudes towards peer bullying, 1 thesis is scale development, 2 theses is self-regulation, 1 thesis is program development, 1 thesis is examination of illustrated children’s books based on bullying, 3 theses is children under risk (children with and without special needs, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, children in need of protection), 1 thesis is cyber bullying, cyber victimization and 1 thesis is social skills. The subject of 1 doctoral thesis is peer relationships, 1 thesis is demographic variables, 1 thesis is bullying behaviours during the game, 1 thesis is teacher opinions, perceptions and attitudes towards peer bullying and 1 thesis is program development.

**Table 15.** Distribution according to the years of the articles.

Year	n	%
2000	0	0.0
2001	0	0.0
2002	0	0.0
2003	0	0.0
2004	0	0.0
2005	0	0.0
2006	0	0.0
2007	0	0.0
2008	0	0.0
2009	1	7.1
2010	0	0.0
2011	1	7.1
2012	1	7.1
2013	0	0.0
2014	2	14.3
2015	0	0.0
2016	1	7.1
2017	0	0.0
2018	2	14.3
2019	3	21.4
2020	3	21.4
Total	14	100.0

According to Table 15, 14 articles were carried out between 2000-2020 on peer bullying during the preschool period. The distribution by the years of the articles shows that 1 article was completed in 2009, 1 in 2011, 1 in 2012, 2 in 2014, 1 in 2016, 2 in 2018, 3 in 2019 and 3 in 2020.

**Table 16.** Distribution according to the provinces of the articles.

Journal	n	%
Ankara	2	14.3
Balıkesir	1	7.1
Bursa	1	7.1
Bingöl	1	7.1
Denizli	3	21.4
Diyarbakır	1	7.1
İzmir	1	7.1
Trabzon	1	7.1
Yozgat	1	7.1
Unstated	2	14.3
Total	14	100.0



According to Table 16, 2 articles were completed in Ankara, 1 in Balıkesir, 1 in Bursa, 1 in Bingöl, 3 in Denizli, 1 in Diyarbakır, 1 in İzmir, 1 in Trabzon and 1 article in Yozgat. The province of the first article was unstated.

**Table 17.** Distribution according to the language of the articles.

Language	n	%
Turkish	13	92.9
English	1	7.1
Total	14	100.0

Table 17 indicates that 13 articles were written in Turkish and 1 in English.

**Table 18.** Distribution according to the keywords used in the screening of the articles.

Keywords	n	%
Peer Violence	5	35.7
Peer Bullying	2	14.3
Peer Bullying Victimization	4	28.6
Preschool Peer Bullying	1	7.1
Bullying	2	14.3
Total	14	100.0

Table 18 displays that among the articles, 5 were screened for the keyword “peer violence”, 2 for the keyword “peer bullying”, 4 for the keyword “peer bullying victimization”, 1 for the keyword “preschool peer bullying” and 2 for the keyword “bullying”.

**Table 19.** Distribution according to the research approach of the articles.

Research Approaches	n	%
Quantitative	10	71.4
Qualitative	4	28.6
Mixed	0	0.0
Total	14	100.0

According to Table 19, 10 articles were conducted through the quantitative and 4 through the qualitative research approach. No articles were observed to be conducted through the mixed approach.

**Table 20.** Distribution according to the research design of the articles.

Research Design	Quantitative		Qualitative	
	n	%	n	%
Descriptive Screening Model	1	10.0	0	0.0
Case Study	0	0.0	2	50.0
Correlational Screening Model	9	90.0	0	0.0
Special Case Study	0	0.0	1	25.0
Basic Qualitative Research	0	0.0	1	25.0
Total	10	100.0	4	100.0

It is evident on Table 20 that 1 article was completed through the descriptive screening model, 2 through the case study, 9 through the correlational screening model, 1 through the special case study and 1 through the basic qualitative research design.

**Table 21.** Distribution according to the sample group of the articles.

Sample Group	n	%
Preschool Period Children	8	57.1
Preschool Teachers	3	21.4
Preschool Period Children and Teachers	1	7.1
Preschool Period Children and Mothers	2	14.3
Total	14	100.0



Table 21 displays that the sample group of eight articles consist of preschool period children, 3 consist of preschool teachers, 1 consists of preschool period children and teachers and 2 consist of preschool period children and their mothers.

**Table 22.** Distribution according to the sample group number range of the articles.

Sample Group Number Range	n	%
0 - 50	3	21.4
51 - 100	3	21.4
101 - 150	0	0.0
151 - 200	3	21.4
201 - 250	3	21.4
251 - 300	1	7.1
301 - 350	0	0.0
Over 351	1	7.1
Total	14	100.0

According to Table 22, the sample group number range of 3 articles is 0-50, 3 articles is 51-100, 3 articles is 151-200, 3 articles is 201-250, 1 article is 251-300 and 1 article is over 351.

**Table 23.** Distribution according to the sample selection of the articles.

Sample Selection Method	n	%
Purposeful Sampling	2	14.3
Simple Random Sampling	6	42.9
Convenience Sampling	2	14.3
Unstated	4	28.6
Total	14	100.0

According to Table 23, 2 articles were carried out through the purposeful sampling, 6 through the simple random sampling, 2 through the convenience sampling methods and 4 articles' methods were unstated.

**Table 24.** Distribution according to the number of data collection tools of the articles.

Number of Data Collection Tools	Quantitative		Qualitative	
	n	%	n	%
1	1	10.0	1	25.0
2	1	10.0	3	75.0
3	5	50.0	0	0.0
4	3	30.0	0	0.0
Total	10	100.0	4	100.0

It is evident on Table 24 that 2 articles were conducted with 1 data collection tool, 4 articles with 2 tools, 5 articles with 3 tools and 3 articles with 4 data collection tools.

**Table 25.** Distribution according to the data collection tools type of the articles.

Data Collection Tools	Quantitative		Qualitative	
	n	%	n	%
Information Form	5	16.7	2	28.6
Form	8	26.7	0	0.0
Interview Form	1	3.3	4	57.1
Observation Form	0	0.0	1	14.3
Sociometric Technique	2	6.7	0	0.0
Scale	14	46.7	0	0.0
Total	30	100.0	7	100.0

Table 25 displays that information form was used in 7 articles, form was used in 8, interview form was used in 5, observation form was used in 1, sociometric technique was used in 2 articles and no scales were used in 14 articles.



**Table 26.** Distribution according to the data collection time frames of the articles.

Data Collection Time Frames	Quantitative		Qualitative	
	n	%	n	%
Longitudinal	1	10.0	0	0.0
Cross Sectional	9	90.0	4	100.0
Total	10	100.0	4	100.0

According to Table 26, longitudinal data collection time frame was used in 1 article and cross sectional was used in 13 articles.

**Table 27.** Distribution according to the subjects of the articles.

Variables examined in articles on peer bullying during preschool period	n	%
Teacher interventions in peer interactions and peer problems	1	4.8
Peer relationships variables	3	14.3
Longitudinal examination of the extent of encountering peer violence victimization and displaying peer violence	1	4.8
Parental attitudes	2	9.5
Emotional intelligences of mothers	1	4.8
Demographic variables	7	33.3
Temperament	1	4.8
School adaptation	1	4.8
Teacher opinions, perceptions and attitudes towards peer bullying	3	14.3
Whether or not witnessing violence or encountering domestic violence	1	4.8
Total	21	100.0

Table 27 shows that the subject of 1 article is peer interactions and teacher interventions on peer problems, 3 articles is peer relationship variables (being liked by peers and aggressiveness, positive social behaviour, displaying unsocial behaviours to peers, being frightened-anxious by peers, being excluded by peers, being hyperactive), 1 article is being victimized by peer bullying and longitudinal examination of displaying peer violence, 2 articles is parental attitudes, 1 article is emotional intelligence of mothers, 7 articles is demographic variables (gender, age, mother’s age, parents’ educational background, parents’ professions, family type, parental attitudes, socio-economic status, preschool education experience, educational experience, birth order, parents’ marital status), 1 article is temperament, 1 article is school adaptation, 3 articles is teacher opinions, perceptions and attitudes towards peer bullying, whether or not witnessing violence and 1 article is whether or not encountering domestic violence.

### DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, and SUGGESTIONS

When the theses in the research are considered, it is evident that the number of master’s theses (f=16) is higher than the number of doctoral theses (f=2). The reason why the number of master’s theses is higher is considered to be related to the low number of students in doctoral programs, the fact that the number of master’s programs is higher than doctoral programs and because doctoral education is longer. In a corresponding study Korkmaz et al. (2021) state that the concept of peer bullying determined within their research was 89% included in master’s and 11% included in doctoral theses. Similarly, in a study conducted by Gülay Ogelman and Güngör (2022), in which 63 theses completed between 2000-2021 on peer relationships during preschool period were examined, it was determined that master’s theses were higher in number than doctoral theses. According to the results of the study conducted by Gülay Ogelman and Güngör (2015) on the examination of studies on environmental education during the preschool period in Turkey, it was underlined that the number of studies and articles, especially doctoral, should be increased.

Research results indicate that no master’s and doctoral theses on peer bullying during the preschool period were carried out in years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2012 and 2014. When distribution by the years of the theses are considered, it is evident that most theses were completed in years 2017 (f=4) and 2019 (f=4). Research results indicate that no articles on peer



bullying during the preschool period were carried out in years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2010, 2013, 2015 and 2017. According to the year distribution of the articles, most articles were completed in years 2019 (f=3) and 2020 (f=3). It was also observed that master's theses and articles on peer bullying during preschool period were regularly prepared between years 2015-2020. The increase in recent years in the number of studies on peer bullying among young children is thought to be due to the increase in peer bullying. With this respect, Doğan (2022) conducted a review study and put forward preventive programs by underlining the fact that peer bullying has increased recently in Turkey. Ergül Topçu (2018) states that there is an increase in peer bullying rates in Turkey. Similarly, Kılıncı (2023) systematically analysed studies on peer bullying in Turkey and examined the number of articles published in journals with reviewers by years, and observed that there is an increase recently in the number of studies on the subject.

When distribution according to the universities where the study theses were conducted in, it was observed that most master's theses were carried out in Gazi University (f=4). Gülay Ogelman and Güngör (2022) also emphasize that most master's theses were conducted in Gazi University. One doctoral thesis examined in the study was completed in Gazi and other was completed in Hacettepe University. When distribution by the provinces of the theses is considered, most master's theses were conducted in Ankara (f=6). One of the doctoral theses was completed in Ankara, the other in İstanbul. When distribution according to the provinces of the articles is considered, it is evident that most studies on the subject were conducted in Denizli (f=3). Based on the findings, it can be assumed that most theses on peer bullying during the preschool period were carried out in metropolitan cities. According to the findings, all master's and doctoral theses were written in Turkish (f=18). This can be related to the fact that the majority of the master's and doctoral programs in Turkey are carried out in Turkish. According to the Findings, most articles examined were completed in Turkish (f=13). Also, it was observed that one article was written in English. Similarly, Toksöz Barlas (2022) examined theses on environmental education in the field of preschool education in Turkey and stated that the majority of the theses were prepared in Turkish. At this point, it can be underlined that findings of the two studies are similar.

It is emphasized that the keyword stated most commonly in master's theses was "bullying" (f=7). The keywords "peer violence" and "bullying" were used most commonly in each one of the doctoral theses. As for the articles, the most commonly used keyword was observed to be "peer violence" (f=5). Based on these findings, it is assumed that the variety of keywords will increase as the number of articles and theses on the subject increases.

According to the study findings, the majority of the master's theses examined were conducted through the quantitative design and the least preferred was the mixed design. One of the doctoral theses was conducted through the quantitative and other through the mixed design. Thus, it is evident that the qualitative approach was not preferred in doctoral theses on the subject. When theses are examined in general, it is obvious that the quantitative method is preferred more. Korkmaz et al. (2021) states that the quantitative and qualitative designs are the most preferred designs among theses on peer bullying. The majority of the examined articles were observed to be conducted through the quantitative research approach (f=10). While there were articles conducted through the qualitative research approach (f=4), it is evident that no articles conducted through the mixed research approach were observed. Kılıncı (2023) states that quantitative methods are preferred in general. With this respect, it is assumed that the literature can be enriched by conducting further studies through more methods. Mixed methods should be preferred more commonly along with qualitative researches. Researchers carrying out quantitative researches generally have the aim of; discriminating between emotions and reality, proving the relationships between variables, making generalizations, making predictions and explaining causal relationships (Büyüköztürk, 2007). Researchers carrying out qualitative researches generally have the aim of; understanding events and states with viewpoints of the participants, making very limited generalizations, leaving the assessment of applicability to the readers, having different personal opinions on the same state and building on the fact that reality is structured in social settings (Karasar, 2020). Researchers carrying out mixed researches have the aim of; using both qualitative and quantitative research methods at the same time (Karagöz, 2019). The mixed research approach is said to help



explaining various features of the case by developing more holistic and more informed educational policies. It is assumed that the mixed research approach is less preferred due to the fact that conducting qualitative and quantitative approaches at the same time can be more difficult, more expensive and more time consuming for a single researcher (Baki and Gökçek, 2012).

With respect to the theses and articles examined in the research, it was observed that there is a difference between research models and classifications. Statements given in the studies were taken into consideration when classifying the findings. Fraenkel and Wallen (2006) state that models of scientific research methods can be defined in three titles as descriptive, correlational and interventional. It was observed that these three models were used together in research models preferred in the field of education. Thus, the descriptive model is the most common screening model in the field of education. Thus, it is evident that while descriptive, screening and descriptive screening models are the same, they are identified differently in various researches (Büyüköztürk et al., 2008). When master's theses on peer bullying during the preschool period are considered, it is evident that the descriptive model is the most frequently used ( $f=4$ ) research model. The second most frequently preferred research model after the descriptive model in master's theses is the correlational screening model ( $f=3$ ). The explanatory design, descriptive screening model, experimental design, document analysis, interview, exploratory sequential, phenomenology, screening model, convergent parallel are among the other preferred research models. With respect to the doctoral theses, 1 thesis was conducted through the correlational screening model and 1 thesis was conducted through the exploratory sequential model. It was observed that the correlational screening model ( $f=9$ ) was the research model most commonly used in the articles examined in the research. The descriptive screening model, case study, special case study, basic qualitative research design are among the other preferred research models. According to Gülay Ogelman's (2014) study on 23 master's theses on social skills in the preschool period and which were completed between 2000-2013, the majority of the theses were conducted through the screening model.

When the theses examined in the study are considered, it is evident that preschool period children is the sample group most commonly preferred in master's theses and secondly is preschool period teachers. One of the doctoral thesis consists of preschool period children and the other consists of preschool period children and their teachers. Preschool period children was the most frequently preferred sample group in the articles of the study. Gülay Ogelman and Güngör (2022) also emphasize that sample groups consist mostly of preschool period children. The reason why preschool period children is the most preferred sample group can be due to the fact that it is considered as an easier accessible group than various sample groups. It is also thought to be the most convenient group to be evaluated in order to put forward peer bullying during the preschool period. Then follows the sample groups of preschool teachers, preschool period children and their mothers, preschool period children and teachers. It was observed that there is a variety in the sample groups of the master's theses. Sample selection of the doctoral theses shows less variety. According to the distribution by sample group number range of the theses, 0-50 and 101-150 sample group number ranges are observed most commonly in master's theses. All of the doctoral theses have a sample group number range of 51-100. According to the distribution by sample group number range of the articles, 0-50, 51-100, 151-200 and 201-250 sample group number ranges were observed 3 times each making them the most frequent number ranges. Thus, it was identified that articles are larger in variety with respect to sample group number ranges and have sample groups larger in number than theses. The fact that articles can be written by more than one author can be said to provide advantage for reaching sample groups large in number.

With respect to the theses and articles examined in the research, it was observed that there is a difference between sampling methods and classifications. In the data analysis stage, studies were included in the study according to the sampling method that was stated. While the literature emphasizes that there can be differentiations in the classification of sampling methods, it is also a frequent measure to conduct probable and improbable methods when determining the sample (Anderson, 1990; Cohen and Manion, 2007; Çingil, 1994). "Random", which is adopted by Fraenkel and Wallen (2006) and refers to population elements having the equal chance of being equally selected in the sample group, was approached as a measure. It was discussed under two dimensions. While random sampling methods are stratified



sampling method and simple random sampling method; non-random sampling methods consist of three titles as purposeful sampling method, systematically sampling method and convenience sampling method. It is evident in the research that the purposeful sampling method ( $f=4$ ) was most frequently used in master's theses. The simple random sampling ( $f=3$ ) and convenience sampling ( $f=3$ ) methods follow the purposeful sampling method. The purposeful sampling method was preferred in one of the doctoral theses and the convenience sampling method in the other thesis. Balcı (2016) states that in the purposeful sampling method the researcher makes his or her preference and includes elements in the sample that are most appropriate with the aim of the research. This can be one of the reasons why the purposeful sampling method is most commonly used in theses. The most preferred sample selection method in articles was the simple random sampling method. There are 4 articles with unstated sample selection. There are 2 articles conducted with the purposeful sample selection method and 2 articles with the convenience sampling method. The study conducted by Gülay Ogelman and Güngör (2022) underlines a similar result stating that the simple random sampling method is used most frequently.

When distribution according to the number of data collection tools of the master's theses is examined, there were maximum 3 data collection tools ( $f=6$ ) used together. Both doctoral theses have 3 data collection tools. When distribution according to the number of data collection tools of the articles is examined, there were maximum 3 data collection tools ( $f=5$ ) used together. Preferring more than 1 method in researches can enhance the reliability and validity of studies. Scale ( $f=20$ ) was observed as the most frequently preferred data collection tool in theses. Scale ( $f=14$ ) was also observed as the most frequently preferred data collection tool in the articles. The reason why the scale method was used most commonly by researchers is because it is a rapid, easy and an accessible method. Gülay Ogelman and Güngör's (2022) study also has a similar result stating that scale is one of the most frequently used data collection tools. It is evident that interview form ( $f=4$ ) was used most frequently in qualitative studies. Karasar (2020) underlines that maintaining subjectivity, accessing detailed information, enabling the participants to present more answers to research questions, being applicable in various conditions and having a rich scope of application are among the advantageous features of interview forms. The interview technique is considered to be preferred due to the fact that it enables easy access to data. It was observed that scales ( $f=20$ ) were most frequently used in quantitative researches and forms ( $f=3$ ) were most frequently used in mixed researches in the theses. It is evident that scales ( $f=14$ ) were most frequently used in quantitative researches and interview forms ( $f=4$ ) were used most frequently in qualitative researches in the articles.

It was examined that the data collection time frame of all the master's and doctoral theses was the cross sectional method. The majority of the articles was carried out through the cross sectional ( $f=13$ ) method and one article was carried out through the longitudinal method. The study conducted by Gülay Ogelman and Güngör (2022) underlines a similar result stating that the cross sectional method is the most frequent data collection time frame preferred in the master's and doctoral theses. The reason why the cross sectional data collection time frame is preferred can be due to the fact that data in these researches are collected in a shorter period of time with and with lower cost. According to Gülay Ogelman's (2014) study on theses, it is stated that it is necessary to conduct social skills theses on 3-4 age group through the experimental and longitudinal methods. According to the study conducted by Başaran and Aksoy (2020) on 58 research articles on school readiness in the preschool period between 2014-2018, it is suggested that longitudinal and experimental studies should be increased and educational plans that aim at whole development rather than only one developmental area should be carried out. It is considered that researches conducted with the longitudinal data collection time frame could be less preferred due to the fact that they are more time consuming.

With respect to the distribution by the subject of the research theses, "demographic variables" (age, gender, sibling variables, birth order, parents' ages, parents' educational background, body mass index, parents' professions, family type, preschool education experience, socio-economic state, parents' marital status, family structure, teachers' professional experience) was the most frequent subject of the examined theses in the research. Yörük's (2016) study on 215 children shows that male students display bullying more than female students and this can be an example thesis study on the subject of





demographic variables. In the same study; whether or not children resorted to bullying based on their parents' educational background was examined and it was observed that bullying behaviours decreased as the educational status increased. Ergül Topçu (2018) emphasizes that preschool period peer bullying should be examined in a holistic manner and that a number of domestic reasons could be effective in peer bullying. The subjects "peer bullying in children under risk" (f=3) and "teacher opinions, perceptions and attitudes towards peer bullying" (f=2) are second and third in the list with respect to the distribution according to the subjects of the theses in the study. One of the theses included in the study with the subject of peer bullying in children under risk was carried out by Yüce (2015) on 60 children with special needs and 60 children with normal development; the study underlines that whether or not the children have special needs has not effect on displaying peer aggression or peer violence. One of the theses studies included in the study with the subject of teacher opinions, perceptions and attitudes towards peer bullying was conducted by Pasin (2017) through interviews with 14 preschool teachers; the majority of the teachers defined peer bullying as exerting physical or psychological pressure. Teachers defined bullying as strong children considering the imbalance of power and displaying intentional bullying behaviours on the child they label as weak so as to make he or she do what they want. Some teachers handled bullying behaviours as a characteristic of the child's age and a way of self-expression. The most common subjects of the doctoral theses are peer relationships, demographic variables, bullying behaviours during the game, teacher opinions, perceptions and attitudes towards peer bullying and program development. Metin Aslan (2013) carried out a study on 55 children attending preschool education and observed that it differs according to demographic variables. With this respect, when physical bullying behaviours are considered by gender, male children display them more frequently. The same study underlines that bullying behaviours have a significant relationship with game behaviours and peer relationships have a significant relationship with bullying behaviours. Koyutürk Koçer (2020) conducted a study on 50 children attending preschool education and 8 teachers and emphasizes that the majority of the teachers observe violence behaviours during free play activities. In the same study an educational program was also conducted on various children. As a result of the education program, a decrease was observed in bullying behaviours of the children. According to the findings, "demographic variables" (age, gender, sibling variables, birth order, parents' ages, parents' educational background, body mass index, parents' professions, family type, preschool education experience, socio-economic state, parents' marital status, family structure, teachers' professional experience) (f=7) was the most frequent subject of the articles examined in the research. One example of the articles included in the study with respect to the demographic variables subject was conducted by Seçer et al (2014) on 200 children attending preschool education institutions; it was observed that peer violence affects school adaptation differently in female children and male children. It is assumed that while it causes problems about school participation in female children; it leads to problems about both school participation and school performance in male children. The subjects "peer relationships variables" (f=3) and "teacher opinions, perceptions and attitudes towards peer bullying" (f=3) are second and third in the list with respect to the distribution according to the subjects of the articles in the study. An example article included in the research on peer relationships variables was conducted by Salı (2014) on 243 5-6 years old children; it was observed that negative peer relationships increase as peer violence increases and assistance oriented social behaviours increase as peer violence decreases. An example article included in the research on teacher opinions, perceptions and attitudes towards peer bullying was conducted by Yalçıntaş Sezgin (2018) through interviews with 21 preschool teachers; it is emphasized that children who are psychically developed, active, have no siblings and raised under permissive parental attitudes display bullying behaviours.

When the conclusions are examined in general; it is evident that master's theses, doctoral theses and articles were not conducted several years on peer bullying during the preschool period. In addition, it can be stated that theses and articles on the subject are being carried out regularly in recent years. Master's and doctoral theses on peer bullying during the preschool period were conducted in a total of 13 public and foundation universities. It was examined that the theses were completed in 14 provinces, mostly metropolitans, and all of them in Turkish. It was observed that the articles were conducted in 9 provinces and mostly in Turkish. 5 keywords were preferred in the examined theses and articles. While



3 (quantitative, qualitative, mixed) research approaches were preferred in master's theses, doctoral theses were conducted through the qualitative research approach and articles were conducted through the mixed research approach. With respect to research designs, 5 master's theses preferred the quantitative research approach and 4 master's theses preferred the qualitative research approach and 2 master's theses preferred the mixed approach.. With respect to research designs, 1 doctoral thesis preferred the quantitative research approach and 1 doctoral thesis preferred the mixed research approach. With respect to research designs, 2 articles preferred the quantitative research approach and 3 articles preferred the qualitative research approach. It was underlined that there were 8 sample group types in the master's theses, 2 types in the doctoral theses and 4 types in the articles. It was also observed that the sample group number participating in the research was less than 151 and that 7 sample selection methods were used in master's theses, 2 were used in doctoral theses and 3 were used in the articles. The sample selection method was unstated in various theses and articles. It was observed that maximum 3 data collection tools were used at once in the theses and articles. With respect to the number of data collection tools, it was examined that maximum 9 tools were used in master's theses, 3 tools in doctoral theses and 4 tools in the articles. With respect to the variety of data collection tools, it was examined that maximum 10 tools were used in master's theses, 5 tools in doctoral theses and 6 tools in the articles. All the master's and doctoral theses and the majority of the articles were carried out with the cross sectional method.

Examined studies show that the subject of peer bullying has been studied more in recent years. In addition, the recent increase in studies dwelling upon peer bullying during the preschool period is assumed to be due to increase in peer bullying in schools. Korkmaz et al. (2021) state that the subject peer bullying has gained focus since 2010 and link the increase in peer bullying studies to the increase in peer bullying instances and the expansion of their results.

### **Suggestions**

Researches on peer bullying are carried out mostly in specific universities, it can be suggested that the subject of peer bullying can be expanded in the postgraduate departments of universities throughout Turkey. Carrying out researches on the subject of peer bullying in more number of cities is suggested so as to analyse peer bullying studies throughout the country. Doctoral theses on peer bullying can be increased. According to the research, the sample selection method and how the sample is determined was unstated in several theses and articles. Thus, it is suggested to give more detailed and explicit information about titles such as methodology and sample group selection method in the methodology section of theses and articles. It is suggested to increase the number of studies with mixed and qualitative approaches so as to carry out in depth and extensive peer bullying studies. Researches were mostly carried out on preschool children and preschool teachers. In addition, expanding the quantity of studies with various and different sample groups such as parents of preschool period aged children, preschool teacher candidates and preschool education institution principals can be suggested. It is suggested to conduct longitudinal studies on peer bullying during the preschool period. It can be suggested to increase the number of studies on various developmental areas and titles along with demographic variables of peer bullying during the preschool period.

While many teachers are informed about peer bullying, various teachers believe that bullying should be well defined, thus it can be suggested to offer in service training activities about peer bullying to teachers. It can be suggested to develop rules about the precautions required to cope with peer bullying which are needed to be applied in the classroom and school and also to include preschool period children to the process. Teachers should inform parents about peer bullying, parents should participate in the intervening process by collaborating with the school. Children should frequently be reminded that regardless of the bullying type, such negative behaviours are unacceptable in the school setting and precaution programs about effectively coping with such problems should be provided. Group games should be regularly offered by preschool teachers at the beginning of the semester so as to develop positive peer relationships and enhance social skills through group activities. Being a role model to children by displaying positive behaviours inside the classroom and interfering instantly to bullying behaviours is suggested.



## Ethics and Conflict of Interest

This study was produced from the first author's master's thesis. Ethical procedures in conducting the study were adhered to by the researchers and they declare that no conflict of interest exists.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, G. (1990). *Fundamentals of educational research*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Baki, A., & Gökçek, T. (2012). A general overview of mixed method researches. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(42), 1-21.
- Balcı, A. (2016). *Research in social sciences: Methods, techniques and principles*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Başaran, M., & Aksoy, A. B. (2020). School readiness in pre-school period: a systematic review. *Kırşehir Education Faculty Journal (KEFAD)*, 21(2), 1122-1166.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2007). *Data analysis handbook for social sciences: Statistics, research design, SPSS applications and commentary*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2008). *Scientific research methods*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Fourth edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Çıngı, H. (1994). *Sampling theory* (second edition). Ankara: Hacettepe University Publication.
- Doğan, Ş. (2022). School-based bullying prevention review of programs. *Journal of Social Research and Behavioral Sciences*, 8(16), 661-679.
- Ergül Topçu, A. (2018). A review of prevalence and nature of peer bullying at schools. *Crisis Journal*, 26(2),0-0.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. (Sixth edition). New York: McGraw-Hill International Edition.
- Gülay, H. (2008). *Standardization of a scale for measuring peer relations among 5-6 years old children and studying the relations between some familial variables and peer relations of children at this age* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, Turkey.
- Gülay Ogelman, H. (2014). Researches on preschool social skills in Turkey: examination of the theses between 2000-2013. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(2), 41-65.
- Gülay Ogelman, H., & Güngör, H. (2015). Investigating the studies on environmental education in preschool period in turkey: investigating the articles and dissertations between 2000-2014. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 12(32), 180-194.
- Gülay Ogelman, H., & Güngör, H. (2022). Examining peer relations thesis completed between 2000-2021 in the field of preschool education. *Humanistic Perspective*, 4(3), 658-680.
- Karagöz Y. (2019). *SPSS AMOS META applied quantitative-qualitative-mixed scientific research methods and publication ethics*, (pp. 979-989), (second edition). Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Karasar, N. (2020). *Scientific research methods*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Kılınc, S. (2023). Systematic analysis of studies on peer bullying in Turkey (2010-2020). *Çankırı Karatekin University Journal of Faculty of Letters (KAREFAD)*, 11(1), 97-115.
- Korkmaz, T., Erkin, M., & Atbaşı, Z. (2021). Examining the concept of peer bullying in postgraduate theses. *Turkish Special Education Journal: International TSPED*, 3(1), 1-19.
- Korkut, E. S. (2019). *Investigation of the relationship between bully-victim behaviors and social skills of preschool children* (Unpublished Master thesis). Karabük University, Turkey.
- Koyutürk Koçer, N. (2020). *Investigation of the effectiveness of the peer violence prevention training program in preschool period* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Turkey.
- Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. (pp. 259-270). Oxford, England: Hemisphere Press.
- Metin Aslan, Ö. (2013). *Analysis of childrens play behavior attending kindergarten and bullying behavior appearing during play* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation) Hacettepe University, Turkey.
- Pasin, S. (2017). *Investigation by pre-school vien (3-6 years) from teacher opinions* (Unpublished Master thesis). Toros University, Turkey.



- Pekel Uludağlı, N., & Uçanok, Z. (2005). Loneliness, academic achievement and types of bullying behaviour according to sociometric status in bully/victim groups. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*, 20(56), 77-95.
- Salı, G. (2014). An examination of peer relationships and exposure to peer violence among pre-school children in terms of different variables. *Çukurova University Faculty of Education Journal*, 43(2), 195-216.
- Seçer, Z., Gülay Ogelman, H., Şimşek, H., Önder, A., & Bademci, D. (2014). Analysis of 5-6 year of preschool children school adjustment differences according to peer victimisation. *Dicle University Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education Journal*, 23, 351-375.
- Şahin, S., & Arslan, M. C. (2014). The effects of teacher strategies used against undesirable student behaviours on students according to student and teacher opinions. *Turkish Studies International Periodical for The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 9(2), 1399-1415.
- Taner Derman, M. (2022). *Conceptual aggression and bullying*. H. Gülay Ogelman (Ed.). Aggression and Bullying in Young Children (pp. 1-44). Ankara: Nobel Publication.
- Toksöz Barlas, F. (2022). *Method analysis of environmental education thesis in the field of pre-school education done in Turkey between 2005-2020* (Unpublished Master thesis). Bahçeşehir University, Turkey.
- Wolke, D., & Lereya, S. T. (2015) Long-term effects of bullying. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 100(9), 879-885.
- Yalçıntaş Sezgin, E. (2018). Views and perceptions of preschool teachers regarding peer bullying: their descriptions of bullying behaviours; the strategies they carry out and the precautions they take in the face of bullying behaviours. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute* (33), 85-104.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2016). *Qualitative research methods in the social sciences*. Ankara: Seçkin.
- Yoon, J. S., & Barton, E. (2008). *The role of teachers in school violence and bullying prevention*. In T.W. Miller (ed.), *School Violence and Primary Prevention*, (pp. 249-275), Springer.
- Yörük, M. (2016). *The investigation of the peer bullying and peer victimization/exposing to peer bullying of 3-6 age group children* (Unpublished Master thesis). Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Turkey.
- Yüce, G. (2015). *Peer relationships and the level of peer victimization among children with special needs who receive special education and children with normal development* (Unpublished Master thesis). Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Turkey.