

# IMPACT OF FAMILY VIOLENCE ON PSYCHOSOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AMONG FEMALE INTERMEDIATE SCHOOLS

Maysam Hussein Rahm<sup>1</sup>, Atheer Kadhim Ibadi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Community Health Technologies, College of Health and Medical Technologies/Kufa, Al-Furat Al-Awsat Technical University, Kufa, Iraq

<sup>2</sup>Department of Pharmacy, Kufa Institute, Al-Furat Al-Awsat Technical University, 31001 Kufa, Al-Najaf, Iraq, atheerkadhimibadi@yahoo.com, kin.ath@atu.edu.iq

## Abstract

**Background:** The family is the paramount institution in our culture. Family abuse, whether it is concealed or results in physical violence, seriously jeopardizes a child's well-being. Approximately 1 billion children, or 50% of all children globally, experience the detrimental impact of violence, leading to profound and lasting consequences on their emotional, social, and economic well. The study aims to determine the sociodemographic characteristics of female intermediate school students under study and evaluate the impact of family violence on social and psychological development among female intermediate school students. **Methodology:** An experimental study design was conducted to achieve this study's objective. A sample is female intermediate school students in Al Nasiriya City, Iraq. **Results:** The study's findings indicated that the teenage stage is the most susceptible to violence, particularly from within the family, and the highest percentage was observed among unemployed mothers and fathers. In addition, the study sample possesses a high level of awareness of family violence. Furthermore, there are no discernible variations in the three readings between the intervention and control groups, and family violence has a significant influence on the development of psychiatric disorders, including anxiety, depression, and suicide. Finally, family violence is associated with emotional and hysterical disorders, as well as anxiety, depression, and suicide. **Conclusion:** Based on these findings, we may infer that during the teenage stage, children's behavior may not meet their parents' expectations, making them more susceptible to experiencing family violence; unemployed parents have the highest proportion of their children being exposed to violence due to the challenges of life and the low economic status.

**Keywords:** Family Violence, Psychosocial development

## INTRODUCTION

The family is the paramount institution in our culture[1]. Family abuse, whether it is concealed or results in physical violence, seriously jeopardizes a child's well-being [2]. Family violence happens in all spheres of society despite cultural, religious, social class, legal, and economic barriers. Studies reveal that both men and women who experienced physical abuse as children exhibit symptoms of psychological anguish [3]. According to baseline "-Statistics" from 96 countries, 50% of children between the ages of 2 and 17 or at least 500 million young people, have experienced violence [4]. Approximately 1 billion children, or 50% of all children globally, experience the detrimental impact of violence, leading to profound and lasting consequences on their emotional, social, and economic well[5]. Based on data provided by the World Health Organization (WHO), around a quarter of adults worldwide have encountered physical abuse inflicted by their parents during their childhood[6]. A study carried out in Iraq revealed differences in the prevalence of parental violence against children. The highest rate was 28.3% in the Baghdad Governorate, while the lowest was 10.5% in the Kirkuk Governorate. At 41%, physical violence ranked highest among the many forms of violence[7]. With over 93% of children experiencing physical violence (which includes shoving, slapping, pinching, beating, and other physical acts that inflict bodily harm), physical violence is the most prevalent kind of family violence[8].

The global prevalence of family abuse is extensive and has detrimental effects on both physical and mental health. This encompasses acts of violence perpetrated against women by their intimate partners or other members of the home, in addition to instances of abuse directed against children[4]. Approximately 50% of the children residing in these volatile households had experienced both interparental violence and direct abuse, which includes physical punishment or neglect from a family member [6]. Children who witness violence between their parents experience similar negative effects as children who are directly harmed. Specifically, children exposed to inter-parental violence have significantly poorer developmental outcomes in terms of their psychosocial and neurocognitive growth compared to children who are not exposed to violence [9]. Family violence exerts a substantial detrimental impact on the overall satisfaction of family members, with children being the most affected group, following women or spouses in terms of experiencing family abuse[10]. Family violence, characterized by human rights breaches, is a pervasive issue that transcends the boundaries of the household [3]. The consequences of family abuse on mental well-being encompass mood disorders, anxiety disorders, feelings of melancholy, and disturbances in sleep patterns[11]. Abundant data suggests that children who are exposed to violence within their families experience numerous negative consequences in all aspects of their development, both during childhood and in adulthood[12]. Family violence encompasses several manifestations, including physical, psychological, and

sexual violence, which can result in a wide range of health consequences. These consequences span from physical injuries to mental health conditions such as sadness, anxiety, and suicide ideation [13]. Children who are exposed to moderate or low levels of violence only show more behavioral problems when they are exposed to it more often. However, children who are exposed to severe violence experience more behavioral issues regardless of the frequency of the violence [12]. Students who are exposed to significant levels of family violence exhibit a limited degree of socio-psychological adjustment, with less than 20% demonstrating such adaptation. In contrast, groups with less exposure to family violence demonstrate a socio-psychological adaptability rate of 41% [1]. Family violence has the potential to result in death [13].

This study aims to determine the sociodemographic characteristics of female intermediate school students under study and evaluate the impact of family violence on social and psychological development among female intermediate school students.

## Methodology

### Study setting

An experimental study design was conducted to achieve this study's objective. A sample was female intermediate school students in Al Nasiriya City, Iraq. 20 intermediate girls' schools were taken from the Dhi Qar Education Directorate. They were divided into two groups according to their social and economic situation (14 low to middle schools and six middle to normal schools). Two schools were taken from each group through simple random sampling.

### Intervention

Students in the experimental group received a lecture about "Family violence and its impact on psychosocial development." The lesson contains 18 slides talking about (domestic violence, its problems, the reasons that push a person to domestic violence, the effects of domestic violence, and strategies to reduce the phenomenon of domestic violence). In comparison, the control group received a lecture about "Empowering Girls: Basic Concepts of Sexual and Reproductive Knowledge." The lesson contains 19 slides that include information about (sexual and reproductive health, its elements, reproductive rights, stages of reproductive health education, goals of education on that, puberty and the signs that indicate it, as well as diseases that affect the reproductive system of both sexes and their consequences). The lecture was displayed on the projector, and all 30-minute lessons were

taken for explanation, including awareness videos on the two topics.

### Data collection

A structured questionnaire was used to elicit information from the study participants. The questionnaire included the following information:

1. Section one: Including Sociodemographic data including age, educational level, family income, parental education (and occupational status).
2. Section two: Including knowledge about family violence and mental health.
3. Section three: Including the impact of family violence and mental health.
4. Section four: Including attitudes about family violence and mental health.

Student knowledge and attitude were assessed before the intervention, immediately after the intervention, and one month after the intervention. The following cutoff scores have been suggested:  $\leq 11$  = normal,  $12 \sim 16$  = mild,  $17 \sim 21$  = moderate,  $\geq 22$  = severe.

### Data analysis

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 28 was used to analyze the data. The frequencies, percentages, mean, and standard deviation were calculated for descriptive data for selected numerical and categorical variables. For inferential statistics, T-tests and linear regression are used to test the difference and the association between dependent and independent variables.

### Ethical considerations

- ❖ An official letter to facilitate this research was taken from Al-Furat Al-Awsat Technical University.
- ❖ Official permission was taken from the Al-Nasiriya Directorate of Education to do this work.
- ❖ Written consent was taken from all participants.

### Results

The total number of respondents in this study was 160 female intermediate school students divided into intervention and control groups. The age range was 11-20 years, and the mean  $\pm$  std. was  $(15.46 \pm 1.889)$  for the intervention and  $(15.63 \pm 2.335)$  for the control group). All participants answered the questionnaire, giving a response rate of 100%. The data was normally distributed. The analyzed data is summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1: Sociodemographic Characteristics of respondents for both groups (intervention-control)**

		Intervention (67)		Control (67)		P.value
Sociodemographic characteristics		Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	
Age Group	11-15Y	36	53.7	43	64.2	0.725**
	16-20Y	31	46.3	24	35.8	
Grade	Intermediate 1	14	20.9	13	19.4	0.860***
	Intermediate 2	12	17.9	14	20.9	
	Intermediate 3	14	20.9	14	20.9	
	Secondary 1	14	20.9	13	19.4	
	Secondary 2	6	9.0	8	11.9	
	Secondary 3	7	10.4	5	7.5	

*Parents Occupation										
Intervention					Control					
Occupations	Father		Mother		Father		Mother		F	***0.29
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	M	***0.06
Housewife	0	0.0	53	79.1	0	0.0	49	73.1		
Not Classified	32	47.7	1	1.5	31	46.2	1	1.5		
Teaching	6	9.0	11	16.4	4	6.0	11	16.4		
Engineering Professionals	8	11.9	1	1.5	1	1.5	0	0.0		
Health Professionals	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.5	1	1.5		
Professional Education	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.0	1	1.5		
Clerical Support Workers	11	16.4	1	1.5	14	20.9	3	4.5		
Commissioned Police Jobs	3	4.5	0	0.0	6	9.0	0	0.0		
Armed Forces	1	1.5	0	0.0	2	3.0	0	0.0		
Legal Professional	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5		
Nursing Professionals	1	1.5	0	0.0	2	3.0	0	0.0		
Administrative Managers	2	3.0	0	0.0	2	3.0	0	0.0		
Educational level	Intervention				Control					
	Father		Mother		Father		Mother		F	0.487***
Educational level	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	M	0.418***
Illiterate	2	3.0	7	10.4	2	3.0	6	9.0		
Read and write	12	17.9	11	16.4	6	9.0	9	13.4		
Primary school graduate	11	16.4	18	26.9	10	14.9	15	22.4		
Intermediate school graduate	15	22.4	15	22.4	16	23.9	11	16.4		
Secondary school graduate	7	10.4	5	7.5	8	11.9	7	10.4		
Diploma	10	14.9	5	7.5	12	17.9	13	19.4		
Bachelor	7	10.4	5	7.5	11	16.4	5	7.5		
Master	2	3.0	1	1.5	2	3.0	0	0.0		
PhD	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5		
		Freq.	Perc.			Freq.	Perc.			
<b>Medical History</b>	Chronic Disease	4	6.0			5	7.5	0.324***		
	Psychiatric Diseases	6	9.0			4	6.0			
	Visit Psychiatric Doctor	1	1.5			0	0.0			
	Taking Medicine	8	11.9			6	9.0			

\*Classification according to ILO, 2023.

\*\*Independent sample T-test, significant at level 0.05.

\*\*\* Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test

The results in the table show that the age group 11-15 years had (73.1). As for education level, the highest percentage in the the highest percentage (53.7) for the intervention group intervention group was for the father with an intermediate compared to the control group (64.2). In the grade, the highest school graduate (22.4) and the mother with a primary school percentage was intermediate (1 and 2) and secondary 1 (20.9) graduate (26.9). As for the control group, the highest percentage for the intervention group compared to the control group, which of fathers with an intermediate school graduate (23.9) and had the highest percentage of intermediate (1 and 3) (20.9). As mothers with a primary school graduate (22.4), and concerning for parents' occupation, the majority was for the father (not medical history, the highest percentage of people taking intervention group. While the control group was higher relative medication for the intervention and control group(11.9, 9.0), to the father (not classified) (46.2) and the mother (housewife) respectively.

**Table 2: Overall knowledge assessment about family violence for both groups at three databases**

No.	T1/Question	Intervention	Control
		Overall knowledge assessment	Overall knowledge assessment
1	Do you know family violence?	Good Knowledge	Good Knowledge
2	Do you know the types of family violence?	Fair Knowledge	Fair Knowledge
3	Do you know the social effects of family violence?	Fair Knowledge	Fair Knowledge
4	Do you know the psychological effects of family violence?	Fair Knowledge	Good Knowledge

5	Do you know the physical effects of family violence?	Fair Knowledge	Fair Knowledge
6	Do you know the behavioral effects of family violence?	Fair Knowledge	Fair Knowledge
7	Do you feel the punishment for the wrong behavior is family violence?	Poor Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
8	Do you know the causes that force your parents to do the family violence?	Poor Knowledge	Fair Knowledge
9	Do you know family violence has important effects on the family and society?	Good Knowledge	Good Knowledge
10	Do you know they are not interested in one of family violence?	Fair Knowledge	Fair Knowledge
No.	T2/Question	Intervention	Control
		Overall knowledge assessment	Overall knowledge assessment
1	Do you know family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
2	Do you know the types of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
3	Do you know the social effects of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
4	Do you know the psychological effects of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
5	Do you know the physical effects of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
6	Do you know the behavioral effects of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
7	Do you feel the punishment for the wrong behavior is family violence?	Poor Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
8	Do you know the causes that force your parents to do the family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
9	Do you know family violence has important effects on the family and society?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
10	Do you know they are not interested in one of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
No.	T3/Question	Intervention	Control
		Overall knowledge assessment	Overall knowledge assessment
1	Do you know family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
2	Do you know the types of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
3	Do you know the social effects of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
4	Do you know the psychological effects of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
5	Do you know the physical effects of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
6	Do you know the behavioral effects of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
7	Do you feel the punishment for the wrong behavior is family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
8	Do you know the causes that force your parents to do the family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
9	Do you know family violence has important effects on the family and society?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge
10	Do you know they are not interested in one of family violence?	Good Knowledge	Poor Knowledge

The results of T1 showed that the respondents' responses were almost similar, although some questions had variations. The overall (mean  $\pm$  Std) of the intervention group (23.194 $\pm$ 4.908), while the control group (25.044 $\pm$ 3.624). According to the results of T2, the first baseline was almost good for the intervention group and poor for the control group in all questions. The overall (mean  $\pm$  Std) of the intervention group (28.701 $\pm$ 1.141) while the control group (26.343 $\pm$ 2.630). According to the results of T3, the second baseline was good for the intervention group and poor for the control group in all questions. The overall (mean  $\pm$  Std) of the intervention group (27.671 $\pm$ 3.062) while the control group (25.164 $\pm$ 2.339).

**Table 3: Overall assessment of general knowledge about family violence for both groups among three databases**

Questions	Intervention (67)		Control (67)		Third Stage	
	Before	After	Before	After	Exp.	Con.
	Freq.\ Perc.	Freq.\ Perc.	Freq.\ Perc.	Freq.\ Perc.		
Q1	46(68.7)	66(98.5)	59(88.1)	65(97.0)	66(98.5)	55(82.1)
Q2	32(47.8)	66(98.5)	45(67.2)	50(74.6)	63(94.0)	40(59.7)
Q3	27(40.3)	66(98.5)	33(49.3)	46(68.7)	63(94.0)	32(47.7)

Q4	35(52.2)	66(98.5)	45(67.2)	51(76.1)	65(97.0)	43(64.1)
Q5	36(53.7)	66(98.5)	42(62.7)	50(74.6)	60(89.6)	41(61.1)
Q6	35(52.2)	67(100.0)	40(59.7)	52(77.6)	60(89.6)	40(59.7)
Q7	11(16.4)	13(19.4)	13(19.4)	19(28.4)	46(68.7)	13(19.4)
Q8	21(31.3)	48(71.6)	36(53.7)	37(55.2)	46(68.7)	33(49.3)
Q9	45(67.2)	66(89.5)	52(77.6)	56(83.6)	64(95.5)	50(74.6)
Q10	40(59.7)	67(100.0)	35(52.2)	45(67.2)	57(85.1)	33(49.3)
Overall (mean $\pm$ Std)	23.194 $\pm$ 4.908	28.701 $\pm$ 1.141	25.044 $\pm$ 3.624	26.343 $\pm$ 2.630	27.671 $\pm$ 3.062	25.164 $\pm$ 2.339
P.value	0.001		0.033			
Int.\Con.\Before	0.014					
Int.\Con.\ After	0.001					
Int.\Con.\ Third	0.001					

The results of the table show that there was a difference between intervention group (28.701 $\pm$ 1.141) while the control group T1, T2, and T3. As the results changed in T2 and T3, it was a (26.343 $\pm$ 2.630) in T2, and overall (mean  $\pm$  Std) of the higher percentage than T1 for the intervention group. As for the intervention group (27.671 $\pm$ 3.062) while the control group (25.164 $\pm$ 2.339) in T3. The results show a statistically significant simple difference from T1. The overall (mean  $\pm$  Std) of the difference between groups according to T1, T2, and T3 p.value intervention group (23.194 $\pm$ 4.908) while the control group were (0.014, 0.001, and 0.001) respectively. (25.044 $\pm$ 3.624) in T1, the overall (mean  $\pm$  Std) of the

**Table 4: Assessment of the impact of violence on study groups among the database levels**

Item	No.	Question	Intervention			Control		
			Assessment Of Violence Impact			Assessment Of Violence Impact		
			Yes\B1	Yes\B2	Yes\B3	Yes\B1	Yes\B2	Yes\B3
Anxiety	1	Have you been physically threatened?	7(10.4)	9(13.4)	1(1.5)	7(10.4)	7(10.4)	7(10.4)
	2	Have you been grabbed roughly by family members?	18(26.9)	21(31.3)	18(26.9)	22(32.8)	22(32.8)	22(32.8)
	3	Do you feel chest tightness and shortness of breath?	33(49.3)	37(55.2)	37(55.2)	41(61.2)	40(59.7)	41(61.2)
	4	Have family members pushed you?	14(20.9)	21(31.3)	18(26.9)	35(52.2)	29(43.3)	35(52.2)
	5	Did you get a physical injury from a family member?	10(14.9)	18(26.9)	14(20.9)	13(19.4)	12(17.9)	13(19.4)
	6	Have family members struck you?	18(26.9)	23(34.3)	19(28.4)	28(41.8)	26(38.8)	28(41.8)
	7	Did anyone force you to have sex?	1(1.5)	4(6.0)	2(3.0)	4(6.0)	10(14.9)	4(6.0)
Depression	1	Do you feel less interested in everyday activities?	15(22.4)	12(17.9)	17(25.4)	22(32.8)	20(29.9)	22(32.8)
	2	Do you feel that you were causing much trouble to others?	34(50.7)	33(49.3)	31(46.3)	46(68.7)	46(68.7)	46(68.7)
	3	Do you feel that your brain response was slow or your memory was poor?	44(65.7)	40(59.7)	38(56.7)	54(80.6)	53(79.1)	54(80.6)
	4	Do you feel easily angered?	28(41.8)	27(40.3)	29(43.3)	34(50.7)	39(44.8)	34(50.7)
	5	Do you feel uninterested in doing anything?	18(26.9)	18(26.9)	15(22.4)	25(37.3)	23(34.3)	25(37.3)
Suicidality	1	Do you feel afraid for no reason?	28(41.8)	29(43.3)	30(44.8)	39(58.2)	38(56.7)	39(58.2)
	2	Have you been raped?	1(1.5)	4(6.0)	1(1.5)	5(7.5)	3(4.5)	5(7.5)
	3	Are you isolated from family and friends?	12(17.9)	13(19.4)	10(14.9)	10(14.9)	9(13.4)	10(14.9)
	4	Do you like a day passes like a year?	18(26.9)	17(25.4)	10(14.9)	20(29.9)	19(28.4)	20(29.9)
Paranoid personality	1	Does anyone yell at you or call you names?	22(32.8)	28(41.8)	22(32.8)	32(47.8)	30(44.8)	32(47.8)
	2	Does your family embarrass you in front of others?	15(22.4)	21(31.3)	19(28.4)	23(34.3)	22(32.8)	23(34.3)
	3	Do you feel belittled regularly by your family?	16(23.9)	22(32.8)	17(25.4)	29(43.3)	30(44.8)	29(43.3)



personality disorder	4	Do you have a habit of finding or looking for a way to blame yourself for your family's behavior?	19(28.4)	19(28.4)	15(22.4)	22(32.8)	22(32.8)	22(32.8)
	5	Do you feel your family overly controls your time, attention, actions, words, activities, or whereabouts?	5(7.5)	10(14.9)	11(16.4)	13(19.4)	14(20.9)	13(19.4)
	1	Does your relationship otherwise feel conflicted or unstable?	13(19.4)	15(22.4)	17(25.4)	31(46.3)	24(35.8)	31(46.3)
	2	Do they blame you for any injury you may suffer from them?	15(22.4)	15(22.4)	19(28.4)	27(40.3)	27(40.3)	27(40.3)
	3	Can little things cause significant emotional fluctuations?	45(67.2)	40(59.7)	45(67.2)	49(73.1)	45(67.2)	49(73.1)
	4	Does your family seem to have low self-esteem?	10(14.9)	12(17.9)	8(11.9)	17(25.4)	15(22.4)	17(25.4)
	5	Does one of your family members often seem hostile, angry, or furious?	26(38.8)	34(50.7)	24(38.8)	32(47.8)	29(43.3)	32(47.8)
	6	Does your family have a rigid belief in male/female roles?	18(26.9)	16(23.9)	20(29.9)	21(31.3)	22(32.8)	21(31.3)
	7	It's hard to control your anger or even refrain from hurting people?	18(26.9)	19(28.4)	19(28.4)	33(49.3)	28(41.8)	33(49.3)
	1	Are You exaggerating when expressing emotions?	22(32.8)	14(20.9)	22(32.8)	26(38.8)	22(32.8)	26(38.8)
	2	Do you tend to express yourself vividly when talking to people, as if you were acting?	17(25.4)	15(22.4)	11(16.4)	31(46.3)	28(41.8)	31(46.3)
	3	Are you susceptible to others or circumstances? Changing your thoughts and behavior?	17(25.4)	20(29.9)	22(32.8)	17(25.4)	17(25.4)	17(25.4)
	4	Do you sometimes pretend to be surprised by small things to get people's attention?	14(20.9)	12(17.9)	11(16.4)	14(20.9)	14(20.9)	14(20.9)

According to the results, the highest percentage of anxiety items was for question 3 in T2 and T3 (55.2) of the intervention group while the control group in T1, and T3 (61.2), the highest percentage of depression items was for question 3 in T1 (65.7) of the intervention group, while in the control group in T1 and T3 (80.6). The highest percentage of suicidality items was for question 1 in T3 (44.8) of the intervention group, while the control group in T1 and T3 (58.2), the highest percentage of paranoid personality disorder items for question 1 in T2 (41.8) of the intervention group while the control group in T1, and T3 (47.8), the highest percentage of emotionally unstable personality disorder items for question 3 in T1, and T3 (67.2) of the intervention group while the control group in T1, and T3 (73.1), and the highest percentage of histrionic personality disorder items for question 1 in T1, and T3 (32.8) of the intervention group while the control group in T1, and T3 (38.8).

**Table 5: Classification of psychiatric impact according to psychological domains through three databases for both groups**

Baseline	Intervention				Control			
	Normal	Mild	Moderate	Sever	Normal	Mild	Moderate	Sever
Anxiety	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	67(100.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	67(100.0)
Depression	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	9(13.4)	58(86.6)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(3.0)	65(97.0)
Suicidality	0(0.0)	3(4.5)	52(77.6)	12(17.9)	0(0.0)	1(1.5)	49(73.1)	17(25.4)
Paranoid personality disorder	0(0.0)	1(1.5)	10(14.9)	56(83.6)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(4.5)	64(95.5)
Emotionally unstable personality disorder	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	67(100.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	67(100.0)
Histrionic personality disorder	0(0.0)	5(7.5)	51(76.1)	11(16.4)	0(0.0)	1(1.5)	45(67.2)	21(31.3)
<b>First After Intervention</b>								
Anxiety	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	67(100.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	67(100.0)
Depression	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	8(11.9)	59(88.1)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(4.5)	64(95.5)
Suicidality	0(0.0)	2(3.0)	52(77.6)	13(19.4)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	50(74.6)	17(25.4)
Paranoid personality disorder	0(0.0)	1(1.5)	7(10.4)	59(88.1)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(4.5)	64(95.5)
Emotionally unstable personality disorder	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	67(100.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	67(100.0)

	Histrionic personality disorder	0(0.0)	5(7.5)	51(76.1)	11(16.4)	0(0.0)	2(3.0)	46(68.7)	19(28.4)
<b>Second database</b>									
	Anxiety	0(0.0)	1(1.5)	43(64.2)	23(34.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	67(100.0)
	Depression	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	38(56.7)	29(43.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(3.0)	65(97.0)
	Suicidality	0(0.0)	2(3.0)	54(80.6)	11(16.4)	0(0.0)	1(1.5)	49(73.1)	17(25.4)
	Paranoid personality disorder	0(0.0)	1(1.5)	47(70.1)	19(28.4)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	3(4.5)	64(95.5)
	Emotionally unstable personality disorder	0(0.0)	2(3.0)	36(53.7)	29(43.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	67(100.0)
	Histrionic personality disorder	0(0.0)	7(10.4)	46(68.7)	14(20.9)	0(0.0)	1(1.5)	45(67.2)	21(31.3)

According to the results in the table, all the respondents had severe anxiety levels in T1, T2 (100.0), and T3 (34.3) of them had severe anxiety level that was shown in the intervention group. However, for the control group, all respondents had severe paranoid personality disorder levels through three data collection. The respondents had severe anxiety levels through three data collection. The respondents had severe depression levels in T1, T2 (86.6, 88.1), and moderate depression in T3 (56.7) of them had severe and moderate depression level that was demonstrated in the intervention group. Nevertheless, for the control group, all respondents had severe depression levels through three data collection. The respondents had moderate suicidality levels in T1, T2 (77.6), and T3 (80.6) of them had moderate suicidality level that was demonstrated in the intervention group. Nevertheless, for the control group, all respondents had moderate suicidality levels through three data collection. The respondents had severe paranoid personality disorder levels in T1, T2 (83.6, 88.1), and moderate paranoid personality disorder in T3 (70.1) of them had severe and moderate paranoid personality disorder level that was demonstrated in the intervention group. However, for the control group, all respondents had severe paranoid personality disorder levels through three data collection. The respondents had severe emotionally unstable personality disorder levels in T1, T2 (100.0), and moderate emotionally unstable personality disorder in T3 (53.7) of them had severe and moderate emotionally unstable personality disorder level that was shown in the intervention group. However, for the control group, all respondents had severe emotionally unstable personality disorder levels through three data collection. The respondents had moderate histrionic personality disorder levels in T1, T2 (76.1), and T3 (68.7) of them had moderate histrionic personality disorder level that was shown in the intervention group. However, for the control group, all respondents had moderate histrionic personality disorder levels through three data collection.

**Table 6: Mean  $\pm$  Std comparison among responses of study groups toward the psychological domains through three databases**

		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>
<b>Baseline</b>		Mean $\pm$ Std	Mean $\pm$ Std	P.value
	Anxiety	15.059 $\pm$ 1.833	15.970 $\pm$ 1.946	0.251
	Depression	11.358 $\pm$ 1.904	12.388 $\pm$ 1.556	0.001
	Suicidality	8.552 $\pm$ 1.171	9.014 $\pm$ 1.022	0.050
	Paranoid personality disorder	10.553 $\pm$ 1.734	11.626 $\pm$ 1.668	0.068
	Emotionally unstable personality disorder	15.537 $\pm$ 2.098	16.686 $\pm$ 2.161	0.004
	Histrionic personality disorder	8.403 $\pm$ 1.243	9.000 $\pm$ 1.348	0.003
<b>First After Intervention</b>				
	Anxiety	15.567 $\pm$ 2.097	15.940 $\pm$ 2.029	0.009
	Depression	11.328 $\pm$ 1.541	12.194 $\pm$ 1.549	0.006
	Suicidality	8.671 $\pm$ 1.119	8.880 $\pm$ 1.108	0.098
	Paranoid personality disorder	11.089 $\pm$ 1.712	11.626 $\pm$ 1.730	0.001
	Emotionally unstable personality disorder	15.597 $\pm$ 2.167	16.313 $\pm$ 2.264	0.042
	Histrionic personality disorder	8.328 $\pm$ 1.247	8.776 $\pm$ 1.485	0.117
<b>Second database</b>				
	Anxiety	15.00 $\pm$ 1.857	15.970 $\pm$ 6.298	0.050
	Depression	11.493 $\pm$ 1.744	16.910 $\pm$ 6.855	0.001
	Suicidality	8.478 $\pm$ 1.078	13.060 $\pm$ 4.464	0.001
	Paranoid personality disorder	10.791 $\pm$ 1.719	10.657 $\pm$ 3.808	0.877
	Emotionally unstable personality disorder	15.006 $\pm$ 2.442	15.836 $\pm$ 5.822	0.044
	Histrionic personality disorder	8.284 $\pm$ 1.454	11.746 $\pm$ 3.665	0.001

Through the results for 3 databases for the same domain, through the results for the overall Mean  $\pm$  Std, it was found that in T2 there was a slight change in the results from T1, and the results remained the same in T3 for the intervention group. Since the control group did not receive the intervention, their results stayed unchanged. Despite these results, significant differences were found between the two groups at the three levels. Through the p-value found in the results of table 6.

**Table 7: Mean  $\pm$  Std comparison among responses of study groups toward the psychological Practice through three databases**

		Intervention	Control	
Baseline		Mean $\pm$ Std	Mean $\pm$ Std	P.value
	Anxiety	16.4478 $\pm$ 5.52757	15.9701 $\pm$ 6.29808	0.642
	Depression	18.5373 $\pm$ 6.63400	16.9104 $\pm$ 6.85506	0.165
	Suicidality	14.0149 $\pm$ 4.24083	13.0597 $\pm$ 4.46495	0.206
	Paranoid personality disorder	12.2537 $\pm$ 6.07365	10.6567 $\pm$ 3.80809	0.070
	Emotionally unstable personality disorder	17.6269 $\pm$ 5.60259	15.8358 $\pm$ 5.82210	0.072
	Histrionic personality disorder	13.8060 $\pm$ 4.41155	11.7463 $\pm$ 3.66533	0.004
First After Intervention				
	Anxiety	16.9552 $\pm$ 5.81907	14.9552 $\pm$ 5.80604	0.048
	Depression	18.6418 $\pm$ 6.60968	15.5522 $\pm$ 6.61560	0.008
	Suicidality	7.3284 $\pm$ 1.11990	12.6567 $\pm$ 4.95603	0.001
	Paranoid personality disorder	11.7313 $\pm$ 3.82013	10.6269 $\pm$ 3.63833	0.089
	Emotionally unstable personality disorder	17.8955 $\pm$ 5.70256	15.2985 $\pm$ 6.04281	0.012
	Histrionic personality disorder	13.4030 $\pm$ 4.43492	12.9104 $\pm$ 7.51308	0.645
Second database				
	Anxiety	17.3433 $\pm$ 6.47033	14.6567 $\pm$ 5.63687	0.012
	Depression	19.9254 $\pm$ 6.93326	15.5821 $\pm$ 6.59465	0.001
	Suicidality	14.5522 $\pm$ 3.78707	12.6269 $\pm$ 4.94159	0.013
	Paranoid personality disorder	11.7164 $\pm$ 3.78116	10.6269 $\pm$ 3.63833	0.046
	Emotionally unstable personality disorder	18.1493 $\pm$ 5.70288	15.2985 $\pm$ 6.04281	0.006
	Histrionic personality disorder	12.9104 $\pm$ 4.07033	12.8806 $\pm$ 7.50055	0.977

Through the results for 3 databases for the same domain, the control group did not receive the intervention, their results through the results for the overall Mean  $\pm$  Std, it was found that stayed unchanged. Despite these results, significant differences in T2 there was a slight change in the results from T1, and the were found between the two groups at the three levels. Through results remained the same in T3 for the intervention group. Since the p-value found in the results of table 7.

**Table 8: Responses of the experimental group toward the psychological practices through three databases**

Baseline	Intervention				Control			
	Normal	Mild	Moderate	Sever	Normal	Mild	Moderate	Sever
Anxiety	2(3.0)	16(23.9)	32(47.9)	17(25.4)	3(4.5)	25(37.3)	18(26.9)	21(31.3)
Depression	0(0.0)	21(31.3)	21(31.3)	25(37.4)	0(0.0)	24(35.8)	23(34.3)	20(29.9)
Suicidality	2(3.0)	26(38.8)	31(46.3)	8(11.9)	8(11.9)	23(34.3)	32(47.9)	4(6.0)
Paranoid personality disorder	4(6.0)	42(62.7)	18(26.9)	3(4.5)	11(16.4)	41(61.2)	15(22.4)	0(0.0)
Emotionally unstable personality disorder	1(1.5)	19(28.4)	21(31.3)	26(38.8)	4(6.0)	19(28.4)	24(35.8)	20(29.9)
Histrionic personality disorder	2(3.0)	34(50.7)	24(35.8)	7(10.4)	5(7.5)	40(59.7)	21(31.3)	1(1.5)
First After Intervention								
Anxiety	4(6.0)	15(22.4)	25(37.3)	23(34.3)	6(9.0)	26(38.8)	15(22.4)	20(29.9)
Depression	0(0.0)	17(25.4)	21(31.3)	29(43.3)	0(0.0)	26(38.8)	26(38.8)	15(22.4)
Suicidality	13(19.4)	54(80.6)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	11(16.4)	22(32.8)	29(43.3)	5(7.5)
Paranoid personality disorder	5(7.5)	38(56.7)	21(31.3)	3(4.5)	10(4.9)	40(59.7)	17(25.4)	0(0.0)
Emotionally unstable personality disorder	0(0.0)	19(28.4)	22(32.8)	26(38.8)	7(10.4)	20(29.9)	22(32.8)	18(26.9)
Histrionic personality disorder	3(4.5)	34(50.7)	22(32.8)	(8(11.9)	6(9.0)	35(52.2)	21(31.3)	5(7.5)
Second database								
Anxiety	9(13.4)	17(25.3)	23(34.3)	18(26.8)	11(16.4)	27(40.2)	22(32.8)	7(10.4)
Depression	3(4.5)	30(44.7)	15(22.4)	19(28.4)	18(26.9)	29(43.3)	15(22.4)	5(7.5)
Suicidality	0(0.0)	13(19.7)	34(50.7)	20(29.9)	8(11.9)	16(23.8)	28(41.7)	15(22.4)
Paranoid personality disorder	3(4.5)	27(40.2)	34(50.7)	3(4.5)	6(9.0)	29(43.3)	28(41.7)	4(6.0)
Emotionally unstable personality disorder	1(1.5)	25(37.3)	20(29.9)	21(31.3)	12(17.9)	24(35.8)	24(35.8)	7(10.4)
Histrionic personality disorder	2(3.0)	36(53.7)	26(38.8)	3(4.5)	6(9.0)	35(53.7)	21(31.3)	5(7.5)



According to the results in the table, all the respondents had moderate anxiety levels in T1, T2, and T3 (47.9, 37.3, and 34.3) of them had moderate anxiety level that was shown in the intervention group. However, for the control group, all respondents had mild anxiety levels through three data collection. The respondents had severe depression levels in T1, T2 (37.4, 43.3), and mild depression in T3 (44.7) of them had severe and mild depression level that was shown in the intervention group. However, for the control group, all respondents had mild and moderate depression levels through three data collection. The respondents had moderate suicidality levels in T1, T3 (46.3, 50.7), and mild suicidality in T2 (80.6) of them had mild and moderate suicidality level that was shown in the intervention group. However, for the control group, all respondents had moderate suicidality levels through three data collection. The respondents had mild paranoid personality disorder levels in T1, T2 (62.7, 56.7), and moderate paranoid personality disorder in T3 (50.7) of them had mild and moderate paranoid personality disorder level that was shown in the intervention group. However, for the control group, all respondents had mild paranoid personality disorder levels through three data collection. The respondents had severe emotionally unstable personality disorder levels in T1, T2 (38.8), and mild emotionally unstable personality disorder in T3 (37.3) of them had severe and mild emotionally unstable personality disorder level that was shown in the intervention group. However, for the control group, all respondents had moderate emotionally unstable personality disorder levels through three data collection. The respondents had mild histrionic personality disorder levels in T1, T2, and T3 (50.7, 50.7, 53.7) of them had mild histrionic personality disorder level that was shown in the intervention group. However, for the control group, all respondents had mild histrionic personality disorder levels through three data collection.

## Discussion

The study's findings, according to the age, indicate that the teenage stage is the most susceptible to violence, particularly from within the family. This is often due to the behavior of the children, which may not align with parental expectations. Additionally, teenagers at this stage are more vulnerable to engaging in deviant behavior. The issue of family violence's effect on children is receiving significant attention because, despite their innocence, these young individuals are profoundly affected and cannot intervene. They are compelled to yield to the incomprehensibility of their parents[10]. According to a report from the United States Department of Justice, teenagers aged twelve to fifteen experience a higher rate of victimization than any other age group. Additionally, adolescents of all ages are victimized at a rate twice as high as the national average[2]. According to occupation, the highest percentage was observed among unemployed mothers and fathers. This high rate of family violence can be attributed to the challenges faced by those who are unable to secure employment, resulting in numerous family issues stemming from their low economic status. Consequently, the well-being of their children is adversely affected. The contagion phenomenon can also elucidate the proliferation of violence within familial relationships. For instance, individuals or caregivers who have undergone family violence may be psychologically affected by

their victimization, impeding their ability to meet the basic needs of their children[14]. Reducing the amount of work parents have to do decreases the burden on them, hence reducing the likelihood of children being subjected to abuse or witnessing it in their own homes[5].

The study sample possesses a high level of awareness of family violence. Furthermore, there are no discernible variations in the three readings between the intervention and control groups. This suggests that family violence is prevalent in the majority of households. The repercussions of abusive experiences on present and future generations have emerged as a significant concern for pediatric communities in North America and Europe[15]. The implementation of violent behavior inside the family serves to compel children towards a trajectory of deviant behavior as a means to cope with the traumatic experiences they have endured. Consequently, this conduct has a detrimental impact on society. The child, who was previously subjected to family abuse, transforms into the very person who seeks retribution, exerting influence on their surroundings. Family violence is prevalent across all parts of society, regardless of characteristics such as culture, religion, social class, and legal and economic standing[3].

The family violence has a significant influence on the development of psychiatric disorders, including anxiety, depression, and suicide. Adolescent and childhood suicidal thoughts are strongly associated with depression and the psychological distress that the adolescent undergoes within their family. Family violence is increasingly prevalent in nearly every community, inflicting physical, psychological, and social harm on all individuals involved, including children[10]. Family violence has several manifestations, including physical, psychological, and sexual violence. Consequently, its impact on health spans from bodily harm to psychological conditions such as sadness, anxiety, and suicide ideation[13]. The consequences of family abuse on mental well-being include mood disturbances, anxiety disorders, feelings of melancholy, and sleep disturbances [11].

Family violence is associated with emotional and hysterical disorders, as well as anxiety, depression, and suicide. The pervasive environment in which certain families reside leads to significant emotional risks for the children within the home. This would perpetuate these emotional threats indefinitely in the individual's life. Thus, the crux of the issue lies not primarily in the physical harm but rather in the mental distress that impacts the children. Children who are vulnerable to depression may be compelled to engage in very perilous behaviors, such as self-inflicted damage and suicide[10]. Witnessing family abuse can have detrimental, lifelong effects on children. UNICEF data show that 52% of children who see violence in the home have behavioral problems, 60% of children who witness family violence hold themselves liable, and 39% of children with adaptation disorders [16].

Childhood exposure to violence heightens the probability of acquiring personality disorders and behavioral disorders in adulthood[16]. Family violence victims in China frequently experience a range of mental health challenges, such as substance misuse, heightened stress levels, anxiety, sadness, and suicidal tendencies[17]. Researchers widely agree on the crucial significance of mental health in influencing an individual's overall health and well-being[17]. There is a direct relationship

between a broken family link and the act of suicide; the absence of serenity and peace resulting from frequent conflicts and assaults causes them to have a sense of exclusion and alienation from those closest to them, rendering them unable to confront the challenges and hardships of life. Recent research, encompassing both prospective and retrospective studies, has revealed a robust association between sequences of stressful events experienced throughout childhood. The range of issues encompassed physical and mental health ailments in adults, alongside social isolation, dysfunctional families, and abuse[1].

## Conclusion

1. The prevalence of severe family violence persists in most households, indicating that stopping the violence is a challenging and long-term endeavor.
2. During the teenage stage, children's behavior may not meet their parents' expectations, making them more susceptible to experiencing family violence.
3. Unemployed parents have the highest proportion of their children being exposed to violence due to the challenges of life and their low economic status, which consequently impacts the well-being of their children.
4. Family violence significantly affects children and has a profound impact on their psychological and mental well-being.
5. According to the results, a percentage of children who tried suicide also experienced anxiety and sadness, indicating that the majority of children were impacted by familial violence.
6. The responses of many participants show that they have an unstable emotional personality disorder as a result of being exposed to family violence within their own families.
7. The respondents exhibit anxiety and depression disorders, along with histrionic and emotionally unstable personality traits in moderate to severe degrees. This indicates that they experienced childhood exposure to family violence. An individual who has experienced various forms of family violence during their childhood may develop psychological problems such as sadness and anxiety. This can result in a progressive decline in their enthusiasm for life, sleep disruptions, difficulty concentrating, and lack of attention. As a result of all these factors, he ultimately embraces death and entirely renounces life. This is the correct choice to terminate one's existence.

## References

1. Al Majali, S. and H. Alsrehan, *The impact of family violence on the social and psychological development of the child*. *Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana*, 2019. 24(5): p. 199-207.
2. Chauhan, S., *Psychological Impact Of Domestic Violence On Children And Its Link With Further Victimization And Delinquency*. *Journal of Law and Legal Studies*, 2022. 2.
3. Malta, D.C., et al., *Factors associated with family violence against adolescents based on the results of the*

*National School Health Survey (PeNSE)*. *Ciencia & saúde coletiva*, 2019. 24: p. 1287-1298.

4. Devakumar, D., et al., *Mental health of women and children experiencing family violence in conflict settings: a mixed methods systematic review*. *Conflict and health*, 2021. 15(1): p. 1-19.
5. Unicef, *Global status report on preventing violence against children 2020*. 2020.
6. Ronzón-Tirado, R., N. Redondo, and M.J. Muñoz-Rivas, *Childhood maltreatment: The role of concurrent advantageous experiences on adolescents' psychosocial adjustment*. *Aggressive behavior*, 2022. 48(6): p. 595-607.
7. Ahmed, M.M.A.A.R., *Domestic violence against children and its spatial spread in Iraq 2020(a study in population geography)*. *Journal of Basic Science*, 2022. 7(11): p. 339-382.
8. Tenkorang, E.Y., *Physical, Sexual, and Psychosocial Health Impacts of Child Abuse: Evidence from Ghana*. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 2023: p. 100559.
9. Booth, A.T., et al., *Child-reported family violence: a systematic review of available instruments*. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 2023: p. 15248380231194062.
10. Khemthong, O. and T. Chutipongdech, *Domestic violence and its impacts on children: A concise review of past literature*. *Asia Social Issues*, 2021. 14(6): p. 249759 (12 pages)-249759 (12 pages).
11. Bhuller, M., et al., *Domestic Violence and the Mental Health and Well-being of Victims and Their Children*. 2022, National Bureau of Economic Research.
12. Lünemann, M., et al., *The impact of cessation or continuation of family violence on children*. *Children and youth services review*, 2022. 140: p. 106565.
13. Drieskens, S., et al., *Domestic violence during the COVID-19 confinement: do victims feel more socially isolated?* *Archives of public health*, 2022. 80(1): p. 39.
14. Sharratt, K., et al., *Childhood abuse and neglect, exposure to domestic violence and sibling violence: profiles and associations with sociodemographic variables and mental health indicators*. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 2023. 38(1-2): p. 1141-1162.
15. Ferrara, P., et al., *Children witnessing domestic and family violence: a widespread occurrence during the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic*. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 2021. 235: p. 305-306. e2.
16. Almış, B.H., F. Gümüştaş, and E.K. Kütük, *Effects of domestic violence against women on mental health of women and children*. *Psikiyatri Guncel Yaklasimlar*, 2020. 12(2): p. 232-242.
17. Su, Z., et al., *Mental health solutions for domestic violence victims amid COVID-19: a review of the literature*. *Globalization and health*, 2021. 17(1): p. 67.