

representing a different opinion. We kept the section differentiation, but the original statements were reduced to fifteen ones and modified because of the different cultural background. Fifteen statements were divided into those five sections. Each section contained three statements which were characteristic of it. In the first section, the teachers blamed the victim, in the second section the teachers blamed the aggressor, in the third one the teachers tended to derogate the situation connected with bullying and in the fourth one the teachers were indifferent towards bullying and in the fifth one they tried to solve the bullying. The teachers were given the following scenario of the initial stages of bullying and they were to deal with it: *Charles is repeatedly ridiculed and mocked by a stronger and more powerful student who successfully manages to persuade other pupils in class not to speak with Charles and to avoid him. As a result of this behaviour Charles feels very lonely and unhappy.* We purposely focused only on the initial stages of bullying, because in the case of advanced stages of bullying it is necessary to cooperate with experts. For each statement (a total of 15 statements) the teachers were to circle only the one of these five variants (strongly agree, agree, neither, disagree, strongly disagree) that best corresponded to their opinions.

In the fourth part the teachers had to determine the order in which they would act in the case of the initial stage of bullying. The sequence of each step was numbered from 1 to 8, where number one meant the first step in solving the initial stages of bullying, number eight the last step. To choose the correct approach while dealing with bullying is extremely important, as taking the wrong step can have serious repercussions for the victim as well as for other participants of bullying.

To ensure the reliability of the scale items in the questionnaire we presented the questionnaire to two representative samplings of the same primary population and the results of both samplings were compared (correlated) with each other. The answers of all the respondents were noted into matrices. To examine the extent of agreement between the responses of both groups of respondents we used Cohen's kappa coefficient. From a total of fifteen values of Cohen's kappa coefficients we calculated the average value of conformity. Usually, it is required that the value of Cohen's kappa coefficient should be higher than 0.80. Our calculated value ($\kappa = 0.84$) matched this requirement. The validity of the author's questionnaire was considered by two independent experts.

4.2. Projective method

The headmasters and educational consultants had to complete nine unfinished sentences. In comparison with closed questions, appearing frequently in questionnaires, this enabled the respondents to express their own opinion. By means of unfinished sentences we wanted to find out:

- their own definition of bullying;
- their strategy of solving the initial stages of bullying;
- actual and preferred level of preventive precautions at selected basic schools.

Individual sentences were assessed by two independent experts. We did not check the reliability because of the problems of the method. The qualitative data obtained from the headmasters, educational consultants and education advisers were considered as complementary material to quantitative data.

4.3. Q – methodology

The way in which most schools deal with problems of bullying is mostly based on the information and recommendations they obtain from different publications, guidelines, guides or professional periodicals. Our aim was to find out the headmasters' and educational consultants' opinion on this issue. We wanted to know which statements the headmasters and educational consultants would consider in terms of the elimination of bullying as the most risky and which would be considered as the most significant for the reduction of bullying at schools. For this purpose we decided to choose Q – methodology. In this method the examined persons are presented with a packet of cards (each card is known as Q – type) which contain certain objects, such as statements, beliefs, attitudes, life values, etc. The investigated persons have to categorize these objects by criteria such as the meaning or importance to the examined person, under the influence, etc. An undisputed advantage of Q – methodology is the fact that sorting can be repeated several times and it is suitable for a small number of individuals, which was also our case.

The number of cards is high, usually 60 to 120 cards. In our case, we decided to create 60 cards (Q – types). The statements were focused on the relationship between the teachers and pupils, the teachers' attitudes pupils, health promotion and healthy climate, whole-school preventive precautions, etc.

The headmasters and educational consultants from the selected basic schools (healthy and control) had to sort individual Q – types according to the scheme, which corresponded to quasinormal distribution (cf., Picture 1). The score was the smallest on the left side (0 points) and gradually increased to the right side. With the increasing score, the importance which the surveyed people attributed to each claim increased accordingly. After sorting the cards the headmasters and educational advisors wrote numbers of all Q – types on the prepared answer sheet.

To determine the reliability of the research instrument the Taylor coefficient of conformity was used. The calculated value of the Taylor coefficient ($rkW = 0$).