

**THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN BULLYING, DOMESTIC MALTREATMENT, AND
PERSONALITY TRAITS AMONG ADOLESCENTS WITHIN A GROUP OF
ARMENIAN SCHOOLS IN LEBANON**

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

BY

MANOUG GARABED IBITIAN

JUNE 2015

Thesis Release Form

I, Manoug Garabed Ibitian

- 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 thesis defense.

Signature

Date

HAIGAZIAN UNIVERSITY

**THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN BULLYING, DOMESTIC MALTREATMENT, AND
PERSONALITY TRAITS AMONG ADOLESCENTS WITHIN A GROUP OF
ARMENIAN SCHOOLS IN LEBANON**

Manoug Garabed Ibitian

Approved by:

Dr. Hanine Hout, Ed. D., Advisor

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

Dr. Hagop Yacoubian, Ph. D., Member of Committee

Copyright© 2015

This document is copyrighted material. Under copyright law, no parts of this document may be reproduced without the expressed permission of the author.

I dedicate this thesis to the valiant survivors of child abuse.

Acknowledgements

My foremost thanks go to God for providing me with the opportunity to acquire higher education in the field of Psychology.

My gratitude goes to my thesis advisor, Dr. Hanine Hout, for her guidance, encouragement, and support.

I would also like to thank the members of my thesis committee: Dr. Hagop Yacoubian and Dr. Marwan Gharzeddine. Thank you for enriching me with your professional skills and valuable experiences, comments, and direction. You have played a major role in improving my adeptness in both research and writing.

Special thanks to Dr. Daoud Tawil, who did not hesitate in providing statistical knowledge and experience.

My deepest appreciation and gratefulness go to Union of the Armenian Evangelical Churches in the Near East (UAENCE) and World Council of Churches (WCC) for providing the financial and moral support for this vision to become a reality.

A special word of thanks to Dr. Desmond Kimo Runyan for providing the domestic child abuse scale, ICAST-CH, and reviewing its outcomes.

I am grateful to Dr. Matthew Cox of East Carolina University for offering English language expertise during thesis editing.

Also, I would like to thank Nerces Armani for his sincere help and time in performing the statistical work. His selfless nature is greatly appreciated.

And finally, my ultimate thanks go to my family for supporting me in so many ways.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	vi
List of Tables	x
Abstract	xi
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Introduction	1
Background of the Study	3
A- Child Domestic Maltreatment, Bullying, and Personality Traits	3
B- Armenian schools of Lebanon and their Mission	6
Rationale and Statement of the Problem	8
The Significance of the Study	9
Overview of Methodology	9
Definitions of Key Terms	10
Chapter Two: Literature Review	12
Bullying Defined	12
Theories of Bullying	14
A- The Individual Perspective	14
B- The Systemic Perspective	15
Child Domestic Maltreatment Defined	17
Types of Maltreatment Used in this Study	17
A- Sexual Abuse	17
B- Physical Abuse	18

C- Neglect	19
Theories of Bullying and Child Domestic Maltreatment	20
A- Attachment Theory	20
B- Social Learning Theory	22
Empirical Research on Bullying and Child Domestic Maltreatment	23
Common Risk Factors of Maltreatment	24
A- The Family Factors	25
B- The Child Factors	26
C- The Environmental Factors	27
Personality Traits of DSM-5 in correlation with Bullying and CDM	28
A- Antagonism Trait	29
B- Disinhibition Trait	30
Conclusion	31
Chapter Three: Method	32
Research Context	32
Participants	33
Materials	34
Procedure	38
Chapter Four: Results	41
Reliability Testing	41
Demographic and Descriptive Data for Bullying and Victimization	42
Hypothesis Testing	42
Additional Analysis	46

Chapter Five: Discussion	48
Findings and Implications	48
A- Association between Child Domestic Maltreatment, Bullying and Victimization	48
B- Relationship between Antagonistic and Disinhibition Personality Traits and Bullying	52
Additional Findings	53
A- Bully and Victim Prevalence	53
B- Both vs. Bully or Victim	53
C- Gender Differences	54
Clinical Implications of the study	55
Future Research Suggestions	56
References	58
Appendices	73
A. Informed Consent	73
B. Demographic Information	74
C. Illinois Bully Scale	75
D. International Child Abuse Screening Tool – Children Home Version	77
E. Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form Child Age 11-17	84
F. Multiple Comparisons of Means between Neglect, Physical Abuse, Sexual Abuse, and Bullying and Victimization.	85

List of Tables

Table 1: Cronbach's alpha for the subscales used in the research	41
Table 2: One Way Analysis of Variance of Neglect, Physical Abuse, and Sexual Abuse by Bully, Victim, Both, and Control Groups	43
Table 3: Descriptive Data of the Groups: Bullies, Victims, Both and Control	44
Table 4: Multiple Comparisons of Means between Physical Abuse, Sexual Abuse, and Bullying and Victimization.	45
Table 5: Correlations between Disinhibition, Antagonism, and Bully	46
Table 6: t-test Results Comparing Males and Females on Being Bully or Victim	47

Abstract

The aim of this study was to identify the association between bullying, child domestic maltreatment, and personality traits among adolescents within a group of Armenian schools in Lebanon. Participants were 185 students in grades 7 to 10, attending Armenian schools in Beirut and its suburbs. The study depended on the self-report method, where participants supplied demographic information and filled in three questionnaires: Illinois Bully Scale, International Child Abuse Screening Tool – Children’s Version (ICAST – CH) and Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form (PID-5-BF) Child Age 11 – 17. Results, calculated by using ANOVA and Pearson correlation, indicated a statistically significant difference at the level of physical abuse between “victim” and “control” groups. Also, there were significant correlations between the “antagonistic” and “disinhibition” maladaptive personality traits and being a bully. The outcome of this study indicated the necessity of entailing parental and school guidance for preventing physical abuse ,as well as concentrating on identifying the bully personality implicated in antagonism and disinhibition maladaptive personality traits within a group of adolescents attending Armenian schools in Lebanon.

The Association between Bullying, Domestic Maltreatment, and Personality Traits among Adolescents within a Group of Armenian Schools in Lebanon

Introduction

Protecting children against maltreatment and bullying is a major global concern for human rights activists, social workers, educators, and psychologists. In fact, one of the main interests of such groups lies in finding associations between variables (for example: family maltreatment, peer aggression, etc.) that can help in predicting and identifying the effect of the violent acts and maltreatment on the children (Baldry & Farrington, 2005; Stein, Dukes, & Warren, 2007). Moreover, recently the spotlight has been directed toward finding a connection between such maltreatments and the personality traits of the abuser or bully (Shields & Cicchetti, 2001; Valen Morgan, 2012).

Keeping in mind the physical, psychological, mental, and emotional well-being of children, it is important to study the impact of child domestic maltreatment (CDM) and bullying at school on these children. CDM is defined as: “any recent act or failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker that result in death, serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse, or exploitation or that presents an imminent risk of serious harm” (Definitions in Federal Law, 2014, para. 2). In fact, the impact of CDM and bullying are receiving wide attention from psychologists and educators due to their negative implications on the maltreated children, bullies, and victims (Lopes, 2013; Olweus, 2003; Fahlberg & Kershner, 2003). For instance, such negative implications can include: depression (Björkqvist, Österman, & Berg, 2011; Klomek, Marrocco, Kleinman, Schonfeld, & Gould, 2008; Stein, et al., 2007; Holt, Finkelhor, & Kantor, 2007; Valen Morgan, 2012; Wolfe, Crooks, Chiodo, & Jaffe, 2009), posttraumatic stress

disorder (Valen Morgan, 2012; Fahlberg & Kershner, 2003; Wolfe et al., 2009), health issues (Fahlberg & Kershner, 2003; Juvonen, Graham, & Schuster, 2003; Rigby, 2003), cognitive difficulties (Fahlberg & Kershner, 2003; Valen Morgan, 2012), psychopathologic behaviors such as aggression, social problems, and externalizing behavior issues (GlasØ, Matthiesen, Birkeland Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2007; Holt et al., 2007; Juvonen et al., 2003; Kim, Leventhal, Koh, Hubbard, & Boyce, 2006; Lopes, 2013; Stein, 2007; Valen Morgan, 2012; Wolfe et al., 2009), and suicidal attempts (Fahlberg & Kershner, 2003; Holt et al., 2007; Klomek, Sourander, Niemela, Kumpulainen, Piha, Tamminen, Almgyst, & Gould, 2009; Valen Morgan, 2012).

Moreover, studies also reveal that there is a relationship between bullying, domestic maltreatment, and the development of a variety of socially unwanted personality traits, such as aggression (Björkqvist et al., 2011; Gershoff, 2002; GlasØ et al., 2007; Juvonen et al., 2003; Ondersma, Chaffin, Mullins, & LeBreton, 2005; Straus, 1991), borderline (Valen Morgan, 2012) and antisocial personality (Lopes, 2013; Valen Morgan, 2012) violent traits which can be implicated in the traits of antagonism and disinhibition where antagonism is related to the characteristics of being unfriendly, skeptic, manipulative, and less empathic (Thomas, Yalch, Krueger, Wright, Markon, & Hopwood, 2012; Wright, Markon, Thomas, Hopwood, Pincus, & Krueger, 2012), and disinhibition more related to being impulsive, less systematic, less self-disciplined, more engaging in delinquent and antisocial behaviors as well as, more expressive of emotional reaction (Thomas et al., 2012; Wright et al., 2012). Therefore, it is critical to determine the personality trait profile of the aggressor in order to prevent the possibility of major aggressive events, such as school shootings, (JeeHae Helen, 2013; Effects of Bullying, 2014), bullycide (bullied children committing suicide) and suicidal attempts (Klomek et al., 2009; School Bully OnLine, 2005; Valen Morgan, 2012).

Bullying and CDM are not only a global concern, but also a concern on the local Lebanese level. As concluded by Usta, Mahfoud, Abi Chahine, and Anani (2008) domestic maltreatment of children is of major concern as it is prevalent within a significant percentage level in Lebanon. Several scholars such as Koleilat (2003) (as cited in Rabah, 2006), Rabah (2006), and Zein (2001) identify serious occurrences of bullying among students in private schools in Lebanon. Moreover, Zein (2001) considers studying the topic of bullying substantial especially after the 15-year Lebanese civil war experience where the grandparents and the parents of current adolescents frequently displayed aggression. This could draw from the role modeling theory in which various aggressive behaviors by adults can be seen as having imitated, and then at some point later, expressed again aggressively by the children (Bandura, 1999). Thus, taking all these factors into consideration, this study will focus on bullying, CDM, and personality traits in a sample of adolescents attending Armenian schools in Lebanon. There are currently limited studies conducted on these topics within the context of Armenian schools.

Background of the Study

Child Domestic Maltreatment, Bullying, and Personality Traits

Child maltreatment has been under the spotlight of research since 1960. From that time, the research has concentrated on the association between child maltreatment and its outcomes (Hong, Espelage, Grogan-Kaylor, & Allen-Meares, 2012). In the same manner, bullying, although certainly noticed by educators before the 1970s, did not receive researchers' full attention until the mid-1970s (Olweus, 2003). Studies around bullying did not reach full intensity until 1983, when three boys in Norway committed suicide after being continuously and severely bullied in school by their peers (Olweus, 2003). Following this horrible incident, Norway's Ministry of Education asked professor Dan Olweus to design and conduct researches on bullying

and find its possible “causes” in the local Norwegian schools (Olweus, 2003). Since this event, several studies have focused on the relationship between child maltreatment at home and bullying (Björkqvist et al. 2011; Hong et al., 2012; Mohr, 2006; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001).

In order to investigate the correlation between these two variables, namely, child maltreatment and bullying, it is important to understand the dynamics of families in general. Family is the first place where children experience and witness interpersonal relationships between their parents and siblings. It is well established that through the family setting children learn what to await, how to act, and the importance of interpersonal relationships outside the home context (Stocker & Youngblade, 1999). Thus, the relationship between parent and child at home has an influence on peer relationships outside the boundaries of home (Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 1990; Mohr, 2006; Ohene, Ireland, McNeely, & Borowsky, 2006; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001; Wolfe et al., 2009). Moreover, in all families there is a member that is in a higher authoritative position allowing him/her to safeguard the well being of those with less power (U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 2003). When the more powerful member (i.e. parent) uses his/her power through maltreatment of the weaker members of the family (i.e. the child) this relationship is identified as child domestic maltreatment or “child abuse”; whereas when it occurs between peers then it is considered as “bullying” (Olweus, 2003). In the current research the maltreatment that occurs between students, regardless of their age difference, it is considered as “bullying”. Thus, according to the nature of this primary interpersonal relationship experience, the child will build his or her schema related to relationships (Lopes, 2013; Wolfe et al., 2009).

The significance of such early relationship schema in the child's life can be traced through a large number of studies that have focused on the high association between physical

maltreatment, sexual victimization, and neglect at home with being a bully and a victim at school later (Björkqvist et al. 2011; Hong et al., 2012; Mohr, 2006; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001). In other words, instead of using appropriate parental disciplinary techniques, child maltreatment is imposed, which, with time, is turned into the children's own violent behavior (i.e. bullying). This confirms the existence of an association between maltreatment and bullying (Hong et al. 2012; Lopes, 2013).

On the other hand, there are few studies that correlate personality traits to the bully (USDHHS, 2003). One of these studies is the one performed by Pontzer (2010) who discovered a correlation between impulsive (disinhibition) traits and the bully. Another was Tani, Greenman, Schneider, and Fregoso's (2003) study that identified the possible contribution of personality traits to bullying behavior in children. Many studies like the ones done by Ondersma et al. (2005), Putnam (2003), Usta et al. (2008), and many more, frequently show a list of traits that are more common among those who are abusive. These traits include: issues in self-esteem, absence of impulse control, anxiety, depression, and tendencies of antisocial behavior (Ondersma et al., 2005; Putnam, 2003; Usta et al., 2008; & Valen Morgan, 2012).

According to a study conducted by Valen Morgan (2012), which concentrated on examining the relationship between personality traits and the potential of abusing a child physically, she found out the existence of high positive significant correlation between abuse and all high-order traits of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Restructured Form (MMPI-2-RF) which includes: Emotional/Internalizing Dysfunction (EID), Thought Dysfunction (THD), and Behavioral/Externalizing Dysfunction (BED). EID ranked the first in the order of correlation with abuse implying that high amount of emotional distress being strongly connected to the potential of physical abuse. Furthermore, in the same study, she found out a correlation

between antisocial behavior, hypomanic activation and demoralization, which are similar to disinhibition (Sher & Trull, 1994) and antagonistic (Miller & Lynam, 2001) personality traits, to that of physical abuse. In the same manner, after examining the DSM-5 personality traits it was found out that these traits were robustly related to four higher order traits of Five-Factor Model (developed by Lewis Goldberg) and other similar models that comprise in them pathology of personality; where introversion was similar to detachment, antagonism, and emotional dysregulation resembling negative emotionality, and impulsivity to that of disinhibition (Hopwood, Thomas, Markon, Wright, & Krueger, 2012; Wright et al., 2012).

Armenian schools of Lebanon and their Mission

Armenians living in Lebanon are a minority ethnic group representing 4% of the total Lebanese population (Central Intelligence Agency, 2014). According to Kaloustian (1958), at the end of First World War, there were approximately 90,000 Armenians living in present-day Lebanon who had total control over their own community life that mainly centered around corresponding churches. In fact, the church was not only an area of religious practice, but also the consolidative power in Lebanese Armenians' community life (Kaloustian, 1958). In this way, the church became the center for describing and expressing the civic rights of the people (Kaloustian, 1958). Armenian schools in Lebanon were mostly under the patronage of churches (Jizmejian, 1963), which is still the case today (Attarian, 2014). Most of these educational institutions were established after a certain religious denomination that created its own board of trustees to regulate its school (Attarian, 2014; Kaloustian, 1958).

As for the history of Armenian schools in Lebanon, according to Kaloustian (1958), there were three Armenian religious denominations: Orthodox, Catholic, and Evangelical, which started establishing churches and schools around the years 1922 and 1923. As indicated by

Tanielian (2002), by the years 1974-1975, there were 60 Armenian schools practicing their role as educative institutions in Lebanon.

According to Varjabedian (1981), Armenian schools in Lebanon were mostly owned by a community; and his statistics about the number of Armenian schools in Lebanon in 1981 counted as follows: 24 schools which were owned by Orthodox denomination, 12 by Catholic denomination, 16 by Evangelical denomination, and several other owned by private educational institutions, including technical ones.

Unfortunately, the Lebanese civil war that started in 1975 had its destructive effect on the Lebanese society, economy and politics. Concurrently, this devastation had its profound effect on decreasing the number of these educational institutions as a large number of Lebanese Armenians immigrated to other countries (Tanielian, 2002).

According to Attarian's report (2014), currently there are 12 Orthodox denomination schools, six Catholic, six Evangelical, one other, and a few technical institutions remaining. These educational institutions are aimed at providing students with quality education and skills, and at the same time keeping Armenian traditions by emphasizing ethical and Christian qualities (Attarian, 2014; Kaloustian, 1958).

In this study four Armenian schools were recruited which belong to the same community. The schools are located in the greater Beirut area; aim at cultivating Armenian, Lebanese and Christian identities in their students; and are at the intermediate or secondary level. Considering that our sample is not representative of all Armenian schools in Lebanon, the results of this study cannot be generalized.

Rationale and Statement of the Problem

Since studies on bullying in the private schools of Lebanon are very rare (Zein, 2001), this study aimed at filling the gap in research in this area, in an attempt to identify the impact of CDM and personality traits (antagonism and disinhibition) on bullying and victimization in adolescents who are attending Armenian schools in Lebanon. It is worth mentioning that several studies that are conducted outside Lebanon, such as the ones by Björkqvist et al. (2011), Hong et al. (2012), Shields & Cicchetti (2001), and many others, found a positive correlation between bullying and CDM; and other studies like the ones by Pontzer (2010), Shields & Cicchetti (2001), Valen Morgan (2012), and many more, obtained a positive correlation between bullying and certain personality traits, mainly antagonism and disinhibition. In the same manner, the author of this study aimed at finding out if the situation was the same regarding the adolescents who attended Armenian schools in Lebanon.

Thus, according to the givens previously mentioned, the author has predicted the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Bullies and victims will not differ on physical abuse but they will differ from control group.

Hypothesis 2: Bullies and victims will not differ on sexual abuse but they will differ from control group.

Hypothesis 3: Bullies and victims will not differ on neglect but they will differ from control group.

Hypothesis 4: There is a positive correlation between the Antagonistic personality trait and being a bully.

Hypothesis 5: There is a positive correlation between the Disinhibition personality trait and being a bully.

The Significance of the Study

The importance of this study lies, first, in being a rare study tackling the topic of CDM, bullying and personality traits on a minority ethnic group in Lebanon, namely, the Armenian adolescents. Second, this study is crucial in identifying the prevalence of CDM and bullying and its impact on adolescents who are attending the targeted Armenian Schools in Lebanon in order to be able to implement prevention programs and provide help to those who are in need of intervention. Third, the significance of this study lies in finding out whether there are certain personality traits for the bully, in order to be able to increase the predictability of locating bullies in Lebanese schools as well non-Lebanese schools suffering from serious bullying issues. Fourth, the outcomes of the study can shed more light on the work of the local practitioners, such as, therapists, clinicians, school counselors, and social workers, who could design and launch culturally sensitive preventive programs in the local communities as well as adopt more effective intervention counseling strategies that are more suitable for abused or bullied young people.

Overview of Methodology

This study is quantitative research that employs One Way ANOVA analysis and correlations in order to test the hypotheses and interpret the data obtained. The sample is a convenient sample that included Armenian students between the ages of 12-17 and from grades 7-10 attending one of the four targeted Armenian schools. Beside the Consent Form (Appendix A) and the demographic sheet (Appendix B), the participants answered the Illinois Bully Scale (2001) (Appendix C), the International Child Abuse Screening Tool-Children's Home Version (2009) (Appendix D), and the Personality Inventory for DSM 5 Brief Form (2013) (Appendix E).

Definitions of Key Terms

Antagonism: A personality trait that is characterized by skepticism regarding others motives, manipulative, hostile, deceitful, callous, and competitive rather than being cooperative (Wright et al., 2012).

Bullying: The phenomenon, which entails the application of repeated negative actions, imbalance in power, and proactive aggression of the bullied or victimized (Olweus, 2003)

Bully: An individual who intentionally hurts others physically, verbally, or socially (Olweus, 2003).

Disinhibition: A personality trait that is characterized as impulsive, unable to conceal some emotional reactions, less systematic, more risk taking, distractible, and irresponsible (Wright et al., 2012).

Domestic maltreatment: Is defined as: “Any recent act or failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker that result in death, serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse, or exploitation or that presents an imminent risk of serious harm” (Definitions in Federal Law, 2014, para. 2).

Neglect: Is defined as: “A type of maltreatment that refers to the failure by the caregiver to provide needed, age-appropriate care although financially able to do so or offered financial or other means to do so” (USDHHS, 2007) (as cited in Child Neglect, 2014, para. 2).

Personality traits: Are defined as: “The enduring patterns of thoughts, feelings, and actions” (McCrae & Costa, 1999, p. 140).

Physical abuse: Any kind of non-accidental physical injury caused to the child by adults resulting in minor injuries to death. (USDHHS, 2003).

Sexual abuse: Is defined as: “The employment, use, persuasion, inducement, enticement, or coercion of any child to engage in, or assist any other person to engage in, any sexually explicit

conduct or simulation of such conduct for the purpose of producing a visual depiction of such conduct; or the rape, molestation, prostitution, or other form of sexual exploitation of children, or incest with children” (Definitions, Scope, and Effects of Child Sexual Abuse, 2014, para. 8).

Victim: “a person is being bullied or victimized, when he/she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other persons” (Olweus, 1994, as cited in Carey, 2003, p. 98).

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

In the past several years bullying has gained broad examination and diligent study by the researchers and those who work with children, especially after leading to serious outcomes such as school shootings, bullycide (bullied children committing suicide), and suicide attempts. For these reasons, many researchers became even more eager to find specific predictors that might be contributing to this aggressive behavior in order to limit or decrease occurrences of bullying in schools.

The aim of this chapter is to (1) define bullying and provide a theoretical background of bullying behavior, and (2) to delve into the two main independent variables: child domestic maltreatment and personality traits (including a theoretical background and empirical studies that associate bullying, CDM, and risk factors as well as the two personality traits that are linked to the bully character and its connection to CDM).

Bullying Defined

Although bullying is not only a contemporary issue, it has only recently received adequate attention from researchers and certain societies (Kyriakides, Kaloyirou, & Lindsay, 2006). This delay could be due to researchers' difficulties in finding a common definition and measurement tool that endorses the multidimensional properties of bullying (Kyriakides et al., 2006). Nevertheless, contemporary bullying in schools is considered to be a kind of aggressive behavior that involves many factors. According to the holistic definition for school bullying provided by Olweus (1993): "a student is being bullied or victimized when he/she is exposed, repeatedly and over time to negative actions on the part of one or more other students. It is a negative action when someone intentionally inflicts, or attempts to inflict, injury or discomfort

upon another” (p. 9). Moreover, Olweus points out that the negative actions do not necessarily indicate physical contact only, but also they comprise verbal or any other methods, like making faces or indecent gestures, and intentionally excluding peers from the team, argue it. However, for a negative act to be considered bullying, it implies the presence of imbalance in the power between the respondents (Kyriakides et al., 2006). Eventually this definition became the basis for developing worldwide research studies (Kyriakides et al., 2006; Pateraki & Houndoumadi, 2001) and unveiling the significant educational problematic value of bullying globally that is able to impede the effectiveness of the school (Ma, 2002).

Currently, there is a common understanding among researchers regarding involvement in bullying (Olweus, 2003). In the literature of bullying, the following roles are taken into consideration: The *bully* is the individual (or the group) who causes harm to other peers; the *victim* is the individual who is targeted by the bully; the *bully-victim* is the individual who is both involved in inflicting harm on others and is a target of the bully at the same time; and the *bystander* is the individual who simply attends and witnesses others being bullied by the bully (Olweus, 2001a; Olweus, 2001b).

By talking about the characteristics of the bully, it is imperative to mention that most bullies have impulsive and aggressive traits, little empathy (especially toward their victims), strong view of self, and popularity among their friends (Olweus, 1993; Stein et al., 2007). On the other hand, victims bear the characteristics of being anxious, vulnerable, sentimental, quiet, and timid. Mostly, they react easily by crying (especially those in lower grades) when targeted by the bully. Typically, their view of self and their situation is negative, because they consider themselves as failures and idiots (Olweus, 1993; Stein et al., 2007). Mainly, victims are abandoned loners (Holt et al., 2007), because they lack the presence of good peers in their school

life. Unlike bullies, victims display negative attitude towards aggression and the means of the use of violence. Thus, we can say that the attitude of victims is neither aggressive nor vexing (Olweus, 1993).

The issue of bullying causes problems for both the victim and the bully. The consequences of bullying are enormous on both the victims and bullies. Victims are prone to suffering from emotional, behavioral and relationship problems, like anxiety, depression, low self-esteem, suicidal ideation, loneliness, health complaints, and poor academic performance; whereas the emotional, behavioral and relationship problems from which bullies suffer are: delinquency, aggression, substance abuse, and sexual harassment (Friedman, Marshal, Guadamuz, Wei, Wong, Saewyc, & Stall, 2011; Holt et al., 2007; Rigby, 2013; & Wolfe et al., 2009).

Theories of Bullying

To understand the dynamism of bullying, it is necessary to discuss the formation of this relational behavior from a theoretical perspective. There are two points of views that mainly explain bullying: the Individual and Systemic Perspectives.

The Individual Perspective. In order to discuss the Individual Perspective, it is necessary to mention that this approach tries to explain bullying behavior through three different theories: Behaviorist, Cognitive Behaviorist, and Role Modeling. The Behaviorist Theory states that the learned behaviors, if reinforced, are more likely to be repeated especially when they are of benefit to the involved individual (McLeod, 2009). Thus, this operant conditioning is also applicable in the bully setting. What, though, can be the benefit or the reward in bullying others? In this case, the reward can be seeing the target (i.e. the victim) become discouraged and depressed. For the victim, on the other hand, the act of bullying conditions cognitive deficits

causing him/her to believe that the situation is out-of-control and nothing can be done except to surrender and allow the bully continued control through bullying. In fact, this scenario was explained by Seligman (1975) as “Learned Helplessness”. As from the victim’s perspective, learned helplessness may unconsciously serve the psychological purpose of warranting the attention of bystanders and school staff (Lines, 2008).

As for Cognitive Theory, it is not the bullying problem per se that causes the difficulties but the faulty thinking of the individual regarding the problem itself (Beck, 1976; Ellis, 1962). In other words, it is the formation of faulty cognitions from negative past experiences, such as, thinking that nobody likes them, or they are no good, that provides the basis for justifying the bullying act. For example, the faulty thinking of “my classmate always intends to harm me” can lead to overreacting to any simple action done by the bully, Thus resulting in more negative outcomes (Lines, 2008), like getting depressed (Björkqvist et al., 2011; Klomek et al., 2008; Stein et al. 2007; Valen Morgan, 2012; Wolfe et al., 2009), health issues (Fahlberg & Kershner, 2003; Juvonen et al., 2003; Rigby, 2003) , cognitive difficulties (Fahlberg & Kershner, 2003; Valen Morgan, 2012), and suicidal attempts (Fahlberg & Kershner, 2003; Klomek et al., 2009; Valen Morgan, 2012).

Finally, Role-Modeling Theory, as explained by Bandura (1999) states that some behaviors, in this case violent or aggressive behaviors, are consciously or unconsciously learned by observing the specific behavior modeled through significant people in the life or environment of the individual. The role-modeling concept is considered as an element of learning theory.

The Systemic Perspective. According to the systemic perspective, the shaping of the behavior takes place when two individuals interact with one another. Taking into consideration that school bullying results from the interaction of two people, we can thus consider it a

relationship issue. In this sense, we will discuss two theories, the Systems Theory and the Developmental Theory. In the Systems Theory, the main focus is the family system where the interrelations between the members of the family give a meaning to the family as a whole entity. And any behavior done by a family member will have an effect on the other family members, that is, the whole family. According to this theory, explaining bullying behavior should take place within the context of the group, which, in its turn, will be able to interpret the bullying behavior on an individual level (Lines, 2008). According to Lines (2008) problems mainly exist within the system and not in the individual, because most of the time behaviors in the system are reciprocal and to understand them we should look at their meaning within the whole entity. Thus, connecting this theory to bullying, it is essential to look at the bullying behavior from the perspective of reciprocal and mutual behavior of the individual and group members, altogether (Lines, 2008).

The Developmental Theory, on the other hand, connects the aggressive behavior of adolescents to their cognitive and hormonal changes that they undergo in their adolescence (Lines, 2008). During this period of development, friendships become the center of interest and the loyalty displayed to the authority figures, like parents and teachers, is shifted onto their peers. Thus, the need to be identified and belong to their peer group increases. In this manner, bullying promotes the feelings of belongingness and identification with the corresponding peer group (Lines, 2008).

After defining bullying and discussing its theoretical implications, we turn our attention to CDM in order to define it and identify its types that concern this study.

Child Domestic Maltreatment Defined

According to Leeb, Paulozzi, Melanson, Smith, & Arias (2008), child maltreatment is defined as any kind of act or series of acts of perpetration like emotional, physical and sexual abuse or acts of omission such as neglect by a parent or a custodian, which usually results in harming, potential harming or threatening to harm a child. In the same manner, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act defined child domestic maltreatment as “any recent act or failure to act on the part of a parent or caretaker that results in death, serious physical or emotional harm, sexual abuse, or exploitation or that presents an imminent risk of serious harm” (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2007, para. 2). Thus, the division of CDM into discrete categories of sexual abuse, physical abuse, and neglect.

Types of Maltreatment Used in this Study

In fact, there are several types of maltreatment, which are categorized, in our study, as follows: sexual abuse, physical abuse, and neglect. It is necessary to understand the definition of each type of maltreatment and its constitution in order to be able to identify its occurrence in the corresponding participants of this research.

Sexual Abuse. According to World Health Organization (1999), child sexual abuse (CSA) is the involvement of a child in a sexual activity that he or she does not fully comprehend, is unable to give informed consent to, because he or she is not developmentally prepared; the sexual abuse violates the laws or social taboos of society. CSA involves physical and psychological violation of the child’s body and personal space. Consequently, sexual abuse can be evident through: kissing, oral-genital contact, intercourse, touching, voyeurism, exhibitionism, sexual jokes, sexual hugs, harmful hygienic practices, and being preoccupied with the child’s body (Fahlberg and Kershner, 2003).

Thus, CSA is considered to be one of the most harmful types of abuse, which can be presented, as defined by Berliner (2000), in the form of sexual acts, motivations, behaviors, or disfigurement of a child. According to the United States Department of Health and Human Services (2003), CSA can include a broad range of behaviors like: penile penetration (oral, genital, or anal), digital or other penetration (genital or anal), genital touch without penetration, caressing the breast or the buttocks of a child, public nudity, insufficient or improper supervision of voluntary sexual activities of a child, or using the child for prostitution, pornography, crimes of internet, or any kind of sexually exploitative activity purposes.

Regarding to the prevalence of CSA, approximately 300,000 children per year are sexually abused in the United States (Fahlberg and Kershner, 2003). As for the Middle East; the rate of abuse is the same for both, males and females (Haj-Yahia and Tamish, 2001). And according to the study performed in Lebanon by Usta et al. (2008), the prevalence turned out to be 16.1% (165 cases in a sample of 1,025 participants).

Physical Abuse. As for physical abuse it includes any kind of physical injury caused to the child. The physical damage, as indicated in the United States Department of Health and Human Services (2003), can be presented as follows: “bruises and fractures resulting from punching, beating, kicking, biting, shaking, throwing, stabbing, choking, hitting, or burning, among others” (USDHHS, 2003, p. 16). The harm that is caused to the child can be either immediate (broken bones) or the result of accumulated occurrences (brain damage caused by shaking). The harm that results from physical abuse can have a wide severity range, which can even lead to death (USDHHS, 2003). And concerning the age range of those children who are most prone to physical abuse, as stated in the statistics of the US Department of Health and

Human Services, Administration on Children, Youth and Families (2009), it is between ages of 4 and 7 and ages 12 and 15.

Regarding to the prevalence of physical abuse it is estimated that 2 children will experience physical abuse out of 1000 (USDHHS, 2003). In Lebanon, as mentioned in Usta et al. (2008), the prevalence of physical abuse indicated that 557 out of 1,025 participants (54.1%) reported as being “sometimes” or “always” subjected to at least one of the abusive acts mentioned in the definition of physical abuse. Here it is worth to clarify that the injury caused to the child is not always accidental. However, this does not indicate that the parent or caregiver purposely injured the child (USDHHS, 2003). Examples of situations where an injury is unintended by the parent or caregiver is either due to severe disciplinary technique usage or adopting a disciplinary method that includes physical punishment which is unfit to the age of the child (USDHHS, 2003).

Neglect. It is essential to mention that neglect is the most commonly identified type of child maltreatment (USDHHS, 2003). As indicated by the studies used in meta-analysis done by Stoltenborgh, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & IJzendoorn (2013), child neglect ranges from 1.4% to 80.1%. Child neglect is mainly defined as the absenteeism of basic and emotional care that places the child at risk of being harmed or results in harm (USDHHS, 2003). Additionally, the absence of basic care also means lack of food, housing, clothing, education, health care, hygiene, or surveillance whenever needed (USDHHS, 2003). As for the absence of emotional care, also known as emotional neglect, it includes: lack of emotional support, abusing others in front of the child, permitting the intake of alcohol or any other drugs by the child, allowing maladaptive behaviors (delinquencies) to happen, or delaying or refusing the psychological professional help of the child regarding psychological issues like suicide attempt (USDHHS, 2003). And

concerning the fatality rates related to the abuse and neglect, it is well known that there is a high rate of fatality for the child in neglect cases (34.9%) as compared to the other maltreatment (USDHHS, 2003).

After stating and clarifying the definition of maltreatment and its types, we are able to talk about the theories that attempt to explain the interconnection between bullying and CDM.

Theories of Bullying and Child Domestic Maltreatment

According to Dussich and Maekoya (2007) the issue of bullying is of primary concern for school administrations and teachers, but the origin of this problem is more related to the conditions at home rather than the school. In their study they have found a significant correlation between physical maltreatment and bullying and victimization. Thus, this research identified the effect of domestic maltreatment on potentially increasing the risk of becoming a bully or a victim in school. In this respect there are several theories, such as the attachment theory and social learning theory, which can explain this relationship.

Attachment Theory. Attachment theorists discuss the connection between maltreatment in childhood, by an abusive caregiver, that leads to development of insecure or negative attachment (Toth, Manly, & Cicchetti, 1992; Shields and Cicchetti, 2001), which in turn results in problems of establishing positive relationships with peers at school (Hong et al., 2012).

Further, children who grow up in authoritarian families are constantly maltreated; thus, they have learned an abusive kind of relationship to be the only way to relate with family members and peers (Olweus, 1993; Rigby, 2013). On the other hand, the same authoritarian style might induce the feelings of shyness and an introvert trait in the individual, thus leading to the failure of defending the self and becoming a target for the bully (Rigby, 2013). Therefore, the

analysis of this concept makes us anticipate that physical abuse or punishment will lead to bullying and victimization.

For the same concern, Baldry and Farrington (2005) performed a study on a sample of 679 Italian male adolescents at an Italian high school. In this study they reported that the family relationship quality can either increase or decrease the experiences of youth with bullying and victimization. Thus, the results suggested that those parents who mainly used punishment, or who had conflictual relationship with their youth had children with increased risk of bullying and victimization, whereas those parents who were more supportive and authoritative type had children who were less likely to be engaged in bullying and victimization. Likewise, in another study performed by Björkqvist et al.(2011), of 4th and 6th grade students in the Åland Islands, Finland, the authors found out that 89 out of 530 students (16.8%) who were hit by an adult were not exposed to bullying at school; whereas, 73 out of 185 (39.5%) who were hit by an adult were exposed to bullying at school, thus obtaining a statistically significant result ($\chi^2 = 23.42, p < .001, \phi = 0.195, \phi^2 = 0.038$). Moreover, according to a very recent study done in Lebanese Armenian Secondary Schools, where 465 students of grades 10, 11, and 12 participated from 9 Armenian Secondary Schools, it was shown that there was a positive correlation between permissive parenting style and bullying ($r = .097, p = .036$), positive correlation between authoritarian parenting style and bullying ($r = .094, p = .044$) and victimization ($r = .150, p = .001$), and negative correlation between authoritative parenting style and bullying ($r = -.209, p = .000$) and victimization ($r = -.224, p = .000$) (Moughalian, 2014). Thus, taking into consideration the high correlations between CDM and permissive parenting style as well as authoritarian parenting style, in a Lebanese Armenian sample (Moughalian, 2014) on one hand, and a positive correlation between CDM and bullying and victimization on the other hand

(Björkqvist et al. 2011; Hong et al., 2012; Lopes, 2013; Mohr, 2006; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001), we can say that in our study we expect to find a positive interrelation between CDM and bullying and victimization among adolescents attending Armenian schools of Lebanon.

Social Learning Theory. The other theory that explains the relationship between CDM and bullying behavior is the Social Learning Theory. Social learning theorists propose that when parents or caregivers, in addition to the antisocial peers, model the abusive behavior in front of the child, then this child will learn this negatively modeled behavior which subsequently will reinforce the aggressive behavior in the child (Akers, 1998; Bender, 2010). However, the supporters of life course theory argue about the importance of positively bonding to law-abiding congenial people or institutions which consequently empower children and adolescents to abstain from misanthropic behaviors like bullying (Bender, 2010). According to Bender (2010), children and adolescents who experience maltreatment or neglect might develop feelings of disconnection from conventional institutions, such as school, and might not establish this aforementioned positive bonding in return. Additionally, when the relation of bonding to law-abiding congenial people or institutions is negatively established through CDM, rather than empowering the child or the adolescent, a negative impact will occur that can be established in bullying, leading to more aggressive interactions with peers (Hong et al. 2012).

This collection of theories may provide explanations for bullying and CDM, but the Social Learning (Role-Model), the Attachment and the Systems theories are more able to directly explain the interrelation between bullying, victimization and the malfunctioning family atmosphere, which is implicated in CDM.

After identifying the theoretical background and interrelation of bullying and CDM, it is essential to provide further explanation by discussing the empirical studies conducted.

Empirical Research on Bullying and Child Domestic Maltreatment

Several studies show that children who experience domestic maltreatment are more likely to undergo behavioral, developmental, interpersonal, and school-associated problems, thus placing them at risk of school bullying victimization (Björkqvist et al. 2011; Hong et al., 2012; Lopes, 2013; Mohr, 2006; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001). In the same context, other studies discuss the association of negative outcomes of domestic maltreatment with school bullying and victimization. The negative outcomes include: depression (Björkqvist et al., 2011; Klomek et al., 2008; Wolfe et al. 2009), posttraumatic stress disorder (Valen Morgan, 2012; Wolfe et al. 2009), health issues (Rigby, 2003), cognitive difficulties (Valen Morgan, 2012), psychopathologic behaviors such as aggression, social problems, and externalizing behavior issues (Baldry & Farrington, 2005; Kim et al., 2006; Wolfe et al., 2009), and suicidal attempts (Klomek et al., 2009; Valen Morgan, 2012). Moreover, the studies also reveal that there is a relationship between domestic physical abuse and the development of variety of socially unwanted personality traits, like aggression (Björkqvist et al., 2011; Gershoff, 2002; Straus, 1991), borderline and antisocial personality violent traits (Sher & Trull, 1994; Valen Morgan, 2012). For example, in 2005, Baldry and Farrington performed a study on a sample of 679 Italian male adolescents at an Italian high school. This study reported that the quality of family relationships either increases or decreases the experience of youth with bullying and victimization. Thus, the results suggested that the abusive parents had children with increased risk of bullying and victimization, whereas the parents who were more supportive and authoritative had children who were less likely to be engaged in bullying and victimization. Another study done by Valen Morgan (2012), on a sample of 155 parents/caretakers, concentrated on examining the relationship between personality traits and child physical abuse. In this study she found the

existence of a significantly positive correlation between physical abuse and all high-order traits of the MMPI-2-RF (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 Restructured Form) which included: Emotional/Internalizing Dysfunction (EID), Thought Dysfunction (THD), and Behavioral / Externalizing Dysfunction (BED), where EID, $r = .90$, $n = 62$, $p < .001$, ranked the first in the order of correlation with abuse implying that high amount of emotional distress being strongly connected to the potential of physical abuse. Furthermore, in the same study, she found out a correlation between antisocial and aggressive behaviors, which are similar to disinhibition (Sher and Trull, 1994) and antagonistic (Miller and Lynam, 2001) personality traits, to that of physical abuse.

Furthermore, several studies concluded that those adolescents who are maltreated as children are more likely to get involved in criminal actions and be arrested as compared to other adolescents, and more likely to perpetrate at least one act of aggressive crime during their adolescent or adulthood years (Holt et al., 2007; Ondersma et al., 2005; Valen Morgan, 2012). In fact, the incidence of alcohol and drug use is a very common consequence in those who are maltreated as children (JeeHae Helen, 2013; Ondersma et al., 2005; Sher & Trull, 1994; Valen Morgan, 2012). Subsequently, the necessity of developing a list of risk factors and indicators for prevention and early detection of child abuse becomes a must (GlasØ et al., 2007; Ondersma et al., 2005; Valen Morgan, 2012).

Common Risk Factors of Maltreatment

The complex effects of child maltreatment on the maltreated can propagate the risk factors that may lead to child maltreatment, thus leading to the appearance of the warning signs of maltreatment. In fact there is no one risk factor that predicts the maltreatment; also there is no one race, culture, religion, or socioeconomic class that is resistant to the maltreatment

(USDHHS, 2003). However, we can locate a set of risk factors that are common characteristics of those who maltreat. These factors include: the family, the child, and the environment of the abuser (USDHHS, 2003).

The Family Factors. Family factors that contribute in increasing the risk of CDM include the problems associated with parental conflicts, single parenting, unemployment rate, and stress level (USDHHS, 2003). Speaking about parental conflict studies indicate the occurrence of child abuse in 30% to 60% of domestic maltreatment of spouses (Valen Morgan, 2012). Moreover, as mentioned by the National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect (1999), not only there is a high chance of child maltreatment in these abusive homes, but also the chance of the child witnessing the domestic maltreatment and being neglected is more (cited in Valen Morgan, 2012). Even if the child is not directly maltreated, he/she is most likely to suffer from emotional abuse or any other kind of emotional issues by simply living in a house where violence prevails (Valen Morgan, 2012). As for single parenting, a study which included 42 countries indicated that those children who live with a single parent are 77% more likely to be physically abused and more likely to be prone to sexual abuse as compared to children who live with both parents (USDHHS, 2003). In another study, the percentage of child maltreatment in a single parent house (27.3% children per 1,000) was almost twice the percentage of the abuse in a both parent house (15.5% children per 1,000) (USDHHS, 2003). Actually, most research shows that children who live with single parents of a lower income (most probably at or below the poverty level) will have a high chance of being maltreated compared to those children who live with both parents (USDHHS, 2003).

Concerning the unemployment rate, the poverty level will play an important role in increasing the stress level of the parents or caregivers which consequently will escalate the rates

of child maltreatment in these households. According to Salhani (2014), the latest Lebanese youth unemployment rate is 35%, which is a considerably a high rate. The general Lebanese unemployment rate is 15% (Sakr, 2013) and the percentage of the Lebanese population living below the poverty line is 28% (Central Intelligence Agency, 2014). Connecting these givens to the outcome of the research done by NIS-3 (Third National Incidence Study) in 1993, which found out that the maltreatment rate being 22 times more in households with family income equal to 15,000\$ per year as compared to those with 30,000\$ per year (Sedlak and Broadhurst, 1996), we can say that similar rating can be expected as well in the Lebanese society. More often poverty and low annual income are interrelated with other factors like stress, drug or alcohol abuse issues, mental health problems, and absence of social support altogether increasing the chance of the child to face different kinds of maltreatment and neglect in similar households (USDHHS, 2003).

The Child Factors. Obviously children are not responsible for being maltreated, but it is necessary to mention some factors that are related to the children that might contribute to their maltreatment. The factors include: the age of the child, developmental stage, and disability. These factors combined with family and environmental factors might make the child more vulnerable to different kinds of maltreatment (Valen Morgan, 2012). Although the relationship between maltreatment and child age is not clear cut, some researches indicate that the type of maltreatment might change according to the age. For example, in a study done in 2000 the results indicated a high neglect rate among children who were between ages 0 to 3 (15.7% per 1,000 similar aged children); whereas teenagers, on the other hand, showed a high rate of sexual abuse (USDHHS, 2003). Furthermore, according to the longitudinal study conducted by Chapple, Tyler, and Bersani (2005), in a representative community sample, adolescents who were

physically and emotionally neglected as children were more likely to be rejected by their peers during their early adolescence and develop violent propensity in their late adolescence.

Regarding the developmental stages, studies indicate that babies and young children are more prone to be maltreated by their parents or caregivers due to their minor physical size, early developmental stage and constant need for care. One of the most prevailing parental maltreatments that babies undergo is the "Shaken Baby Syndrome" (USDHHS, 2003). As for those who suffer from physical, cognitive or emotional disabilities they are more susceptible to domestic maltreatment. One of the national studies performed in 1993 found out 1.7 times increase of maltreatment in children with disability as compared to those without disability. Moreover, children who have a difficult temperament (personality) were within those of high risk for maltreatment (USDHHS, 2003).

The Environmental Factors. Environmental factors are considered to be a combination of the aforementioned family and child factors. In addition to those factors like unemployment and poverty that are mentioned previously, environmental factors include in it the aggressive community and media. It has been found that those children who are living in dangerous areas were at higher risk of being maltreated or neglected than those who lived in safer places. Researchers believe that poverty is one of the main reasons behind this maltreatment, however being exposed to violence also can be an important factor for increasing the rate of maltreatment in these children. Moreover, the elevated rate of violence in the public media is playing an additionally negative role in increasing the risk of violence and abuse against children. Furthermore, several researches showed the existence of a positive correlation between the levels of violence broadcast on television and the level of aggression depicted by those who watch a large amount of violent television programs (USDHHS, 2003).

Studies found that children who were physically, sexually, or emotionally abused in their households are more likely to be loners or establish deviant or antisocial peer relationships (Bender, 2010). Thus, the concern of finding a correlation between specific personality traits and the bully perpetrator is the focus of the proceeding paragraphs.

Personality Traits of DSM-5 in correlation with Bullying and CDM

The new Personality Inventory for Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (PID-5), the brief form of this scale is used in this study, contains in it the multidimensional trait system that represents the Personality Disorders (PDs) proposed by the DSM-5 and the Personality Disorder Work Group (Strickland, Drislane, Lucy, Krueger, & Patrick, 2013). In this framework, 25 principal trait scales were categorized under 5 higher order traits as follows: Negative Affect (Anxiousness, Emotional Lability, Perseveration, and Separation Insecurity), Detachment (Withdrawal, Anhedonia, Restricted Affectivity, Depressivity, and Intimacy Avoidance), Antagonism (Manipulativeness, Grandiosity, Deceitfulness, Callousness, Attention Seeking, and Hostility), Disinhibition (Impulsivity, Risk Taking, Distractibility and Irresponsibility), and Psychoticism (Eccentricity, Perceptual Dysregulation, and Unusual Beliefs) (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Thomas et al. 2012; Wright et al. 2012). In fact, the five higher order personality traits show a convergence with the observed maladaptive personality traits in bullies that were mentioned by Olweus (1993) where he categorized the bully as the aggressive person and the bullying “as a subset of aggressive behavior” which is directed against a specific person or a group (cited in Hong et al. 2012).

Other researches who have also found significant high levels of aggressive behavior among children with emotional dysregulation (Chang, Schwartz, Dodge, & McBride-Chang,

2003; Valen Morgan, 2012) discovered that these children were more at risk of bullying others and being rejected by peers (Shields and Cicchetti, 2001). Also, a significant amount of documented work shows the effect of abuse on increasing the aggression in the maltreated child. Mainly, adults rated those children who were maltreated as more aggressive on both verbal and physical levels. As for peers of the maltreated children, they considered them as more mean and always ready to pick fights (Shields and Cicchetti, 2001). Moreover, many well-established studies were able to establish a link between emotional dysregulation on one hand and increased violent and antisocial behavior as well as depression and anxiety on the other hand (Chang et al., 2003; Marsee & Frick, 2007; Shields and Cicchetti, 2001; Valen Morgan, 2012).

Thus, since bullying is considered a kind of aggressive behavior which is overlapping with antagonism and disinhibition personality traits of PID-5 (Valen Morgan, 2012; Thomas et al. 2012; Wright et al. 2012), it is necessary to elaborate more on the characteristics of these two bully related personality traits.

Antagonism Trait. Agreeableness versus Antagonism is mentioned and measured in several personality instruments, such as 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (developed by Raymond Cattell), Five-Factor Model (developed by Lewis Goldberg), the Big Five Inventory (developed by Oliver John), Revised NEO Personality Inventory (developed by Paul T. Costa & Robert R. McCrae), and HEXACO Model (Ashton, Lee, Perugini, Szarota, de Vries, Di Blas, Boies, K., & De Raad, 2004). Mainly the agreeableness is defined as the personality trait, which is manifested in idiosyncratic characteristics that are comprehended as sympathetic, kind, considerate, cooperative and warm (Carlo, Okun, Knight, & de Guzman, 2005; John & Srivastava, 1999). On the opposite continuum of this trait there exists antagonism or low agreeableness, which is defined as personality trait that is characterized by being skeptical

regarding others motives, manipulative in social relationships, and competitive rather than being cooperative. Mainly these individuals are less concerned with the well-being of others', more skeptic to the level that leads to suspiciousness and unfriendliness, and display low levels of empathy to others (Hopwood et al., 2012; Strickland et al., 2013; Wright et al., 2012).

Accordingly, several studies exhibited a strong correlation between antagonism-related traits and narcissistic (Hopwood et al., 2012; Wright et al., 2012) and antisocial personality disorder (GlasØ, 2007; Hopwood et al., 2012; Strickland et al., 2013; Wright et al., 2012).

Disinhibition Trait. Conscientiousness versus Disinhibition also measured by many personality tools, such as the Big Five Inventory (developed by Oliver John), 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (developed by Raymond Cattell), and Revised NEO Personality Inventory (developed by Paul T. Costa & Robert R. McCrae), and Temperament and Character Inventory (devised by Robert Cloninger). Conscientiousness is a personality trait that is characterized by being careful, thorough, or alert, in addition to having the desire of doing a task well. As for the conscientious individuals, they are more organized, efficacious, self-disciplined, dutiful, aim achiever, and systematic (John & Srivastava, 1999). On the other hand, those who score low on conscientiousness it means they have more disinhibition traits which is defined as impulsive, unable to conceal some of the emotional reaction, less systematic, and more likely to engage in delinquent, criminal, and antisocial behaviors (Hopwood et al., 2012; Sher & Trull, 1994; Wright et al., 2012). According to different studies, disinhibition can be a common symptom of brain physical injury, mania, aggressive outburst or substance use (Hopwood et al., 2012; Sher & Trull, 1994; Wright et al., 2012).

Thus, from these studies we conclude that since the antagonism trait is strongly related to negative emotionality and antisocial personality, and the disinhibition trait is strongly connected

to impulsivity as well as to antisocial personality, then both are also expected to be positively correlated to physical abuse. And since physical abuse is highly correlated to the bully character we can hypothesize that the antagonistic and disinhibition traits of personality to be positively correlated to the bully character as well.

Conclusion

In summary, the purpose of this study was to identify the interrelation of CDM (physical abuse, sexual abuse, and neglect) and bullying (bully and victim), in addition to studying the correlation between the bully and personality traits (antagonism and disinhibition) in order to find out the possible characteristics of children who will become bullies.

To restate once again, the following hypotheses were predicted:

Hypothesis 1: Bullies and victims will not differ on physical abuse but they will differ from control group.

Hypothesis 2: Bullies and victims will not differ on sexual abuse but they will differ from control group.

Hypothesis 3: Bullies and victims will not differ on neglect but they will differ from control group.

Hypothesis 4: There is a positive correlation between the Antagonistic personality trait and being a bully.

Hypothesis 5: There is a positive correlation between the Disinhibition personality trait and being a bully.

CHAPTER III

Method

This study researched the association between school bullying, CDM, and personality traits among adolescents who attend Armenian schools in Lebanon. The study was performed by the researcher who asked participants to report demographic information and questionnaires that identified the extent of bullying and victimization, the extent of CDM, and their personality traits implicated in Antagonism and Disinhibition.

This chapter provides information about the context of the research, research participants, instruments utilized, procedures used for data collection and data analysis.

Research Context

This study took place in the classrooms of four Armenian Schools where the participants filled out the questionnaire. It covered a period of one month, from May 2014 to June 2014.

Although there are six Armenian schools within the studied community in Lebanon, only four schools were considered for the following study. The reason two schools were not taken into consideration is one of the schools being only an elementary school having students between age range 3 to 12 (thus not covering the age range covered by the study performed which is between 12 to 17). The reason the second school did not participate was due to differences in the context of this school compared to others. The first difference was its location in a rural area (Bekaa Valley), while the four participant schools were from Beirut city and its suburbs. The second difference was the nature of this school (it contained a dormitory section where some of the students who attend this school lived there throughout the academic year because of their family circumstances: coming from divorced families, or being from very poor socioeconomic class, or

being from abroad). Thus, in order to prevent discrimination between the participants, these two schools were ruled out of the study.

Participants

Initially, the total number of participants was 231. Thirty participants were in the pilot study and were excluded later from the actual study. During the data collection, 10 students did not give their informed consent and six others incompletely answered the questionnaire. Therefore, the total remaining number of participants was 185, who were from grades 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the four studied Armenian Schools in Lebanon. The response rate of this study was 92%. These schools were chosen according to the convenient sampling method. The mean age of participants was 14.32 (± 1.24) years (ranging between 12 and 17 years old), because many studies, such as the ones performed by Chapple et al. (2005), Hong et al. (2012), Shields & Cicchetti (2001), Espelage & Swearer (2003), suggest the prevalence of bullying and CDM among this age range the most. The gender distribution went as follows: 79 males (42.7 %) and 106 females (57.3 %). Whereas the grade distribution was in the following way: grade 7, 37 students (20 %); grade 8, 52 students (28.1 %); grade 9, 45 students (24.3 %), and grade 10, 51 students (27.6 %). As for the nationality distribution it was as follows: Lebanese, 152 (82.2%), Syrian 29 (15.7), and others 4 (2.2 %). And family status distribution was in the following manner: father and mother together 175 (94.6%), father and mother separated 5 (2.7 %), father dead 3 (1.6%), and other 2 (1.1%).

To secure the confidentiality of the schools, all the four participating institutions were labeled with a combination of letters and numerical codes.

Materials

The participants received a booklet that included the informed consent and ethical codes (Appendix A), the demographic information sheet (Appendix B), and the instruments of this study (Appendices C, D, & E).

The demographic information sheet contained questions about the students' gender, current date, age, school name, grade, family status, nationality, and religious affiliation.

Overview of the Scales Used

All three scales used were in English, the original language of the scales. The translation was not necessary for three reasons: a) the results of the pilot study showed that the participants understood the content of the questions, b) the Cronbach Alphas yielded (mentioned below) were within the acceptable range, thus, this indicated the reliability of the questionnaires, and c) Moughalian (2014) did two pilot studies, where in the first one she used questionnaires in English and the other one in Armenian, and she did not find a significant difference in her study done on Armenian students attending secondary school. Regarding the cultural bias, Illinois Bully Scale (IBS) and International Child Abuse Screening Tool – Children Home Version (ICAST – CH) were both used in Lebanon; IBS was used by Moughalian (2014) and ICAST-CH was used by Usta et al. (2008). Only the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form Child Age 11 – 17 (PID-5-BF) did not seem to have been used in a Lebanese context.

In this study we used three scales:

Illinois Bully Scale

Illinois Bully Scale (IBS) was used to measure the degree of bullying in this study (see Appendix A). According to Orpinas and Frankowski (2001) the Illinois Bully Scale was a modified version of the Aggression Scale (as cited in Espelage, Holt, & Henkel, 2003). The

targeted age ranged between ages 8 to 18. The scale comprised 18 items of three subscales: bully, victim, and fighting. This scale measured the frequency of each subscale. In this study the subscale of bully (items 1, 2, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18) and victim (items 4, 5, 6, and 7) were used. The bully items indicated were connected to teasing, name-calling, social exclusion and rumor dispersion, whereas the items of victimization were related to being made fun of, called names, picked on, and hit or pushed. The students were asked how often, in the past 30 days, did they upset others for the fun of it, teased others, harassed other students, etc. As for the victim items mentioned were related to being picked on by other students, made fun of by others, called by names, etc. As for the response options of both subscales it included: a) never, b) 1 or 2 times, c) 3 or 4 times, d) 5 or 6 times, and e) 7 or more times. The bully subscale ranged from 0 to 36, where higher scores indicated more frequent bullying; and the victim subscale ranged from 0 to 16, where higher scores indicated more frequent victimization. According to Espelage and Holt (2001), the construct validity of the Illinois Bully Scale was supported by confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis with a Cronbach alpha equal to 0.87 for bully subscale and 0.88 for victim subscale.

International Child Abuse Screening Tool – Children Home Version (ICAST – CH)

International Child Abuse Screening Tool – Children’s Version (ICAST – CH) (Appendix B) was a self rated child abuse tool for surveillance and research purposes that was administered either for groups or individuals. The age range was from 11 to 18 years. This tool was aimed to identify the frequency of disciplinary punishment experiences of children in their home (<http://www.ispcan.org/?page=ICAST>). This scale was originated from the Parent Child Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, Hamby, Finkelhor, Moore, & Runyan, 1998), the LONGSCAN Youth Self-Report (Amaya-Jackson, Socolar, Hunter, Runyan, & Colindres, 2000), the WorldSafe

survey (Sadowski, Hunter, Bangdiwala, & Munoz, 2004), and the Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (Finkelhor, Hamby, Ormrod, & Turner, 2005). After eliminating the items unrelated to the abuse, the experts concentrated on items and concepts that were able to detect the victimization in children; thus the development of the instrument named as ICAST-CH. This instrument had five subscales: Violence Exposure, Psychological Victimization, Neglect, Physical Punishment, and Sexual Abuse. In our study we were interested in Neglect, Physical Punishment, and Sexual Abuse subscales. In order to answer to the questions of this instrument it was asked from the adolescents to remember past year experiences related to the events mentioned in the question. All the questions were rated on a 4 point Likert scale scored by us as follows: 0 = Never, 1 = Not in the past year but this happened, 2 = Sometimes, and 3 = Many times. In case the child replied positively to the subscales of Physical Abuse and Sexual Abuse then he/she had to identify the abuser whether he/she is “adult”, “another child or adolescent”, or “both”. As for the sexual abuse subscale it was followed by another question asking about the extent of knowledge of the perpetrator through the following options “not at all”, “not very well”, and “very well”. The neglect items included six items (questions 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, & 21) like “Do you feel that you did not get enough to eat (went hungry) and/or drink (were thirsty) even though there was enough for everyone?”, “Felt that you were not important?” etc.; this subscale ranged from 0 to 18 where higher scores indicate neglect. The Physical Abuse score items included ten items (questions 14, 14a, 22, 22a, 23, 23a, 24, 24a, 25, 25a, 26, 26a, 27, 27a, 28, 28a, 29, 29a, 30, 30a) like “Pushed, grabbed, or kicked you?”, “Hit, beat, or spanked you with a hand?”, etc.; this subscale ranged from 0 to 30 where higher scores indicated physical abuse. Finally, the Sexual Abuse items included six items (questions 31, 31a, 31b, 32, 32a, 32b, 33, 33a, 33b, 34, 34a, 34b, 35, 35a, 35b, 36, 36a, 36b) like “Made you upset by speaking to you

in a sexual way or writing sexual things about you?”, “Made you look at their private parts or wanted to look at yours?”, etc.; this subscale ranged from 0 to 18 where higher scores indicated sexual abuse. As for the Cronbach alphas of internal consistency reliability of the subscales it goes as follows: neglect (.83), physical punishment (.77), and sexual abuse (.72)

(Zolotor, Runyan, Dunne, Jain, Peturs, Ramirez, Volkova, Deb, Lidchi, Muhammad, & Isaeva, 2009).

Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form Child Age 11 – 17

Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form (PID-5-BF) Child Age 11 – 17 was a self-rated scale of personality trait assessment for children of age’s from 11 to 17. It comprised of 25 items of 5 subscales, where each subscale was composed of five items. Mainly this scale assessed 5 high order personality domains that included Negative Affect, Detachment, Antagonism, Disinhibition, and Psychoticism. Each subscale consisted of 5 items. In this study we only used subscales of Antagonism (items 17, 19, 20, 22, & 25) and Disinhibition (items 1, 2, 3, 5, & 6), because our pilot study yielded low Cronbach alpha for domains Negative Affect (.068), Detachment (.379), and Psychoticism (.406) . The Antagonism items included statements like “It’s no big deal if I hurt other people’s feelings”, “I crave attention”, etc.; whereas items for Disinhibition included statements like “People would describe me as reckless”, “I’m not good at planning ahead”, etc. The students were asked to rate themselves on 4 point Likert scale ranging from a) 0 = very false or often false, b) 1 = sometimes or somewhat false, c) 2 = sometimes or somewhat true, and d) 3 = very true or often true. Each subscale or trait domain ranged from 0 to 15 where higher scores indicated greater personality dysfunction. The average domain score was computed by summing up the domain scores and dividing it with the number of items comprising by the domain (Krueger, Derringer, Markon, Watson, & Skodol, 2013).

Procedure

Prior to conducting the data collection, the researcher of this study contacted the principal of each school in order to explain the aim of the research, to get the consent of the principals and schedule the dates of the data collection at each school. Before distributing the questionnaires, the researcher explained the purpose of the research, provided some information about bullying, CDM, and personality traits to the students, and answered questions posed by the participants. In addition to these the students got a clear explanation about the confidentiality and anonymity of the performed research.

During data collection the participants were given the freedom to voluntarily and anonymously participate in the research and were informed of having the total right of withdrawing or discontinuing their participation from the research without any penalty; however, once they submitted their questionnaire the withdrawal was not possible. Those who decided to participate in the research were asked to give their informed consent and fill in the self-reported questionnaires that identified their role as bully and/or victim, their domestic abuse status as being physically abused, sexually victimized, and/or neglected, and their personality traits of antagonism and/or disinhibition. The whole questionnaire of the study had the following parts: 1. Informed consent (Appendix A), 2. Demographic Information (Appendix B), 3. Illinois Bully Scale (2001) (Appendix C), 4. International Child Abuse Screening Tool-Children's Home Version (2009) (Appendix D), and 5. The Personality Inventory for DSM-5-Brief Form (2013) (Appendix E). The total number of the questions were 53, demographic information inclusive.

The introductory part of the questionnaire contained the written consent that gave the participants the freedom to choose to participate or abstain; moreover, it also mentioned their right of discontinuing in case they felt uncomfortable or disturbed. As for the Ethical Codes, the

questionnaire described its following of the Ethical Codes of 1) informed consent of the participating institution and the participant, 2) offering no excessive or financial inducements, 3) using non-deceptive procedures, 4) debriefing, and 5) not intending to cause any physical and psychological harm and/or offense (Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct, 2010). Throughout the data collection the researcher tried to ensure the safety and well being of the participants and did not cause any physical and psychological harm and/or offense. And in this regard, the participants were told to inform the researcher, in private or via email, about any disturbance or anxiety that they might have during filling out the questionnaire that is related to their abuse recall in order to get the necessary therapeutic help or referral. At the end of the participation, the students received a photocopied list of local social institutions, and their helpline phone numbers that provided psychological, legal, medical, and social help to the children who were victims of domestic maltreatment or bullying.

A pilot study was conveyed in order to identify the reliability of the instruments used with the population under study. The following instruments were used: a) the three subscales of the Illinois Bully Scale: Bully, Victim, and Fight; b) the five subscales of the International Child Abuse Screening Tool-Children's Home Version: Violence Exposure, Psychological Victimization, Neglect, Physical Punishment, and Sexual Abuse , c) the five subscales of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form (PID-5-BF) Child Age 11 – 17: Negative Affect, Detachment, Antagonism, Disinhibition, and Psychoticism, and d) Questionnaire Evaluation consisting of four questions.

In this study all data input and analyses were done on SPSS version 20. Descriptive analyses were done to compute the means, standard deviations, and percentages. As for data analysis, neglect, physical abuse, sexual abuse, antagonistic personality trait, and disinhibition

personality trait were used as the five independent variables of the study, whereas bullying perpetration and victimization were used as the two dependent variables. The extent of neglect, physical punishment and sexual abuse was measured by using participants' scores from the International Child Abuse Screening Tool-Children's Home Version; while antagonistic and disinhibition personality traits were calculated by using participants' scores to the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form (PID-5-BF) Child Age 11 – 17. Whereas, the extent of being bully or victimized was computed by using scores from the Illinois Bully Scale. One Way ANOVA analyses were taken into consideration in examining the first three hypotheses: H1, H2, H3 of this study, that is, the role of CDM in predicting no difference between the bully and victim, but predicting a difference between bully and victim on one hand and control group (uninvolved either in bullying or victimization) on the other hand. The significance level was set at 95% with $p < 0.05$. While, the last two hypotheses: H4 and H5 were calculated by Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between personality traits and the bully, where significance was set at 99% with $p < 0.01$ considered significant.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

An overview of the results of the study provided in this chapter includes reliability testing of the subscales, descriptive data related to bullying and victimization, testing of the five predicted hypotheses as well as some additional analysis that proved to be significant statistically.

Reliability Testing

The following scales were used by this study: the subscales of Bullying and Victimization of the Illinois Bully Scale; the subscales of Neglect, Physical Abuse, and Sexual Abuse of the International Child Abuse Screening Tool-Children's Home Version; and the subscales of Antagonism and Disinhibition of the Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form (PID-5-BF) Child Age 11 – 17. The internal reliability of these scales was computed by calculating the Cronbach's alpha of each scale and subscale (see table 1).

Table 1
Cronbach's alpha for the subscales used in the research

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Previous Cronbach alpha</i>	<i>Current Cronbach alpha</i>
Bullying Perpetration	0.87	0.779
Victimization	0.88	0.773
Neglect	0.83	0.709
Physical Abuse	0.77	0.637
Sexual Abuse	0.72	0.684
Antagonism	-	0.535
Disinhibition	-	0.659

Demographic and Descriptive Data for Bullying and Victimization

Out of a total number of 185 students, 10.8% (n= 20) were identified as bullies, 6.5% (n=12) as victims, 11.9% (n= 22) both who are bully and victim at the same time, 45.9% (n=85) as control group who are neither bullies nor victims (uninvolved), and 24.9% (n=46) as “borderline”.

The cut off scoring of Bully and Victim subscales was used from prior research conducted by Juvonen et al. (2003), which was done as follows: Those students who fell 0.5 standard deviations above the sample mean of the Bully subscale and below the sample mean of the Victim subscale were identified as “bully”; students who fell 0.5 standard deviations above the sample mean of the Victim subscale and below the sample mean of the Bully subscale were identified as “victim”; students who fell 0.5 standard deviations above the sample mean on both Bully and Victim subscales were classified as “both”; those who fell below the sample mean on both Bully and Victim subscales were identified as “control”; Whereas, the rest of the sample was considered as “borderline”.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1: Bullies and victims will not differ on physical abuse but they will differ from control group.

A one-way between-group ANOVA (Post Hoc, Benferroni) was conducted to explore the impact of physical abuse (punishment), sexual abuse, and neglect on bullying and victimization, as measured by Illinois Bully Scale (IBS). Subjects were divided into four groups according to their IBS score (Group 1: Bullies; Group 2: Victims; Group 3: Both; Group 4: Control).

There was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level in physical abuse scores (see Table 4) only for the victims [$F(3, 135) = 8.9, p = .00$] (see Table 2). Post Hoc comparisons

using the Benferroni test indicated that the mean score of the Victim ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 2.72$) was significantly different from Control ($M = 1.74$, $SD = 2.44$) (see Table 3), whereas, Bully ($M = 1.80$, $SD = 2.12$) did not differ significantly from Control (see Table 3). Thus, hypothesis 1 is partially accepted.

Table 2
One Way Analysis of Variance of Neglect, Physical Abuse, and Sexual Abuse by Bully, Victim, Both, and Control Groups

ANOVA

		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
NEGLECT	Between Groups	81.797	3	27.266	2.249	.085
	Within Groups	1636.606	135	12.123		
	Total	1718.403	138			
PHYSICAL ABUSE	Between Groups	219.542	3	73.181	8.892	.000
	Within Groups	1110.991	135	8.230		
	Total	1330.532	138			
SEXUAL ABUSE	Between Groups	16.353	3	5.451	4.371	.006
	Within Groups	168.352	135	1.247		
	Total	184.705	138			

Table 3
Descriptive Data of the Groups: Bullies, Victims, Both and Control

		<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</i>		<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
						<i>Lower Bound</i>	<i>Upper Bound</i>		
NEGLECT	Bully	20	2.1500	2.96071	.66203	.7643	3.5357	.00	9.00
	Victim	12	4.2500	4.13686	1.19421	1.6216	6.8784	.00	11.00
	Both	22	4.5000	4.17190	.88945	2.6503	6.3497	.00	15.00
	Control	85	2.8588	3.30279	.35824	2.1464	3.5712	.00	12.00
	Total	139	3.1367	3.52877	.29931	2.5449	3.7285	.00	15.00
PHYSICAL ABUSE	Bully	20	1.8000	2.11760	.47351	.8089	2.7911	.00	6.00
	Victim	12	4.1667	2.72475	.78657	2.4354	5.8979	.00	8.00
	Both	22	4.9091	4.60754	.98233	2.8662	6.9520	.00	14.00
	Control	85	1.7412	2.43561	.26418	1.2158	2.2665	.00	10.00
	Total	139	2.4604	3.10508	.26337	1.9397	2.9812	.00	14.00
SEXUAL ABUSE	Bully	20	.6000	.99472	.22243	.1345	1.0655	.00	3.00
	Victim	12	.8333	1.58592	.45782	-.1743	1.8410	.00	4.00
	Both	22	1.1364	1.88466	.40181	.3008	1.9720	.00	6.00
	Control	85	.2353	.75035	.08139	.0734	.3971	.00	4.00
	Total	139	.4820	1.15691	.09813	.2880	.6760	.00	6.00

Table 4***Multiple Comparisons of Means between Physical Abuse, Sexual Abuse, and Bullying and Victimization.***

Dependent Variable	(I) Category	(J) Category	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
PHYSICAL ABUSE	Victim	Control	2.42549*	.88466	.042	.0567	4.7943
	Both	Bully	3.10909*	.88631	.004	.7358	5.4824
		Control	3.16791*	.68621	.000	1.3304	5.0054
SEXUAL ABUSE	Both	Control	.90107*	.26712	.006	.1858	1.6163

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Hypothesis 2: Bullies and victims will not differ on sexual abuse but they will differ from control group.

There was not a statistically significant difference at the $[F(3, 135) = 4.4, p = .06]$ $p < .05$ level in sexual abuse scores (Appendix F) between the Bully and Victim. Post Hoc comparisons using the Benferroni test indicated that the mean score of the Control ($M = .24, SD = .75$) was not significantly different from Bully and Victim (see Table 3). Thus, hypothesis 2 is rejected.

Hypothesis 3: Bullies and victims will not differ on neglect but they will differ from control group.

There was not a statistically significant difference at the $[F(3, 135) = 2.25, p = .085]$ $p < .05$ level in neglect scores (Appendix F) for the Bully and Victim. Post Hoc comparisons using the Benferroni test indicated that the mean score of the Control ($M = 2.86, SD = 3.30$) was not significantly different from Bully and Victim (see Table 3). Thus, hypothesis 3 is rejected.

Hypothesis 4: There will be a positive correlation between the Antagonistic personality trait and being a bully.

To test the association between the variables of personality traits: antagonism and disinhibition, and bullying and victimization, Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient analysis was conducted.

Hypothesis four was confirmed, as the results of the correlation indicated that Antagonistic personality trait is positively and significantly correlated with being bully $r = .407$, $p = .000$ (see Table 5).

Table 5

Correlations between Disinhibition, Antagonism, and Bully

		<i>DISINHIBITION</i>	<i>ANTAGONISM</i>	<i>BULLY</i>
DISINHIBITION	Pearson Correlation	1	.294**	.229**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.002
	N	185	185	185
ANTAGONISM	Pearson Correlation	.294**	1	.407**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	185	185	185
BULLY	Pearson Correlation	.229**	.407**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.000	
	N	185	185	185

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

Hypothesis 5: There will be a positive correlation between the Disinhibition personality trait and being a bully.

Hypothesis five was confirmed, as the results of the correlation revealed that disinhibition personality trait was positively and significantly correlated with being bully $r = .229$, $p = .002$ (see Table 5).

Additional Analysis

Additional analyses, not related to the predicted hypotheses, were performed and the following significant results were found. An independent-samples t-test was conducted to see if

there is a gender difference between being a bully in males and females. In fact, a significant difference between males (M= 7.5316, SD= 5.73079) and females (M= 4.0189, SD= 2.78766); $t(183) = -5.501, p= 0.000$ has been identified.

Table 6
t-test Results Comparing Males and Females on Being Bully or Victim
Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
BULLY	Equal variances assumed	33.97	.000	-5.50	183	.00	-3.512	.64	-4.77	-2.25
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.02	105.50	.000	-3.51	.70	-4.90	-2.13
VICTIM	Equal variances assumed	1.50	.222	-2.54	183	.012	-1.18	.47	-2.10	-.26
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.50	156.99	.014	-1.18	.47	-2.12	-.25

Group Statistics						
		1. Please tell us if you are a girl or a boy.			Std. Error Mean	
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation		
BULLY	Female	106	4.0189	2.78766	.27076	
	Male	79	7.5316	5.73079	.64476	
VICTIM	Female	106	2.9057	2.97779	.28923	
	Male	79	4.0886	3.33663	.37540	

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The aim of this research study was to identify the association between bullying, child domestic maltreatment, and personality traits among adolescents within a group of Armenian schools in Lebanon. This chapter comprises a discussion about the findings and implications of the results, limitations of this study and suggestions for future researches.

Findings and Implications

Association between Child Domestic Maltreatment, Bullying and Victimization

This study explored the relation between physical abuse, sexual abuse, neglect, bullying and victimization. Specifically, it was hypothesized that bullies and victims will not differ on physical abuse but they will both differ from the control group. The results showed that only the victims and not the bullies differed from the control group on physical abuse. Moreover, although it was not originally hypothesized by the author of this study, the group labeled as "both", i.e., victim and bully, differed significantly from the control group. Both results concur with other published studies such as Holt et al. (2007) research that concluded that both groups, the "both" (bully and victim) and the "victim", reported significantly higher levels of physical abuse. In fact, Holt et al.'s (2007) study was one of the rare studies, if not the only one, which reported results which are similar to the results of the current study, specifically to the variables of physical and sexual abuse (neglect was not included in their hypotheses). When both studies were compared, no clear similarity was noted except in the following: 1) the same questionnaire of bully/victim identification, that is, IBS was used, 2) the same method of identifying the groups of "bully", "victim", "both", etc., was employed and 3) the sample used was also from an urban

environment, i.e., adolescents living in an urban environment are usually expected to more exposed to violence and witness different kinds of aggression as compared to nonurban environments (environmental factor) (Holt et al., 2007). Further exploration is needed in order to identify the reason behind this similarity of results.

Additionally, this significant difference between the "victim" and the control group when it comes to physical abuse, is explained through the attachment theory where the connection between child maltreatment by an abusive parent or caregiver leads to the development of an insecure attachment (Koiv, 2012; Toth et al., 1992; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001; Wolfe et al., 2009), which consequently plays a negative role in establishing maladaptive relationships with peers at school (Koiv, 2012; Hong et al., 2012). Moreover, physical punishment or abuse is considered as a factor in developing a victim identity in a child who unwillingly becomes vulnerable to the bullies who are in search of their victims (Björkqvist et al., 2011; Dussich and Maekoya, 2007; Hong et al., 2012; Shields and Cicchetti, 2001; Wolfe et al., 2009). Furthermore, studies have shown that children who are maltreated at home are more likely to suffer from internalizing behaviors such as depression (Björkqvist et al., 2011; Norman, R. E., Byambaa, M., De, R., Butchart, A., Scott, J., & Vos, T., 2012; Holt et al., 2007; Wolfe et al., 2009), anxiety (Hong et al., 2012; Stein et al., 2007), posttraumatic stress disorder (Hong et al., 2012; Norman et al., 2012; Valen Morgan, 2012), health issues (Juvonen et al., 2003; Rigby, 2003), and cognitive difficulties (Fahlberg & Kershner, 2003; Norman et al., 2012; Valen Morgan, 2012), making them more vulnerable to be identified and eventually targeted by bullies (Espelage and Holt, 2001; Hong et al., 2012; Klomek et al., 2008).

The absence of a significant difference between the "bully" and the control group could be explained through the social-ecological model of bullying where it necessitates the

understanding of the multiple contexts in which the child is found and the dynamism in which these contexts react with each other (Holt et al., 2007). A good example of the social-ecological model of bullying is given through life course theorists' suggestion of the existence of a healthy bonding between the maltreated child and a caring non-abusive adult, like a teacher or a leader, who is able in buffering and preventing bullying incidents by encouraging a positive interacting environment for neutralizing the negative effect of the early experience that was established through insecure attachment to the parent or the caregiver (Hong et al., 2012) In fact, taking the family status of this study into consideration, where 94.6 % of the parents living together as a family and not divorced (low divorce rate), might be helpful in explaining the reason for not getting a significant result. To explain more, according to the social-ecological theory when there is a healthy bonding and secure attachment with at least one of the adults, like one of the parents, then this can play an essential role in buffering the negative effect of the CDM on the child. As it was mentioned in the literature review, regarding to the family factor where a study done in 42 countries indicated that children living with single parents are 77% more likely to be physically and sexually abused as compared to children who live with both parents (USDHHS, 2003). Thus, these examples can show that our sample of students attending Armenian schools in Lebanon might have the family status as a confounding variable, which could be an interesting topic to be studied in the future.

Another confounding variable could be the level of aggression broadcast on TV and the online social media, where the increase in the rate of violence broadcasting plays an additional role in elevating the level of aggression in children. Furthermore, several studies revealed the existence of a positive correlation between the levels of violence broadcasted on television and the level of violence learned by those who watch a quite large amount of violent television

programs (USDHHS, 2003). It is an unfortunate fact that children living in Lebanon are exposed to the explicit photos and movie previews of violence related to the wars, barbaric conducts, and car bomb scenes (Day & Ghandour, 1984; Usta et al., 2008), etc. Thus, this kind of exposure might also play a role in increasing the rate of aggression among the children, which can be implicated in bullying.

Nevertheless, it is important to mention that during the cycle of violence, not all maltreated children are going to develop aggressive behavior, like bullying (Widom, 1989). In fact here lies the challenge for the researchers to diligently exercise their expertise that prompts the discovery of differential outcomes related to the importance of understanding the reasons of why some maltreated children become victims, whereas others become bullies, and others become socially resilient (Shields & Cicchetti, 2001).

As for the association between sexual abuse and bullying, it was hypothesized that bullies and victims will not differ on sexual abuse but they will differ from the control group. However unlike other studies (Friedman et al., 2011; Hong et al. 2012; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001; Viljoen, O'Neill, & Sidhu, 2005), the results of this study did not find any significant difference between the bully and the victim compared to the control group. In fact, the explanation for this outcome is similar to the one given between the "bully" and the "control" regarding the physical abuse.

The "both" group (victims and bullies), however, which was not part of the predicted hypothesis of this study was found to be significantly different from the control group. This particular result concurs with other published studies where the bully/victim group reported significantly higher levels of sexual victimization (Holt et al, 2007).

As for the association between neglect and bullying, it was hypothesized that bullies and victims will not differ on neglect but they will differ from the control group. The results of this study did not find any significant difference between the bully and victim compared to the control group, which concurs with one study by Shields and Cicchetti (2001). In this case, too, the possible explanation for this outcome is again similar to the one given between the “bully” and the “control” regarding the physical abuse.

As for this research being conducted in a Lebanese Armenian culture, it did not add to the significance of the study. It seems that the main differences could be more explained through family and environmental factors that are not specific to the Armenian culture in particular.

Relationship between Antagonistic and Disinhibition Personality Traits, and Bullying

In order to identify the bully it was indispensable to locate the maladaptive personality traits that can characterize the bully. Thus, this study took into consideration two maladaptive personality traits, the antagonistic and the disinhibition personality trait and hypothesized a positive correlation between these two traits and being a bully. The obtained results were in line with other studies that have indicated the presence of a positive relation between these two maladaptive traits and being a bully. In his study performed on 527 university students, Pontzer (2010) discovered a positive correlation between impulsive (disinhibition) trait and those who were categorized as a bully. In the same manner, other studies, (Ondersma et al. (2005), Putnam (2003), Tani et al. (2003), Usta et al. (2008) have frequently showed a list of maladaptive traits that were more common among those who were abusive. These traits included: absence of impulse control, aggressive behavior, and tendencies of antisocial behavior (Ondersma et al., 2005; Putnam, 2003; Rigby, 2013; Usta et al., 2008; & Valen Morgan, 2012). Moreover, in other studies there was an association between the antagonistic and disinhibition traits; which were

implicated in externalizing behaviors like: aggression, hostility, lack of empathy, delinquency and impulsivity, and being a bully (GlasØ, 2007; Holt et al., 2007; Hong et al., 2012; Hopwood et al., 2012; Olweus; 1993; Strickland et al., 2013; Valen Morgan, 2012; Wright et al., 2012).

Additional Findings

Bully and Victim Prevalence

In this sample of adolescents who attended Armenian Schools of Lebanon, 29.2% were involved in bullying in the following manner: 10.8% as bullies, 6.5% as victims, and 11.9% as both. As a matter of fact, these percentages of prevalence are similar to the ones obtained in a study done by Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton, and Scheidt (2001), where 29.9% of the 15,686 school-aged children of grades 6 to 10 were involved in bullying in the following manner: 13% as bullies, 10.6% as victims, and 6.3% as both. Likewise, in a survey performed on students from grades 7 to 12 in Taiwan by Chen and Cheng (2013) reported that 27.1% of the participants were connected in bullying as follows: 10.9% bullies, 10.7% victims, and 5.5% both. And in a study done by Moughalian (2014) she reported that 22.96% of the students from the studied Armenian schools in Lebanon had the following prevalence percentages: 7.96% as bullies and 15% as victims.

Both vs. Bully or Victim

In fact, the “both” group was not within the tested hypotheses of this study, but the results yielded significant differences, such as, when comparing between “Both” ($M = 4.91$, $SD = 4.61$) and “Control” ($M = 1.74$, $SD = 2.44$) groups regarding the scores of Physical Abuse as well as between “Both” ($M = 1.14$, $SD = 1.88$) and “Control” ($M = .24$, $SD = .75$) groups regarding the scores of Sexual Abuse. Thus, it is worth touching upon these additional findings. For example, in a study by Stein et al. (2007), 1,312 males in grades 7 to 12 were classified as

bullies, victims, bully-victims (both), and neutral groups (control group) in order to find out the relation between bullying, school attitude, psychosocial health, problem behaviors, and physical injury. The findings of this study indicated that the “both” group were the most at risk group that reported serious issues related to the problem behaviors, psychological health, school attitude, and physical injury than the ones who had been categorized as neutrals, bullies, or victims (Stein et al., 2007). Moreover, the same study found out that those who were in the “both” group carried more weapons and involved in more delinquencies than the other groups. In the same manner, other studies like the ones done by Baldry and Farrington (2005), Holt et al. (2007), Juvonen et al. (2003), Viljoen et al. (2005) and many others showed the striking involvement of the “both” group in negative maladaptive behaviors, aggression, school disciplinary issues, and other externalizing behaviors than those who were categorized as only bully or victim. Consequently, it seems that analyzing the impact of the “both” group of bullying will be essential in future research whether in Armenian or non Armenian schools in Lebanon.

Gender Differences

As for the result obtained related to the gender difference, the current study showed significant gender differences related to being a bully or a victim, where males were significantly more bullied and victimized than females. Since there are contradictory results obtained from the researches in the literature where some identified no gender differences related to bullying categorization (Björkqvist et al., 2011; Rose, Espelage, Aragon, & Elliott, 2011; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001) and many others found a gender difference that aligns with this study, where males were more categorized as bully (Junoven et al., 2003; Nansel et al., 2001; Rivers & Smith, 1994; Viljoen et al., 2005) and victim (Nansel et al. 2001; Rivers & Smith, 1994), it seems important to investigate this issue more. In fact, it will be important to include the gender

difference in future studies that might be done in Armenian schools of Lebanon in order to find out whether there is a significant gender difference among adolescents who attend these schools. Such conclusions could help in designing gender-specific prevention programs and planning intervention strategies for the bully or the victim accordingly.

Clinical Implications of the study

In this research the interest was on three levels: Parental level that is taken into consideration through CDM (home environment/nurture), School level through bullying (social environment/nurture), and Personal level through personality traits (nature). Thus, this study tackled these three vital levels that play a significant role in the life of the student and help the psychologists, school counselors, social workers, educators, and practitioners in creating successful prevention programs and curricula that take into consideration the interplay of these three levels. Furthermore, identifying the significant effect of physical punishment on victims and bully/victims of bullying, in addition to the significant effect of sexual abuse on bully/victims, can help clinicians, school counselors, teachers, etc. in investigating the occurrence of domestic physical abuse in victims of the bullying on one hand, and the occurrence of domestic physical and sexual abuse in bully/victims on the other hand. In addition to, the positive correlation of the antagonistic and disinhibition maladaptive personality traits with being a bully can play a role in early detection of the bully and the victim within the population of the adolescents attending Armenian Schools in Lebanon. In fact, on average students spend 175 days per year and eight hours per day at school; thus, fast and early detection of the bully or victim at schools within a shorter period of time is a critical element (Harris & Petire, 2003) in providing an effective psychological help for those who are exposed to violence. Being able to achieve that

will hopefully reduce bullying and as well as help educate parents in realizing the negative outcomes of physical punishment and sexual abuse on their children.

Future Research Suggestions

First, the limitation of this study was related to the generalizability issue where the sample was a convenient one, that is, all participants came from Armenian Schools in Lebanon. Future research could target more representative samples of the Armenian community in Lebanon in order to be able to generalize the results to the whole population. Second, it would be valuable if the same study was replicated within other community samples of Lebanese society, especially within the Armenians who are attending non-Armenian schools in Lebanon. The results of such replication can play an important role in ecological and population validity of the results of this study, with implications of reducing bullying in Lebanese schools in general.

A second research option could be valuable in designing a differential study which compares gender differences with victimization, and includes in it the “both” group (bully/victim). In fact, lately the main concern that is getting the attention of researchers, and as it is indicated in the current research, is the negative influence of the physical and sexual abuse on the “both” group who are more prone, than the bully or victim, to psychosocial, maladaptive behavior, familial, and extra-familial problems (Baldry & Farrington, 2005; Holt et al., 2007; Juvonen et al., 2003; Vilojen et al., 2005; Stein et al., 2007).

This study explored the association between bullying, CDM and personality traits. The results revealed that being physically abused was significantly related to being a victim of a bully, while sexual abuse and neglect were not significantly related to being a bully or a victim. As for the personality traits, it was found out that both, “antagonistic” and “disinhibition”, maladaptive personality traits were significantly correlated to being a bully. Previous studies

have delved in similar and other factors that affect bullying and/or victimization in different ethnic groups and populations. The current study examined the association between bullying, CDM, and personality traits among adolescents within a group of Armenian schools in Lebanon. The findings of this study will provide the practitioners who work in the educational sector with the opportunity to take into consideration the factors mentioned in this research in order to help the students who attend Armenian schools in Lebanon.

References

- Akers, R. (1998). *Social learning and social structure: A general theory of crime and deviance*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Amaya-Jackson, L., Socolar, R. R. S., Hunter, W. M., Runyan, D. K., & Colindres, R. (2000). Directly questioning children and adolescents about maltreatment: A review of survey measures used. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15* (7), 725–759.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Attarian, H. (2014). *Armenian Schools and Education in Lebanon Fostering a New Culture of Learning, Teaching, and Practice*. Retrieved April 20, 2014, from http://www.gulbenkian.pt/mediaRep/gulbenkian//files/institucional/atividades/Comunidades%20Armenias/lebanon%20school%20report/English_Book_with_Cover.pdf
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2005). Protective factors as moderators of risk factors in adolescence bullying. *Social Psychology of Education, 8*(3), 263–284.
DOI:10.1007/s11218-005-5866-5
- Bandura, A. (1999). Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 2* (1), 21-41.
- Beck AT (1976) *Cognitive Therapy and the Emotional Disorders*. International Universities Press, NY, USA.
- Bender, K. (2010). Why do some maltreated youth become juvenile offenders? A call for further investigation and adaptation of youth services. *Children and Youth Services Review, 32*(3), 466–473. DOI:10.1016/j.childyouth.2009.10.022

- Berliner, L. (2000). What is sexual abuse? In H. Dubowitz, & D. DePanfilis (Eds.), *Handbook for child protection practice*. (pp. 18-23). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452205489.n5szaas>
- Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Berg, P. (2011). Higher rates of victimization to physical abuse by adults found among victims of school bullying. *Psychological Reports*, 109 (1), 167-168. DOI: 10.2466/02.07.11.16.PR0.109.4.167-168.
- Carey, T. A. (2003). Improving the success of anti-bullying intervention programs: A tool for matching programs with purposes. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 12(2), 16-20.
- Carlo, G., Okun, M. A., Knight, G. P., & de Guzman, M. R. T. (2005). The interplay of traits and motives on volunteering: agreeableness, extraversion and pro-social value motivation. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 38(6), 1293-1305. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2004.08.012
- Central Intelligence Agency. (2014). *The World Factbook*. Retrieved April 17, 2014, from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/le.html>
- Chang, L., Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., & McBride-Chang, C. (2003). Harsh parenting in relation to child emotion regulation and aggression. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 17(4), 598–606. doi: [10.1037/0893-3200.17.4.598](https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.17.4.598)
- Chapple, C. L., Tyler, K., and Bersani, B. E. (2005). "Child Neglect and Adolescent Violence: Examining the Effects of Self-Control and Peer Rejection". *Sociology Department, Faculty Publications*. Paper 67. Retrieved April 17, 2014, from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/sociologyfacpub/67>

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

Child Neglect. Retrieved April 20, 2014, from <http://www.americanhumane.org/children/stop-child-abuse/fact-sheets/child-neglect.html>

Child Welfare Information Gateway (2007). Definitions in federal law. Retrieved January 1, 2015, from <https://www.childwelfare.gov/topics/can/defining/federal/>

Day, R. C., & Ghandour, M. (1984). The effect of television-mediated aggression and real-life aggression on the behavior of Lebanese children. *Journal Of Experimental Child Psychology*, 387-18. doi:10.1016/0022-0965(84)90015-8

Definitions in federal law. Retrieved April 17, 2014, from <http://www.childwelfare.gov/can/defining/federal.cfm>.

Definitions, Scope, and Effects of Child Sexual Abuse, Retrieved April 20, 2014, from <https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/usermanuals/sexabuse/sexabuseb.cfm>

Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (1990). Mechanisms in the cycle of violence. *Science*, 250(4988), 1678–1683. DOI: 10.1126/science.2270481

Dussich, J. P. J., & Maekoya, C. (2007). Physical child harm and bullying-related behaviors: A comparative study in Japan, South Africa, and the United States. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51(5), 495–509.

DOI:10.1177/0306624X06298463

Effects of Bullying. (n. d.). Retrieved April 20, 2014, from <http://www.stopbullying.gov/at-risk/effects/>

Ellis, A. (1962). Reason and Emotion in Psychotherapy. New York: Stuart.

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., Holt, M. K. & Henkel, R. R. (2003). Examination of Peer-Group Contextual Effects on Aggression During Early Adolescence. *Child Development*, 74(1), 205-220.

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.

Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct.(2010). Retrieved April 27, 2014, from <http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx?item=11>

Fahlberg, V. and Kershner, S. “Child Sexual Abuse Across Cultures: What We Know So Far.”
Commissioned by UNICEF. February 10, 2003, pp.1-40.

Finkelhor, D., Hamby, S. L., Ormrod, R., & Turner, H. (2005). The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire: Reliability, validity, and national norms. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 29(4), 383–412. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2004.11.001>

Friedman, M. S., Marshal, M. P., Guadamuz, T. E., Wei, C., Wong, C. F., Saewyc, E. M., & Stall, R. (2011). A Meta-Analysis of Disparities in Childhood Sexual Abuse, Parental Physical Abuse, and Peer Victimization Among Sexual Minority and Sexual Nonminority Individuals. *American Journal of Public Health*. 101(8), p1481-1494. DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.2009190009.

- Gershoff, E. (2002) Corporal punishment by parents and associated child behaviors and experiences: a meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128 (4), 539-579.
- Glasø, L., Matthiesen, S. B., Birkeland Nielsen, M., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Do targets of workplace bullying portray a general victim personality profile? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48, 313–319. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2007.00554.x
- Haj-Yahia, M.M. and Tamish, S. (2001). “The Rates of Child Sexual Abuse and Its Psychological Consequences as Revealed by a Study among Palestinian University Students. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 25(10), 1303-1327. DOI:10.1016/S0145-2134(01)00277-0
- Harris, S, & Petrie, G. (2003). *Bullying. The bullies, the victims, the bystanders*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Holt, M. K., Finkelhor, D., Kantor, G. K. (2007). Hidden Forms of Victimization in Elementary Students Involved in Bullying. *School Psychology Review*, 36 (3), 345-360.
- Hong, J., Espelage, D., Grogan-Kaylor, A., & Allen-Meares, P. (2012).. Identifying potential mediators and moderators of the association between child maltreatment and bullying perpetration and victimization in school. *Educational Psychology Review*. 24(2), 167-186. DOI: 10.1007/s10648-011-9185-4.
- Hopwood, C. J., Thomas, K. M., Markon, K. E., Wright, A. G. C., & Krueger, R. F. (2012). DSM-5 Personality Traits and DSMIV Personality Disorders. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 121 (2), 424 – 432. DOI: 10.1037/a0026656
- JeeHae Helen, L. (2013). School Shootings in the U.S. Public Schools: Analysis Through the Eyes of an Educator. *Review of Higher Education & Self-Learning*, 6(22), 88-119.

- Jizmejian, A. K. (1963). *Discipline in Armenian secondary schools in Lebanon* [unpublished master's thesis]. American University of Beirut, Lebanon.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 2, 102–138. New York: Guilford Press. Retrieved April 21, 2014, from <http://www.fetzer.org/sites/default/files/images/stories/pdf/selfmeasures/Personality-BigFiveInventory.pdf>
- Juvonen, J., Graham, S., & Schuster, M. A. (2003). Bullying Among Young Adolescents: The Strong, the Weak, and the Troubled. *Pediatrics*, 112(6), 1231-1237. DOI: 10.1542/peds.112.6.1231
- Kaloustian, K. M. (1958). *A study of Armenian schools in Lebanon* [unpublished master's thesis]. American University of Beirut, Lebanon.
- Kim, Y. S., Leventhal, B. L., Koh, Y. J., Hubbard, A., & Boyce, W. T. (2006). School bullying and youth violence: Causes or consequences of psychopathologic behavior? *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 63(9), 1035–1041.
- Klomek, A. B., Marrocco, F., Kleinman, M., Schonfeld, I. S., & Gould, M. S. (2008). Peer victimization, depression, and suicidality in adolescents. *Suicide & Life-Threatening Behavior*, 38(2), 166–180. DOI:10.1521/suli.2008.38.2.166
- Klomek, A. B., Sourander, A., Niemela, S., Kumpulainen, K., Piha, J., Tamminen, T., Almgvist, F., & Gould M. (2009). Childhood bullying behaviors as a risk for suicide attempts and completed suicides: A population-based birth cohort study. *Journal of the American*

Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 48(3), 254–261.

DOI:10.1097/CHI.0b013e318196b91f

Koiv, K. (2012). Attachment Styles among Bullies, Victims and Uninvolved Adolescents. *Online Submission*.

Krueger, R. F., Derringer, J., Markon, K. E., Watson, D., & Skodol, A. E. (2013). *The Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form – Child Age 11- 17*. Retrieved from <http://www.psychiatry.org/practice/dsm/dsm5/online-assessment-measures#Level1>

Kyriakides, L., Kaloyirou, C., Lindsay, G. (2006). An analysis of the revised Olweus bully/victim questionnaire using Rasch measurement model. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76 (4), 781-801. 21p. DOI: 10.1348/000709905X53499.

Leeb, R. T., Paulozzi, L., Melanson, C., Smith, T., & Arias, I. (2008). Child maltreatment surveillance: Uniform definition for public health and recommended data elements, version 1.0. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Retrieved April 17, 2014, from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pub/cmp-surveillance.html>

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>

Lopes, B.C. (2013). Differences Between Victims of Bullying and Nonvictims on Levels of Paranoid Ideation and Persecutory Symptoms, the Presence of Aggressive Traits, the Display of Social Anxiety and the Recall of Childhood Abuse Experiences in a

- Portuguese Mixed Clinical Sample. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 20 (3), 254-266. DOI: 10.1002/cpp.800.
- Ma, X. (2002). Bullying in Middle school: Individual and school characteristics of victims and offenders. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 13(1), 63–89.
- Marsee, M. A., & Frick, P. J. (2007). Exploring the cognitive and emotional correlates to proactive and reactive aggression in a sample of detained girls. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 35(6), 969–981. URL:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10802-007-9147-y>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T., Jr. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 139–153). New York: Guilford Press.
- 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. D. and Lynam, D. (2001). Structural models of personality and their relation to antisocial behavior: A meta-analytic review. *Criminology*, 39 (4). DOI: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.2001.tb00940.x
- Mohr, A. (2006). Family variables associated with peer victimization: Does family violence enhance the probability of being victimized by peers? *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 65(2), 107–116. DOI: 10.1024/1421-0185.65.2.107
- Moughalian, R. K. (2014). *Interrelationship between Bullying, Self-esteem, Peer Support, School Climate, and Parenting Styles among Armenian Secondary Students*. [unpublished master's thesis]. Haigazian University, Lebanon.

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

Norman, R. E., Byambaa, M., De, R., Butchart, A., Scott, J., & Vos, T. (2012). The Long-Term

Health Consequences of Child Physical Abuse, Emotional Abuse, and Neglect: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Plos Medicine*, 9 (11), 1-31.

doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001349

Ohene, S.-A., Ireland, M., McNeely, C., & Borowsky, I. W. (2006). Parental expectations,

physical punishment, and violence among adolescents who score positive on a psychosocial screening test in primary care. *Pediatrics*, 117(2), 441-447.

DOI:10.1542/peds.2005-0421

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

Cambridge USA: Blackwell Publishers.

Olweus, D. (2001a). Peer harassment: A critical analysis and some important issues. In J.

Juvonen & s. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school* (pp. 3-20). New York: Guilford Publications.

Olweus, D. (2001b). *Olweus' core program against bullying and antisocial behavior: A teacher*

handbook. Bergen, Norway: Research Center for Health Promotion, University of Bergen.

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

- Ondersma, S. J., Chaffin, M. J., Mullins, S. M., & LeBreton, J. M. (2005). A brief form of the Child Abuse Potential Inventory: development and validation. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 34*(2), 301-311.
- Pateraki, L., & Houndoumadi, A. (2001). Bullying among primary school teachers in Athens, Greece. *Educational Psychology, 21*(2), 167–175. DOI: 10.1080/01443410020043869
- Pontzer, D. (2010). A Theoretical Test of Bullying Behavior: Parenting, Personality, and the Bully/Victim Relationship. *Journal of Family Violence, 25*(3), 259-273. DOI: 10.1007/s10896-009-9289-5
- Putnam, F. W. (2003). Ten-year research update review: child sexual abuse. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 42*(3), 269-278
- Rabah, J. Y. (2006). *Bullying problems in Lebanese private schools: teachers' and administrators' perceptions* (master's thesis). American University of Beirut, Lebanon.
- Rigby, K. (2003). Consequences of bullying in schools. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 48*(9), 583–590.
- Rigby, K. (2013). Bullying in Schools and its Relation to Parenting and Family Life. *Family Matters, 92*, 61-67.
- Rivers, I., & Smith, P. K. (1994). Types of Bullying Behaviour and Their Correlates. *Aggressive Behavior, 20*(5), 359-368.
- Rose, C. A., Espelage, D. L., Aragon, S. R., & Elliott, J. (2011). Bullying and Victimization among Students in Special Education and General Education Curricula. *Exceptionality Education International, 21*(3), 2-14.

- Sadowski, L. S., Hunter, W. M., Bangdiwala, S. I., & Muñoz, S. R. (2004). The world studies of abuse in the family environment (WorldSAFE): A model of a multi-national study of family violence. *Injury Control and Safety Promotion, 11*(2), 81–90.
DOI:10.1080/15660970412331292306
- Sakr, E. (2013, Sep. 30). Economists: World Bank unemployment figure too low. *The Daily Star Lebanon*, p.5. Retrieved from <http://dailystar.com.lb/Business/Lebanon/2013/Sep-30/232988-economists-world-bank-unemployment-figure-too-low.ashx#axzz39hNiWCvq>
- Salhani, J. (2014, June 6). Youth unemployment hits 35 pct in Lebanon. *The Daily Star Lebanon*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailystar.com.lb/Business/Lebanon/2014/Jun-06/259134-youth-unemployment-hits-35-pct-in-lebanon-survey.ashx#axzz39hNiWCvq>
- School Bully OnLine. (2005). Retrieved, April 20, 2014, from <http://www.bullyonline.org/schoolbully/index.htm>
- Sedlak, A. J., & Broadhurst, D. D. (1996). Third national incidence study of child abuse and neglect (NIS-3). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect. Retrieved April 20, 2014 from http://www.nis4.org/NIS_History.pdf
- Sher, K. J., Trull, T. J. (1994). Personality and disinhibitory psychopathology: Alcoholism and antisocial personality disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 103*(1), 92-102. doi: [10.1037/0021-843X.103.1.92](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.103.1.92)
- Shields, A. & Cicchetti, D. (2001). Parental maltreatment and emotion dysregulation as risk factors for bullying and victimization in middle childhood. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 30*(3), 349–363.

- Stein, J. j., Dukes, R. L., & Warren, J. I. (2007). Adolescent Male Bullies, Victims, and Bully-Victims: A Comparison of Psychosocial and Behavioral Characteristics. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 32*(3), 273-282.
- Stoltenborgh, M., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M., & IJzendoorn, M. (2013). The neglect of child neglect: a meta-analytic review of the prevalence of neglect. *Social Psychiatry & Psychiatric Epidemiology, 48*(3), 345-355. doi:10.1007/s00127-012-0549-y.
- Stocker, C. M., & Youngblade, L. (1999). Marital conflict and parental hostility: Links with children's sibling and peer relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology, 13*(4), 598–609
- Straus, M. A. (1991) Discipline and deviance: physical punishment of children and violence and crime in adulthood. *Social Problems, 38*(2), 133-154
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Finkelhor, D., Moore, D. W., & Runyan, D. (1998). Identification of child maltreatment with the Parent–Child Conflict Tactics Scales: Development and psychometric data for a national sample of American parents. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 22*(4), 249–270.
- Strickland, C. M., Drislane, L. E., Lucy, M., Krueger, R. F., & Patrick, C. J. (2013). Characterizing Psychopathy Using *DSM-5* Personality Traits. *Assessment, 20* (3), 327-338. DOI: 10.1177/1073191113486691
- Tani, F., Greenman, P. S., Schneider, B. H., & Fregoso, M. (2003). Bullying and the Big Five: A Study of Childhood Personality and Participant Roles in Bullying Incidents. *School Psychology International, 24*(2), 131-46.

Tanielian, J. (2002). *Լիբանանահայ դպրոցը: թիվեր եւ մտորումներ*. [Lebanese Armenian schools: numbers and thoughts]. Beirut: Sipan.

Thomas, M. K., Yalch, M. M., Krueger, R. F., Wright, A. G. C., Markkon, K. E., & Hopwood, C. J. (2012). The Convergent Structure of DSM-5 Personality Trait Facets and Five-Factor Model Trait Domains. *Assessment*, 20 (3), 308-311. DOI: 10.1177/1073191112457589.

Toth, S. L., Manly, J. T., & Cicchetti, D. (1992). Child maltreatment and vulnerability to depression. *Development and Psychopathology*, 49(1), 97–112. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400005587>

U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. (2003). A coordinated response to child abuse and neglect: The foundation for practice. In *Child Abuse and Neglect User Manual*. Retrieved April 20, 2014, from <https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/usermanuals/foundation/foundation.pdf>

US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Children, Youth and Families (2009). *Child Maltreatment 2007*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office. Retrieved April 19, 2014, from <http://archive.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/pubs/cm09/cm09.pdf>

Usta, J. A., Mahfoud, Z. R., Abi Chahine, G., & Anani, G. A. (2008). Child sexual abuse: The Lebanese situation. Retrieved March 1, 2014 from <http://www.kafa.org.lb/studies-publications/13/2/child-sexual-abuse-the-situation-in-lebanon>

- Valen Morgan, B. (2012) *Correlation between the child abuse potential inventory and the MMPI-2-RF in a sample of court-referred parents*. (Master's thesis). Western Carolina University. Retrieved from <http://libres.uncg.edu/ir/wcu/f/Morgan2012.pdf>
- Varjabedian, S. H. (1981). *Հայերը Լիբանանի մէջ* [Armenians in Lebanon]. Beirut: Sevan Publishing House.
- Viljoen, J. j., O'Neill, M. L., & Sidhu, A. (2005). Bullying behaviors in female and male adolescent offenders: prevalence, types, and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Aggressive Behavior, 31*(6), 521-536. doi:10.1002/ab.20036
- Widom, C. 1. (1989). Does Violence Beget Violence? A Critical Examination of the Literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 106*3-28. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.106.1.3
- Wolfe, D. A., Crooks, C. C., Chiodo, D., & Jaffe, P. (2009). Child Maltreatment, Bullying, Gender-Based Harassment, and Adolescent Dating Violence: Making the Connections. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 33* (1), 21-24. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.01469.x
- World Health Organization. (1999). Report of the Consultation on Child Abuse Prevention, 29-31 March 1999, WHO, Geneva. (WHO/HSC/PVI/99.1). Geneva, Switzerland: Author.
- Wright, A. G. C., Markon, K. E., Thomas, K. M., Hopwood, C. J., Pincus, A. L., Krueger, R. F. (2012). The Hierarchical Structure of DSM-5 Pathological Personality Traits. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 121* (4), 951-957. DOI: 10.1037/a0027669.
- 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.
- Zolotor, A. J., Runyan, D. K., Dunne, M. P., Jain, D., Peturs, H. R., Ramirez, C., Volkova, E., Deb, S., Lidchi, V., Muhammad, T., Isaeva, O. (2009). ISPCAN Child Abuse Screening

Tool Children's Version (ICAST-C):Instrument development and multi-national pilot testing. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 33, 833–841. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2009.09.004

Appendix A: Informed Consent

Participant Number: _____

My name is Manoug Ibitian and I am a graduate student at Haigazian University. This research project is conducted as part of a requirement for obtaining my MA degree. This research consists of questions that relate to behaviors such as bullying and abuse.

All the information and data of this research will remain **CONFIDENTIAL & ANONYMOUS**. Only researcher and his supervisor will have access to view any data collected during this research.

This research intends to follow all the acknowledged Ethical Codes of: 1. informed consent of the participating institution and the participant, 2. offering no excessive or financial inducements, 3. Using nondeceptive procedures, 4. debriefing, and 5. not intending to cause any physical and psychological harm and/or offense.

Filling in the questionnaire will indicate your VOLUNTARY participation in this research project.

Remember! It is your total right to ASK any question related to this research. Also, you have the right to REJECT participation or WITHDRAW during filling in the questionnaire whenever you feel uncomfortable or willing to discontinue participation at any time without penalty. However, you cannot withdraw from the research after submitting you questionnaire.

No incentive or payment will be received for participation

Filling in the questionnaire might take **20** minutes of your time.

Please be sure of **answering all the questions** mentioned in this questionnaire.

Thank you for your interest in participating in this research and for further inquiry you can contact me via the following email: manoug77@hotmail.com

I have read and understood the above, and I agree to participate in the study.

Please check the following box with an "X" if you would like to participate

Appendix B: Demographic Information

Instructions: Circle the BEST answer(s) that best describes you.

1. Gender: **a. Female** **b. Male**

2. Today's date:

3. Age:

4. What is the name of the school you attend?

5. Grade/class: **a. Grade 7** **b. Grade 8** **c. Grade 9**
d. Grade 10

6. Family status: **a. Father & mother together** **b. Father & mother separated**
c. Father dead **d. mother dead** **e. Father& mother dead**
f. Other (specify in the box)

7. What is your nationality? **a. Lebanese** **b. Syrian** **c. Other (specify in the box)**

8. What is your religious affiliation? **a. Armenian Orthodox** **b. Armenian Catholic**
c. Armenian Evangelical **d. Other (specify in the box)**

Appendix C: Illinois Bully Scale (IBS)

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 D: International Child Abuse Screening Tool – Children Home Version (ICAST – CH)

We want to find out about experiences that happen to children **at home / inside the family**. This questionnaire is being used with children in many parts of the world to ask children about experiences that they might have had so that people can know what things they have to pay attention to keep children safe.

We want to find out about the things that adults sometimes do to children and adolescents that may hurt or make them feel uncomfortable, upset or scared in their school. We want to ask you about things that have happened to you **in the past year**.

These questions may seem strange or hard to answer. Please try to answer them as best you can, thinking about the past year. This is not a test. There is not right or wrong answer, just say what you remember happened to you. If at any point you feel too uncomfortable to continue you can stop.

If you want to get help about any of the things we ask about, talk to the person who gave this questionnaire to you. Unless you tell us you want to talk, no one will ever know that the answers that you give are about you.

Instructions: In every question and sub-question circle the ONE best choice.

** Sometimes, when children are growing up, people who are responsible for caring for them (for example parents/stepparents/adoptive parents/other carers/aunts and uncles) do not know how to care for children properly, and the children do not get what they need to grow up healthy. Have any of these things happened to you **in the past year**?*

14. Threatened to hurt or kill you, including invoking evil spirits against you?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

14.a. If this ever happened, was it by

a. Adult **b.** Another child or adolescent **c.** Both

16. Do you feel that you did not get enough to eat (went hungry) and/or drink (were thirsty) even though there was enough for everyone?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

17. Have to wear dirty, torn clothes, or clothes that were not warm enough/too warm, shoes that were too small even though there were ways of getting better/new ones?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

18. Not taken care of when you were sick - for example not taken to see a doctor when you were hurt or not given the medicines you needed?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

19. You did not feel cared for?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

20. Felt that you were not important?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

21. Felt that there was never anyone looking after you, supporting you, helping you when you most needed?

a. Many times (more than twice) b. Sometimes (once or twice) c. Never d. Not in the past year but this has happened

** Sometimes people that live in the same home as children and adolescents can hurt them physically. Thinking about yourself, **in the past year**, has anyone in your **home** (for example natural parents/ grandparents/ stepparents/adoptive parents/ caregivers/aunts and uncles/ older brother or sisters or cousins) done something such as:*

22. Pushed, Grabbed, or Kicked you?

a. Many times (more than twice) b. Sometimes (once or twice) c. Never d. Not in the past year but this has happened

22.a. If this happened, was it by an

a. Adult b. Another child or adolescent c. Both

23. Hit, beat, or spanked you with a hand?

a. Many times (more than twice) b. Sometimes (once or twice) c. Never d. Not in the past year but this has happened

23.a. If this happened, was it by an

a. Adult b. Another child or adolescent c. Both

24. Hit, beat, or spanked you with a belt, paddle, a stick or other object?

a. Many times (more than twice) b. Sometimes (once or twice) c. Never d. Not in the past year but this has happened

24.a. If this happened, was it by an

a. Adult b. Another child or adolescent c. Both

25. Choked you, smothered you or tried to drown you?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

25.a. If this happened, was it by an

a. Adult **b.** Another child or adolescent **c.** Both

26. Burned or scalded you, (including putting hot chilies or peppers in your mouth)?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

26.a. If this happened, was it by an

a. Adult **b.** Another child or adolescent **c.** Both

27. Locked you up in a small place, tied you up, or chained you to something?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

27.a. If this happened, was it by an

a. Adult **b.** Another child or adolescent **c.** Both

28. Pulled your hair, pinched you, or twisted your ear?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

28.a. If this happened, was it by an

a. Adult **b.** Another child or adolescent **c.** Both

29. Making you stay in one position holding a heavy load or another burden or making you do exercise as punishment?

a. Many times (more than twice) b. Sometimes (once or twice) c. Never d. Not in the past year but this has happened

29.a. If this ever happened, was it by an

a. Adult b. Another child or adolescent c. Both

30. Threatened you with a knife or a gun

a. Many times (more than twice) b. Sometimes (once or twice) c. Never d. Not in the past year but this has happened

30.a. If this ever happened, was it by

a. Adult b. Another child or adolescent c. Both

** Sometimes adults do sexual things to children or show sexual things to children and adolescents. Thinking about yourself, have anyone (for example parents/ stepparents /adoptive parents/ caregivers/aunts or uncles /older brother or sisters or cousins) done any of these things to you in the past year?*

31. Made you upset by speaking to you in a sexual way or writing sexual things about you?

a. Many times (more than twice) b. Sometimes (once or twice) c. Never d. Not in the past year but this has happened

31.a. If this ever happened, was it by an

a. Adult b. Another child or adolescent c. Both

31.b. How well did you know the person?

a. Not at all b. Not very well c. Very well

32. Made you watch a sex video or look at sexual pictures in a magazine or computer when you did not want to?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

32.a. If this happened, was it by an

a. Adult **b.** Another child or adolescent **c.** Both

32.b. How well did you know the person?

a. Not at all **b.** Not very well **c.** Very well

33. Made you look at their private parts or wanted to look at yours?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

33.a. If this happened, was it by an

a. Adult **b.** Another child or adolescent **c.** Both

33.b. How well did you know the person?

a. Not at all **b.** Not very well **c.** Very well

34. Touched your private parts, or made you touch theirs?

a. Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the past year but this has happened

34.a. If this happened, was it by an

a. Adult **b.** Another child or adolescent **c.** Both

34.b. How well did you know the person?

a. Not at all **b.** Not very well **c.** Very well

35. Made a sex video of you alone or with other people doing sexual things?

- a.** Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the

past year but this has happened

35.a. If this happened, was it by an

- a.** Adult **b.** Another child or adolescent **c.** Both

35.b. How well did you know the person?

- a.** Not at all **b.** Not very well **c.** Very well

36. Tried to have sex with you when you did not want them to?

- a.** Many times (more than twice) **b.** Sometimes (once or twice) **c.** Never **d.** Not in the

past year but this has happened

36.a. If this happened, was it by an

- a.** Adult **b.** Another child or adolescent **c.** Both

36.b. How well did you know the person?

- a.** Not at all **b.** Not very well **c.** Very well

Appendix E: Personality Inventory for DSM-5 Brief Form Child Age

11 – 17 (PID-5-BF)

Instructions: This is a list of things different people might say about themselves. We are interested in how you would describe yourself. There is no right or wrong answers. So you can describe yourself as **honestly** as possible, we will keep your responses **confidential**. We'd like you to take your time and **read** each statement **carefully**, selecting the response that **best** describes you.

		Very False or Often False	Sometimes or Somewhat False	Sometimes or Somewhat True	Very True or Often True	Item Score
1	People would describe me as reckless.	0	1	2	3	
2	I feel like I act totally on impulse.	0	1	2	3	
3	Even though I know better, I can't stop making rash decisions.	0	1	2	3	
5	Others see me as irresponsible.	0	1	2	3	
6	I'm not good at planning ahead.	0	1	2	3	
17	It's no big deal if I hurt other peoples' feelings.	0	1	2	3	
19	I crave attention.	0	1	2	3	
20	I often have to deal with people who are less important than me.	0	1	2	3	
22	I use people to get what I want.	0	1	2	3	
25	It is easy for me to take advantage of others.	0	1	2	3	

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING ☺

Appendix F: Multiple Comparisons of Means between Neglect, Physical Abuse, Sexual Abuse, and Bullying and Victimization.

Dependent Variable	(I) Category	(J) Category	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
NEGLECT	Bully	Victim	-2.10000	1.27138	.605	-5.5044	1.3044
		Both	-2.35000	1.07573	.184	-5.2305	.5305
		Control	-.70882	.86532	1.000	-3.0259	1.6082
	Victim	Bully	2.10000	1.27138	.605	-1.3044	5.5044
		Both	-.25000	1.24952	1.000	-3.5958	3.0958
		Control	1.39118	1.07372	1.000	-1.4839	4.2663
	Both	Bully	2.35000	1.07573	.184	-.5305	5.2305
		Victim	.25000	1.24952	1.000	-3.0958	3.5958
		Control	1.64118	.83287	.305	-.5890	3.8713
	Control	Bully	.70882	.86532	1.000	-1.6082	3.0259
		Victim	-1.39118	1.07372	1.000	-4.2663	1.4839
		Both	-1.64118	.83287	.305	-3.8713	.5890
PHYSICAL ABUSE	Bully	Victim	-2.36667	1.04751	.153	-5.1716	.4382
		Both	-3.10909*	.88631	.004	-5.4824	-.7358
		Control	.05882	.71295	1.000	-1.8502	1.9679
	Victim	Bully	2.36667	1.04751	.153	-.4382	5.1716
		Both	-.74242	1.02950	1.000	-3.4991	2.0143
		Control	2.42549*	.88466	.042	.0567	4.7943
	Both	Bully	3.10909*	.88631	.004	.7358	5.4824
		Victim	.74242	1.02950	1.000	-2.0143	3.4991
		Control	3.16791*	.68621	.000	1.3304	5.0054
	Control	Bully	-.05882	.71295	1.000	-1.9679	1.8502
		Victim	-2.42549*	.88466	.042	-4.7943	-.0567
		Both	-3.16791*	.68621	.000	-5.0054	-1.3304
SEXUAL ABUSE	Bully	Victim	-.23333	.40777	1.000	-1.3252	.8585
		Both	-.53636	.34502	.734	-1.4602	.3875
		Control	.36471	.27753	1.000	-.3784	1.1078
	Victim	Bully	.23333	.40777	1.000	-.8585	1.3252
		Both	-.30303	.40076	1.000	-1.3761	.7701
		Control	.59804	.34437	.508	-.3241	1.5202
	Both	Bully	.53636	.34502	.734	-.3875	1.4602
		Victim	.30303	.40076	1.000	-.7701	1.3761
		Control	.90107*	.26712	.006	.1858	1.6163
	Control	Bully	-.36471	.27753	1.000	-1.1078	.3784
		Victim	-.59804	.34437	.508	-1.5202	.3241
		Both	-.90107*	.26712	.006	-1.6163	-.1858

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.