

**INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BULLYING, SELF-ESTEEM, PEER
SUPPORT, SCHOOL CLIMATE, AND PARENTING STYLES AMONG
ARMENIAN SECONDARY STUDENTS**

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF
HAIGAZIAN UNIVERSITY FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER IN ARTS**

BY

ROZINE KEVORK DJIGUERIAN MOUGHALIAN

JUNE 2014

Thesis Release Form

I, Rozine Djiguerian Moughalian

☐ Authorize Haigazian University to supply copies of my thesis to libraries or individuals upon request.

☐ Do not authorize Haigazian University to supply copies of my thesis to libraries or individuals for a period of two years starting the date of the thesis defense.

Signature

Date

HAIGAZIAN UNIVERSITY

**INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BULLYING, SELF-ESTEEM, PEER
SUPPORT, SCHOOL CLIMATE, AND PARENTING STYLES AMONG
ARMENIAN SECONDARY STUDENTS**

Rozine Djiguerian Moughalian

Approved by:

Dr. Hanine Hout, Ed. D., Advisor

Dr. Marwan Gharzeddine, Ph. D., Member of Committee

Dr. Daoud Tawil, Ed. D., Member of Committee

*To my family, Vasken, Catherine and Garo Moughalian
for their unconditional love, patience and continuous support*

Acknowledgment

I would like to take the opportunity to thank all those individuals who have helped me throughout my thesis. First and foremost, my gratitude goes to my advisor, **Dr. Hanine Hout**, who was there to encourage me during each phase, with much patience and positive attitude.

Special thanks to **Dr. Daoud Tawil**, who with his statistical talent and critical perspective provided me with insight and understanding to make sense of statistics.

Sincere thanks to **Dr. Marwan Gharzeddine**, whose genuine support and care all throughout my work and especially during analysis of results, provided me with confidence to carry on with the difficulties of the task.

My deepest appreciation goes to my friend, **Mr. Yervant Kotchounian**, for providing moral support, for translating all the scales utilized in this thesis, and for editing my entire work.

With much gratitude, I thank the principals of the Armenian secondary schools, for the special interview time I had with them, and for their help in coordinating the data collection.

Ultimately, with deep love, I thank my family, my husband and my children (especially, my daughter Catherine for her assistance with the SPSS program), for the many sacrifices they made, for their belief in me, and for their support in helping me realize my dream.

Without God's grace, none of these would have been possible.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	v
List of Tables	ix
Abstract	x
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Introduction	1
Background of the study	2
A- Why does bullying prevention require special attention in secondary schools?	2
B- Armenian secondary schools and their mission	5
C- The impact of self-esteem, peer support, school climate and parenting style on bullying	12
The problem statement	15
The professional significance of the study	15
Overview of methodology	16
Delimitations of the study	17
Definitions of key terms	18
Chapter Two: Literature review	20
Defining bullying	20
Theoretical models for interpreting bullying behavior	22
A- The individual perspective	22
B- The systemic perspective	23

Self-esteem and the characteristics of the bully and the victim	24
School climate and its role in the bullying problem	26
From peer exclusion/rejection to peer support	31
Bullying and the parent-child relationship	33
A- The effect of the parent-child relationship on the bully	33
B- The effect of the parent-child relationship on the victim	35
C- Research findings on the parent-child relationship	36
Conclusion	38
Chapter Three: Method	40
General Perspective	40
Research context	40
Participants	41
Materials used in data collection	42
Procedure	45
Chapter Four: Results	47
Reliability testing	47
Prevalence of bullying and victimization	48
Hypothesis testing	48
Regression analysis	52
One-way ANOVA	56
Chapter Five: Discussion	57
Discussion of Results	57
A- Relationship between Self-esteem, Peer Support,	57

School Climate, Parenting Styles, and Bullying	
B- Relationship between Self-esteem, Peer Support, School Climate, Parenting Styles, and Victimization	62
C- Between-School Comparison	68
D- Prevalence of Bullying and Victimization	68
E- Additional Findings	69
Clinical and Educational Implications	70
Delimitations	71
Future Directions	72
Conclusion	72
References	74
Appendices	88
A. Demographic Information	88
B. Illinois Bully Scale	89
C. Student School Survey	92
D. Parental Authority Questionnaire	95
E. Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale	98
F. Translation into Armenian	99

List of Tables

Table 1: Chronbach's alpha for the subscales and for the self-esteem scale	47
Table 2: Correlations Results	51
Table 3: Significance of the regression model in predicting bullying	52
Table 4: The strength of each predictor	53
Table 5: Percentage of variance explained in bullying	53
Table 6: Significance of the regression model in predicting victimization	54
Table 7: The strength of each predictor	55
Table 8: Percentage of variance explained in victimization	56

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine bullying and to explore the relationship between self-esteem, peer support, school climate, parenting styles and bullying on the one hand; and self-esteem, peer support, school climate, parenting styles and victimization on the other, among Armenian secondary students in Lebanon. Participants were 465 students from grades 10, 11 and 12, attending Armenian secondary schools in Beirut and its suburbs. The study relied on a self-report method, where participants provided demographic information, and filled in four questionnaires: Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale, Student School Survey, Parental Authority Questionnaire and Illinois Bully Scale. Results were calculated using analyses of correlation and regression. Results showed that self-esteem, school climate, and the three parenting styles (permissive, authoritative and authoritarian) were significantly correlated with bullying. School climate and authoritative parenting style were significant predictors of bullying. With regard to victimization, self-esteem, peer support, school climate, authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles were significantly correlated with victimization; with self-esteem and peer support being significant predictors of victimization. Victimization was ultimately found to be the most significant predictor for bullying. The results of this study highlight the importance of including school climate and authoritative parenting style variables in bullying prevention programs, and focusing on self-esteem and peer support variables to buffer against victimization when working with Armenian secondary students.

INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BULLYING, SELF-ESTEEM, PEER SUPPORT, SCHOOL CLIMATE, AND PARENTING STYLES AMONG ARMENIAN SECONDARY STUDENTS

Introduction

Students are at the center of attention in schools. Their physical, emotional, social and educational needs are of the utmost importance. For any meaningful learning to take place, children need to feel safe, happy, satisfied and enthusiastic to attend school. Consequently, factors that have influence both on students' learning and psychological well-being have to be addressed. One of those factors that has attracted much attention from researchers in recent years is bullying.

Bullying is a serious issue because it causes problems not only for the victims, but for the bullies as well. There are many consequences of bullying and the outcomes are quite shocking for both the victims and the bullies. Victims of bullying are at risk for emotional and relationship problems, such as low self-esteem, social anxiety and loneliness, depression, suicidal thoughts and school absenteeism ("Why Worry about Bullying", 2012). Bullies on the other hand, face relationship and behavior problems, such as aggression, delinquency, sexual harassment, drug and alcohol use ("Why Worry about Bullying", 2012). Aluede (2008) reports that bullies turn out to be anti-social adults.

Bullying exists in most schools worldwide and may have an impact on students at different grade levels. According to Olweus (2003), "researchers started to study bullying systematically in 1970s" (p. 12) and since then the topic has started to draw much

attention in different countries, such as England, Australia, the United States and Canada (Beaty & Alexeyev, 2008), where preventive programs have been devised to put an end to bullying.

Lebanese schools are no exception. According to Kolehlat (2003) (as cited in Rabah, 2006) a serious bullying problem exists in Lebanese private schools and it needs intense preventive measures. In her research conducted at 10 Lebanese schools located in Beirut, Rabah (2006) reports that the participant teachers in her study categorized both physical and non-physical bullying at these schools to be very serious. Zein (2001) considers exploring the topic of bullying in Lebanon important, especially after the emergence of the country from the 17-year civil war, where citizens displayed aggression on a daily basis. Hence, studying the timely topic of aggressive behavior in Lebanese schools might be conducive of taking appropriate preventive measures. This study will focus on the Lebanese Armenian students and the bullying situation in Armenian private schools in Beirut and its suburbs.

Background of the Study

Why does bullying prevention require special attention in secondary schools?

Bullying intervention and prevention in secondary schools require special attention for several reasons: a) the continuation of verbal bullying in secondary schools (Cohn & Canter, 2003), b) the existence of pack bullying throughout secondary years (Syrkiewicz, 2011), c) the developmental changes adolescents undergo (Smith, 2010), d) the risk-taking characteristic of adolescence (Arnett, 1999), e) the stability of victim and

bullying tendencies (Boulton & Smith, 1994) and f) the organizational structure in secondary schools (Smith, 2010).

According to Cohn & Canter (2003), despite the fact that physical bullying declines in secondary schools, verbal bullying remains constant and continues to be a threat to the psychological well-being of adolescent students.

Talking about pack mentality in bullying, which is the kind of bullying that is carried out by a group, Syrkiewicz (2011) mentions that pack bullying is widespread in high schools and lasts longer than bullying performed by a single individual. Since most bullies lack confidence and self-esteem, they prefer to act in a group with an audience around them, because the audience provides them with the encouragement needed to victimize another person, thereby getting the attention they yearn for. The awful harm of this pack mentality in secondary schools is that it makes it difficult for the single victim to resist the bully who has a group to support him/her.

The developmental transformations (such as hormonal changes, sexual maturity and the search for identity) adolescents undergo during their secondary school years affect their relationships with each other and with adults, especially those in positions of authority. Their relationships also undergo certain changes. According to Smith (2010), adolescents start paying more attention to friendships. Conformity to peer pressure increases especially under stressful circumstances, such as anti-social situations. The anxiety over friendship may lead to bullying as a way to ensure status, or to staying away from victims as a means to protect status and avoid being bullied themselves.

Arnett (1999) states that adolescence is characterized by risk-taking and anti-social behavior. Risk-taking could be through either socially acceptable behaviors, such

as activities related to sports, or anti-social behaviors, such as shoplifting or drug use. Peers have important influence on these behaviors. Adolescents who have disruptive friends are more inclined to be involved in troublemaking, disruptive and anti-social behaviors. And bullying is obviously an anti-social behavior.

Another factor related to developmental changes during adolescence is that, with age, victim and bullying tendencies seem to remain stable. Victims in secondary schools, having fallen in a vicious cycle (having negative or low self-esteem, constantly being labeled as a victim and not having good friends) tend not to report bullying, thereby remaining in this hurtful cycle of victimization, which makes recovery for them much more difficult (Boulton & Smith, 1994). The same is true with the stability of the bullying role. For bullying adolescents, being labeled as aggressive helps them have improved status within the group, thereby making it difficult for them to change their behavior or to stay away from disruptive peers.

The organizational structure of secondary schools affects the way bullying is dealt with in these schools. As the curriculum in secondary schools centers on traditional subject matter, students in secondary schools have a number of different teachers; hence, it becomes difficult for one teacher to influence the students' behavior or to intervene in bullying problems. Besides, it might not be clear for secondary teachers whose responsibility it is to deal with bullying problems. Hence, the probability that a secondary school teacher might take action by reacting quickly to episodes of bullying decreases in secondary schools (Smith, 2010).

Armenian secondary schools and their mission

Armenians, as an ethnic group, are a minority in Lebanon, as they represent 4% of the population of the ethnic groups in the country (Central Intelligence Agency, 2013). They are dispersed among several political parties and religious denominations, and every Armenian secondary school is affiliated either ideologically or confessionally.

After the First World War, there were around 90.000 Armenians in Lebanon; they had freedom to lead their community life, which was centered around their respective churches. The church was not only a spiritual center, but also the unifying force of community life. As such, the church was the center through which the civic rights of people were described and expressed (Kaloustian, 1958). According to Jizmejian (1963), Armenian secondary schools in Lebanon were mostly owned and run by churches. Each religious denomination had its individual educational institution and had its own board of education, which governed its own schools. Each program had its aim and was independent of the other (Kaloustian, 1958). Talking about the history of Armenian schools, Kaloustian (1958) mentions that Armenians, with different religious denominations (Orthodox, Catholic and Evangelical) started to build, in 1922 and 1923, their schools and churches, which improved and multiplied in number with time. According to one statistics, in 1974-1975, the number of the Armenian schools went up to 60 (Tanielian, 2002).

Varjabedian (1981) also mentions that Armenian schools in Lebanon were mostly community owned; he provides the following statistics about the Armenian schools in 1981: schools owned by the Orthodox denomination: 24; Catholic schools: 12; and Evangelical schools: 16; in addition to private schools and technical institutions.

The civil war that broke in 1975, however, had a devastating effect not only on the social, economic and political aspects of the Lebanese-Armenian society, but on its educational structure as well. With the decreasing number of the Armenians in Lebanon, a significant number of Armenian schools closed their doors permanently (Tanielian, 2002).

In his book about the Lebanese Armenian schools, Tanielian (2002) provides post civil war statistical information about Armenian secondary schools. According to him, three secondary schools were run by the Orthodox denomination; three secondary schools were under the auspices of the Catholic denomination; four secondary schools were run by the Evangelical denomination; one secondary school was governed by the Armenian General Benevolent Union; and one secondary school was run by the Hamazkayin Armenian Educational and Cultural Association. These figures correspond to the current representation of the Armenian secondary schools.

These schools aimed at imparting the students with academic knowledge and skills, in addition to maintaining their tradition, emphasizing an ethical and Christian character (Kaloustian, 1958).

Talking about the mission of Armenian National Schools, Levon and Sophia Hagopian Armenian College, cites article one of the Statute for the Armenian National Schools on its website: “The objective of the National Schools of the Armenian Lebanese diocese is to nurture the new generation of the Lebanese Armenians with education till they reach university” (History / Mission, para. 1, 2013). The same article declares that

these schools aim at preparing young adults who are responsible, and citizens who are loyal (History / Mission, 2013).

To fulfill its mission, Levon and Sophia Hagopian Armenian College provides opportunities for various educational, intellectual, cultural and national day activities throughout the academic year. Students and the school administration organize different activities to commemorate Armenian or Lebanese national holidays. Activities include paying visits to museums, having meetings and discussions with authors, attending exhibitions, planning and organizing cultural hours, and preparing bulletin boards. Within the realm of preserving the Armenian identity, the school provides courses in Armenian History, Prominent Representatives of Armenian Thought, Armenian Culture, the Armenian Genocide and the Armenian Cause, and History of the Armenian Church. Students also receive character education, where different social topics are discussed (Z. Berberian, personal communication, December 20, 2013).

Yeghishe Manoukian College lays great emphasis upon preserving the Armenian identity. To this aim, the administration allocates 4 hours to Armenian Literature and 2 hours to Armenian History for grades 10 and 11, and 3 hours to Armenian Literature and 1 hour to Armenian History for grade 12. In addition, grade 11 students have a special course, “Prominent Representatives of Armenian Thought”, which they are graded for. Grade 12 students, on the other hand, have one hour per week for the course “Comparative Genocide”, where they are acquainted with and discuss 20th century genocides. To provide them with social skills, the school allows secondary students to have their own student committee. Besides, students have the opportunity to form

different clubs, such as a literature club, Armenian Cause club, advocacy club, sports club, cultural club, theatre club, and history club. In addition, different events are organized honoring Armenian and Lebanese national holidays, thereby upholding the local and the Armenian cultures (Z. Ghazarian, personal communication, December 23, 2013).

During its assembly in 2001, the Union of the Armenian Evangelical Churches in the Near East (UAECNE) put forward the mission of its Educational Council in Lebanon. UAECNE describes, on its website, the Mission Statement of the Armenian Evangelical Schools. Based on this mission, the Armenian Evangelical Schools aim at providing quality education (instructing the whole person), cultivating Armenian identity (“through the teaching of Armenian language, literature, history and cultural programs”) (Educational Council Lebanon, para. 1, 2001) and acquiring Armenian Evangelical heritage (inviting students to know God). School boards, principals and teachers are encouraged to fulfill this mission by preparing citizens and leaders who are characterized by their Christian identity (Educational Council Lebanon, 2001).

In their mission of passing on the Armenian Evangelical heritage, the Armenian Evangelical Central High School obliges the students to attend chapel three times per week. For the remaining two days of the week, students discuss different moral topics with their homeroom teachers. They also bring up topics from the different character education books they have. Besides the chapel and classroom discussions, students take a religion course and Armenian history course for one hour per week, respectively. During the religion course, lessons from the Holy Bible are introduced to the students. Different

Armenian and local holidays are celebrated during the cultural hour, which they hold once per week. Several clubs, such as dance, drama, cooking, sports and music, hold their meeting on Fridays. In addition, students get the chance to publish their articles in the school's yearbook (M. Deyirmendjian, personal communication, December 23, 2013).

In the Armenian Evangelical Shamlian Tatigian School, students attend chapel every morning for 25 minutes, which serves the mission of promoting the Evangelical heritage. The cultural hour which is held once per week, is the forum where different events and activities take place. To mention a few, different student clubs hold their meetings during this hour, if there aren't any Armenian or Lebanese national holidays to celebrate. The cultural hour also provides the students with the chance to exhibit their musical and artistic talents (V. Balekjian, personal communication, December 17, 2013).

The Armenian Evangelical College promotes extracurricular activities besides the service held in the chapel three times a week. The administration provides weekly assembly programs that include general knowledge contests, speeches and performances by prominent personalities from the community, student talent shows and sport games. Students organize different activities and trips by joining student clubs, such as the History club, the Bible club, the Armenian club, the Drama club, the Environmental club and the Folkdance club. Students also publish several periodicals, such as Ani: the history periodical; Karni: the Armenian periodical; and Sada Al Tulab: the Arabic periodical. The cultural hour, held once per week, tackles national, moral and scientific topics (Z. Meserlian, personal communication, December 23, 2013).

The Central Committee of Hamazkayin Armenian Educational and Cultural Association manages the educational, administrative and economic activities of Melankton and Haig Arslanian Djemaran. The school's website states the mission of the school as providing the forthcoming generation with "sound general knowledge" and "solid Armenian education". Students are inspired to love their mother language, to value Armenian culture and to keep the national spirit alive in them (Lyceum Djemaran of Hamazkayin, 2010).

Melankton and Haig Arslanian Djemaran focuses on preserving the Armenian identity, and as such, assigns substantial hours to teaching Armenian literature and Armenian history. Grade 10 students have 4 hours of Armenian literature and two hours of Armenian history per week; while grade 11 students have, besides those hours, an hour per week of Armenian civic education, where they tackle the topics of nation, native country, state, international organization, the Armenian church, the Armenian political parties, the constitution of Armenia, and the Armenian Cause. Secondary students throughout grades 10, 11 and 12 have a student association, which has its own executive board and a representative student from each class. This association gives the chance to the students to practice public life affairs. The students within the association organize events, receive guests, and carry out different group activities. The school encourages self-discipline, where the students develop self-confidence, and are ready to support each other (D. Djinbashian, personal communication, December 26, 2013).

Armenian General Benevolent Union describes, on its website, the mission of AGBU Lebanon Schools, encouraging its students and teachers to have passion for

lifelong learning and discovery. AGBU schools aim at inspiring students to think critically and creatively, to support and to serve their community, and to strive to become responsible citizens. Above all, the schools' mission is to preserve Armenian heritage and to promote Armenian identity (About us / Mission and Vision, 2010).

The cultural hour at AGBU Tarouhy-Hovagimian secondary school, held once per week, is the forum for different activities, from guest speakers presenting various topics to talent shows performed by students. The school offers the chance for students to join one of several clubs: science, chess, taekwondo, dance, football or basketball. Further to the above, Armenian history is part of the curriculum at Tarouhy-Hovagimian secondary school (A. Vassilian, personal communication, December 17, 2013).

Christian norms and spirit are highly valued at the Armenian Catholic Holy Cross Harboyan High School. Students pray every morning in their classrooms, and they attend the religious ceremony of Communion once a week. They also have a class hour for religion once a week. Armenian language and culture are encouraged too, and national holidays are celebrated on every occasion. Furthermore, there is room for character education on special occasions, where students get involved in community service. Besides, students get the chance to express their opinions by writing in the quarterly magazine – *Tritchk* – published by the school (R. Boyadjian, personal communication, December 20, 2013).

The current study aims at examining those factors that have an impact on bullying in Armenian secondary schools, taking into consideration the severity of the bullying

issue and its impact on the bully and the victim, in addition to the importance of having bullying preventive programs in secondary schools.

The impact of self-esteem, peer support, school climate and parenting style on bullying

According to Murray-Harvey and Slee (2010), students perceive not only peer relationships, but also relationships with families and teachers as sources of stress or support in their lives at school. Hence, these three groups (peers, teachers and parents) have to be taken into consideration in any effective bullying/victimization preventive program. Since bullying is a relationship issue, strategies that target bullying need to consider not only the bully and/or the victim, but also the people secondary students interact with, namely peers, teachers and family members. Therefore, the results of the current study also help in suggesting bullying preventive programs that might target the peers, the teachers or the families, according to the results of the study or the outcomes at each Armenian secondary school.

The goal of the current research was two-fold: First, to determine the prevalence of bullying among Armenian secondary school students; second, to discover the correlation between bullying and victimization each on the one hand, and the Armenian secondary students' self-esteem, and the students' perception of school climate, peer support and parenting style, on the other.

Regarding the bully's self-esteem, looking at the situation of the Lebanese secondary schools from the bullying perspective, and taking into consideration that most of the bullying takes place in the presence of peers and classmates (whose support provides some sort of satisfaction to the bully) (Syrkiewicz, 2011), the current study -

unlike previous studies where some researches mention that the bully has high self-esteem, while others point out that the bully has low self-esteem - assumes that the bully wouldn't have resorted to bullying were s/he someone satisfied and pleased with her/himself, and were s/he someone with high self-esteem.

Concerning the role of peer support and how the students perceive peer support when it comes to bullying or victimization, since the bully enjoys the bystanders' reaction, thereby feeling proud of him/herself while bullying, and as the victim feels humiliated in front of classmates (Buhs, Ladd, & Herald-Brown, 2010), the current study speculates that – although researchers have come up with different results regarding the role of peer support in bullying (Frisen, Hasselblad & Holmqvist, 2012; Cheng et al., 2010) - if the peers encourage the bully, bullying will not stop. But if they defend and support the victim, bullying will eventually decrease.

As for school climate, studies reveal that teachers' support and positive school climate help reduce bullying (Eliot, Cornell, Gregory & Fan, 2010; Langdon & Preble, 2008). However, since some teachers in Armenian secondary schools are mostly part-timers, meaning they leave school right after the class hours are over, without spending additional time with the students, and since the students spend most of their time with their peers (especially during recess) rather than with their teachers, and as reported by Murrey-Harvey and Slee (2010), that older students are unwilling to report bullying incidents to teachers because, in their opinion, adults make matters worse, this study proposes that school climate, especially when it comes to teachers' support, will not play an important role in reducing bullying.

With regard to the relationship of parenting style with bullying, though research presents different perspectives about the relationship between *permissive* parenting style and bullying (Kawataba, Alink, Tsend, Ijzendoorn & Crick, 2011; Georgiou, 2008; Olweus, 1993), the current study predicts that perception by students of permissive parenting style will be positively correlated with bullying and victimization. This prediction is based on the premise that *permissive* parents allow their children to behave freely without setting boundaries that inhibit children's inappropriate behavior. Hence, children do not learn emotion regulation and are free to form their own judgment without any constraints. While in the case of *authoritative* parenting style, this study puts forward that an authoritative parenting style helps children become assertive, competent in controlling their emotions, socially capable of interacting and expressing their ideas. Hence, in line with bullying literature (Kawataba et al., 2011; Christie-Mizell, Keil, Laska & Stewart, 2011), the relationship between perceived authoritative parenting style and bullying/victimization in the current study is proposed to be a negatively correlated one. On the other hand, children who are raised in an *authoritarian* home environment and who are constantly abused and maltreated, will learn, in time, the same style of relating to people and will display it in their interaction with their peers. At the same time and according to their character, an authoritarian parenting style might render them shy and introvert people, who during their communication with peers and classmates, might fail to defend themselves and become easy targets for bullying. Thus, this study anticipates that authoritarian parenting style will lead to bullying and victimization.

The Problem Statement

Based on the above-discussed premises, the following hypotheses were predicted:

- 1) There will be a negative correlation between self-esteem and both bullying and victimization.
- 2) There will be a positive correlation between perceived peer support and bullying and negative correlation between perceived peer support and victimization.
- 3) There will be a negative correlation between school climate and both bullying and victimization.
- 4) There will be a positive correlation between perceived permissive parenting style and both bullying and victimization.
- 5) There will be a negative correlation between perceived authoritative parenting style and both bullying and victimization.
- 6) There will be a positive correlation between perceived authoritarian parenting style and both bullying and victimization.

The Professional Significance of the Study

The problem of bullying is a serious issue in every school, not just in Armenian schools. As Armenians in Lebanon have a unique composition, being affiliated with different religious denominations and political parties, the current study was interested in finding out if and how much the youth in this segregated population is involved in bullying and what factors play a role in the bullying problem.

Zein (2001) in her research about the extent of bully problems in private schools in Beirut mentions, “In Lebanon, studies related to the issue of bullying are much harder

to find”. In addition, since to date, no research has been done to study the impact of these four variables of self-esteem, peer support, school climate and parenting style on bullying/victimization in Lebanese Armenian schools, this study was conducted to shed light on the bullying problem, providing valuable information to practitioners, parents and school administrations in their effort to create positive school environments, and to foster learning and socialization. The study also helps school counselors in recommending and working on specific preventive programs that would target the relevant variables at each Armenian school.

Overview of Methodology

This study was quantitative in nature, which included correlational analyses and regression in testing the hypotheses and interpreting the obtained data.

Secondary students, grades 10, 11, and 12 attending Armenian secondary schools in Beirut, Lebanon, and its suburbs participated in the study. They filled self-reported questionnaires that assessed their involvement in bullying or victimization, their self-esteem and their perception of school climate, peer support and parenting styles. Four instruments were used in the study: the two subscales of bullying and victimization of the Illinois Bully Scale (2001), the two subscales of the Students School Survey (2007): School Climate and Perceived Peer Support, Parental Authority Questionnaire (1990), and Rosenberg’s Self-esteem Scale (1965).

The students were asked to answer the questions anonymously in order to control any bias on the part of the students in filling the questionnaires. Before conducting the research, the consent of each school principal was obtained. The researcher was present

during the administration of the questionnaires to provide information about bullying, to explain the purpose of the study and to answer the questions asked by the participants.

Delimitations of the Study

The current research has a few boundaries that cause the findings to lack generalizability. Participation in the study was limited to Armenian students attending Armenian secondary schools, which implied that the results could not be generalized to Armenian students attending non-Armenian schools, as the context of the school changes completely from Armenian to non-Armenian schools.

Another delimitation of the study is that data were collected only from self-reported questionnaires, and whether the students were totally honest in filling the questionnaires was questionable, though participants were asked to respond anonymously in order to rule out respondents' bias in providing information.

Definitions of Key Terms

Authoritarian Parent: Values obedience and favors punitive, forceful measures to curb self-will at points where the child's actions or beliefs conflict with what the parent thinks is right conduct (Baumrind, 1978, p. 244).

Authoritative Parent: Directs the child's activities in a rational issue-oriented manner, encourages verbal give and take, shares with the child the reasoning behind parental policy and solicits the child's objections when the child refuses to conform (Baumrind, 1978, p. 245).

Bullying: To treat abusively or to affect by means of force and coercion (Merriam-Webster online Dictionary)

Bully: The person who intentionally inflicts injury or discomfort on someone else through physical contact, with words, spreading rumors or excluding someone from a group (Olweus, 2003).

Parenting Style: A constellation of attitudes toward the child that are communicated to the child and that, taken together, create an emotional climate in which the parent's behaviors are expressed (Darling & Steinberg, 1993, p. 488).

Permissive Parent: Behaves in an affirmative, acceptant, and benign manner towards the child's impulses and actions (Baumrind, 1978, p. 244).

School Climate: "School climate is a general concept that captures the atmosphere of a school: it is experienced by teachers and administrators, describes their collective perceptions of routine behavior, and affects their attitudes and behavior in the school" (Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R., 2002).

Victim: A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students. (Olweus, 1993, p.9).

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the course of the past 30 years, bullying became a universal problem for schools and communities at large. At first, researchers focused their efforts on understanding the bullying problem, determining its prevalence and revealing the negative consequences. Later on, after the suicide of three 14-year old boys in Norway as a consequence of harassment by classmates, much research was dedicated to establishing preventive programs that would successfully reduce bullying in schools (Espelage & Swearer, 2003).

This review of the literature starts with presenting a clear definition of the bullying construct, followed by an exploration of the different theoretical models that have interpreted the bullying behavior, starting from the individual perspective to the systemic one. Furthermore, the review delves into each independent variable of this study, namely self-esteem, school climate, peer support and parent-child relationships, providing information about each concept, followed by the empirical research pertinent to the related construct.

Defining Bullying

There is a substantial number of bullying definitions. However, according to Swearer, Siebecker, Johnsen-Frerichs and Wang (2010), researchers agree that the most extensively used definition is the one derived by Olweus, who in his book *Bullying at School*, defines bullying as follows: “A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more

other students” (p. 9). By negative action, Olweus (1993) refers to the intention of someone to cause harm or discomfort to another person. This definition implies that the behavior is purposeful, that it involves an imbalance of power or power differential, and that it is continuously repeated.

Bullying as purposeful behavior. Swearer et al. (2010) state that the bully purposefully inflicts harm on the victim, and that this harm can be physical, verbal, relational or social. Much of the initial research focused on physical bullying (hitting, pushing, fighting and kicking); and only recently researchers found out that school children and youth can bully others in many ways, such as verbal (name-calling and teasing in a hurtful way), relational or social (gossiping, leaving someone out of the group and spreading rumors).

Wang, Iannotti and Nansel (2009) consider physical and verbal bullying to be a direct form of bullying, whereas relational bullying to be an indirect form. According to them, boys are more involved in direct bullying, while girls are more engaged in indirect bullying.

Bullying as an imbalance of power. There is a power differential between the bully and the victim in such a way that the bully has more authority than the victim does. This authority or power can be manifested in either physical strength or high social status, whereby the bully can easily damage the victim’s social standing. This imbalance of physical strength or power over the victim makes it very difficult for the victim to defend himself or herself. (Swearer et al. 2010).

Bullying as a repeated behavior. Bullying happens repeatedly. This means that a single act of “negative action” or harassment may not be considered bullying and that the

negative act or the behavior has to be performed “repeatedly and over time” (Olweus, 1993). The implication is that occasional negative behavior that is not serious cannot be considered bullying.

There is also agreement among researchers (Olweus, 2001a; Olweus, 2001b) (as cited by Olweus, 2003) about what is meant by involvement in bullying. In the bullying literature, the following roles are identified: The *bully*, who is the person (or the group) inflicting harm on other students; the *victim*, the student who is the target of bullying; the *bully-victim*: this is the student who is both engaged in bullying and is bullied; and the *bystanders*: students who observe and witness bullying.

Theoretical Models for Interpreting Bullying Behavior

In order to grasp the dynamics of bullying behavior one has to look at certain theories that explain bullying and relational behavior. The two viewpoints that describe behavior formation in relationships are discussed below, the Individual Perspective and the Systemic Perspective:

The Individual Perspective. Under the “Individual Perspective”, three theories are discussed, namely, the Behaviorist Theory, the Cognitive Theory and the Role Modeling Theory. Starting with the behaviorists, learning theorists state that certain behaviors get repeated over time if they bring some kind of benefit to the individual involved; which implies that reinforced behaviors become habitual (McLeod, 2009). This principle, which is known as operant conditioning, is also relevant to bullying behavior. To understand bullying, one has to find the answer to the question: what benefit does the person get from bullying or controlling another person? In case of the victim, the

development of a conditioned behavior, a phenomenon known as “learned helplessness” might shed light on why a person may surrender to being controlled by another person (Seligman, 1975) (as cited in Lines, 2008). Learned helplessness is a condition where the person allows himself/herself to be violated or bullied. Learned helplessness may serve, at an unconscious level, a psychological purpose for the victim, being perceived as a person worthy of attention for the audience - in this case the bystanders or the school staff (Lines, 2008).

According to the cognitive theory, on the other hand, it is the faulty thinking of the person that creates difficulties, not the problem itself (Beck, 1976; Ellis, 1962) (as cited in Lines, 2008). This approach puts forward that some young people form faulty cognitions or conclusions because of negative past experiences, thinking ‘nobody likes me’, or ‘I’m no good’. In the case of the bullying behavior, if a person supposes, due to his/her faulty thinking, that a classmate intends to harm him/her, the person might overreact in a way resulting in a negative outcome (Lines, 2008).

Finally, according to Bandura (1976) (as cited in Lines, 2008), certain behaviors – in this case aggressive or violent behaviors - are learned, consciously or unconsciously, through modeling by significant people in an individual’s life or surrounding. The role-modeling principle is another element of the learning theory.

The Systemic Perspective. The systemic perspective states that behavior is shaped or is affected by the interaction between people. Bullying in schools stems from the relationship between two people; thus, it is a relationship problem. Two theories are discussed here under the Systemic Perspective, namely, the Systems Theory and the Developmental Theory. First, the System Theory focuses on the family, which is a

system where the parts are interrelated in such a way that it gives meaning to the whole. The behavior of a family member cannot be taken into consideration without looking at its effect on other family members or on the whole unit (Lines, 2008). This has implication for bullying, as bullying behavior has to be considered within the group context, and group dynamics has to be taken into consideration when interpreting individual bullying behavior. Lines (2008) states that according to the systems theory there are no individual problems, but that problems exist within the system, that behaviors are reciprocal, and that understanding a behavior would be misleading without looking at its meaning within the group. Applying this to bullying, it would be misleading to look at the behavior of one person without considering the mutual behavior of the other group members.

The Developmental Theory, on the other hand, describes how adolescents go through certain cognitive and hormonal changes that prompt aggression (Lines, 2008). During this developmental period, adolescents display transferred loyalty from their parents and teachers to their peer groups. There is an increased need to identify with and belong to their adolescent group. To this end, bullying and dominance may promote the process of identification and belonging (Lines, 2008).

Self-Esteem and the Characteristics of the Bully and the Victim

Self-esteem, “a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the self” (Rosenberg, 1965), is a perception; a person’s outlook toward his/her personal value, affected by the involvement of the person in social life; and since the social world of a person is

characterized by interpersonal relationships, interpersonal conflicts, at times, might lead to behaviors such as bullying (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010).

Olweus (1993), after extensive research, has come up with a clear picture of the typical bully and the victim, their characteristics, and their perception of their self-esteem. A distinguishing characteristic of the bullies is their positive attitude toward violence and use of violent means, their aggression toward peers, parents and teachers. They like to be stronger than others, and tend to dominate people in general, and victims in particular. Usually bullies are impulsive, with little empathy toward the victim. They have strong views of themselves and are popular among their peers. The typical bully has an aggressive reaction pattern (Olweus, 1993).

Victims, on the other hand, are known to be anxious, insecure, sensitive, cautious and quiet. Usually they react by crying, mainly in the lower grades, when attacked by bullies. Their view of themselves and their situation is negative; as such, they regard themselves to be failures and unattractive; and at times, they even feel stupid and ashamed (Olweus, 1993).

Most of the time victims do not have a good friend in their class, and that is why they usually are lonely and abandoned. Unlike the bullies, they have a negative attitude toward both violence and use of violent means. Victims are neither aggressive nor teasing in their behavior (Olweus, 1993).

The literature about the relationship of bullying and self-esteem reveals different findings. In their study about adolescents' perception of bullying, Frisen, Jonsson and Persson (2007) reported that the most common answer by the adolescents to the question of 'why adolescents bully others' was that bullies have low self-esteem. They found this

answer interesting because according to them, earlier research revealed contradictory results to the question of whether bullies have high or low self-esteem. Lower levels of self-esteem were also correlated with experiences of cyberbullying, both in the case of bullies and the victims (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010). On the other hand, according to Estevez, Murgui and Musitu (2009), bullies had positive views of themselves, similar to those adolescents not involved in bullying. They also added that since bullies were the central figures in their group, they enjoyed being socially included, and this, in turn, had a positive influence on their self-perception.

Graham (2010) considered the belief that bullies have low self-esteem to be a myth. According to her, the origin of this myth lies in the idea that people uncritically accept the thought that those who bully do so because their self-concept is poor. She adds that the contrary is true, owing to many studies which report that bullies have a positive view of themselves, and that they even have inflated self-views (Baumeister, Campbell, Kruger & Vohs, 2003).

School Climate and Its Role in the Bullying Problem

A positive school climate that promotes a caring attitude fosters students' sense of belonging to the school. A school that is characterized by its positive climate is inviting. In such an environment, the likelihood of aggressive behavior is reduced and students perform better academically (Eisenberg, Neumark-Sztainer, & Perry, 2003).

Orpinas & Horne (2010) found eight critical components that are important in fostering a positive school climate and reducing bullying: a) excellence in teaching, b) school values, c) policies and accountability, d) awareness of strengths and problems, e)

positive expectations, f) caring and respect, g) teacher support, and h) physical environment characteristics. These components are explained below:

Excellence in Teaching. Students' academic performance is an important goal for schools, and it can be promoted through good teaching skills, well-prepared lesson plans, and an ability and willingness to inspire students (Hein, 2004) (as cited in Orpinas & Horne, 2010). Good teaching skills include not only mastery of the subject matter, but excellent skills in classroom dynamics, where teachers exercise respect and dignity while teaching, and facilitate understanding rather than rote memorization.

School Values. Three school values that encourage a positive school climate, thereby reducing bullying, are: 1) all individuals in the school community ought to be treated respectfully and with dignity, 2) all students are capable of learning, and 3) violence, bullying and aggressive behavior are intolerable (Bosworth, 2000) (as cited in Orpinas & Horne, 2010). Educators need to not only take part in defining these values, but also have to endorse and practice them in their everyday life at school.

Policies and Accountability. In order to enhance a positive school climate, schools need to take the following two into consideration: a) policies to prevent bullying, and b) accountability of the offender. For the most successful outcome, all members of the school community have to participate in the decision-making process, providing their input in solving discipline problems.

Curwin and Mendler (1988) differentiate between responsibility and obedience. They promote responsibility, because it makes the students accountable for their decisions. Under this model, when a student bullies someone, s/he might be asked to

apologize to the bullied student, and to think about an alternative method of behavior in similar future circumstances.

Awareness of Strengths and Problems. In order to improve and be able to change, educators need to be aware of problems that need to be solved and strengths that should be taken advantage of in schools. Throughout this process, educators need to be careful in their attitudes, stated through such expressions as: “bullying is just a normal part of childhood” (p.51), or “it is best to ignore bullying incidents” (p.51) (Orpinas & Horne, 2010).

Positive Expectations. Teachers’ expectations of their students have an impact on how they behave toward those students; which, in turn, have their consequences on the students’ behavior and performance in school (Kolb & Jussim, 1994). When teachers have positive expectations of students, they tend to explain in detail and provide more feedback, thus enhancing a classroom climate that facilitates learning.

Caring and Respect. Hein (2004) puts forward that when educators demonstrate caring and respect toward their students, they create an environment where all students display proper behavior out of respect for their peers rather than as a result of fear. Some strategies that foster caring and respect are: a) planning activities that enhance connectedness, such as cooperative learning, b) being a role model demonstrating respect and caring, by avoiding yelling at students or using sarcastic expressions.

Teacher Support. Teachers play an important role in creating positive classroom environments. However, daily stress and the demands posed on them may cause burnout and teacher exhaustion. Teachers who are worn out tend to perceive their students as demonstrating aggressive behavior and misconduct, which makes them have low

expectations for their students. To avoid such a negative atmosphere, teachers need all the support from the administration; they also need to attend skills development workshops and training sessions, bringing up to date their information and knowledge (Orpinas & Horne, 2010).

Physical Environment. A physical environment that is clean, safe and beautifully equipped also helps promote positive school climate just as relationships between people do (Orpinas & Horne, 2010).

In other words, the above discussed meaning of school climate (i.e., teachers' respect for the students, teachers' fairness, the methods employed by the staff to prevent bullying, the principals' positive attitude towards the students) and how the students perceive that climate plays an important role in whether students get involved in aggressive behavior or not. A positive perception about the school will help students feel they belong to a place where teachers and staff are supportive and fair. On the other hand, if too much bullying exists in a school, it will bring about a negative impact on school climate.

According to Eliot, Cornell, Gregory & Fan (2010), an important aspect in reducing bullying is whether students feel enough support at schools to report about episodes of bullying or not. Middle school students' perception of supportive school climate was a key element in their willingness to seek help from teachers and other adults for bullying. When students perceived their teachers to be caring, respectful and interested in their well-being, they were encouraged to tell their teachers that they or their classmates were being bullied.

Respect is an important component of school climate. How much respect students receive from their teachers affects their experiences of bullying. Langdon and Preble (2008) found out that perceived respect from both adults and peers at the school was significantly correlated with bullying, whereby those students who perceived respect reported lower levels of bullying than those students who observed or received lower levels of respect.

Inconsistent with the above results is the research by Delfabbro et al. (2006), who in their study about the nature and the prevalence of bullying/victimization by peers and teachers in Australian private schools, found out that over 40% of the students reported having been either bullied or picked on by teachers. The results showed that the victims of teacher victimization had less intention to complete school and were more likely to be engaged in drug use, gambling and under-age drinking.

Flaspohler, Elfstrom, Vanderzee, Sink & Birchmeier (2009) reported that perceived social support from peers and teachers has differential effects on the relationship between quality of life and experiences of bullying. The results suggested that students who are not involved in bullying feel more supported by their peers and teachers compared to those who bully and/or are bullied. They added that their results are in harmony with previous research, which indicates that, those students who are not engaged in bullying feel they are connected to their peers in mutual friendship and that they have supportive teachers at their school.

From Peer Rejection/Exclusion to Peer Support

Children who bully constantly demonstrate power, and this power demonstration is done in the presence of peers. It is possible that bullying might attract observers, or it might be initiated when a group of students is already present. Whatever the situation, peers who witness bullying might be either part of the problem or part of the solution (Salmivalli, Karna & Poskiparta, 2010).

According to Buhs, Ladd, & Herald-Brown (2010), bystanders, who do not support the victim and encourage the bully's behavior do so by cheering and laughing, or by silently witnessing what is happening, which the bully interprets as approval of his/her behavior. Thus, the performance and the attitudes of peers, in this case, are likely to maintain and encourage bullying rather than help the victim. Attitudes of peers are an indicator of the level of peer sentiment, how much they like or dislike a certain student. Peers show their dislike for a classmate by treating him/her negatively; and this negative treatment serves as an indicator of peer rejection. Once a student is marked by this maltreatment, s/he is more likely to be marginalized by classmates, which results in the student withdrawing, or becoming swayed toward the edge of the classroom or the corner of the playground. This means that peers who become aware of targeted students tend to avoid and exclude them from their activities. These targeted students are also likely to avoid getting involved in peer activities to escape further abuse or maltreatment. Thus, peer rejection results in withdrawn behavior patterns and might cause a range of school adjustment problems (Buhs, Ladd, & Herald-Brown, 2010).

Not all peers support the bully, however. There are students who defend the victim. Peers who support the victim have certain characteristics, which might also be taken into consideration while devising prevention programs.

Bystanders who display pro-victim behavior are distinguished by their empathy, which is often associated with helping and pro-social conduct (Eisenber, 1987). Another characteristic that has positive association with supporting the victim is peers' self-efficacy, the perception of their abilities to engage in pro-social behavior, and their knowledge of how it can be done. A further distinguishing quality of supportive peers is their high status in the classroom. Students who perceive themselves to be popular tend to take sides with the victim (Caravita, DiBlasio, & Salmivalli, 2009). The reason why socially preferred children are inclined to defend the victim is their reduced risk of being a victim themselves and their secured position in the group. Another motive for pro-social behavior on their part is their belief that their parents and friends expect them to protect and stand for the victim (Rigby & Johnson, 2006).

Researchers have come up with differing results about the influence and the role of peer support on students and adolescents' psychological well-being and on the extent to which they bully or are bullied.

In their research about the relationship between being bullied and psychosocial adjustment among Chinese students, Cheng et al. (2010) describe a number of protective factors against being bullied, among which is the supportive social network in schools, where sampled students who reported that most of their peers in their school were kind and helpful and who had close friends, were less likely to be bullied than those students who did not. In another study about the mediating role of perceived peer support in the

relationship between peer victimization and academic adjustment, Wang, Iannotti & Luk (2011) report that perceived classmate support was negatively correlated with victimization and positively correlated with academic adjustment. Wang et al. (2011) state that their findings are consistent with previous studies that have shown that adolescents who receive less peer support and have fewer friends are at greater risk to be bullied.

In their study, which focused on the perspective of former victims, Frisen, Hasselblad & Holmqvist (2012), found out that peer support had an insignificant role in stopping bullying, as very few adolescents reported that bullying stopped as a result of peer support. Their study revealed that adolescents in general, and victims in particular, do not perceive peer support an effective anti-bullying mechanism. According to Juvonen and Galvan (2008) (as cited in Frisen et al. 2012), peers do not interfere in stopping the bullying because of two reasons: First, because they want to strengthen their social standing by siding with the person in power, that is the bully; and second, because by appearing as if they accept the bully's behavior, they might be protected from being bullied themselves.

Bullying and Parent-Child Relationship

Parent-child relationship is of utmost importance in promoting healthy child development. Many aspects of this relationship have an impact on children's personality and their social, emotional and behavioral development.

The Effect of Parent-Child Relationship on the Bully. The attachment bond between an infant and his/her mother or primary caregiver is the earliest bond in life, and

it guides the person's future relationships throughout his/her lifespan (Bowlby, 1969). Securely attached children turn out to be more competent and socialized adults than insecurely attached children. Research demonstrates that bullies' attachment style with their parents in their childhood is an insecure one (Monks, Smith, & Swettenham, 2005; Troy & Sroufe, 1987).

Social support, which has to do with interpersonal relationships, impacts an individual's psychological functioning and behavior. A person gets social support first from parents and then from the social network of peers. Aspects of social support are emotional support (feelings of love and trust); appraisal support (getting evaluative feedback and positive reinforcement); informational support (receiving guidance and advice); and instrumental support (time spent with the support agent, or materials received). According to Rigby (1994), bullies report perceiving lower levels of parental emotional support, and this perception of lack of parental social support predicts adolescents' involvement in other violent behaviors, such as using a weapon in school. Furthermore, research by Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon (2000) indicates that lack of time spent with parents (instrumental aspect of social support) and not having enough parental supervision (informational aspect of social support) are associated with adolescent bullying.

Parenting style, characterized by authoritative, authoritarian or permissive approaches, influences children's behavior. Parents who employ an authoritarian parenting style, portrayed by physical punishment, high parental control and very little warmth, raise children who are aggressive and display violent emotional outburst (Olweus, 1993). Parents' use of physical punishment is associated with children's

bullying behavior (Nickerson et al, 2010). Conversely, permissive parenting style, marked by low parental control and high warmth allows “aggressive behavior on the part of the child” (Olweus, 1993, p. 39). As these parents are tolerant of aggressive behavior, the level of their children’s aggression is expected to increase.

The affective atmosphere in the family is also related to bullying behavior. Rigby (2005) found that a negative emotional atmosphere in families was a strong predictor of adolescents’ involvement in bullying. Lack of parental affection and warmth, in addition to weak emotional attachment are related to bullying behavior.

The Effect of Parent-Child Relationship on the Victim. Looking at the attachment style of victims, Troy and Sroufe (1987) found that the history of the victims’ parent-child relationship is marked by insecure attachment. When parents provide emotional, informational, instrumental and appraisal support, children are less likely to be victimized.

Enmeshment in the family and in the parent-child relationships refers to controlling patterns on behalf of the parents, who restrain the independence of another family member. Enmeshment with parents, where overprotection and emotionally intense interactions are regular patterns of parents’ behavior, is strongly linked with victimization. Different methodologies, such as observations (Ladd & Ladd, 1998), children’s self-report (Finnegan, Hodges, & Perry, 1998), and interviews with parents of victimized children (Olweus, 1993) have been implemented in different studies revealing the strong association between enmeshment and victimization. Besides, children who are enmeshed with their parents form a “victim schema”, where they perceive themselves as helpless and consider their parents to be controlling. According to Perry, Hodges, & Egan

(2001), this perception leads to peer victimization (as cited in Nickerson et al, 2010).

Victimization is also related to being physically or emotionally abused by the parents.

Research Findings on Parent-Child Relationship. Studying the parental style and the child's bullying and victimization experiences at school, Georgiou (2008) reports that permissive mothers (who are high in responsiveness by definition) raise children who score low in bullying. Responsiveness, according to Georgiou's study, protects children from aggressiveness, and teaches them, in a social learning manner, how to be sociable and friendly to others, especially to those who are weak and vulnerable. However, this same responsiveness and permissiveness places children at risk for victimization, because permissive/responsive parents, by being overprotective, turn their children into submissive individuals who easily become targets for bullying.

In contrast to the above mentioned results, Kawataba, Alink, Tsend, Ijzendoorn and Crick (2011) report that uninvolved parenting, which according to them matches Baumrind's *permissive parenting style*, fails to set limits to children's disruptive behavior, thereby negatively reinforcing relational aggression. In addition, since uninvolved/permissive parents do not supervise or monitor their children's behavior, they are unable to stop them from behaving aggressively.

In a study about the association of parenting styles with relational aggression in adolescents, Kawataba et al. (2011) demonstrated that a positive parenting style, which, according to them, matches Baumrind's *authoritative parenting style*, supports children, creates a positive, safe and comfortable environment; hence, it is associated with lower levels of aggression. Children of authoritative parents are more pro-social and able to

control their emotions, thereby not reacting with emotional aggression in confusing and stressful social situations.

According to Christie-Mizell, Keil, Laske and Stewart (2011), fathers' work hours and adolescents' perception of time spent with their fathers has a significant association with bullying. When adolescents perceive that they spend adequate time with their fathers, they will be at less risk for behavior problems and bullying. According to Christie-Mizell et al. (2011), a quality home environment that incorporates emotional support and cognitive stimulation (which are characteristics of authoritative parenting style) is a buffer against bullying.

According to the study by Kawataba et al. (2011), children of harsh or authoritarian parents fail to learn emotion regulation and social competence; they find it difficult to control their anger when they get mad at their peers; hence, they display aggressive behavior, whether physical or relational.

Ahmad and Braithwaite (2002) mention that bullies can be recognized by their family environments, because their parents usually endorse and approve of the authoritarian parenting style.

Studying parental maltreatment, bullying and adolescent depression, Seeds, Harkness and Quilty (2010) reveal that father-perpetrated maltreatment and bullying are related to depression; this is obvious in adolescents' perception that they are isolated from their peers and hence have poor perception of social support.

Conclusion

In summary, this literature review portrayed the most extensively used definition of bullying, adequately clarifying the terms used in the definition. The following section on the theoretical models extended the information on bullying, providing an understanding of the bullying problem from the different perspectives of the behavioral, cognitive, role-modeling, systems and developmental theories. How do the bully and the victim perceive their self-esteem, and what characterizes the typical bully and the victim were the next aspects of bullying reviewed in this chapter; followed by a brief explanation of the eight components of a positive school climate. Furthermore, the consequences of peer rejection or support on both the victim and the bully were evaluated, alongside an explanation of how peer rejection might lead to victimization. Finally, the effects of parent-child relationship on the bully and the victim were presented, including an account of the role the attachment bond, the social support, the different parenting styles, the affective atmosphere of the family and the enmeshment with the parents may play in the bullying problem.

In conclusion, based on the above-discussed review of literature, the following research hypotheses were predicted:

- 1) There will be a negative correlation between self-esteem and both bullying and victimization.
- 2) There will be a positive correlation between perceived peer support and bullying and negative correlation between perceived peer support and victimization.

- 3) There will be a negative correlation between school climate and both bullying and victimization.
- 4) There will be a positive correlation between perceived permissive parenting style and both bullying and victimization.
- 5) There will be a negative correlation between perceived authoritative parenting style and both bullying and victimization.
- 6) There will be a positive correlation between perceived authoritarian parenting style and both bullying and victimization.

METHOD

This study explored the relationship between school bullying and secondary students' self-esteem, perceived peer support, school climate and parenting style. It was performed by having students provide demographic information and fill in questionnaires that assess the extent to which they are involved in bullying, their level of self-esteem, their perception of school climate, peer support and parenting styles.

The following chapter provides information about the research design and context, research subjects, instruments used, and procedures employed for data collection and data analysis.

General Perspective

As a quantitative study, this research used correlational analysis and regression in analyzing the data and interpreting the results.

Research Context

The study took place in the classrooms of Armenian secondary schools from which students were recruited. It covered a period of one and a half years, from October 2012 to February 2014.

Although there are 12 Armenian secondary schools in Lebanon, only 10 schools were considered for this study. Two schools were not taken into consideration because of the difference in the context of these schools with respect to the rest. The first difference was that these two schools were located in the rural area of the Bekaa Valley, while the rest of the schools were located in the city of Beirut and its suburbs. The second

difference was that some of the students attending one of these two schools remained in the dormitory of the school after school hours, because they had specific family circumstances – they came from broken families, or had parents with very low socioeconomic status, or in case of some students, they were from abroad. Hence, in order not to discriminate between students, these two schools were not included in the study.

Participants

Students in grade 10, 11 and 12 from all the Armenian secondary schools in Beirut and its suburbs participated in the study.

The total number of the participants was 534. Forty students were included in the first pilot study, and 27 students were taken in the second pilot study. During the data collection two students returned incompletely answered surveys. Hence, the response rate was 99.5%. The remaining 465 students were the subject of the research. Henceforth, the statistics provided under this heading and the forthcoming Results Chapter pertains to the remaining 465 students and 9 schools only. The gender distribution was 195 males (41.9 %) and 270 females (58.1%). The grade distribution was as follows: grade 10, 187 students (40.2 %); grade 11, 171 students (36.8 %), and grade 12, 107 students (23 %).

To preserve confidentiality, the 9 schools, which were included in this study, are designated with numerical numbers.

Materials Used in Data Collection

The participants were given a leaflet that included the instruments of this study, in addition to the demographic information sheet.

The demographic information sheet asked the students to specify their gender and grade level, their political or religious affiliation, the number of siblings, and their birth order.

Illinois Bully Scale

In order to indicate the extent of bullying, the Illinois Bully Scale (IBS) was administered to the students (see Appendix A). The Illinois Bully Scale was developed by Espelage and Holt in 2001. It targets youth between the ages of 8 to 18. The Illinois Bully Scale is an 18-item instrument that assesses the frequency of bullying, fighting and victimization by peers. Only the subscales pertaining to bullying and victimization were utilized in this study. The bullying subscale included items 1, 2, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18, which were related to teasing, name-calling, rumor spreading and social exclusion; while the victimization subscale comprised of items 4, 5, 6, and 7, which were related to being picked on, called names, made fun of, and pushed or hit. For both subscales, the response options varied from Never through 7 or more times. Each subscale was scored by summing the respective items. For the bullying subscale, the range was from 0 to 36, with higher scores indicating more bullying perpetration; whereas for the victimization subscale, the range was from 0 to 16, with higher scores indicating more victimization. According to Espelage and Holt (2001), the Cronbach alpha for bullying subscale was 0.87, and for the victimization subscale 0.88.

Student School Survey

School climate and perceived peer support were measured using the two subscales of the Student School Survey (SSS): School Climate and Perceived Peer Support. The Student School Survey addresses youth between the ages of 10 to 17; it was developed by Williams and Guerra, 2007 (see Appendix B).

The School Climate subscale comprised 9 items about school staff and administrators, teachers, school policy and the student's perception of his/her connectedness to the school. The subscale was scored by summing the items to form an additive index. Scales ranged from 1-Really Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Agree, to 4-Really Agree. Possible scores ranged from 9 to 36, with high scores indicating perception of a positive school climate. According to Williams and Guerra (2007), the alpha coefficient for the School Climate subscale was .84.

The Perceived Peer Support subscale included 4 items that centered on positive and negative characteristics of peers, which students consider a basis for social support. The scales ranged from 1-No, Not at All, 2-A Little, 3-Pretty Much, to 4-Yes, Completely. The 4 items were summed to form possible scores that ranged from a low of 4 to a high of 16, with high scores indicating perception of peers as supportive, while low scores implied the negative view. According to Williams and Guerra (2007), the alpha coefficient for this subscale was .79.

Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)

Students' perception of parenting style was assessed using the Parental Authority Questionnaire, developed by Buri, 1991 (see Appendix C). PAQ targets older adolescents and young adults. The instrument consisted of 3 subscales, with 10 items for each of the permissive (items 1, 6, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24 and 28), authoritative (items 4, 5, 8, 11, 15, 20, 22, 23, 27 and 30) and authoritarian (items 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 16, 18, 25, 26 and 29) parenting style subscale. Scales ranged from 1-Strongly Disagree, 2 -Disagree, 3 -Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 -Agree, to 5 -Strongly Agree. Each subscale was scored by summing up the items to form an additive index, and possible scores ranged from 10 to 50 for each parenting style, with higher scores reflecting a more permissive, authoritative or authoritarian parenting styles. Each student received a different score for each of the three parenting styles. The original instrument consisted of 30 items that provided permissive, authoritative and authoritarian scores for both the mother and the father independently (Buri, 1991). However, for the purpose of estimating the parenting styles from a holistic viewpoint, Wu Maryann (2009) used the scale to assess overall parenting style, rather than performing a separate assessment for each of the father and the mother independently. According to Wu (2009), the internal reliability for the permissive parenting style was .82, and for the authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles it was .88, respectively.

Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale

To estimate the students' level of self-esteem, Rosenberg's self-esteem scale was used (see Appendix D). An instrument developed by Rosenberg in 1965, it included 10

items. Items 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 had positive connotation, and the scales ranged from 0-Strongly Disagree, 1-Disagree, 2-Agree to 3-Strongly Agree. The rest of the items carried negative implication, and the scales ranged from 0-Strongly Agree, 1-Agree, 2-Disagree to 3-Strongly Disagree. Scores were computed by summing the items, and possible scores ranged between 0 and 30, where higher scores suggested positive self-esteem, and scores below 15 implied low self-esteem. According to Patchin and Hinduja (2010), the Cronbach alpha of the scale was .768.

Procedure

Before conducting the research, the investigator of this study held a separate meeting with the principal of each school, to explain the purpose of the research, to obtain the principals' consent and schedule the data collection at each school. Prior to administering the questionnaires, the researcher provided information about bullying to the students, explained the purpose of the study, and answered questions posed by the participants. To maintain confidentiality and to safeguard against student bias in filling the questionnaires, students were asked to answer the questions anonymously.

A pilot study was conducted to test the reliability of the instruments with the population under study, using the following instruments: a) the four subscales of the Student School Survey: Bully Perpetration, Bully Victimization, School Climate and Perceived Peer Support; b) Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, and c) the Parental Authority Questionnaire. As the two subscales of Bully Perpetration and Bully Victimization did not yield reliable results, they were dropped from the second pilot study and were replaced by the bullying and victimization subscales of the Illinois Bully Scale,

meanwhile keeping the remaining two instruments of Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale and Parental Authority Questionnaire. Moreover, since participants asked various questions about the meaning of several items in the Parental Authority Questionnaire, the instruments were translated into Armenian, with a second back translation into English prior to conducting the second pilot study (see Appendix E).

To analyze the data, parenting style, self-esteem, school climate and perceived peer support were used as the four independent variables of the study, while bullying perpetration and victimization were used as the two dependent variables. Parenting style was measured using students' scores from the Parental Authority Questionnaire; self-esteem was calculated using students' answers to Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale; whereas school climate and perceived peer support were determined utilizing the indices from the Student School Survey. The extent to which students bully or are victimized was computed using scores from the Illinois Bully Scale. Multiple regression analyses were considered in examining the six hypotheses of the study, including the role of parenting style, self-esteem, school climate and perceived peer support in predicting bullying and victimization.

RESULTS

This chapter provides an overview of the results of the current study, including reliability testing, prevalence of bullying and victimization, hypotheses testing and regression analysis.

Reliability testing

This study used the following scales: the Bullying and Victimization subscales of the Illinois Bully Scale; the School Climate and the Perceived Peer Support subscales of the Student School Survey; the Permissive Parenting Style, Authoritative Parenting Style and Authoritarian Parenting Style subscales of the Parental Authority Questionnaire; and Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale. The internal reliability of these scales was determined by calculating the Chronbach's alpha for each scale and subscale (see Table 1).

Table 1
Chronbach's alpha for the subscales and for the self-esteem scale

Scale	Previous Chronbach alpha	Current Chronbach alpha
Bullying Perpetration	0.87	0.872
Victimization	0.88	0.81
School Climate	0.84	0.795
Perceived Peer Support	0.79	0.806
Pemissive Parenting Style	0.82	0.561
Authoritative Parenting Style	0.88	0.681
Authoritarian Parenting Style	0.88	0.631
Self-esteem Scale	0.768	0.726

Prevalence of Bullying and Victimization

Out of a total number of 465 students, 7.96% ($n=37$) were identified as bullies, and 15% ($n=70$) as victims.

Bullies and victims were defined as those students who scored between 2 and 4 on the Bullying and Victimization subscales of the Illinois Bully Scale; that is, those students who bullied between “3 or 4 times” and “7 or more times” in the past month.

Hypothesis Testing

To test the relationship between the variables of self-esteem, perceived peer support, school climate, permissive parenting style, authoritative parenting style, authoritative parenting style, and bullying and victimization, Pearson product correlation analysis was conducted.

Hypothesis 1: There will be a negative correlation between self-esteem and each of bullying and victimization.

Hypothesis one was confirmed, as the results of the correlation revealed that self-esteem was negatively and significantly correlated with each of bullying, $r = -.127$, $p = .006$, and victimization, $r = -.290$, $p = .000$ (see table 2).

Hypothesis 2: There will be a positive correlation between perceived peer support and bullying and a negative correlation between perceived peer support and victimization.

Hypothesis two was partially confirmed, since the results of the correlation between perceived peer support and each of bullying and victimization showed that peer support was significantly and negatively correlated with victimization, $r = -.321$, $p = .000$, but was not significantly related to bullying (see table 2).

Hypothesis 3: There will be a negative correlation between school climate and each of bullying and victimization.

Hypothesis three was confirmed as Pearson product correlation analysis revealed a significant negative correlation between school climate and each of bullying $r = -.169$, $p = .000$ and victimization $r = -.179$, $p = .000$ (see table 2).

Hypothesis 4: There will be a positive correlation between perceived permissive parenting style and each of bullying and victimization.

Hypothesis four was partially confirmed, as the results of the analysis showed a significant positive correlation between permissive parenting style and bullying, $r = .097$, $p = .036$. No significant correlation was found, however, between permissive parenting style and victimization (see table 2).

Hypothesis 5: There will be a negative correlation between perceived authoritative parenting style and each of bullying and victimization.

Hypothesis 5 was confirmed, as the results of the analyses revealed a significant negative correlation between authoritative parenting style and each of bullying, $r = -.209$, $p = .000$, and victimization, $r = -.224$, $p = .000$ (see table 2).

Hypothesis 6: There will be a positive correlation between perceived authoritarian parenting style and each of bullying and victimization.

Hypothesis six was confirmed, as the correlation analysis showed that there was a significant positive correlation between authoritarian parenting style and each of bullying, $r = .094$, $p = .044$, and victimization, $r = .150$, $p = .001$ (see table 2).

Table 2
Correlations Results

		Correlations						
		School_Climate	Bullying	Victimization	Peer_Support	SEQ	Permissive	Authoritative
Bullying	Pearson Correlation	-.169**						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000						
	N	463						
Victimization	Pearson Correlation	-.179**	.447**					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000					
	N	463	465					
Peer_Support	Pearson Correlation	.330**	-.049	-.321**				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.290	.000				
	N	461	463	463				
SEQ	Pearson Correlation	.160**	-.127**	-.290**	.199**			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.006	.000	.000			
	N	462	464	464	462			
Permissive	Pearson Correlation	-.048	.097*	.037	-.032	-.049		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.304	.036	.427	.492	.293		
	N	462	464	464	462	463		
Authoritative	Pearson Correlation	.190**	-.209**	-.224**	.121**	.219**	-.012	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.009	.000	.793	
	N	462	464	464	462	463	464	
Authoritarian	Pearson Correlation	-.028	.094*	.150**	-.109*	-.146**	.137**	-.152**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.547	.044	.001	.020	.002	.003	.001
	N	462	464	464	462	463	464	464

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Regression analysis

Separate simple regression analyses were computed to analyze the role of the independent variables in significantly predicting bullying and victimization.

Tables 3, 4 and 5 report the results of the regression analyses, where the dependent variable (bullying) was regressed on the 6 independent variables of this study, namely school climate, peer support, self-esteem, permissive parenting style, authoritative parenting style and authoritarian parenting style, in addition to victimization. Table 3 is the ANOVA result. Table 4 displays the coefficients, while table 5 represents the model summary.

Table 3
Significance of the regression model in predicting bullying

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	53.270	7	7.610	18.668	.000 ^a
	Residual	183.849	451	.408		
	Total	237.119	458			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Victimization, Permissive, School_Climate, Authoritarian, Authoritative, SEQ, Peer_Support

b. Dependent Variable: Bullying

For this model, the F ratio is equal to $F = 18.69$, which indicates that adding the predictors school climate, peer support, self-esteem, permissive parenting style, authoritative parenting style, authoritarian parenting style and victimization improved the ability to predict bullying.

Table 4
The strength of each predictor

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.641	.391		1.641	.102
School_Climate	-.198	.070	-.127	-2.839	.005
Victimization	.338	.036	.427	9.341	.000
Peer_Support	.174	.046	.174	3.803	.000
SEQ	.003	.073	.002	.039	.969
Permissive	.100	.062	.068	1.623	.105
Authoritative	-.124	.059	-.092	-2.095	.037
Authoritarian	.030	.058	.022	.505	.614

a. Dependent Variable: Bullying

This model shows that the strongest predictor of bullying is victimization, $\beta = .43$, $p < .05$. The second strongest predictor is school climate, $\beta = -.13$, $p < .05$. The third predictor is authoritative parenting style, $\beta = -.09$, $p < .05$. None of the other variables was a significant predictor of bullying.

Table 5
Percentage of variance explained in bullying

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.474 ^a	.225	.213	.638

a. Predictors: (Constant), Authoritarian, School_Climate, Permissive, SEQ, Authoritative, Victimization, Peer_Support

In this model summary, $R^2 = .225$ accounts for 22.5% of the variance in bullying.

This means that all the predictors school climate, self-esteem, peer support, permissive parenting style, authoritarian parenting style, authoritative parenting style and victimization together can explain only 22.5% of the variance in bullying.

Tables 6, 7 and 8 indicate the results of the regression analyses, where the dependent variable (victimization) was regressed on the 6 independent variables of this study, namely school climate, peer support, self-esteem, permissive, authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles, in addition to bullying. Table 6 displays the ANOVA results. Table 7 shows the coefficients and table 8 represents the model summary.

Table 6
Significance of the regression model in predicting victimization

ANOVA ^b						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	117.644	7	16.806	29.028	.000 ^a
	Residual	261.115	451	.579		
	Total	378.759	458			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Authoritarian, School_Climate, Permissive, Bullying, SEQ, Authoritative, Peer_Support

b. Dependent Variable: Victimization

For this model, the F ratio is equal to $F=16.81$, $p < .05$, which indicates that adding the predictors school climate, peer support, self-esteem, permissive parenting style, authoritative parenting style, authoritarian parenting style and bullying improved

the ability to predict victimization. This shows that the model created does a better job of predicting the victimization than the mean.

Table 7
The strength of each predictor

Coefficients ^a					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	2.338	.454		5.153	.000
School_Climate	.025	.084	.013	.301	.763
Peer_Support	-.318	.053	-.252	-5.976	.000
SEQ	-.363	.085	-.177	-4.274	.000
Permissive	-.042	.074	-.022	-.565	.572
Authoritative	-.121	.071	-.070	-1.703	.089
Authoritarian	.096	.070	.056	1.377	.169
Bullying	.480	.051	.380	9.341	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Victimization

This model shows that the strongest predictor of victimization is bullying, $\beta = .38$, $p < .05$. The second strongest predictor is peer support, $\beta = -.25$, $p < .05$, and the third predictor is self-esteem, $\beta = -.18$. The other predictors were not significant.

Table 8
Percentage of variance explained in victimization

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.557 ^a	.311	.300	.761

a. Predictors: (Constant), Bullying, Peer_Support, Permissive, Authoritarian, Authoritative, SEQ, School_Climate

In this model summary, $R^2 = .311$ accounts for 31.1% of the variance in victimization. This means that the predictors school climate, self-esteem, peer support, permissive parenting style, authoritative parenting style, authoritarian parenting style and bullying can explain a higher variance in victimization (31.1%) compared to bullying (22.5%).

One-way ANOVA

A one-way analysis of variance showed that the nine schools did not differ significantly on the levels of bullying and victimization.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research paper was to study the interrelation between bullying, self-esteem, peer support, school climate, and parenting styles among Armenian secondary students in Lebanon. This chapter provides a discussion of the results, practical implications, limitations of the study and future suggestions.

Discussion of Results

Relationship between Self-esteem, Peer Support, School Climate, Parenting Styles and Bullying

This study sought to explore the relationship between self-esteem, peer support, parenting styles, school climate and bullying. In particular, it was hypothesized that self-esteem would be negatively correlated with bullying. As exemplified in this study, self-esteem was in fact negatively correlated with bullying. This result is supported by the existing literature. Wild, Flisher, Bhana, and Lombard (2004) found out that grade 11 students who scored lower than average in self-esteem reported having bullied others in the past 12 months. They also discovered that low self-esteem in the school milieu was a strong predictor of risk behavior and aggression during adolescence. Rodkin (2012) talks about marginalized bullies and their low self-esteem; he states that their bullying stems from their desire to gain social status, in addition to their inability to control their impulsive behavior. Mentioning the marginalized bully, Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim,

and Sadek (2010) add that the bully “holds significantly negative attitude and beliefs about himself or herself and others” (p. 76).

As for the relationship between perceived peer support and bullying, it was hypothesized that there would be a positive correlation between both variables. However, contrary to the hypothesis, the results of this study did not reveal a significant correlation between them.

Although the literature mentions that peers and bystanders support the bully by cheering or laughing (Buhs et al., 2010; Salmivalli et al., 2010), in a Finnish study assessing peers’ attitudes, besides a small percentage of participants who supported either the bully or the victim, 30% of the students did not take sides with anyone (Salmivalli, 2010). According to Salmivalli (2010), students might monitor each other’s behavior, and when they find out that no one is intervening, they might infer that bullying is not a serious issue, and construe it as mild verbal abuse or as simple joking. This means that they will not have particularly strong attitudes towards the issue, thereby displaying a neutral one. In line with the above-mentioned research, the results of this study revealed that, there was no significant correlation between peer support and bullying. It must be noted, however, that in this particular Armenian sample, rather than being completely neutral, bystanders seem to take the side of the victim, since the results showed that peer support was a strong negative predictor of victimization (as will be discussed in more details later). Hence, more research is warranted to study peer attitudes in Armenian schools, including students’ perception of bullying and whether they consider bullying to be a serious problem.

Available literature talks about the mediating role of positive school climate in decreasing the students' involvement in various undesirable behaviors, including bullying (Wang, Berry, & Swearer, 2013; Klein, Cornell, & Konold, 2012). Bullied students seek help when they perceive teachers and staff as supportive, and when they feel connected to a school that applies policies, reinforces values, and provides a caring atmosphere (Eliot et al., 2010). School climate comprises several dimensions, such as the school organizational structure, social milieu, cultural variables and relationships between the students and the adults (Wang et al., 2013). In line with the above-mentioned findings, the results of this study revealed a negative correlation between school climate and bullying. Moreover, school climate was found to be a significant predictor of bullying. Most of the students in this study feel respected by their teachers, which reflects the caring and respectful atmosphere of Armenian schools, a component Orpinas and Horne (2010) find critical in fostering positive school climate. Orpinas and Horne (2010) also believe that school values play an important role in advancing the positive climate of the school, especially when it comes to considering violence, bullying and aggressive behaviors to be intolerable. Sampled students in this current study regard teachers and staff at their schools as doing the right things to prevent bullying, as expressed by the students' positive answer to the item that assesses the extent to which teachers at the school are doing the right things to prevent bullying.

Wang et al. (2013) define school climate to include feelings of students about school, which participant students indicated through their feeling of belongingness at their schools, and their preference of their school as a good place to be. Talking about school climate, one needs to ask the question whether the school is characterized by a

democratic or an autocratic climate (Rodkin, 2012). A democratic school climate is based on healthy interpersonal relationships between peers and with teachers; something, which Armenian schools promote, by providing the students with the chance to form different clubs (personal communication, December 2013), where group norms are implemented, and group leaders have egalitarian and cohesive relationship with the members. The results of this study suggest that - school climate being a significant predictor of bullying – promoting positive school climate reduces the likelihood of aggressive behavior on behalf of the students.

Children's socialization starts at home. The nature of the parent-child relationship, and the way adolescents perceive that relationship, have an impact on their personality and their social development. Children's psychosocial and emotional functioning has much to do with parenting styles (Brand, Hatzinger, Beck, & Holsboer-Trachsler, 2009). Accordingly, the results of this study (as hypothesized) revealed that both permissive and authoritarian parenting styles were positively correlated with bullying, while the authoritative parenting style was negatively correlated with bullying. These results are in line with previous studies that report about a significant association between the authoritarian parenting style and the high involvement of children in bullying at schools (Rigby, 1994; Espelage et al., 2000; Baldry, & Farrington, 2000; Kokkinos, 2013). Authoritarian parenting is characterized by parental expectations of obedience on behalf of children, in addition to parents' failure in explaining the reasoning behind imposed rules (Rigby, 2013). This was also stated by participant students in the current study, where more than half of the respondents agreed to the statements "Even if their children didn't agree with them, my parents felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to

conform to what they thought was right” and “Whenever my parents told me to do something as I was growing up, they expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions”. A possible explanation for this result is that when children get frustrated at their parents who do not provide them with the needed support, they direct their aggression towards their peers.

Permissive parenting style, on the other hand, also leads to bullying (Rigby, 2013). Adolescents whose parents do not know their whereabouts are prone to engage in bullying (Georgiou, 2008). Permissive parenting, which is characterized by lack of involvement in the affairs of the children due to parents’ lenient and indulgent attitudes, provide the chance for the reinforcement of children’s negative behaviors, including bullying, in the absence of limit setting parenting. Moreover, permissive parents may not even have the ability to exert behavioral control and supervision to stop their children’s relational aggression, thereby failing to promote self-regulatory skills that are necessary for adolescents to cope with peer problems (Kawabata et al., 2011).

In addition to these two parenting styles, when it comes to the authoritative parenting style, the results of this study add valuable information to the existing literature. As revealed with this sample of Armenian secondary students, the authoritative parenting style plays a positive role in reducing bullying. Furthermore, this study illustrated that authoritative parenting style is a significant negative predictor of bullying, which has implications for practitioners, counselors and school administrators. These findings are supported by the literature regarding the relationship between parenting style and bullying. Past studies have shown that positive parenting, characterized by parental

warmth and emotional sensitivity, is related to lower levels of relational aggression and bullying. This type of parenting offers the children the socializing context where they learn emotion regulation, practice social skills, become socially competent, acquire self-confidence, and start having confidence in others (Kawabata et al., 2011). Children with such positive qualities are unlikely to interpret negatively social situations that are ambiguous, thereby exhibiting even less likelihood of having externalizing problems, such as reacting with relational aggression.

Ultimately, school climate and authoritative parenting style are the two variables that need to be focused on in any bullying prevention or intervention program.

Relationship between Self-esteem, Peer Support, School Climate, Parenting Styles and Victimization

In order to buffer the negative side effects of victimization, it is important to study those factors that have an impact on this variable. One of those factors this study focused on was self-esteem, which was shown to have a negative correlation with victimization. This result was in line with the literature that has discussed the relationships between different kinds of victimization and self-esteem. Soler, Kirchner, Paretilla, & Forns (2013) in their study with 736 adolescents attending secondary schools in Spain, found out that victimization was negatively correlated with self-esteem, especially self-liking, which is an indication of the extent to which adolescents experience negative self-evaluation of worth as social beings. In another study, Soler et al. (2012) revealed that adolescents' sense of personal value, which is related to their sense of social worth

decreased significantly when participant students experienced different kinds of victimization.

The current study also found out that self-esteem was a significant predictor of victimization. This result might be explained from two theoretical perspectives, cognitive and behaviorist viewpoints, which describe behavior formation in relationships.

According to the behaviorists, who say that a behavior gets repeated if it brings a kind of benefit to the person involved (McLeod, 2009), the victim surrenders to being bullied because in time, he/she has learned helplessness (Seligman, 1975) (as cited in Lines, 2008). “Learned helplessness” is a condition that serves the victim (on an unconscious level) the purpose of being perceived as a person worthy of attention; which is an indication of low self-esteem. According to the cognitive theory, on the other hand, the faulty thinking of the victim creates difficulties for him/her. Because of these faulty cognitions – which might be the consequences of previous experience – the victim might think, “nobody likes me” or “I am not good”; which explains why a victim might let him/herself get bullied. Taking into consideration these two theoretical perspectives and the results of this study, it can be concluded that both the behaviorist and the cognitive theories applied to Armenian adolescents explain how self-esteem has an impact on victimization.

Peer support is another variable that was found to have a negative correlation with victimization in this study. In fact, peer support was a significant negative predictor of victimization. Prior studies have talked about the crucial role of peer relationships for students who are looking to cope with harassment and bullying. Social support and social

networks in schools were found to be protective factors against being bullied (Cheng et al., 2010). Looking at the relationship of peer support with victimization from the Systems Theory perspective, in order to interpret a person's behavior, one has to look at the group dynamics, as well as the behavior's effect on other group members. Here it is assumed that peers form a system in which they are interrelated with each other. Since in such a system behaviors are reciprocal, it would be misleading to try to understand a behavior without looking at its meaning within the group (Lines, 2008). Hence, to comprehend the behavior of the victim, one has to consider the mutual behavior of peers and their support in the group; as is the case with the sample of Armenian students in this study, where peer support plays a significant role in reducing victimization. The Developmental Theory, on the other hand, posits that during the developmental period, adolescents go through a phase, where they have an increased need to, not only identify with but also to belong to their adolescent group. Once an adolescent victim finds support from a peer, his/her need to belong to the peer group gets fulfilled (Lines, 2008). This explains why peer support is so crucial a protective factor, and a significant predictor of victimization in this study, where the results demonstrate that these theories apply to Armenian adolescents too.

School climate was found to be negatively correlated with victimization in this study. The literature encompasses many discussions associating positive school climate with less incidents of victimization. As discussed in chapter two, school climate comprises several dimensions, of which policies and accountability is one (Orpinas & Horne, 2010). In a study with 240 schools in Canada, Ma (2002) found out that positive disciplinary climate was associated with lower levels of victimization. When schools

enhance positive climate, they consider policies and accountability, where responsibility is promoted and the student is made accountable for his/her actions and decisions. In this regard, participant students in this study find that “When students break rules at their school, they are treated fairly”, an indication of the extent to which Armenian schools take into consideration the accountability of the offender, an important element that promotes positive climate.

Another factor that is characteristic of school climate is opportunities for participation and contribution, where students not only become involved in school life, but also contribute to the school community through extra-curricular activities (Ryan, 2009). All Armenian schools in this study promote extra-curricular activities, providing students with opportunities to commemorate Armenian and Lebanese national holidays, and to organize various educational, intellectual and cultural activities. Some schools even encourage the organization of intramural sports games.

Concerning parenting style and its relationship with victimization, this study had hypothesized that both permissive and authoritarian parenting styles will be positively correlated with victimization, and authoritative parenting style will be negatively correlated with victimization. Contrary to the hypothesis regarding the relationship of permissive parenting style with victimization, this study revealed no significant correlation between these two variables. The lack of the significant result can be explained by the following factor: Permissive parenting style is characterized by low level of parental control. In addition, permissive parents are reluctant to impose limits; instead, they allow their kids to regulate themselves (Dewar, 2011). As such, these

parents may be perceived as being unaware of their children's plight and victimization at school (Georgiou & Fanti, 2010). Besides, earlier research has associated victimization with internalizing problems (Peskin, Tortolero, Markham, Addy, & Baumler 2007). Children who have internalizing problems tend to be withdrawn and exhibit less behavioral problems. As internalizing problems are less visible than externalizing problems, permissive parents may not notice the children's difficulties (Georgiou & Fanti, 2010). Moreover, Unnever and Cornell (2004) put forward that whether children report being bullied or not depends on their perception of parenting style. This implies that children who are raised in permissive households, and who find themselves left on their own to adjust their behavior, might not be willing to report being bullied.

With regard to the other two parenting styles, authoritarian and authoritative, the results of this study revealed (as it was hypothesized) a positive correlation between authoritarian parenting style and victimization, and a negative correlation between authoritative parenting style and victimization. These results are supported by previous literature, which discusses the negative impact of authoritarian parenting style and the positive influence of authoritative parenting style on children's self-esteem.

Authoritarian parents restrict the autonomy of their children; they believe that children should accept their rules and expectations unconditionally, without leaving room for verbal communication whatsoever. Hence, since communication is not a characteristic of authoritarian parents, and as communication is vital in the family for promoting development of positive identities among adolescents (Noller & Callan, 1991), the self-esteem of children of authoritarian parents gets affected negatively. Rigby (1994) in his

study with Australian adolescent schoolchildren found out that lack of effective communication in families led adolescent girls to be victimized. The absence of positive communication and lack of parental nurturance had a negative impact on adolescents' self-esteem. As the current study verified that self-esteem was a significant negative predictor of victimization, this explains how low levels of communication and affect, characteristics of authoritarian parenting style, are associated with victimization. Slade (2012) in her study about the relationship of parenting styles with relational aggression revealed that authoritarian parenting style was a significant predictor of relational victimization.

Concerning authoritative parenting style, studies have focused a lot on the role of parents in boosting the self-esteem of their children. Authoritative parents positively reinforce their children by praising their achievements. The current study revealed that authoritative parenting style was negatively correlated with victimization, a finding similar with that of previous research. Children who feel positive about themselves exhibit more confidence and more assertive behavior, which renders them less vulnerable to bullying. The confidence and the assertive attitudes of children with high self-esteem prevent as well as protect them from being viewed as easy targets by potential bullies (Rigby, 2013). In another study with 300 female college students, Hesari & Hejazi (2011) found out that the authoritative parenting style had a positive effect on self-esteem. And as self-esteem was found by this study to be a negative predictor of victimization, it implies that children of authoritative parents are unlikely to be victimized.

One can conclude at this point that self-esteem and peer support are two significant predictors of victimization in this study that need to be taken into serious consideration by teachers and mental health professionals to help protect young students from becoming victims themselves.

Between-School Comparison

One-way analysis of variance showed that there was no significant difference between schools on the levels of bullying and victimization. This implies that the emphasis of different extra-curricular activities by the schools did not show any difference in bullying from one school to the other, which means that being affiliated with different religious denominations or associations does not make a significant difference in the prevalence of bullying between schools.

Prevalence of Bullying and Victimization

In this sample of Armenian students, 23% reported involvement in bullying, 8% as bullies, and 15% as victims. In a study measuring the prevalence of bullying behaviors among US youth, similar results were found by Nansel T. R. et al. (2001), where 23.6% of the participants were found to be involved in bullying, 13% as bullies and 10.6% as victims. In a survey assessing the estimate of bullying and victimization among secondary students in Taiwan, Chen and Cheng (2013) reported that 21.3% of the participants were engaged in bullying behaviors, 10.9% as bullies and 10.7% as victims.

Additional Findings

Although this study measured bullying and victimization separately as two different constructs, considering the literature indicating that being victimized can lead the victim to become a bully in the future (Hanish & Guerra, 2004), the researcher inserted victimization in the prediction model as a possible predictor of bullying. Upon further analysis of the variables bullying and victimization, results showed that victimization was indeed a strong predictor for bullying. Previous researchers have demonstrated that children who are repeatedly victimized are at risk for becoming increasingly aggressive over time (Hodges & Perry, 1999). These aggressive victims exhibit more disturbed functioning than bullies or passive victims, and have problems in several domains (emotional, behavioral, academic and social) (Schwartz, Proctor, & Chien, 2001). Some studies report that aggressive victims are even more prevalent than passive victims are (Baldry & Farrington, 1998). In their study with 1722 grade 4 students, Hanish & Guerra (2004) found out that nearly 20% of aggressive victims became bullies, over the follow-up period. Moreover, previous studies have also demonstrated that bully victimization at an early age contributes to the development of violence and delinquency. Those interested in school safety need to consider the possible relationship between victimization and extreme violence. Since this study did not measure the bully/victim construct, and as the results of the current study show that victimization is a strong predictor for bullying (as supported by the literature), future research with Armenian students might encompass measuring this construct, to examine its relationship with the variables included in the current study.

Clinical and Educational Implications

The results of this study provide important implications for practitioners, counselors and administrators working in the educational field. The role of parents, school personnel, peer support and self-esteem of students need to be considered important variables in discussions about the factors involved in bullying/victimization problems at schools.

Regression analyses revealed that school climate and authoritative parenting style were negative predictors for bullying. This implies that school administrators and counselors working on developing bullying prevention programs need to consider these two variables while devising the plan of such programs. Planned strategies need to target both parents and school personnel, providing parents with instructional material about their important role in positively disciplining their children; and by empowering school personnel with skills development workshops, encouraging them to foster positive school climate that helps reduce bullying.

Results of regression analyses showed that self-esteem and peer support were negative predictors for victimization. The implication of these results is that any victimization intervention or prevention plan in Armenian schools needs to concentrate on providing students with proper character education that is meant to enhance their self-esteem on the one hand, and their self-efficacy on the other. Once students perceive themselves positively, they are less likely to be victimized; and once they become aware of their abilities, they will be more prone to engage in pro-social behavior. Peers who display pro-victim attitudes are characterized by their empathy and self-efficacy. Hence,

victimization intervention plans that enhance students' self-efficacy and promote empathy are meant to result in supportive peer relationships, ensuing in less victimization.

Delimitations

This study has certain delimitations that need to be taken into consideration. First, the findings lack generalizability since the participant students were selected from Armenian secondary schools only; in other words, the results cannot be generalized to Armenian students who are attending non-Armenian schools in Lebanon.

As data collection was carried out in the classrooms of the secondary schools, students did not have the option of not answering the questionnaires, as they were obliged by the school administration to take part in the survey, regardless of whether they were willing to or not.

Another delimitation of the study was that with the use of self-reported questionnaires, results reflected the students' own ratings and their subjective experiences of parental upbringing. Thus, there could have been a discrepancy between students' perceived parenting style and actual parenting style. Besides, with the use of self-reported questionnaires, there is always the inherent risk for social desirability bias, and whether the students were totally honest in filling the questionnaires or not is disputable, despite the fact that they were asked to respond anonymously, and were told that the questionnaires were to be confidential.

Future Directions

For future studies, the opportunity for research on the relationship between bullying and victimization on the one hand, and self-esteem, peer support, school climate and parenting styles on the other, is broad. In the regression model summary, the percentage of the variance in bullying and victimization was 22.5% and 31.5% respectively. This means more research is required to find out the variables that might explain the rest of the variance in bullying and victimization. Factors such as student character (introvert, extrovert), SES, student involvement in community service may be explored to investigate their role in bullying and victimization with the Armenian population of secondary students.

Moreover, since the findings of this study lack generalizability to Armenian students attending non-Armenian schools, it would be interesting to find out what factors play a role in bullying and victimization with the population of Armenian students attending non-Armenian secondary school.

Conclusion

This study investigated the relationship between bullying and victimization on the one hand, and self-esteem, peer support, school climate and parenting styles on the other. The results revealed that school climate and authoritative parenting style were significant predictors for bullying, while self-esteem and peer support were significant predictors for victimization. Peer support and permissive parenting style were not found to be

correlated either with bullying or with victimization correspondingly. In an unanticipated finding, victimization was found to be a strong and significant predictor for bullying.

Previous studies have investigated the factors that affect bullying and/or victimization on different populations. The present study examined the relationship of self-esteem, peer support, school climate and parenting styles in Armenian secondary students attending Armenian schools. The findings provide practitioners working in the educational domain with the opportunity to consider those factors that play a role in bullying/victimization problems faced by Armenian secondary students.

References

- About Us / Mission and Vision. (2010). In *Armenian General Benevolent Union Lebanon Schools*. Retrieved December 9, 2013, from <http://agbuschools.edu.lb/about.php>
- Ahmad, E., & Braithwaite, V. (2004). Bullying and victimization: cause for concern for both families and schools. *Social Psychology of Education*, 7(1), 35-54.
doi: [10.1023/B:SPOE.0000010668.43236.60](https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SPOE.0000010668.43236.60)
- Aluede, O., Adeleke, F., Omoike, D., & Afen-Akpaida, J. (2008). A review of the extent, nature, characteristics and effects of bullying behavior in schools. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35(2), 151-158. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/213916211?accountid=8555>
- Arnett, J. (1999). Adolescent storm and stress, reconsidered. *American Psychologist*, 54(5), 317-326. doi: [10.1037/0003-066X.54.5.317](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.5.317)
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (1998). Parenting influences on bullying and victimization. *Legal and criminological Psychology*, 3, 237-254
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2000). Bullies and delinquents: personal characteristics and parental styles. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 10(1), 17-31.
doi: [10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1298\(200001/02\)10:1<17::AID-CASP526>3.0.CO;2-M](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(200001/02)10:1<17::AID-CASP526>3.0.CO;2-M)
- Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles? *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 4(1), p. 1-44
doi: [10.1111/1529-1006.01431](https://doi.org/10.1111/1529-1006.01431)
- Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children.

Youth and Society, 9(3), p.239. doi: 10.1177/0044118X7800900302

Beaty, L.A., & Alexeyev, E.B. (2008). The problem of school bullies: what the research tells us. *Adolescence*, 43(169), 1-12. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/195947580?accountid=8555>

Berkowitz, R., & Benbenishty, R. (2012). Perceptions of teachers' support, safety and absence from school because of fear among victims, bullies, and bully-victims.

American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 82(1), p. 67-74.

doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.2011.01132.x.

Boulton, M. J. & Smith, P. K. (1994). Bully/victim problems in middle-school children: stability, self-perceived competence, peer perceptions and peer acceptance.

British Journal of Developmental psychology, 12(3), 315-329.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss*. London: Health Press.

Brand, S., Hatzinger, M., Beck, J., & Holsboer-Trachsler, E. (2009). Perceived parenting styles, personality traits and sleep patterns in adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*,

32, 1189-1207. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.01.010

Buhs, E. S., Ladd, G. W., & Herald-Brown, S. L. (2010). Victimization and exclusion: links to peer rejection, classroom engagement, and achievement. In

S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: an international perspective* (pp. 163-172). New York & London:

Routledge

Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57(1), p. 110-119

Caravita, S., Di Blasio, P., & Salmivalli, C. (2009). Unique and interactive effects of

empathy and social status on involvement in bullying. *Social Development, 18*(1), p. 140-163. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00465.x

Central Intelligence Agency. (2013). *The World Factbook*. Retrieved from

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/le.html>

Chen, L., & Cheng, Y. (2013). Prevalence of school bullying among secondary students in Taiwan: measurements with and without a specific definition of bullying.

School Psychology International, 34(6), 707-720.

doi: 10.1177/0143034313479694

Cheng, Y., Newman, I. M., Qu, M., Mbulo, L., Chai, Y., Chen, Y., & Shell, D. F. (2010).

Being bullied and psychological adjustment among middle school students in China. *Journal of School Health, 80*(4), 193-199.

doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2009.00486.x

Christie-Mizell, A. C., Keil, J. M., Laske, M. T., & Stewart, J. (2011). Bullying behavior,

parents' work hours and early adolescents' perceptions of time spent with

parents. *Youth and Society, 43*(4), 1570-1595. doi: [10.1177/0044118X10388261](https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X10388261)

Cohn, A. & Canter, A. (2003). *Bullying: facts for schools and parents*. Retrieved January

4, 2012, from http://www.nasponline.org/resources/factsheets/bullying_fs.aspx

Cook, C. R., Williams, K. R., Guerra, N. G., Kim, T. E., & Sadek, S. (2010). Predictors

of bullying and victimization in childhood and adolescence: a meta-analytic

investigation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 25*(2), 65-83. doi: 10.1037/a0020149

Curwin, R. L., & Mendler, A. N. (1988). *Discipline with dignity*. Alexandria VA:

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Darling, N. & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: an integrative model.

Psychological Bulletin, 113(3), 487-496. doi: [10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487)

Delfabbro, P., Winefield, T., Trainor, S., Dollard, M., Anderson, A., Metzger, J., & Hammarstrom, A. (2006). Peer and teacher bullying/victimization of South Australian secondary school students: prevalence and psychosocial profiles.

British Journal of Educational Psychology, 76(1), p. 71-90.

doi: 10.1348/000709904X24645.

Dewar, G. (2011, September). Permissive parenting: a parenting science guide to the research [Web log post]. Retrieved from

<http://www.parentingscience.com/permissive-parenting.html>

Educational Council Lebanon (2001). In *Union of the Armenian Evangelical Churches in the Near East*. Retrieved December 9, 2013, from

http://www.uaecne.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=68&Itemid=88

Eisenberg, M. E., Neumark-Sztainer, D., & Perry, C. L. (2003). Peer harassment, school connectedness, and academic achievement. *Journal of School Health*, 73(8), p. 311-316. doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2003.tb06588.x

Eisenberg, N., & Miller, P. A. (1987). The relation of empathy to prosocial and related behaviors. *Psychological Bulletin*, 101(1), p. 91-119

doi: [10.1037/0033-2909.101.1.91](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.101.1.91)

Eliot, M., Cornell, D., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2010). Supportive school climate and student willingness to seek help for bullying and threats of violence. *Journal of School Psychology*, 48(6), 533-553. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2010.07.001

Espelage, D. L., Bosworth, K., & Simon, T. R. (2000). Examining the social context of

bullying behaviors in early adolescence. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 78(3), p. 326-333. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/219021014?accountid=8555>

Espelage, D. L. & Holt, M. K. (2001). Bullying and victimization during early adolescence: peer influences and psychosocial correlates. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2(2-3), 123-142. doi: 10.1300/J135v02n02_08

Espelage, D. L. & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: what have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review*, 32(3), 365-383. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/219647160?accountid=8555>

Estevez, E., Murgui, S., & Misitu, G. (2009). Psychological adjustment in bullies and victims of school violence. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 24(4), 473-483. doi: 10.1007/BF03178762

Farmer, T. W., Petrin, R. A., Robertson, D. L., Fraser, M. W., Hall, C. M., Day, S. H., & Damisma, K. (2010). Peer relations of bullies, bully-victims, and victims: the two social worlds of bullying in second-grade classroom. *The Elementary School Journal*, 110(3), 364-392. doi: 10.1086/648983

Finnegan, R. A., Hodges, E. V. E., & Perry, D. G. (1998). Victimization by peers: association with children's reports of mother-child interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(4), p. 1076-1086.

doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.1076](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.1076)

Flaspohler, P. D., Elfstrom, J. L., Vanderzee, K. L., & Sink, H. E. (2009). Stand by me: the effects of peer and teacher support in mitigating the impact of bullying on

quality of life. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46(7), 636-649.

doi: 10.1002/pits.20404.

Frisen, A., Hasselblad, T., & Holmqvist, K. (2012). What actually makes bullying stop?

Reports from former victims. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(4), 981-990.

doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.02.001.

Frisen, A., Jonsson, A., & Persson, C. (2007). Adolescents' perception of bullying: who

is the victim? Who is the bully? What can be done to stop bullying? *Adolescence*, 42(168), 749-761. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/195944853?accountid=8555>

Georgiou, S. N. (2008). Parental style and child bullying and victimization experiences

at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 11(3), 213-227.

doi: [10.1007/s11218-007-9048-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-007-9048-5).

Georgiou, S. N. & Fanti, K. A. (2010). A transactional model of bullying and

victimization. *Social Psychology of Education: An International Journal*, 13(3), 295-311. doi: 10.1007/s11218-010-9116-0

Graham, S. (2010). What educators need to know about bullying behaviors. *Phi Delta*

Kappan, 92(1), 66-69. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25753632>

Hanish, L. D. & Guerra, N. (2004). Aggressive victims, passive victims, and bullies:

developmental continuity or developmental change. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 50(1), 17-38. doi: 10.1353/mpq.2004.0003

Hein, C. D. (2004). *Preventing aggression in the classroom: a case study of*

extraordinary teachers. [Doctoral dissertation]. Retrieved from

https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/hein_katherine_d_200405_phd.pdf

- Hesari, N. K. Z. & Hejazi, E. (2011). The mediating role of self-esteem in the relationship between the authoritative parenting style and aggression. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 1724-1730.
doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.333
- History / Mission. (2013). In *National Levon & Sophia Hagopian College*. Retrieved December 9, 2013, from <http://sophiahagopian.com/en/history/mission>
- Hodges, E. V. E. & Perry, D. G. (1999). Personal and interpersonal antecedents and consequences of victimization by peers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(4), 677-685. doi: [10.1037/0022-3514.76.4.677](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.4.677)
- Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., & Sweetland, S. R. (2002). The development of organizational climate index for high schools: its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *The High School Journal*, 86(2), 38-49. doi: 10.1353/hsj.2002.0023
- Jizmejian, A. K. (1963). *Discipline in Armenian secondary schools in Lebanon* (Unpublished master's thesis). American University of Beirut, Lebanon.
- Kaloustian, K. M. (1958). *A study of Armenian schools in Lebanon* [unpublished master's thesis]. American University of Beirut, Lebanon.
- Kawabata, Y., Alink, L. R. A., Tseng, W., van Ijzendoorn, M. H., & Crick, N. R. (2011). Maternal and paternal parenting styles associated with relational aggression in children and adolescents: a conceptual analysis and meta-analytic review. *Developmental Review*, 31(4), 240-278. doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2011.08.001.
- Klein, J., Cornell, D., & Konold, T. (2012). Relationships between bullying, school climate, and student risk behaviors. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 27(3), 154-169. doi: 10.1037/a0029350

- Kokkinos, C. M. (2013). Bullying and victimization in early adolescence: associations with attachment style and perceived parenting. *Journal of School Violence, 12*(2), 174-192. doi: 10.1080/15388220.2013.766134
- Kolb, K. J., & Jussim, L. (1994). Teacher expectations and underachieving gifted children. *Roepers Review, 17*(1), p. 26-30. doi: 10.1080/02783199409553613
- Ladd, G. W., & Ladd, B. K. (1998). Parenting behaviors and parent-child relationships: correlates of peer victimization in kindergarten? *Developmental Psychology, 34*(6), 1450-1458. doi: [10.1037/0012-1649.34.6.1450](https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.34.6.1450)
- Langdon, S. W., & Preble, W. (2008). The relationship between levels of perceived respect and bullying in 5th through 12th graders. *Adolescence, 43*(171), 485-503. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/195946053?accountid=8555>
- Lines, D. (2008). *The bullies: understanding bullies and bullying* [DX Reader version]. Retrieved from <http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.aub.edu.lb/lib/aub/docDetail.action?docID=10251452>
- McLeod, J. (2009). *An introduction to counseling* [DX Reader version]. Retrieved from http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aub.edu.lb/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzI4NjU4NF9fQU41?sid=a5a33145-49fa-4750-9673-b206e8fd617c@sessionmgr4003&vid=1&format=EB&lpid=lp_i&rid=0
- Miller, J. M., Dilorio, C., & Dudley, W. (2002). Parenting style and adolescent's reaction to conflict: is there a relationship? *Journal of Adolescent Health, 31*(6), 463-468. doi: S1054-139X(02)00452-4
- Monks, C. P., Smith, P. K., & Swettenham, J. (2005). Psychological correlates of peer

victimization in preschool: social cognitive skills, executive function and attachment profiles. *Aggressive Behavior*, 31(6), p. 571-588.

doi: 10.1002/ab.20099

Murray-Harvey, R., & Slee, P. T. (2010). School and home relationships and their impact on school bullying. *School Psychology International*, 31(3), 271-295.

doi: 10.1177/0143034310366206.

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285(16), 2094-2100. doi: 10.1001/jama.285.16.2094

Nickerson, A. B., Mele, D., & Osborne-Oliver, K. M. (2010). Parent-child relationships and bullying. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: an international perspective* (pp. 187-197). New York & London: Routledge

Noller, P. & Callan, V. (1991). *The adolescent in the family*. London and New York: Routledge.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: what we know and what we can do*. Oxford UK & Cambridge USA: Blackwell Publishers.

Olweus, D. (2003). A profile of bullying at School. *Educational Leadership*, 60(6), 12-17.

Orpinas, P., & Horne, A. M. (2010). Creating a positive school climate and developing

- social competence. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: an international perspective* (pp. 49-59). New York & London: Routledge
- Patchin, J.W., & Hinduja, S. (2010). Cyber bullying and self-esteem. *Journal of School Health*, 80(12), 614-621. doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2010.00548.x.
- Peskin, M. F., Tortolero, S. R., Markham, C. M., Addy, R. C., & Baumler, E. R. (2007). Bullying and victimization and internalizing symptoms among low income Black and Hispanic students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40(4), 372-375
doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.10.010
- PREVNet (2012). *Why worry about bullying*. Retrieved August 24, 2012, from <http://prevnet.ca/BullyingFacts/Whyworryaboutit/tabid/118/Default.aspx>
- Rabah, J. Y. (2006). *Bullying problems in Lebanese private schools: teachers' and administrators' perceptions* (Unpublished master's thesis). American University of Beirut, Lebanon.
- Rigby, K. (1994). Psychosocial functioning in families of Australian adolescent school children involved in bully/victim problems. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 16(2), p. 173-187. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6427.1994.00787.x
- Rigby, K. (2005). Why do some children bully at school? The contributions of negative attitudes towards victims and the perceived expectations of friends, parents and teachers. *School Psychology International*, 26(2), p. 147-161
doi: 10.1177/0143034305052910
- Rigby, K. (2013). Bullying in schools and its relation to parenting and family life. *Family Matters*, 92, 61-67

- Rigby, K., & Johnson, B. (2006). Expressed readiness of Australian schoolchildren to act as bystanders in support of children who are being bullied. *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology*, 26(3), p. 425-440. doi: 10.1080/01443410500342047
- Rodkin, P. C. (2012). Bullying and children's peer relationships. *Colleagues*, 8(2), 1-6.
Retrieved from: <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/colleagues/vol8/iss2/4>
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: a review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, (15)2, 112-120. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007
- Salmivalli, C., Karna, A., & Poskiparta, E. (2010). From peer putdowns to peer support: a theoretical model and how it translated into a national anti-bullying program. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: an international perspective* (pp. 441-454). New York & London: Routledge
- Schwartz, D., Proctor, L. J., & Chien, D. H. (2001). The aggressive victim of bullying: emotional and behavioral dysregulation as a pathway to victimization by peers. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 147-174). New York: Guilford Press.
- Seeds, P. M., Harkness, K. L., & Quilty, L. C. (2010). Parental maltreatment, bullying, and adolescent depression: evidence for the mediating role of perceived social support. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 39(5), 681-692.
doi: [10.1080/15374416.2010.501289](https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2010.501289)

- Slade, W. E. (2012). *The effects of parenting style and psychological control on relational aggression in African-American girls* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3508861)
- Smith, P. K. (2010). Bullying in primary and secondary schools: psychological and organizational comparisons. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: an international perspective* (pp. 137-150). New York & London: Routledge
- Soler, L., Kirchner, T., C., Kirchner, & Forns, M. (2013). Impact of poly-victimization on mental health: the mediator and/or moderator role of self-esteem. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(13), 2695-2712. doi: 10.1177/0886260513487989
- Soler, L., Paretilla, C., Kirchner, T., & Forns, M. (2012). Effects of poly-victimization on self-esteem and post-traumatic stress symptoms in Spanish adolescents. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 21(11), 645-653.
doi: 10.1007/s00787-012-0301-x
- Swearer, S. M., Siebecker, A. B., Johnsen-Frerichs, L. A., & Wang, C. (2010). Assessment of bullying/victimization: the problem of comparability across studies and across methodologies. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: an international perspective* (pp. 305-327). New York & London: Routledge
- Syrkiewicz, J. (2011). *Understanding pack mentality in bullying*. Retrieved June 12, 2012 from [http://www.bullyingeducation.org/2011/11/21/UNDERSTANDING-PACK-M ENTALITY-IN-BULLYING/](http://www.bullyingeducation.org/2011/11/21/UNDERSTANDING-PACK-MENTILITY-IN-BULLYING/)
- Tanielian, J. (2002). *Լիբանանահայ դպրոցը: թիւեր եւ մտորումներ* [Lebanese

Armenian schools: numbers and thoughts]. Beirut: Sipan.

Troy, M., & Sroufe, A. L. (1987). Victimization among preschoolers: role of attachment relationship history. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 26(2), p. 166-172.

Unnever, J. D., & Cornell, D. G. (2004). Middle school victims of bullying: who reports being bullied? *Aggressive Behavior*, 30(5), 373-388. doi: 10.1002/ab.20030

Varjabedian, S. H. (1981). *Հայերը Լիբանանի մէջ* [Armenians in Lebanon]. Beirut: Sevan Publishing House.

Wang, C., Berry, B., & Swearer, S. M. (2013). The critical role of school climate in effective bullying prevention. *Theory into Practice*, 52, 296-302.
doi: 10.1080/00405841.2013.829735

Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., & Luk, J. W. (2010). Peer victimization and academic adjustment among early adolescents: moderation by gender and mediation by perceived classmate support. *Journal of School Health*, 81(7), 386-392.
doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2011.00606.x

Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., & Nansel, T. R. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: physical, verbal, relational and cyber. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45(4), 368-375. doi: 0.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.03.021

Why worry about bullying. (2012). Retrieved August 24, 2012, from

<http://prevnet.ca/BullyingFacts/Whyworryaboutit/tabid/118/Default.aspx>

Wild, L. G., Flisher, A. J., Bhana, A., & Lombard, C. (2004). Associations among adolescent risk behaviors and self-esteem in six domains. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45(8), 1454-1467.

doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00330.x

Williams, K. R. & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of Internet bullying.

Journal Of Adolescent Health, 41, S14-S21.

doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.018

Wong, J. S. & Schonlau, M. (2013). Does bully victimization predict future

delinquency?: a propensity score matching approach. *Criminal Justice and*

Behavior, 40(11), 1184-1208. doi: 10.1177/0093854813503443

Wu, M. (2009). *The relationship between parenting styles, career decision self-efficacy,*

and career maturity of Asian American college students [Doctoral dissertation].

Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.aub.edu.lb/docview/304998440>

Zein, I. B. (2001). *A survey of the extent of bully/victim problems in private schools in*

Beirut (unpublished master's thesis). American University of Beirut, Lebanon.

Appendix A: Demographic Information

What grade are you in? ☐ 10th ☐ 11th ☐ 12th

Are you a....? ☐ Male ☐ Female

Which of the following do you most closely identify as your religious or political affiliation or preference?

☐ Evangelical ☐ Hay Heghapokhagan Tashnagtsoutioun

☐ Catholic ☐ Hentchagian Party

☐ Orthodox ☐ Ramgavar Azadagan Party

How many brothers do you have? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
None (0) One (1) Two (2) More than 2

How many sisters do you have? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
None (0) One (1) Two (2) More than 2

Where are you in birth order? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Only child Oldest Second oldest 3rd or younger

Appendix B: Illinois Bully Scale

Please mark your answers below with an "x". Example: X

For each of the following questions, choose how many times you did this activity or how many times these things happened to you in the LAST 30 DAYS:

1. I upset other students for the fun of it.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

2. In a group I teased other students.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

4. Other students picked on me.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

5. Other students made fun of me.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

6. Other students called me names.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

7. I got hit and pushed by other students.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

8. I helped harass other students.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

9. I teased other students.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

14. I was mean to someone when I was angry.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

15. I spread rumors about other students.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

16. I started (instigated) arguments or conflicts.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

17. I encouraged people to fight.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

18. I excluded other students from my clique of friends.

- ☐ Never
- ☐ 1 or 2 times
- ☐ 3 or 4 times
- ☐ 5 or 6 times
- ☐ 7 or more times

Appendix C: Student School Survey

MY SCHOOL: Think about how strongly you disagree or agree with the following statements about your school. Mark the answer that best shows us what you feel based on your experience since this past year.

1. My teachers respect me.
 - ☐ Really disagree
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Really agree
 - ☐ Pass
2. My teachers are fair.
 - ☐ Really disagree
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Really agree
 - ☐ Pass
3. Teachers in my school are nice people.
 - ☐ Really disagree
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Really agree
 - ☐ Pass
4. When students break rules in my school, they are treated fairly.
 - ☐ Really disagree
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Really agree
 - ☐ Pass
5. The principal ask students about their idea at my school.
 - ☐ Really disagree
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Really agree
 - ☐ Pass

6. My school is a good place to be.
- ☐ Really disagree
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Really agree
 - ☐ Pass
7. I feel like I belong at my school.
- ☐ Really disagree
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Really agree
 - ☐ Pass
8. My school is important to me.
- ☐ Really disagree
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Really agree
 - ☐ Pass
9. Teachers and staff at my school are doing the right things to prevent bullying.
- ☐ Really disagree
 - ☐ Disagree
 - ☐ Agree
 - ☐ Really agree
 - ☐ Pass

ABOUT ME AND OTHERS: Now, think about students your age (not just your closest friends) since this past year. Mark how true each of the following statements are for you.

1. Really care about what happens to me.
- ☐ No, not at all
 - ☐ A little
 - ☐ Pretty much
 - ☐ Yes, completely
2. Are there for me whenever I need help.
- ☐ No, not at all
 - ☐ A little

- Pretty much
- Yes, completely

3. Can be trusted a lot

- No, not at all
- A little
- Pretty much
- Yes, completely

4. Care about my feelings

- No, not at all
- A little
- Pretty much
- Yes, completely

Appendix D: Parental Authority Questionnaire

Instructions: For each of the following statements, circle the number of the 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) that best describes how that statement applies to you and your parents. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your parents during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don't spend a lot of time on any one item. Be sure not to omit any items.

If your parents were separated or divorced before you reached age 12, think about the parent with whom you spent the most time when you answer the questions.

1 = Strongly disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = Neither agree nor disagree

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly agree

___ 1. While I was growing up my parents felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.

___ 2. Even if their children didn't agree with them, my parents felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what they thought was right.

___ 3. Whenever my parents told me to do something as I was growing up, they expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.

___ 4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my parents discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.

___ 5. My parents have always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.

___6. My parents has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.

___7. As I was growing up my parents did not allow me to question any decision they had made.

___8. As I was growing up my parents directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.

___9. My parents have always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.

___10. As I was growing up my parents did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.

___11. As I was growing up I knew what my parents expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my parents when I felt that they were unreasonable.

___12. My parents felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.

___13. As I was growing up, my parents seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.

___14. Most of the time as I was growing up my parents did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.

___15. As the children in my family were growing up, my parents consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.

___16. As I was growing up my parents would get very upset if I tried to disagree with them.

___17. My parents feel that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up.

___18. As I was growing up my parents let me know what behavior they expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, they punished me.

___19. As I was growing up my parents allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from them.

___20. As I was growing up my parents took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions but they would not decide something simply because the children wanted it.

___21. My parents did not view themselves as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.

____22. My parents had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but they were willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.

____23. My parents gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and she expected me to follow their direction, but they were always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.

____24. As I was growing up my parents allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and they generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.

____25. My parents have always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.

____26. As I was growing up my parents often told me exactly what they wanted me to do and how they expected me to do it.

____27. As I was growing up my parents gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but they were also understanding when I disagreed with them.

____28. As I was growing up my parents did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family.

____29. As I was growing up I knew what my parents expected of me in the family and they insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for their authority.

____30. As I was growing up, if my parents made a decision in the family that hurt me, they were willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if they had made a mistake.

Appendix E: Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale

Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Circle your choice from the options of Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.

	STATEMENT	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.	I feel that I have a number of good qualities..	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.	All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.	I am able to do things as well as most other people.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5.	I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6.	I take a positive attitude toward myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7.	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8.	I wish I could have more respect for myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9.	I certainly feel useless at times.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10.	At times I think I am no good at all.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix F: Translation into Armenian

Այս ուսումնասիրությունը նախադասություններու շարք մըն է որ առիթ կու տայ քեզի արտայայտելու կարծիքներդ ու զգացումներդ դպրոցիդ մասին: Մի մոռնար որ միայն քու կարծիքներդ կ'ուզենք, ոչ ուրիշներունը: Որեւէ պատասխան ճիշտ կամ սխալ չէ, այնպէս որ հաճիս ընտրէ այն պատասխանը որ լաւագոյն ձեռով կ'արտայայտէ քու կարծիքդ կամ զգացումդ իւրաքանչիւր նախադասութեան գծով: Եթէ հարցում մը կայ որուն չես ուզեր պատասխանել, հաճիս ընտրէ «կը նախընտրեմ չպատասխանել» տարբերակը:

Ո՞ր դասարանն ես ☐ 10րդ ☐ 11րդ ☐ 12րդ

Ո՞ր սեռին կը պատկանիս ☐ Արական ☐ Իգական

Հետեւեալներէն ո՞ր մէկուն հետ ամենամօտը կ'առնչուիս իբրեւ քու կրօնական կամ քաղաքական պատկանելիութիւնդ կամ նախընտրութիւնդ:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Աւետարանական | <input type="checkbox"/> Հայ Յեղափոխական Դաշնակցութիւն |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Կաթողիկէ | <input type="checkbox"/> Հնչակեան Կուսակցութիւն |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Առաքելական | <input type="checkbox"/> Ռամկավար Ազատական Կուսակցութիւն |

Քանի՞ եղբայր ունիս ☐ Ոչ մէկ ☐ Մէկ ☐ Երկու ☐ Երկուքէն աւելի

Քանի՞ քույր ունիս ☐ Ոչ մէկ ☐ Մէկ ☐ Երկու ☐ Երկուքէն աւելի

Քանի՞երո՞րդ զաւակն ես ☐ Միակը ☐ Ամենամեծը ☐ Երկրորդ մեծը ☐ Երրորդ կամ աւելի փոքրը

Հետևելալ իւրաքանչիւր հարցումին պարագային, ընտրէ թէ քանի անգամ այս բաները դուն ըրած ես, եւ կամ ուրիշեր ըրած են քեզի:

	1 կամ 2	3 կամ 4	5 կամ 6	7 կամ 7-է
Բնաւ	անգամ	անգամ	անգամ	աւելի անգամներ

- 1.- Հաճոյքի համար նեղութիւն պատճառեցի ուրիշ աշակերտներու:
- 2.- Խումբի մը մէջ տարբեր-տարբեր աշակերտներ ծաղրեցի:
- 4.- Տարբեր-տարբեր աշակերտներ հետս «կախուեցան»:
- 5.- Տարբեր-տարբեր աշակերտներ վրաս խնդացին:
- 6.- Տարբեր-տարբեր աշակերտներ ածականներ կախեցին ինծի:
- 7.- Տարբեր-տարբեր աշակերտներ զարկին եւ հրեցին զիս:
- 8.- Տարբեր-տարբեր աշակերտներ նեղացնելու մասնակից եղայ:
- 9.- Տարբեր-տարբեր աշակերտներ ծաղրեցի:
- 14.- Մէկու մը չարութիւն ըրի բարկութեանս ընթացքին:
- 15.- Բամբասանք տարածեցի ուրիշ աշակերտներու հասցէին:
- 16.- Վէճեր եւ հարցեր պատճառեցի (հրահրեցի):
- 17.- Քաջալերեցի մարդոց որ կռուին:
- 18.- Տարբեր-տարբեր աշակերտներ իմ բարեկամական խմբակէս դուրս վտարեցի:

ԻՄ ԴՊՐՈՑՍ:

Մտածե՛ք որքանով համաձայն ես կամ ոչ՝ հետևեալ նախադասութիւններուն հետ քու դպրոցիդ առնչութեամբ: Նշէ այն պատասխանը որ լաւագոյն ձեռով ցոյց կու տայ թէ ինչ կը զգաս հիմնուելով փորձառութեանդ վրայ, այս տարուին՝ սկսեալ:

	Իսկապէս		Իսկապէս		կը նախընտրեմ չպատաս- խանել
	Անհամաձայն	Անհամաձայն	Համաձայն	Համաձայն	
8.- Ուսուցիչներս զիս կը յարգեն:					
9.- Ուսուցիչներս արդար են:					
10.- Դպրոցիս ուսուցիչները սիրելի մարդիկ են:					
11.- Երբ դպրոցէս ներս կանոններ խախտեն, աշակերտները արդարօրէն կը դատուին:					
12.- Դպրոցէս ներս տնօրէնը աշակերտներուն կարծիքը կը հարցնէ:					
13.- Դպրոցս լաւ տեղ մըն է յաճախելու համար:					
14.- Կը զգամ որ կը պատկանիմ այս դպրոցին:					
15.- Դպրոցս կարելոր է ինծի համար:					
16.- Դպրոցէս ներս ուսուցիչներն ու անձնակազմը ճիշդ բաները կ'ընեն <i>պուլիինկ</i> ի առաջքը առնելու համար:					

Այժմ մտածեք ու տարեկից աշակերտներու (ոչ միայն քու մօտիկ ընկերներու) մասին: Նշէ թէ որքանով ճիշտ է հետեւեալ իրաքանչիւր նախադասութիւնը քեզի համար:

Ոչ, Բնաւ	Քիչ մը	Բաւականին շատ	Այո, ամբողջովին	Կը նախընտրեմ չպատասխանել
-------------	-----------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------------

Իմ տարեկից աշակերտները՝

39. Հետաքրքրուած են ինձմով:

40. Ներկայ են երբ օգնութեան պէտք ունենամ:

41. Շատ վստահելի են:

42. Կարելորութիւն կու տան զգացումներուս:

Ծնողական Հեղինակության Հարցարան

Հետեւեալ իւրաքանչիւր նախադասութեան համար, ընտրէ մէկէն հինգ պատասխաններէն (1=խստօրէն անհամաձայն, 5=խստօրէն համաձայն) այն թիւը որ լաւագոյն ձեռով կը նկարագրէ թէ այդ նախադասութիւնը որքանով կ'առնըչուի քեզի եւ քու ընտանիքիդ: Փորձէ կարդալ եւ մտածել թէ ինչպէս իւրաքանչիւր նախադասութիւն կ'առնըչուի քեզի եւ քու ծնողքիդ՝ տունը մեծնալու տարիներուդ: Ճիշտ կամ սխալ պատասխաններ չկան, այնպէս որ երկար ժամանակ մի յատկացնէր որեւէ մէկ հարցումի: Ուշադիր եղիր որ որեւէ հարցում զանց չառնես:

Եթէ ծնողքդ բաժնուած կամ ամուսնալուծուած էին նախքան որ դուն 12 տարեկան ըլլաս, հարցումներուն պատասխանած ատենդ մտածէ այն ծնողին մասին որուն հետ ամենէն աւելի ժամանակ անցուցած ես:

1 = Հաստատօրէն անհամաձայն

2 = Անհամաձայն

3 = Ոչ համաձայն եւ ոչ ալ անհամաձայն

4 = Համաձայն

5 = Հաստատօրէն համաձայն

-----1. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս կը մտածէին որ լաւ կառավարուող տան մը մէջ երախաները ընտանիքէն ներս իրենց ուզածը պէտք է կարենան ընել նոյնքան յաճախ որքան ծնողները:

-----2. Նոյնիսկ եթէ իրենց զուակները համաձայն չըլլային իրենց, ծնողքս կը մտածէին որ մեր լաւութեան համար պէտք էր ստիպուած ըլլայինք համակերպելու իրենց շիտակ համարածին:

-----3. Մեծցած ատենս, երբ որ ծնողքս հրամայէին որ բան մը ընեմ, կ'ակնկալէին որ անմիջապէս ընեմ, առանց որեւէ հարցում հարցնելու:

-----4. Մեծցած ատենս, ամբողջ մը որ ընտանիքէն ներս օրէնք մը հաստատուէր, ծնողքս օրէնքին ետին գտնուող պատճառաբանութիւնը կը քննարկէր ընտանիքի երախաներուն հետ:

- 5. Ծնողքս միշտ քաջալերած է կարծիքներու բերանացի փոխանակումը, ամէն անգամ որ զգացած եմ թէ ընտանեկան կանոններն ու սահմանափակումները անտրամաբանական էին:
- 6. Ծնողքս միշտ կը զգար որ երախաները պէտք ունին ազատ ըլլալու իրենց որոշումները կայացնելու եւ իրենց ուզածը ընելու, նոյնիսկ եթէ ատիկա չհամապատասխանէր իրենց ուզածին:
- 7. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս թոյլ չէին տար ինծի որ հարցաքննեմ որեւէ որոշում որ իրենք կայացուցած էին:
- 8. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս դատողութեամբ եւ կարգապահութեամբ ուղղութիւն կու տային ընտանիքի զաւակներուն զբաղումներն ու որոշումներուն:
- 9. Ծնողքս միշտ կը մտածէր որ պէտք էր աւելիով ոյժ գործածէին որպէսզի ստիպէին երախաներուն վարուիլ այնպէս ինչպէս որ կ'ակնկալուէր երախաներէն:
- 10. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս չէին կարծեր թէ պէտք է հնազանդէի վարուելակերպի կարգ ու կանոններու պարզապէս որովհետեւ իշխանութեան տէր անձ հաստատած էր զանոնք:
- 11. Մեծցած ատենս, գիտէի թէ ծնողքս ինչ կ'ակնկալէր ինձմէ ընտանիքէս ներս, բայց նաեւ ազատ կը զգայի ծնողքիս հետ քննարկելու այդ ակնկալութիւնները երբ կարծէի թէ ատոնք անտրամաբանական էին:
- 12. Ծնողքս կը մտածէր թէ իմաստուն ծնողներ պէտք է կանուխէն սորվեցնեն իրենց զաւակներուն թէ ճիշդ ո՛վ է տէրն ու տիրականը ընտանիքէն ներս:
- 13. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս հազուադէպօրէն ցուցմունք կու տար վարուելակերպիս նկատմամբ:
- 14. Մեծցած ատենս, ընտանեկան որոշումներ առնելու ատեն, մեծ մասամբ ծնողքս կ'ընէին ինչ որ ընտանիքի երախաները կ'ուզէին:
- 15. Ընտանիքիս երախաներուն մեծնալու ատենը, ծնողքս հետեւողականօրէն տրամաբանական եւ առարկայական կերպով ուղղութիւն եւ ցուցմունք կու տային մեզի:
- 16. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս շատ կը բարկանային եթէ փորձէի իրենց հետ համաձայն չըլլալ:
- 17. Ծնողքս կը մտածէ որ ընկերութեան հարցերուն մեծ մասը կը լուծուէր եթէ ծնողներ չսահմանափակէին իրենց զաւակներուն զբաղումները, որոշումներն ու ցանկութիւնները անոնց մեծցած ատենը:
- 18. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս ինծի հասկցուցին թէ ինչ վարուելակերպ կ'ակնկալէին ինձմէ, և եթէ այդ ակնկալութիւնները չբաւարարէի, կը պատժէին զիս:

- 19. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս արտօնեցին ես ինձի որոշել գրեթե ամեն բան, առանց իրենց կողմէ յաճախակի ուղղութեան:
- 20. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս երախաներուն կարծիքները նկատառութեան կ'առնէին ընտանեկան որոշում մը առնելու ատեն, բայց բան մը չէին որոշեր պարզապէս որովհետեւ երախաները ատիկա կ'ուզէին:
- 21. Ծնողքս իրենք զիրենք պատասխանատու չէին զգար իմ վարուելակերպս առաջնորդելու եւ ուղղելու մեծցած ատենս:
- 22. Ծնողքս յստակ չափանիշեր ունէին մեր տան երախաներուն համար մեծցած ատենս, բայց յօժար էին այդ չափանիշերը ընտանիքի երախաներէն իւրաքանչիւրի պէտքերուն յարմարեցնելու:
- 23. Ծնողքս վարուելակերպիս ու զբաղումներուս համար համար ուղղութիւն կու տային ինձի մեծցած ատենս եւ կ'ակնկալէին որ հետեւիմ իրենց ուղղութեան, բայց միշտ յօժար էին մտահոգութիւններս լսելու եւ այդ ուղղութիւնը հետս քննարկելու:
- 24. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս կ'արտօնէին որ ընտանեկան հարցերու գծով ես իմ անձնական կարծիքս կազմեմ եւ ընդհանրապէս թոյլ կուտային որ ինքնիրենս որոշեմ թէ ինչ պիտի ընեմ:
- 25. Ծնողքս միշտ մտածած են թէ ընկերութեան հարցերուն մեծ մասը կը լուծուէր եթէ կարենայինք ծնողները ստիպել խստօրէն եւ վճռականօրէն վարուիլ իրենց գաւակներուն հետ երբ անոնք չեն ըներ ինչ որ կ'ակնկալուի որ պէտք է ընեն իրենց մեծցած ատենը:
- 26. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս յաճախ որոշակիօրէն կը պատուիրէին ինձի ինչ որ կ'ուզէին որ ընեմ եւ ինչպէս կ'ակնկալէին որ ընեմ ատիկա:
- 27. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս յստակ ուղղութիւն տուած են վարմունքիս ու զբաղումներուս համար, բայց նաեւ հանդուրժող էին երբ իրենց հետ չհամաձայնէի:
- 28. Մեծցած ատենս, ծնողքս ուղղութիւն չտուին տան երախաներուն վարմունքին, զբաղումներուն կամ փափաքներուն:
- 29. Մեծցած ատենս, զիտէի ծնողքս ինձմէ ինչ կ'ակնկալէր ընտանիքէն ներս եւ իրենք կը պնդէին որ համակերպիմ այդ ակնկալութիւններուն պարզապէս որպէս յարգանք իրենց հեղինակութեան:
- 30. Մեծցած ատենս, եթէ ծնողքս ընտանիքէն ներս որոշում մը առնէր որ ցաւ կը պատճառէր ինձի, իրենք յօժար կ'ըլլային այդ որոշումը քննարկելու հետս եւ ընդունելու եթէ սխալ մը գործած էին:

Ստորել կը գտնէք նախադասութիւններու շարք մը, որ կը վերաբերի ձեր անձին հանդէպ ունեցած ձեր ընդհանուր զգացողութեան:

Շրջանակի մէջ առ քու պատասխանը, ընտրելով հետեւեալ տարբերակներէն մէկը.- Հաստատօրէն համաձայն, Համաձայն, Անհամաձայն, Հաստատօրէն անհամաձայն:

ՆԱԽԱԴԱՍՈՒԹԻՒՆ	Հաստատօրէն համաձայն	Համաձայն	Անհամաձայն	Հաստատօրէն Անհամաձայն
1. Կը զգամ որ արժանիք ունեցող անձ եմ, առնուազն ուրիշներու հետ հաւասար մակարդակի վրայ:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Կը զգամ որ կարգ մը լաւ յատկութիւններ ունիմ:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Ընդհանուր առմամբ հակամէտ եմ զգալու որ ձախողին մէկն եմ:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Ուրիշ մարդոց նման գործերս լաւ կրնամ ընել:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Կը կարծեմ թէ հպարտ ըլլալու շատ բան չունիմ:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Դրական կեցուածք ունիմ անձիս հանդէպ:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Ընդհանուր առմամբ, գոհ եմ ես ինձմով:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 8. Կը փափաքիմ աւելի յարգանք ունենալ ես իմ անձիս հանդէպ: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Անկասկած որ երբեմն անպէտք կը զգամ: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Երբեմն կը մտածեմ որ ոչ մէկ օգուտ ունիմ: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |