



<https://doi.org/10.5559/di.31.4.03>

VICTIM OR ABUSER: VICTIMISATION BY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AS A PREDICTOR OF VIOLENT BEHAVIOUR OF JUVENILES TOWARDS FAMILY MEMBERS

Ljiljana STEVKOVIĆ
Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation,
University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

UDK: 364.632-058.5/.6(497.11)
364.642-058.5/.6(497.11)

Original scientific paper

Received: January 7, 2021

Domestic violence (DV) manifests itself in different forms, given the specific dynamics of the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim. In addition to partner violence, child abuse and violence against the elderly, in recent years scientists have focused on the violent behaviour of juveniles towards other family members. The results of the research unequivocally point out the victimisation of juveniles as a risk factor for their violent behaviour towards parents and siblings. The paper aims to present a part of the research findings on juvenile domestic violence in Serbia on the connection between the victimisation of juveniles and their violent behaviour towards family members. The research was conducted on a sample of 1335 students of elementary (7th and 8th grade) and high (all grades) schools in Belgrade and Novi Sad. The results show a high prevalence of domestic violence committed by juveniles and a high prevalence of their victimisation by domestic violence. Additionally, the findings indicate a possibility of prediction of juvenile domestic violence, with the experience of victimisation as the most significant predictor of all risk factors that were tested.

Keywords: domestic violence, child-to-parent abuse, sibling abuse, juveniles, Serbia



Ljiljana Stevković, Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation, University of Belgrade, Visokog Stevana 2, 11000 Belgrade, Serbia.
E-mail: stevkoviclj@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Violence as a multidimensional phenomenon with different aetiology, forms and consequences on a personal, family, social and global level, is a reality that every society faces regardless of its level of development.¹ Serbia with its history of interethnic conflicts, transition processes and degradation of moral and social values, faces an increase of violence, both within the family and between different individuals and social groups. We are witnessing the popularisation of violent behaviour among youth who acquire and maintain their status in peer groups by verbal, physical or even sexual abuse of those who are in any way different from them.

Domestic violence is a specific and one of the most socially dangerous forms of crime (Nikolić-Ristanović & Konstantinović Vilić, 2018). For centuries, various violent practices as a form of disciplining women and children had been socially accepted and even desirable patterns of behaviour. Feminist activists in the mid-1970s made a significant contribution to the opening of the family' and the understanding of domestic violence as a form of crime (Nikolić-Ristanović & Konstantinović Vilić, 2018). Shortly afterwards, child-to-parent violence was scientifically recognised thanks to Harbin and Madden (1979), who introduced the term 'battered parent syndrome', referring to the consequences of physical violence perpetrated by juveniles towards their parents. A year after, Straus and associates found that, along with child-to-parent violence (CPV), sibling violence (SV) was also present in American families, as the most frequent form of juvenile domestic violence (Straus et al., 1980).

Up until now, studies have provided some knowledge about the phenomenological characteristics of child-to-parent and sibling violence, while experiences in working with families in which juvenile domestic violence occurs indicated the multiple causes, which found empirical confirmation (e.g. Cottrell & Monk, 2004; Boxer et al., 2009). Factors contributing to the violent behaviour of juveniles towards family members are similar to risk factors of juvenile crime in general and include factors related to the characteristics and behaviour of violent juveniles (individual factors), those resulting from various mistakes' of parents and family dysfunction in general (family factors), and social factors, such as gender socialisation, socialising with delinquent peers and living in a criminal environment (Routt & Anderson, 2011).

Family risk factors, specifically the experience of inter-family victimisation, have gradually become the focus of research (Kennedy et al., 2010; Ibabe et al., 2013; Contreras & Cano, 2014; Nowakowski-Sims & Rowe, 2017; Beckmann, 2020; Del Hoyo-Bilbao et al., 2020). Experience of parent-to-child abuse and exposure to intimate partner violence, especially if

combined, increase the risk of internalising and externalising outcomes in adolescence (Evans et al., 2008; Moylan et al., 2010), including the child-to-parent and sibling violence. A linear correlation between parent-to-child abuse and subsequent child-to-parent abuse has been empirically confirmed (Pagani et al., 2004; Gámez-Guadix & Calvete 2012; Holt, 2013; Margolin & Baucom, 2014; Miles & Condry, 2015; Beckmann, 2020). Furthermore, previous studies have confirmed that parent-to-child violence predicts child-to-parent violence (Routt & Anderson, 2011; Contreras & Cano, 2016; Del Hoyo-Bilbao et al., 2020). Gallego and associates (2019) concluded that the probability of developing child-to-parent violence among adolescents victimised by their parents was 71% higher than in non-victimised adolescents under different conditions (i.e. community or judicial population, different types of violence: physical or psychological, and different types of victimisation: direct or indirect). Additionally, parents who seek professional help because of their child's violent behaviour towards them often tell a therapist about the child's witnessing incidents of the IPV (Biehal, 2012). In her study, Biehal (2012) found that the risk of child-to-parents violence triples if the child witnesses the IPV, which especially refers to the son-to-mother violence. Furthermore, sons who justify the father's violence against the mother more often use physical violence against mothers themselves (Gallagher, 2004; Del Hoyo-Bilbao et al., 2020). Besides inter-parental violence, non-violent family conflicts have been related to increased aggression in adolescents, and child-to-parent violence in particular (Ibabe & Bentler 2016).

Corporal punishment, which should be and in the present study is considered as a form of direct victimisation (Straus, 1994; Stevković, 2013), is also a salient predictor of child-to-parent and sibling violence (Bobic, 2002; McLaurin, 2005; Eriksen & Jensen, 2009; Ibabe et al., 2010). When parents use more severe forms of corporal punishment (they use more severe physical violence in order to discipline the child), the punished child uses more severe forms of physical violence towards a brother or a sister, as if he/she is trying to get revenge for what the parent did to him/her (Eriksen & Jensen, 2009).

Victimisation by domestic violence is also associated with the most severe forms of child-to-parent violence. It was identified as the most significant risk factor for child-to-parent killing, as a result of the identification of a child with an aggressive parent and his violent behaviour (in the case of indirect victimisation) (Flowers, 2002). Based on her clinical work, Heide developed a typology of parent killers, which includes a type of child-killer victim (Heide & Petee, 2007). Those are children with experience of continuous direct and indirect vic-

timisation that worsens over time. In these families, situations in which the other parent (usually the mother) does not help the child or protect him/her from an abusive parent are not rare. As a result, the child's tolerance of violent incidents decreases, so the primary motive for these murders is the ending of parent-to-child abuse when a child kills a parent out of desperation or fear (Heide & Petee, 2007; Heide & Frei, 2010).

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Various theoretical models have been used for explaining the correlation between the experience of domestic violence victimisation and subsequent juvenile violence towards family members. The most frequently applied is Bandura's theory of social learning (Bandura, 1977). Applied to the explanation of CPV and SV, the social learning theory proposes that violent behaviour is modelled through direct conditioning through reward and punishment (direct experience), and by observing and imitating the violent model (violent parent in the case of witnessing the IPV). The process of learning a violent pattern of behaviour takes place when a child is a direct victim of domestic violence, as well as when he/she is witnessing the IPV (mostly father-to-mother). A decisive influence is exercised by modelling throughout repetition and encouragement of the child's aggressive behaviour by the parents (Björkovist, 1997, p. 71). This theory is often used in the explanation of the frequent victimisation of mothers (son-to-mother violence), and the influence of corporal punishment on CPV and SV. Juveniles who are exposed to corporal punishment perceive that their parents use violence to punish them for some wrongdoing or to make them change their behaviour (Siegel et al., 2006). As a result, children may perceive violence as an acceptable strategy for making others (parents or siblings) do whatever they (children) want (Stevanović & Srna, 2010). Consequently, CPV and SV are results of the child's belief that violence is an appropriate, useful conflict resolution (Holt, 2013).

The main postulates of the social learning theory are incorporated in the Theory of intergenerational transmission of violence. The basic assumption of this theory is that a child who grows up in a violent family will become violent towards others, especially towards parents and siblings. The family in which the IPV and/or parent-to-child abuse is present represents an environment for training' violent behaviour throughout repeated exposure of the child to such behaviour (Cornell & Gelles 1982; Hoffman & Edwards, 2004). In the context of sibling violence, a child repeats patterns of (violent) behaviour that he/she has witnessed or experienced directly, and the spectrum of violent behaviour towards a sibling can be broader and different from that to which he/she has been exposed (Hoffman & Edwards, 2004).

The hypothesis of two-way domestic violence, according to which children who are violent towards their parents are often victims of parental violence themselves (Boxer et al., 2009), is in line with the basic postulates of Patterson's theory of coercion (Patterson, 1986). Originally, the theory of coercion was based on basic postulates of the social learning theory, as one of the first theories of developmental criminology. According to this theory, learning of delinquent behaviour is a result of coercion that runs through four stages. The mechanism of coercion in high-risk families, such as families in which violent conflicts occur, is more often repeated because the child has more benefits from aggressive than from prosocial behaviour, which is not sufficiently supported by the parents (Patterson, 1998). Eventually, the child learns that violent behaviour helps him/her to gain control over the behaviour of the parents and to prevent possible future punishments. By repeating such behaviour, he/she begins to apply it in all conflict situations with his/her parents.

AIM AND HYPOTHESIS

Domestic violence committed by juveniles in Serbia has never been studied before, although the official data of the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia show that juveniles are reported, accused and even convicted for the criminal offence of domestic violence (Republički zavod za statistiku, 2021). Bearing that in mind, the author conducted quantitative and qualitative research on this form of juvenile violent crime in Serbia. In this paper, part of the results of the cross-sectional quantitative research is presented. The research aimed to determine the phenomenological and aetiological characteristics of violence committed by juveniles against family members, i.e. parents, siblings and grandparents. The research had nine hypotheses, out of which one hypothesis is relevant for the paper. This paper aims to present the results of the analysis based on the assumption that direct and indirect victimisation is a significant predictor of this form of juvenile violent crime.

METHOD

Sample

The quantitative research was conducted on a representative city-based sample, which consisted of 1335 pupils from elementary (7th and 8th grade) and secondary (all grades) schools in Belgrade and Novi Sad, the two largest cities in Serbia. The sample encompassed pupils from 12 to 19 years of age ($M = 15.46$; $Mdn = 16.00$; $SD = 1.760$) and was gender uniform, with slightly more boys (52.2%) than girls (47.8%).

Instrument

This research was conducted within the International Self-Report Delinquency Study 3 (ISR3) project.² The data was collected by using a standardised ISR3 questionnaire, which consists of eleven modules. The questionnaire is a combination of self-report and victimisation survey, and for data collection, in Serbia, an online questionnaire was used, but in its offline version (since some of the schools from the sample didn't have Internet access), FluidSurveys software was implemented. The first seven modules make a fixed (first) part of the questionnaire (Demographic background; Family; School; Victimization; Leisure and peers; Attitudes and values; Offending) and modules 8 to 10 make a flexible (second) part of the questionnaire (Substance use; Norm transmission strength; Procedural justice questions). The third part of the questionnaire consists of optional (module 11) and one or more nationally specific modules (Enzmann et al., 2018). The questionnaire used in Serbia had three additional modules, of which two were nationally specific, with questions about domestic violence victimisation (Family – Some things that may have happened to you) and questions regarding perpetration of domestic violence (Family – Some things you might have done).³ These two modules included questions about lifetime and last-year victimisation and violent behaviour. Both modules included questions about the frequency and continuity of victimisation and violent behaviour towards family members, as well as questions about who was violent towards respondents (mother or father, brother or sister, or both) and towards whom exactly the respondents were violent (mother or father, brother or sister, grandmother or grandfather, or both).

To conduct the current analysis, all variables from both nationally specific modules and two variables from the module Family (physical fights and the experience of repeated serious conflicts between parents) were selected.

Procedure

The school sample was randomly selected from the list of schools and classes in Belgrade and Novi Sad. In order to obtain approval for the implementation of the survey in elementary and secondary schools in selected cities, the Serbian Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development was contacted. A positive opinion was obtained, but it wasn't obligatory for schools. Since schools in Serbia have autonomy, school principals were the ones who could accept or refuse the school's participation in the study. Originally, it was planned to include 24 schools, but six schools, four in Belgrade and two in Novi Sad refused access, mainly complaining about an increasing influx of studies to schools, too many obligations and so on. The final sample included twenty schools. Before

collecting the data, teachers and school psychologists were given detailed information about the aims of the research in a one-hour presentation. The questionnaire was administered in regular classes under the supervision of the researcher and it took about 45 minutes to complete. Participants were given guarantees of confidentiality and anonymity regarding their responses. Informed consent was obtained from parents and pupils and it resulted in 8% of pupils' refusal to take part in the survey, while only 6 pupils (0.4%) were excluded from the survey by parental decision (Stevković & Nikolić-Ristanović, 2016). The research had an action character. Pupils were given information regarding the person to whom they could turn to if they wanted to talk about what they were being questioned about, as well as persons and/or organisations/institutions they could turn to if they had experienced domestic violence or were violent towards family members. The researcher was also available to the respondents, if they wanted to talk about data collection or about their experiences in regard to what they were questioned about.

For data analysis, descriptive statistics and binary logistic regression were used. Descriptive statistics were used to analyse the characteristics of the sample, as well as for the prevalence of different types of domestic violence victimisation of the respondents and different types of their violent behaviour towards family members. Binary logistic regression was used to test the possibility of prediction of juvenile domestic violence by their experience of victimisation within the family. Originally, other variables were also included in the analysis but, bearing in mind the aim of the paper, they will not be presented. All results presented in the paper relate to the lifetime juvenile violent behaviour towards family members and lifetime victimisation.

RESULTS

Prevalence of violent behaviour of juveniles towards family members and victimisation by domestic violence

To obtain data on the prevalence of juvenile domestic violence, the respondents were asked to report if they had perpetrated one or more forms of violent behaviour mentioned in the questionnaire during their lifetime (Table 1). The results showed that the majority of pupils (69.5%, $n = 965$) were violent towards family members at some point in their lives, with sibling violence as the most frequent form, followed by child-to-parent violence and grandchild-to-grandparent violence. More precisely, the most prevalent forms of violence are physical sibling violence, followed by psychological violence against parents, grandparents and siblings. A lower prevalence was found

for psychological (verbal) violence towards grandparents. Additionally, almost every fifth respondent (18.3%) was physically violent towards their mother or father at some point in his or her life. Furthermore, more than a third of the respondents were violent towards more family members. Precisely, at the same time, they were victimising their parents and siblings (38.1%, $n = 509$).

TABLE 1
Number and percentage of respondents who committed domestic violence

Type of violent behaviour		N	%
According to the relationship between juvenile and family member-victim	Child-to-parents violence	487	35.7
	Sibling violence	672	50.3
	Grandchild-to-grandparents violence	375	28.1
According to the method of perpetration	Psychological violence towards parents	400	30.0
	Physical violence towards parents	245	18.3
	Psychological sibling violence	271	20.3
	Physical sibling violence	506	43.0
	Psychological violence towards grandparents	306	22.9
	Physical violence towards grandparents	165	12.3

$N = 1335$

As the data in Table 2 suggest, many of the respondents were victims of indirect and direct victimisation by domestic violence at some point in their lives as well. More than half of them, as was expected, were exposed to continuous corporal punishment, as well as psychological abuse by parents. Also, slightly less than half of the respondents were victims of psychological sibling violence, as well as victims of indirect victimisation, i.e. they were exposed to severe inter-parental violence manifested as repeated verbal conflicts and/or physical fights between parents.

TABLE 2
Number and percentage of respondents with experience of domestic violence victimisation

Type of violent victimisation	N	%
Corporal punishment	756	56.6
Psychological violence by parents	728	54.7
Physical violence by parents	283	21.4
Psychological violence by siblings	638	47.5
Physical violence by siblings	207	17.5
Indirect victimisation	596	44.4

$N = 1335$

Domestic violence victimisation of juveniles as a predictor of perpetration of domestic violence

Tables 3, 4 and 5 provide the results of the logistic regression used to answer the question of whether the experience of parent-to-child and sibling abuse victimisation and witnessing inter-parental violence can predict the perpetration of juvenile do-

mestic violence and which of the above-mentioned predictors have the strongest influence on juvenile violent behaviour towards family members.

The regression model (Table 3) was found to be statistically significant ($\chi^2(5) = 124.47; p < 0.001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.457$) and it correctly classified 86.1% of cases (PAC = 86.1). When it comes to domestic violence of juveniles in general, regardless of the relationship between a violent juvenile and a family member who is a victim of his/her behaviour, all predictors are significant. The experience of corporal punishment and victimisation by psychological sibling violence have the strongest influence (Table 3). Respondents who experienced continuous corporal punishment compared to those without that experience have a fivefold higher risk of being violent towards one or more family members. Similarly, the probability of committing domestic violence increases 4.27 times with the experience of victimisation by psychological sibling violence, while it increases 3.73 times and 3.37 times, respectively, with the experience of victimisation by mild and severe physical sibling violence.

TABLE 3
Binary logistic
regression of violent
behaviour of juveniles
towards family
members (regardless
of relationship and
method of
perpetration) predicted
by domestic violence
victimisation of
juveniles

Type of victimisation as a predictor	B	Exp. (B)	p	95% CI for B	
				Lower bound	Upper bound
Physical fights between parents ¹	0.796	2.217	0.002**	1.349	3.645
Verbal conflicts between parents ¹	0.978	2.683	0.000***	2.047	3.516
Corporal punishment ²	1.612	5.013	0.000***	3.892	6.456
Psychological violence by parents ²	1.114	3.047	0.000***	2.143	4.331
Mild physical violence by parents ²	1.059	2.884	0.000***	2.242	3.710
Severe physical violence by parents ²	0.634	1.885	0.006**	1.197	2.967
Psychological violence by siblings ²	1.453	4.276	0.001**	2.695	6.785
Mild physical violence by siblings ²	1.319	3.739	0.059	2.801	4.991
Severe physical violence by siblings ²	1.311	3.371	0.002**	2.170	6.346

¹ Indirect victimisation; ² Direct victimisation. ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Regarding violent behaviour towards parents, the logistic regression model (Table 4) proved to be statistically significant ($\chi^2(5) = 93.02; p < 0.001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.508$), and it correctly classified 73.1% of cases (PAC = 73.1). Except for the experience of victimisation with mild physical sibling violence, all other predictors are significant. Once again, the experience of corporal punishment has the strongest influence. Respondents whose parents use corporal punishment to discipline them have a 3.77 times higher chance of being violent towards their parents than children whose parents use non-violent methods of discipline. As was expected, other forms of abuse by parents have a stronger influence than victimisation with sibling violence.

Type of victimisation as a predictor	B	Exp. (B)	<i>p</i>	95% CI for B	
				Lower bound	Upper bound
Physical fights between parents ¹	0.836	2.308	0.000***	1.570	3.394
Verbal conflicts between parents ¹	0.929	2.518	0.000***	1.994	3.719
Corporal punishment ²	1.315	3.775	0.000***	2.903	4.778
Psychological violence by parents ²	0.882	2.416	0.000***	1.849	3.157
Mild physical violence by parents ²	0.653	1.921	0.000***	1.531	2.409
Severe physical violence by parents ²	0.848	2.336	0.000***	1.615	3.378
Psychological violence by siblings ²	0.537	1.711	0.001**	1.261	2.322
Mild physical violence by siblings ²	0.235	1.265	0.059	0.991	1.615
Severe physical violence by siblings ²	0.551	1.735	0.002**	1.215	2.447

¹ Indirect victimisation; ² Direct victimisation. ** *p* < 0.01, ****p* < 0.001

TABLE 4
Binary logistic regression of violent behaviour towards parents predicted by domestic violence victimisation of juveniles

The regression model for violence against siblings (Table 5) proved to be significant ($\chi^2(5) = 123.51$; $p < 0.001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.422$), and it correctly classifies 82.1% of cases (PAC = 82.1). Six predictors are statistically significant, with victimisation by mild physical sibling violence and psychological sibling violence as predictors with the strongest influence. Data show that the risk of being violent towards a brother or sister is 4 times higher for respondents who experienced mild physical sibling abuse and 3.7 times higher for those who experienced psychological sibling abuse. Additionally, the experience of corporal punishment increases the risk of violent behaviour towards siblings 2.7 times.

TABLE 5
Binary logistic regression of violence against siblings predicted by domestic violence victimisation of juveniles

Type of victimisation as a predictor	B	Exp. (B)	<i>p</i>	95% CI for B	
				Lower bound	Upper bound
Physical violence between parents ¹	0.353	1.424	0.098	0.936	2.164
Verbal conflicts between parents ¹	0.473	1.605	0.000***	1.260	2.044
Corporal punishment ²	1.029	2.797	0.000***	2.205	3.548
Psychological violence by parents ²	0.615	1.805	0.000***	1.378	2.482
Mild physical violence by parents ²	0.823	2.276	0.000***	1.799	2.880
Severe physical violence by parents ²	0.186	1.205	0.362	0.807	1.798
Psychological violence by siblings ²	1.318	3.738	0.001**	2.242	5.287
Mild physical violence by siblings ²	1.431	4.185	0.059	3.289	5.374
Severe physical violence by siblings ²	0.905	2.472	0.002**	1.685	3.628

¹ Indirect victimisation; ² Direct victimisation. ** *p* < 0.01, ****p* < 0.001

Finally, the regression model for violence against grandparents (Table 6) proved to be significant ($\chi^2(5) = 46.32$; $p < 0.001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.401$), and it correctly classified 76.0% of cases (PAC = 76.0). Six predictors were found to be significant, but with a less strong influence than they have on the pre-

TABLE 6
Binary logistic regression of violence towards grandparents predicted by domestic violence victimisation of juveniles

diction of violence towards parents and sibling violence. Once again, the experience of corporal punishment is a predictor with the strongest influence – the risk for violence towards grandparents is doubled for respondents whose parents use violent disciplinary methods.

Type of victimisation as a predictor	B	Exp. (B)	<i>p</i>	95% CI for B	
				Lower bound	Upper bound
Physical violence between parents ¹	0.426	1.131	0.037*	1.026	2.285
Verbal conflicts between parents ¹	0.762	2.142	0.000***	1.667	2.736
Corporal punishment	0.893	2.442	0.000***	1.888	3.158
Psychological violence by parents	0.615	1.850	0.011*	1.378	2.482
Mild physical violence by parents	0.510	1.665	0.000***	1.310	2.117
Severe physical violence by parents	0.674	1.962	0.000***	1.349	2.855
Psychological violence by siblings	0.252	1.287	0.130	0.929	1.784
Mild physical violence by siblings	0.350	1.419	0.008**	1.094	1.840
Severe physical violence by siblings	0.708	2.030	0.000***	1.410	2.924

¹ Indirect victimisation; ² Direct victimisation. ** *p* < 0.01, ****p* < 0.001

DISCUSSION

The main aim of the present study was to analyse whether the experience of domestic violence victimisation of juveniles contributes to the prediction of their violent behaviour towards family members. As was expected, pupils' reports indicate a high prevalence of juvenile domestic violence in Serbia, with sibling violence as the most prevalent form, which is in line with the findings of numerous studies suggesting that sibling abuse is a common form of family violence and the most frequent form of maltreatment experienced by children (Straus et al., 1980; Button & Gealt, 2010; Purcell et al., 2014; Phillips et al., 2018). On the other hand, the prevalence of sibling violence in Serbia is much higher than in some countries, such as Turkey, where only 8% of respondents from the sample (70 out of *N* = 1105) reported perpetrating sibling abuse (Kiziltepe & Axel, 2017). Also, the results indicate a much higher prevalence of child-to-parent violence than in the USA, Canada and Europe, where the prevalence rate is between 5% and 13% (Ulman & Staus, 2003; Pagani et al., 2009; Calvete et al., 2011). These discrepancies could be a result of differences in methodologies and samples used in these studies. Findings based on adolescent reports, like in the present study, indicate prevalence rates for physical child-to-parent violence between 7% and 22%, and psychological violence between 65.8% and 95.3% (Calvete et al., 2017). The results of the present study showed that pupils from the sample were also victims of domestic violence. More than half of them experienced corporal punishment (56.6%) and psychological child-to-parent abuse

(54.7%). Moreover, slightly less than half of them (almost every second respondent) were victims of indirect victimisation. These findings are not surprising since they speak in favour of the high prevalence of domestic violence in Serbia, both intimate partner violence and child abuse.

This research also provides important findings on the prediction of violent behaviour towards family members by the experience of domestic violence victimisation. The results of the present study corroborated the relevance of violent family discipline, child abuse, sibling abuse, and family conflicts as risk factors for juvenile domestic violence. The regression model of child-to-parent violence based on victimisation by domestic violence based on respondents' reports explained 50% of the variance, while the regression model of sibling violence explained 42% of the variance, and the regression model of grandchild-to-grandparent violence based on victimisation by domestic violence explained 40% of the variance. These are excellent and parsimonious statistical models. Findings reveal that all forms of direct and indirect victimisation are a significant risk factor for the child-victim to become a violent child (sibling/grandchild) who will, out of anger or fear, retaliate with aggression against those who primarily used violence against them (e.g. parent or sibling), or they will 'learn' that violence will help them get whatever they want, so they will use violence against other family members who may not have behaved hurtfully towards them. Unsurprisingly, the experience of corporal punishment was found to be the most significant predictor that increases the likelihood of juvenile domestic violence fivefold. Aggressive and abusive discipline by parents may evoke feelings of fear, anxiety, and anger in children, therefore, the reversal of a child's violence against a parent is not necessarily something bad and pathological, because it could be a survival response by the child when their well-being is threatened (Loeber & Hay, 1997). The results of a longitudinal study on a national sample of USA male adolescents indicate a reciprocal relationship between parent-to-child abuse and child-to-parent violence, characterised by countervailing effects (UNICEF, 2010). Similarly, an eight-year longitudinal study on a sample of violent children and parents, victims of their violent behaviour, show that the experience of witnessing father-to-mother violence increases the risk of a child's verbal aggression towards parents (Margolin & Baucom, 2014). Similarly, Routt and Anderson (2011) confirmed that among children who were violent towards their parents, more than half witnessed inter-parental violence (53%), while more than a third were victims of physical abuse (38%).

Results of the present study reveal that experience of domestic violence victimisation is a predictor of sibling violence

as well, which is consistent with the findings of other studies (e.g., Linares, 2006; Phillips et al., 2018). Unsurprisingly, the strongest correlation was found between victimisation by sibling violence and the perpetration of sibling violence. Moreover, it was found that experiencing mild physical sibling abuse increases the risk of acting violently against a brother or sister, four times. This is consistent with the findings of other studies on the overlapping role of victim and perpetrator (Hardy et al., 2010; Tippet & Wolke, 2015). This could be explained in two ways: sibling abuse could be the result of delayed revenge for the experience of previous (sibling) abuse or it is a defensive reaction to the acute violent situation of (mostly) physical violence committed by his/her brother or sister.

In addition to child-to-parent violence and sibling violence, the results show that the prevalence of psychological and mild physical grandchild-to-grandparent violence increases with the experience of victimisation by domestic violence, especially with the experience of corporal punishment, while the prevalence of severe forms of physical violence increases with the experience of victimisation by more severe physical abuse by parents. This is in line with the rare empirical knowledge about the violence of underaged grandchildren towards grandparents (Flowers, 2002; Brownell et al., 2003). Like child-to-parent violence, the experience of corporal punishment was found to be the most significant predictor. Grandparents have an important role in the upbringing of grandchildren that is often similar to parenting. A child experiencing corporal punishment perceives violence as a useful strategy for achieving the goal and making others do what he/she wants (Stevanović & Srna, 2010), so he/she can apply that strategy to the relationship with a grandparent.

This research contributed to shedding light on the problem of juvenile domestic violence in Serbia, which is important since this hidden form of domestic violence is unrecognised in the public discourse, although, as mentioned above, official data show that juveniles are officially registered as perpetrators of this violent offence. The quality of this study comes from the fact that it provides knowledge on mild and severe forms of juvenile violent behaviour towards parents, siblings and grandparents. Moreover, the findings contributed to the identification and recognition of child abuse as a risk factor for the intergenerational transmission of violence.

It is important, however, to acknowledge the study's limitations. It does not explain how child abuse and interparental violence influence juvenile domestic violence over time. In order to better understand the dynamics of the association between violent victimisation and violent behaviour in the context of juvenile domestic violence, it would be preferable to conduct longitudinal studies. Future research should ob-

tain more detailed information on the directionality of inter-personal violence in child-parent relationships, sibling relationships and grandchild-grandparent relationships in order to find out to what extent juvenile domestic violence is bidirectional or unidirectional violence. Another limitation comes from the use of self-reports. One of the shortages of self-report surveys is false and socially desirable answers. Additional worries come from cognitive issues (whether the respondent understands the questions) and social issues (has the environment in which the person is filling out the questionnaire impacted their answers) (Brener et al., 2003; Lucas & Baird, 2006). The ISRD project uses many tools to help ensure that this self-reported data is as accurate as it can be. The researcher is present in the classroom while pupils fill out the questionnaire. At the very beginning, before the pupils start filling out the questionnaire, they are given detailed information about the questionnaire and the researcher helps them understand the questions if needed. The ISRD questionnaire gets reviewed every few years to incorporate new areas of focus or rewrite problematic questions to get data as accurately as possible. A lack of complete response is one of the problems with self-reported data. The ISRD 3 questionnaire design envisages questions that must be answered in order to move on to the next question. Moreover, pupils were answering the questionnaire on Tablets, which they found interesting. The University of Hamburg re-evaluated and cleaned data for each country participating in the project and analysed the probability of socially desirable answers. In Serbia, 1344 pupils filled out the questionnaire, but nine of them were excluded from the analysis because they were incomplete. Moreover, the probability of socially desirable answers was found to be less than 1%. Bearing that in mind, it can be assumed but not claimed with certainty that the data on the prevalence rates of juvenile domestic violence is as close to the real picture as it can be.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, aggressive parental discipline and child abuse, as well as witnessing inter-parental violence should be considered as important risk factors for child-to-parent violence as well as for grandchild-to-grandparent violence. Additionally, there is a high risk of committing sibling abuse for those who were victimised by sibling abuse, often as bidirectional violence. Therefore, raising awareness about this hidden form of domestic violence and violent juvenile crime and its serious consequences for a violent child, for victims of their violent behaviour, and for the whole family, is necessary. Finally, it is necessary to develop and implement evidence-based prevention strategies and programmes for the empowerment of

families in which this form of violence persists. Families in the situation of juvenile domestic violence, especially in the context of child-to-parent violence, have specific needs at the personal, family and social levels, so the interventions should be focused on their needs. To prevent CPV and SV, parents could benefit from training to reduce abusive discipline and from training in recognising the nuances between sibling rivalry and sibling abuse and reducing prejudices about the innocence of sibling violence. Therefore, maybe the starting point should be in promoting positive parenting programmes that focus on the acquisition of parenting skills that improve the exercise of parenting (Rodrigo et al., 2009). However, when children use violence over time and when parents, siblings and grandparents, fear their child, sibling or grandchild, they need to be empowered to get out of that situation.

Funding

This research was funded by the Swiss Federal Office for Migration, as a part of the International Self-Report Study 3 (ISRD3). Thanks to Professor Martin Killias, who applied for funding for the ISRD3 project in Switzerland, Serbia and a few other countries, this research was possible.

Conflicts of interest

The author declares no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study, in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data, in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

NOTES

¹ In this paper a part of the research findings of the author's doctoral dissertation on "Juvenile domestic violence", approved by the Faculty of Special Education and Rehabilitation, University of Belgrade, are presented.

² For more information see the project's website <https://web.northeastern.edu/isrd/>.

³ Data regarding juvenile domestic violence are 'locked' for the purposes of dissertation of the author of this paper, and only she has access to this data.

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice Hall.

Beckmann, L. (2020). Family relationships as risks and buffers in the link between parent-to-child physical violence and adolescent-to-parent physical violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 35(2), 131–141. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-019-00048-0>

Biehal, N. (2012). Parent abuse by young people on the edge of care: A child welfare perspective. *Social Policy and Society*, 11(2), 251–263. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746411000595>

Björkovist, K. (1997). Learning aggression from models: From social learning toward a cognitive theory of modelling. In S. Feshbach & J. Zagrodzka (Eds.), *Aggression: Biological, developmental and social perspectives* (pp. 69–81). Plenum Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-5883-5_5

Bobic, N. (2002). *Adolescent violence towards parents: Myths and realities*. Rosemount Youth and Family Services.

Boxer, P., Gullan, R. L., & Mahoney, A. (2009). Adolescent physical aggression towards parents in a clinically referred sample. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 38(1), 106–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374410802575396>

Brener, N. D., Billy, J. O., & Grady, W. R. (2003). Assessment of factors affecting the validity of self-reported health-risk behavior among adolescents: Evidence from the scientific literature. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 33(6), 436–457. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1054-139X\(03\)00052-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1054-139X(03)00052-1)

Brownell, P., Berman, J., Nelson, A., & Fofana, R. C. (2003). Grandparents raising grandchildren: The risks of caregiving. *Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect*, 15(3/4), 5–31. https://doi.org/10.1300/J084v15n03_02

Button, D., & Gealt, R. (2010). High risk behaviors among victims of sibling abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(2), 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-009-9276-x>

Calvete, E., Orue, I., & González-Cabrera, J. M. (2017). Violencia filio parental: Comparando lo que informan los adolescentes y sus progenitores [Child-to-parent violence: Comparing adolescent-reports with parent-reports]. *Revista de Psicología Clínica con Niños y Adolescentes*, 4(1), 9–15. <https://www.revistapcna.com/sites/default/files/16-08.pdf>

Calvete, E., Orue, I., & Sampedro, R. (2011). Violencia filio-parental en la adolescencia: Características ambientales y personales [Child to parent violence in adolescence: Environmental and individual characteristics]. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 34(3), 349–363. <https://doi.org/10.1174/021037011797238577>

Contreras, L., & Cano, C. (2014). Family profile of young offenders who abuse their parents: A comparison with general offenders and non-offenders. *Journal of Family Violence*, 29(8), 901–910. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-014-9637-y>

Contreras, L., León, S. P., & Cano-Lozano, M. C. (2020). Socio-cognitive variables involved in the relationship between violence exposure at home and child-to-parent violence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 80(1), 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2020.01.017>

Cornell, C. P., & Gelles, R. J. (1982). Adolescent to parent violence. *Urban and Social Change Review*, 15(1), 8–14.

Cottrell, B., & Monk, P. (2004). Adolescent-to-parent abuse: A qualitative overview of common themes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 25(8), 1072–1095. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X03261330>

Del Hoyo-Bilbao, J., Orue, I., Gámez-Guadix, M., & Calvete, E. (2020). Multivariate models of child-to-mother violence and child-to-father violence among adolescents. *European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, 12(1), 11–21. <https://doi.org/10.5093/ejpalc2020a2>

Enzmann, D., Kivivuori, J., Haen Marshall, I., Steketee, M., Hough, M., & Killias, M. (2018). *A global perspective on young people as offenders*

and victims: First results of the ISRD3 Study. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63233-9>

Eriksen, S., & Jensen, V. (2009). A push or punch: Distinguishing the severity of sibling violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(1), 183–208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260508316298>

Evans, S. E., Davies, C., & DiLillo, D. (2008). Exposure to domestic violence: A meta-analysis of child and adolescent outcomes. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 13(2), 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2008.02.005>

Flowers, B. R. (2002). *Kids who commit adult crimes: Serious criminality by juvenile offenders*. The Haworth Press.

Gallagher, E. (2004). Parents victimized by their children. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 25(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1467-8438.2004.tb00573.x>

Gallego, R., Novo, M., Fariña, F., & Arce, R. (2019). Child-to-parent violence and parent-to-child violence: A meta-analytic review. *European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, 11(2), 51–59. <https://doi.org/10.5093/ejpalc2019a4>

Gámez-Guadix, M., & Calvete, E. (2012). Violencia filio-parental y su asociación con la exposición a la violencia marital y la agresión de padres a hijos. [Child-to-parent violence and its association with exposure to marital violence and parent-to-child violence]. *Psicothema*, 24(2), 277–283.

Harbin, H., & Madden, D. (1979). Battered parents: A new syndrome. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 136(10), 1288–1291. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.136.10.1288>

Hardy, M., Beers, B., Burgess, C., & Taylor, A. (2010). Personal experience and perceived acceptability of sibling aggression. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(1), 65–71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-009-9270-3>

Heide, K. M., & Frei, A. (2010). Matricide: A critique of the literature. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 11(1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838009349517>

Heide, K. M., & Petee, T. A. (2007). Parricide: An examination of 24 years of U.S. data. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(11), 1382–1399. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260507305526>

Hoffman, K. L., & Edvards, J. N. (2004). An integrated theoretical model of sibling violence and abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19(3), 185–200. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOFV.0000028078.71745.a2>

Holt, A. (2013). *Adolescent-to-parent abuse: Current understandings in research, policy and practice*. The Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.46692/9781447308645>

Ibabe, I., & Bentler, P. M. (2016). The contribution of family relationships to child-to-parent violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 31(2), 259–269. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-015-9764-0>

Ibabe, I., & Jaureguizar, J. (2010). Child-to-parent violence: Profile of abusive adolescents and their families. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 616–624. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.04.034>

Ibabe, I., Jaureguizar, J., & Bentler, P. M. (2013). Risk factors for child-to-parent violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 28(5), 523–534. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-013-9512-2>

- Kennedy, T., Edmonds, W., Dann, K., & Burnett, K. (2010). The clinical and adaptive features of young offenders with histories of child-parent violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 25*(5), 509–520. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-010-9312-x>
- Kiziltepe, R., & Aksel, S. (2017). *The prevalence of sibling abuse in Turkish adolescents*. [Unpublished paper presented at the 15th European Congress of Psychology, July 11 to July 14, 2017, Amsterdam, Holland] (paper obtained from authors).
- Linares, O. L. (2006). An understudied form of intra-family violence: Sibling-to-sibling aggression among foster children. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11*(1), 95–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2005.07.001>
- Loeber, R., & Hay, D. (1997). Key issues in the development of aggression and violence from childhood to early adulthood. *Annual Review of Psychology, 48*, 37–410. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.48.1.371>
- Lucas, R. E., & Baird, B. M. (2006). Global self-assessment. In M. Eid & E. Diener (Eds.), *Handbook of multimethod assessment* (pp. 29–42). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/11383-003>
- Margolin, G., & Baucom, B. R. (2014). Adolescents' aggression to parents: Longitudinal links with parents' physical aggression. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 55*(5), 645–651. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.05.008>
- McLaurin, S. L. (2005). *Childhood experiences of sibling abuse: An investigation into learned helplessness*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Miles, C., & Condry, R. (2015). Responding to adolescent to parent violence: Challenges for policy and practice. *British Journal of Criminology, 55*(6), 1076–1095. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azv095>
- Moylan, C. A., Herrenkohl, T. I., Sousa, C., Tajima, E. A., Herrenkohl, R. C., & Russo, M. J. (2010). The effects of child abuse and exposure to domestic violence on adolescent internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. *Journal of Family Violence, 25*(1), 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-009-9269-9>
- Nikolić-Ristanović, V., & Konstantinović Vilić, S. (2018). *Kriminologija [Criminology]*. Izdavačko-grafičko preduzeće "Prometej".
- Nowakowski-Sims, E., & Rowe, A. (2017). The relationship between childhood adversity, attachment, and internalizing behaviors in a Diversion program for child-to-mother violence. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 72*, 266–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.08.015>
- Pagani, L., Tremblay, R. E., Nagin, D., Zoccolillo, M., Vitaro, F., & McDuff, P. (2004). Risk factor models for adolescent verbal and physical aggression toward mothers. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28*(6), 528–537. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01650250444000243>
- Pagani, L., Tremblay, R. E., Nagin, D., Zoccolillo, M., Vitaro, F., & McDuff, P. (2009). Risk factor models for adolescent verbal and physical aggression toward fathers. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*(3), 173–182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-008-9216-1>
- Patterson, G. R. (1986). Performance models for antisocial boys. *American Psychologist, 41*(4), 432–444. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.4.432>

Patterson, G. R. (1998). Coercion as a basis for the early age of onset for arrest. In J. McCord (Ed.), *Coercion and punishment in long-term perspectives* (pp. 81–105). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527906.005>

Phillips, D., Bowie, B., Wan, D., & Yukevich, K. (2018). Sibling violence and children hospitalized for serious mental and behavioral health problems. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33(16), 2558–2578. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516628289>

Purcell, R., Baksheev, G. N., & Mullen, P. E. (2014). A descriptive study of juvenile family violence: Data from intervention order applications in a children's court. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 37(6), 558–563. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlp.2014.02.029>

Republički zavod za statistiku [Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia] (2021). *Maloletni učinioci krivičnih dela 2020 [Juvenile perpetrators of crime 2020]*. Saopštenje br. 194. Retrieved January 3, 2021, from <https://publikacije.stat.gov.rs/G2021/Pdf/G20211194.pdf>

Rodrigo, M. J., Martín Quintana, J. C., Cabrera Casimiro, E., & Máiquez Chaves, M. L. (2009). Las competencias parentales en Contextos de Riesgo Psicosocial [Parental competencies in the context of psychosocial care]. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 18(2), 113–120. <https://doi.org/10.5093/in2009v18n2a3>

Rouff, G., & Anderson, L. (2011). Adolescent violence toward parents. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 20(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2011.537595>

Siegel, L. J., Welsh, B. C., & Senna, J. J. (2006). *Juvenile delinquency: Theory, practice and law*. Thompson Wadsworth.

Stevanović, I., & Srna, J. (2010). Eliminisanje telesnog kažnjavanja dece kao ljudsko pravo [Elimination of corporal punishment of children as human right]. *Temuda*, 13(4), 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.2298/TEM1004037S>

Stevković, Lj. (2013). Telesna kazna: Nasilno sredstvo vaspitanja dece kao faktor rizika nasilnog ponašanja u odraslom dobu [Corporal punishment: Violent means of raising children as a risk factor for violent behavior in adulthood]. *Zbornik Instituta za kriminološka i sociološka istraživanja*, 32(2), 165–184.

Stevković, Lj., & Nikolić-Ristanović, V. (2016). Istraživanje maloletničke delinkvencije u Srbiji primenom Međunarodne ankete samoprijavlivanjem (ISR3) – Metodološki okvir [Research of juvenile delinquency by using International self-report survey (ISR3) – Methodological framework]. In V. Nikolić-Ristanović (Ed.), *Delinkvencija i viktimizacija maloletnih lica u Srbiji: Rezultati Međunarodne ankete samoprijavlivanjem delinkvencije [Delinquency and victimization of juveniles in Serbia: International self-reported delinquency study]* (pp. 4–78). Izdavačko preduzeće "Prometej".

Straus, M. A. (1994). Should the use of corporal punishment by parents be considered child abuse? In M. A. Mason & E. Gambrell (Eds.), *Debating children's lives: Current controversies on children and adolescents* (pp. 196–222). Sage.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R., & Steinmetz, S. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Double-day.

Tippett, N., & Wolke, D. (2015). Aggression between siblings: Associations with the home environment and peer bullying. *Aggressive Behavior, 41*(1), 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21557>

Ulman, A., & Straus, M. A. (2003). Violence by children against mothers in relation to violence between parents and corporal punishment by parents. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 34*(1), 41–60. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jcfs.34.1.41>

UNICEF (2010). *Child disciplinary practices at home evidence from a range of low-and middle-income countries*. New York, NY, USA. Retrieved December 3, 2021, from <https://data.unicef.org/resources/child-disciplinary-practices-at-home-evidence-from-a-range-of-low-and-middle-income-countries/>

Žrtva ili počinitelj: viktimizacija obiteljskim nasiljem kao prediktor nasilnoga ponašanja maloljetnika prema članovima obitelji

Ljiljana STEVKOVIĆ

Fakultet za specijalnu edukaciju i rehabilitaciju, Sveučilište u Beogradu, Beograd, Srbija

Nasilje u obitelji iskazuje se na razne načine, s obzirom na specifičnu dinamiku odnosa između počinitelja i žrtve. Uz partnersko nasilje i nasilje nad djecom i starijima, u zadnje vrijeme znanstvenici su pažnju upravili na nasilničko ponašanje maloljetnih članova obitelji prema drugim članovima obitelji. Rezultati istraživanja ovog oblika nasilja u obitelji nedvojbeno izdvajaju viktimizaciju maloljetnika kao faktor rizika za njihovo nasilničko ponašanje prema roditeljima i braći i sestrama. Cilj je ovog rada prikazati dio rezultata kvantitativnog istraživanja obiteljskoga nasilja nad maloljetnicima u Srbiji, koji se odnose na odnos viktimizacije maloljetnika i njihova nasilnog ponašanja prema članovima obitelji. Istraživanje je provedeno na uzorku od 1335 učenika osnovnih i srednjih škola u Beogradu i Novom Sadu. Rezultati govore u prilog visokoj prevalenciji obiteljskoga nasilja nad maloljetnicima i visokoj prevalenciji viktimizacije maloljetnika obiteljskim nasiljem. Istraživanje je dalo važne podatke o mogućnosti predikcije obiteljskoga nasilja maloljetnika – od svih ispitanih etioloških čimbenika, kao čimbenik s najjačim prediktorskim utjecajem izdvojeno je iskustvo viktimizacije.

Ključne riječi: obiteljsko nasilje, nasilje djece nad roditeljima, nasilje nad braćom i sestrama, maloljetnici, Srbija



Međunarodna licenca / International License:
Imenovanje-Nekomercijalno / Attribution-NonCommercial