Research Article

Exploring the Links between Personality Traits, Mindfulness, and Bullying behavior tendencies among adolescents

Teguh Lesmana*[a], Mutiara Mirah Yunita[b], Kornelis Seralarat[c]

[a] Department of Psychology, Universitas Persada Indonesia Yayasan Administrasi Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia; Psychology Department, Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang, Indonesia.

[b] Department of Psychology, Universitas Persada Indonesia Yayasan Administrasi Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia; Psychology Department, Universitas Bunda Mulia, Jakarta, Indonesia.

[c] Department of Psychology, Universitas Persada Indonesia Yayasan Administrasi Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia; STPAK St. Yohanes Penginjil Ambon.

Abstract

This study aimed to examine the relationship between personality traits, mindfulness, and bullying behavior tendencies among adolescents. A correlational quantitative method was employed with a total of 350 participants selected through convenience sampling. The instruments used included the Adolescent Peer Relations Instrument-Bully/Target (APRI-BT), the HEXACO-60, and the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ). Revealed that the traits of honesty-humility, emotionality, and conscientiousness were significantly negatively correlated with bullying tendencies, while extraversion and openness to experience were significantly positively correlated. Additionally, all mindfulness facets were found to be significantly negatively correlated with overall bullying tendencies. Most mindfulness facets, except for non-judging, were negatively correlated with physical and social bullying, while all except non-reacting showed significant negative correlations with verbal bullying.

Keywords: personality traits; mindfulness; bullying; adolescents

Table of Contents

The phenomenon of bullying behavior is a part of juvenile delinquency in adolescence (Ilham et al., 2021). Bullying is a problem of global concern (Putri et al., 2015). Bullying is a frightening experience that is usually faced by many teenagers at school (Garret, 2014). In addition, according to the UNICEF (Ijazah, 2020), bullying is an aggressive behavior in the form of abuse of power perpetrated by a person or group against another person, which can result in repeated physical, psychological, and social damage, which often occurs in schools and other places where children gather, including social media. In this case, bullying seems to be a sub-culture that is inherent in society and has penetrated various sectors of life, be they social, cultural, political, or security threats (Erismon & Karneli, 2021).

The American Psychological Association (APA, 2013) defined bullying as "a form of aggressive behavior in which someone intentionally and repeatedly causes another person injury or discomfort." Bullying was described as aggressive behavior involving the abuse of power perpetrated by an individual or group against others, which could result in repeated physical, psychological, and social harm. Such acts were often found in schools and other places where children congregated, including on social media (Ilham et al., 2021). Mishna (2012) stated that bullying was aggressive behavior that could be expressed either directly or indirectly, whether verbally, physically, psychologically, or through relationships. According to Kuykendall (2012), bullying was defined as an act in which an individual or group with more power repeatedly attacked others who were weaker, with the intention of causing harm, stress, and fear. Randall (in Rigby, 2002) defined bullying as aggressive behavior intentionally carried out to harm others physically and psychologically. Furthermore, Dewi (2020) stated that bullying occurred when there was an abuse of power by individuals or groups with the intention of causing harm to others.

Previous research found that bullying behavior among children, particularly adolescents, had occurred in Jakarta (Wiguna et al., 2016), with 4.6% of bullying taking place inside schools

and 7.5% outside schools. Bullying itself, based on earlier studies, had already been observed in early childhood, with a prevalence of 35%. Gender was found to have no direct impact on the occurrence of bullying; however, boys were more likely to engage in physical bullying. In terms of age, bullying was more commonly observed among children aged six years (Hartati et al., 2020). A survey also revealed that Jakarta ranked as the third city with the highest number of reported bullying incidents, following Yogyakarta and Surabaya, which were ranked first and second, respectively (Hidayati & Amalia, 2021). According to previous research by Yusuf et al. (2022), which gathered data since 2015, school-aged adolescents in Indonesia were found to experience a relatively high prevalence of bullying. The causes of bullying were reported to vary depending on personal and environmental factors. A study conducted by Lesmana and Febrianto (2020) indicated that self-esteem and gender prejudice were identified as contributing factors to bullying among adolescents in Jakarta, especially in cases involving digital or cyberbullying.

Bullying behavior was found to be caused by several factors. One of the factors highlighted in this study was personality characteristics, as supported by previous research that examined the role of personality in bullying tendencies among Indonesian youth (Pertiwi, 2019). This finding was also reinforced by research conducted by Zhang et al. (2021), which showed that personality played a role in the likelihood of bullying behavior occurring at school. According to a study by Nurfadilah and Listiyandini (2017) on adolescents in Jakarta, it was found that bullying tendencies among youth could be reduced when adolescents possessed high levels of mindfulness and empathy. Therefore, mindfulness was considered one of the fundamental variables contributing to the reduction of bullying behavior in schools.

Bullying cases were often described as an iceberg phenomenon—those that were visible appeared to be few, whereas in reality, many remained hidden, deeply rooted in tradition, and often overlooked by both schools and parents (Fachrosi, 2016). The prevalence of bullying, particularly in school settings, had been reported to increase each year and occurred across various countries worldwide (Erismon & Karneli, 2021). Based on data from UNESCO, which covered 144 countries, it was revealed that 16.1% of children had experienced physical bullying (Borualogo & Gumilang, 2019). Furthermore, data released by the Indonesian Child Protection Commission (Komisi Perlindungan Anak Indonesia, 2017), based on a survey by the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW), showed that Indonesia ranked highest in bullying cases in schools among ASEAN countries, with a prevalence rate of 84%, followed by Nepal and Vietnam (79%), Cambodia (73%), and Pakistan (43%).

The occurrence of bullying was known to have various negative impacts not only on victims but also on the perpetrators. Wahyuni et al. (2019) emphasized that bullying had detrimental effects on both parties. This conclusion was echoed in a study by Darmayanti et al. (2019), which stated that while both victims and perpetrators were affected by bullying, the most significant impact was experienced by the victims. Dewi (2020) added that the negative impacts could be both short-term and long-term. The short-term impacts included feelings of depression and a decrease in motivation to complete school assignments. In the long term, victims often faced difficulties in building healthy relationships with peers and experienced persistent anxiety about being treated poorly by others.

In addition to its effects, bullying behavior was also influenced by underlying factors. According to Mujtahidah (2018), the causes of bullying could be divided into two main categories: internal and external factors. Internal factors included personality traits and past experiences of violence, while external factors involved environmental influences and cultural norms. Rigby (2002) explained that individuals involved in bullying, whether as perpetrators or victims, could not be separated from the influence of their personality (Pertiwi, 2019). It was also stated that individuals who were targeted for bullying often possessed weak personalities and lacked the ability to stand up to their aggressors (Pertiwi, 2019). However, a study by Diyantini et al. (2015) found that while 58.2% of children reported having experienced bullying at school, there was no significant relationship between their personality traits (introvert or extrovert) and bullying incidents. In contrast, research by Putri et al. (2015) showed that adolescents with extroverted personality traits were more likely to exhibit high levels of bullying behavior.

The HEXACO six-factor model was a personality framework developed based on the assumptions of trait theories, which had increasingly been recognized for being more comprehensive in explaining personality (Natasha et al., 2017). The HEXACO model evolved from the Big Five model and consisted of six dimensions. This personality framework provided explanations for personality phenomena that were not addressed by the Big Five concept (Mardhiah & Lutfi, 2019). For example, the HEXACO model was particularly valuable due to the inclusion of the Honesty-Humility dimension, as this domain was uniquely associated positively with prosocial behavior and negatively with antisocial behavior (Pronk et al., 2021). Furthermore, the cross-cultural validity of the HEXACO model made it an ideal option for studying bullying (Volk et al., 2018). The HEXACO model was in some ways similar and in other ways different from the Big Five traits (de Vries et al., 2016). The dimensions of Extraversion (X), Conscientiousness (C), and Openness to Experience (O)

were comparable to those in the Big Five (de Vries et al., 2016), while the remaining three dimensions differed significantly. The sixth dimension, Honesty-Humility (H), represented the most substantial divergence between the two models and was defined by traits such as sincerity, fairness, modesty, and the avoidance of greed—traits that were largely absent in the Big Five (de Vries et al., 2016). Moreover, Emotionality in the HEXACO model, similar to Neuroticism in the Big Five, encompassed elements such as anxiety, fear, and dependency (de Vries et al., 2016).

Bullying behavior was regarded as having highly detrimental impacts on all parties involved, particularly victims and perpetrators (Pertiwi, 2019). Therefore, efforts to reduce bullying behavior were deemed essential in order to mitigate its harmful consequences. In contrast to bullying behavior—which was often characterized by impulsivity and a lack of empathy—mindfulness was found to enhance empathy and a sense of care for others (Abid et al., 2017). According to Jon Kabat-Zinn, mindfulness referred to a form of awareness (Hidayati, 2018). It was generally defined as a state of attentiveness and awareness of the present moment (Olpin & Hesson, 2021). Hidayati (2018) further explained that mindfulness was the awareness cultivated by intentionally paying attention in a particular way, in the present moment, and without judgment.

Baer et al. (2006) identified five facets of mindfulness, which were developed into the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ): observing, describing, acting with awareness, non-judging of inner experience, and non-reactivity to inner experience. Observing referred to an individual's capacity to pay attention to or be present with various internal and external experiences. This included perceptions, feelings, and thoughts that involved the senses—such as sight, sound, smell, and sensation—as well as cognitive and emotional experiences. Based on previous studies, the observing aspect had been recognized as a central component of mindfulness. Describing referred to the individual's ability to label or articulate feelings, sensations, or experiences using appropriate language. Meanwhile, acting with awareness referred to the tendency to maintain awareness and presence during activities, in contrast to operating on "autopilot," where attention would typically be diverted away from the present moment. This dimension emphasized conscious attention and intentionality in one's behavior. The non-judging of inner experience aspect described the individual's inclination to accept their thoughts and emotions without criticism or evaluation, allowing them to experience internal states sincerely and openly. Lastly, non-reactivity referred to the individual's ability to allow thoughts and feelings to emerge and pass without being overwhelmed or responding impulsively. This dimension reflected the capacity to acknowledge internal experiences while maintaining emotional distance and regulation.

Based on the above description, it was explained that bullying remained a common phenomenon among adolescents, with Jakarta reported as the province with the highest prevalence of bullying in Indonesia. Several studies also indicated a relationship between bullying and personality traits. However, some previous research reported no significant relationship between personality traits and bullying, particularly when using the Big Five or other trait models. Some studies supported the suitability of the HEXACO model for examining bullying, emphasizing its cross-cultural validity (Volk et al., 2018). Therefore, the present study aimed to investigate whether personality traits—as defined by the HEXACO model—were associated with bullying tendencies and to determine which specific traits contributed to such behavior. In addition to exploring the relationship between personality traits and bullying, the researcher also included mindfulness as a variable of interest, intending to examine whether a significant relationship existed between mindfulness and bullying behavior.

Personality Traits as Predictor of Bullying

The relationship between bullying and personality had been examined using various personality models and had been associated with multiple personality constructs (Volk et al., 2018). Among these models, the HEXACO model was considered particularly suitable for investigating the personality correlates of youth involvement in bullying (Pronk et al., 2021), as it provided a more comprehensive framework that complemented contemporary perspectives in bullying research (Pronk et al., 2021). The primary distinctions between the Big Five and the HEXACO model were found in the dimensions of honesty-humility, agreeableness, and emotionality (Ashton & Lee, 2007). The honesty-humility dimension was characterized by the extent to which individuals exploited or manipulated others, as well as by levels of sincerity, cooperation, and self-entitlement (Farrell et al., 2014). Furthermore, in contrast to the Big Five, the HEXACO model defined agreeableness as involving a greater tendency to forgive others and to let go of past grievances (Pronk et al., 2021).

Mindfulness as Predictor of Bullying

Evidence has shown that a relationship existed between mindfulness and bullying behavior (Faraji et al., 2019). A study conducted by Abid et al. (2017) on children demonstrated that mindfulness and bullying behavior were negatively correlated; children who exhibited high levels of bullying behavior tended to have lower levels of mindfulness, and vice versa. However, the findings differed from research conducted on employees, which indicated that mindfulness did not significantly moderate the effects of bullying on emotional exhaustion and employee resilience (Anasori et al., 2020).

Method

Objective and Hypotheses

The objective of this study was to examine the relationships between personality traits (as measured by the HEXACO model), mindfulness (as measured by the FFMQ), and bullying behavior tendencies among adolescents in Jakarta. This study aimed to identify specific personality traits and mindfulness facets that are significantly correlated with bullying tendencies.

The hypotheses tested in this study were as follows:

- H1: There is a relationship between Honesty-Humility (H) and the tendency of bullying behavior in adolescents.
- H2: There is a relationship between Emotionality (E) and the tendency of bullying behavior in adolescents.
- H3: There is a relationship between Extraversion (X) and the tendency of bullying behavior in adolescents.
- H4: There is a relationship between Agreeableness (A) and the tendency of bullying behavior in adolescents.
- H5: There is a relationship between Conscientiousness (C) and the tendency of bullying behavior in adolescents.
- H6: There is a relationship between Openness to Experience (O) and the tendency of bullying behavior in adolescents.
- H7: There is a relationship between Mindfulness and the tendency of bullying behavior in adolescents.

Research Design and Sampling Technique

This study was conducted using a quantitative method with a survey research design involving a rating scale questionnaire. The unit of analysis was defined as individual adolescents who were enrolled at schools or universities in Jakarta. According to data from the Central Bureau of Statistics, adolescents in Jakarta aged 10–14 years were recorded as totaling 765,642; those aged 15–19 years totaled 710,184; and those aged 20–24 years totaled 784,252. Therefore, the total adolescent population in Jakarta was identified as 2,260,078.

CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

Participants were explained the study's objectives and purpose, and written consent to participate in the study was taken from them according to the protocol approved by The

Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Psychology, Muhammadiyah University of Malang.

To determine the appropriate sample size, the Slovin formula was applied as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + Ne^2}$$

Where:

- n = Sample size
- N = Population size (2,260,078)
- e = margin of error (0.05)

Substituting the values:

$$n = \frac{2,260,078}{1 + 2,260,078 \times 0.05^2} = \frac{2,260,078}{1 + 2,260,078 \times 0.0025} = \frac{2,260,078}{1 + 5,650.195} \approx \frac{2,260,078}{5,651.195} \approx 399.95$$

Based on this calculation, the minimum sample size required was estimated to be approximately 400 respondents. In this study, data were collected from 350 adolescents, which was considered sufficiently close to the required sample size and therefore acceptable for further analysis. A non-probability sampling technique was employed, specifically convenience sampling. The inclusion criteria for participants were defined as adolescents aged 11–20 years who were attending school or university in Jakarta. The demographic characteristics of the participants were presented in Table 1.

Table 1.
Demographic Data Descriptive Results

Variable	*N*	*%*
Gender		
Male	131	37.4
Female	219	62.6
Total	350	100
Age		
11-13	20	5.71
14-16	171	48.86
17-20	159	45.43
Total	350	100

Domicile		
Central Jakarta	48	13.7
North Jakarta	48	13.7
West Jakarta	109	31.1
South Jakarta	72	20.6
East Jakarta	73	20.9
Total	350	100

Measures

Data collection techniques were carried out using a questionnaire in the form of a scale. The method used to obtain responses from participants was the distribution of questionnaires through social media, specifically Google Forms. The questionnaire used as the instrument in this study was composed of three measurement tools: the Adolescent Peer Relations Instrument–Bully/Target by Solberg and Olweus (2003), the HEXACO-60 by Ashton and Lee (2007), and the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ) based on the facets developed by Baer et al. (2006). All instruments were administered using a Likert scale.

Bullying

In this study, the tendency of bullying behavior was measured using the Adolescent Peer Relations Instrument—Bully/Target (APRI-BT), based on aspects defined by Solberg and Olweus (2003). The scale consisted of 18 items, including six items each for verbal bullying, social bullying, and physical bullying. A six-point Likert scale was used, with options ranging from 1 (never), 2 (sometimes), 3 (once or twice a month), 4 (once a week), 5 (several times a week), to 6 (daily). Responses closer to 1 indicated infrequent involvement in bullying behavior, whereas scores closer to 6 indicated frequent involvement. Each bullying type had its own subscore and could be analyzed separately; however, a total bullying score was obtained by summing all item scores to reflect an individual's overall bullying tendency.

HEXACO

The tendency of bullying behavior was measured using the HEXACO-60, developed by Ashton and Lee (2007). This scale consisted of 60 items, with ten items for each of the following dimensions: Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience. A five-point Likert scale was employed, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Agree), to 5 (Strongly Agree). For each personality dimension, scores were summed, and the dimension with the highest total score was identified as the respondent's dominant personality trait.

Mindfulness

The tendency of bullying behavior was measured using the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ), based on the aspects proposed by Baer et al. (2006). The scale

consisted of five facets with a total of 39 items: observing (8 items), describing (8 items), acting with awareness (8 items), non-judging of inner experience (8 items), and non-reactivity to inner experience (7 items). A five-point Likert scale was employed, ranging from 1 (Very Rarely True), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neutral), 4 (Agree), to 5 (Always True). Each facet produced an individual score and could be analyzed separately; however, a total mindfulness score was calculated by summing all item scores to reflect the respondent's overall level of mindfulness.

Reliability

To assess the reliability of the instruments, data were processed using SPSS version 22 for Windows. Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for each subscale. A coefficient of ≥ .6 was considered acceptable. The results of the reliability analysis for the three instruments are presented in Tables 2, 3, and 4

Table 2.
Cronbach's Alphas of *HEXACO Personality Reliability Test, Mindfulness Reliability Test Bullying Reliability Test*

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
Honesty-Humility	.822
Emotionality	.685
Extraversion	.664
Agreeableness	.688
Conscientiousness	.767
Openness to Experience	.718
Observing	.751
Describing	.780
Nonjudging	.801
Nonreacting to inner experience	.608
Act with awareness	.818
Overall Mindfulness as Single Factor	.905
Verbal Bullying	.888
Physical Bullying	.936
Indirect or Social Bullying	.906
Overall Bullying as Single Factor	.957

Procedure

The original questionnaire items were in English; therefore, a sworn translator was consulted to translate the instruments into Indonesian. To evaluate construct validity, the expert judgment method was applied, involving assessment and discussion of the adapted items by six experts. Based on their evaluation, the items were deemed appropriate, as all had Aiken's V values exceeding 0.75, indicating acceptable construct validity. For content validity, a trial run was conducted, followed by item analysis using the corrected item-total correlation.

Items with an r-value above 0.3 were considered valid, while those below this threshold were excluded.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This research was approved by The Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Psychology, Muhammadiyah University of Malang (Ethical Code No: E.6.m/022/KE-FPsi-UMM/VIII/2023).

Human and animal rights

No animals were used in this research. All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of institutional and/or research committees and with the 1975 Declaration of Helsinki, as revised in 2013.

Results

The normality test used in this study was conducted using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test to determine whether the obtained data were normally distributed. The data were considered normally distributed if the significance value was greater than .05 ($p > .05$), and not normally distributed if it was less than .05 ($p < .05$). The Kolmogorov–Smirnov One-Sample test was applied using SPSS to assess the normality of the variables, including bullying, mindfulness, honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. The data normality test results were presented in Table 5.

Table 3.
Data Normality Test Results

Variable	Test Statistic	p
Honesty-humility	.086	.000
Emotionality	.078	.000
Extraversion	.092	.000
Agreeableness	.109	.000
Conscientiousness	.135	.000
Openness to experience	.125	.000
Observing	.065	.001
Describing	.081	.000
Non judging	.095	.000
Non reacting	.131	.000
Act with awareness	.047	.057
Mindfulness total score	.070	.000
Verbal bullying	.116	.000
Physical bullying	.210	.000
Social bullying	.176	.000
Bullying total score	.128	.000

Based on Table 5, it can be seen that most of the variables obtained a significance value of p < .001 (p < .05). Therefore, it was concluded that the data were not normally distributed. As a result, Spearman's correlation analysis was applied to examine the relationships between variables in this study.

Table 4.

Correlation Analysis between HEXACO, Mindfulness Total Score and Three Bullying Types

Variable	Verbal Bullying	Physical Bullying	Social Bullying	Bullying Total
1. Honesty	-.689**	-.427**	-.539**	-.632**
2. Emotionality	-.386**	-.429**	-.423**	-.444**
3. Extraversion	.265**	.220**	.237**	.259**
4. Agreeableness	-.099	.068	.045	-.024
5. Conscientiousness	-.248**	-.051	-.123*	-.166**
6. Openness	.199**	.178**	.140**	.191**
7. Observe	-.210**	-.206**	-.256**	-.236**
8. Describe	-.212**	-.268**	-.305**	-.272**
9. Non Judging	-.228**	.033	-.057	-.117*
10. Non Reacting	-.092	-.201**	-.188**	-.154**
11. Act aware	-.474**	-.222**	-.313**	-.396**
12. Mindfulness Total	-.366**	-.228**	-.308**	-.334**

* p < .05; ** p < .01

Based on Table 6, it can be seen that several significant correlations were found between the HEXACO personality traits and bullying tendencies. For the Honesty-Humility trait, significant negative correlations were found with verbal bullying (r(348) = −.689, p < .01), physical bullying (r(348) = −.427, p < .01), and social bullying (r(348) = −.539, p < .01), as well as overall bullying tendencies (r(348) = −.632, p < .01). Emotionality was also negatively correlated with verbal bullying (r(348) = −.386, p < .01), physical bullying (r(348) = −.429, p < .01), social bullying (r(348) = −.423, p < .01), and overall bullying (r(348) = −.444, p < .01). Extraversion showed significant positive correlations with verbal bullying (r(348) = .265, p < .01), physical bullying (r(348) = .220, p < .01), social bullying (r(348) = .237, p < .01), and overall bullying (r(348) = .259, p < .01). Agreeableness was not significantly correlated with any type of bullying. Conscientiousness was significantly negatively correlated with verbal bullying (r(348) = −.248, p < .01), social bullying (r(348) = −.123, p < .05), and overall bullying (r(348) = −.166, p < .01), but not with physical bullying. Lastly, Openness to Experience had significant positive correlations with verbal bullying (r(348) = .199, p < .01), physical bullying (r(348) = .178, p < .01), social bullying (r(348) = .140, p < .01), and overall bullying (r(348) = .191, p < .01).

In addition to the personality traits, mindfulness facets also showed significant correlations with bullying tendencies, as presented in Table 6. The observing facet showed significant negative correlations with verbal bullying ($r(348) = -.210$, $p < .01$), physical bullying ($r(348) = -.206$, $p < .01$), social bullying ($r(348) = -.256$, $p < .01$), and overall bullying tendencies ($r(348) = -.236$, $p < .01$). The describing facet was also significantly negatively correlated with verbal bullying ($r(348) = -.212$, $p < .01$), physical bullying ($r(348) = -.268$, $p < .01$), social bullying ($r(348) = -.305$, $p < .01$), and overall bullying ($r(348) = -.272$, $p < .01$). The non-judging facet had significant negative correlations with verbal bullying ($r(348) = -.228$, $p < .01$) and overall bullying ($r(348) = -.117$, $p < .05$). The non-reacting facet showed significant negative correlations with physical bullying ($r(348) = -.201$, $p < .01$), social bullying ($r(348) = -.188$, $p < .01$), and overall bullying ($r(348) = -.154$, $p < .01$). The acting with awareness facet showed the strongest negative correlations across all types: verbal bullying ($r(348) = -.474$, $p < .01$), physical bullying ($r(348) = -.222$, $p < .01$), social bullying ($r(348) = -.313$, $p < .01$), and overall bullying ($r(348) = -.396$, $p < .01$). Finally, overall mindfulness was also significantly negatively correlated with verbal bullying ($r(348) = -.366$, $p < .01$), physical bullying ($r(348) = -.228$, $p < .01$), social bullying ($r(348) = -.308$, $p < .01$), and overall bullying tendencies ($r(348) = -.334$, $p < .01$).

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the relationship between bullying behavior tendencies, HEXACO personality traits, and mindfulness in adolescents in Jakarta. Based on the correlation results, significant relationships were found between bullying tendencies and several HEXACO traits, including Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience. Specifically, Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, and Conscientiousness were negatively correlated with bullying, while Extraversion and Openness to Experience showed positive correlations. The Agreeableness trait was not significantly correlated with bullying tendencies.

These findings suggest that higher scores in Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, and Conscientiousness are associated with lower bullying tendencies. Conversely, higher scores in Extraversion and Openness to Experience are associated with increased bullying behavior. In addition, most mindfulness facets were significantly negatively correlated with verbal, physical, social, and overall bullying tendencies.

The results can be summarized as follows: (1) Honesty-Humility, Emotionality, and Conscientiousness traits showed significant negative correlations with bullying tendencies,

indicating that individuals with higher scores in these traits tend to exhibit lower bullying behavior. (2) Extraversion and Openness to Experience traits showed significant positive correlations with bullying tendencies, suggesting that individuals with higher scores in these traits may display more bullying behavior. (3) Agreeableness was not significantly correlated with any form of bullying. (4) Conscientiousness was not significantly correlated with physical bullying but was negatively correlated with verbal, social, and overall bullying. (5) Among all traits, Honesty-Humility had the strongest correlations with verbal, social, and overall bullying, while Emotionality was most strongly correlated with physical bullying.

The Honesty-Humility dimension reflects honesty and humility (Mardhiah & Lutfi, 2019). Individuals with high Honesty-Humility scores are described as avoiding manipulation or deceit, valuing fairness, and refraining from exploiting others (Lee et al., 2013). On the other hand, low scorers may exhibit selfishness, greed, and exploitative behavior (Volk et al., 2018). Bullying is characterized as a goal-directed exploitation of power (Pronk et al., 2021). In this study, Honesty-Humility was negatively correlated with bullying tendencies, aligning with prior research by Volk et al. (2018) and Farrell et al. (2014), which emphasized the role of this trait in reducing bullying behavior.

Emotionality reflects emotional attachment and altruism toward others (Farrell et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2013). High Emotionality is linked to empathy and harm avoidance (Ashton & Lee, 2007; de Vries et al., 2016), while low scores are associated with cruelty, fearlessness, and risk-seeking behavior. In this study, Emotionality was negatively correlated with bullying, consistent with findings from Volk et al. (2018) in a Chinese sample.

Extraversion relates to social presence and leadership (Pronk et al., 2021). While it can have both positive and negative effects depending on social context, it is essentially about social attention (de Vries et al., 2016). This study found a positive correlation between Extraversion and bullying, supporting prior findings by Putri et al. (2015), who noted that extraverted adolescents often engage in bullying. However, this result contrasts with Volk et al. (2018), who found lower Extraversion scores in Canadian bullying samples.

Agreeableness involves forgiveness and tolerance (Lee et al., 2013; Pronk et al., 2021). Higher Agreeableness is associated with harmonious interactions, while lower levels are linked to grudge-holding and irritability (Volk et al., 2018). In this study, Agreeableness did not significantly correlate with bullying, although prior research, such as that by Pronk et al. (2021) and Volk et al. (2018), found otherwise. Differences in age and educational background among participants may explain this discrepancy.

The Conscientiousness trait is associated with diligence, goal orientation, and organization (Pronk et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2013). Lower scores indicate impulsiveness and carelessness (Ashton & Lee, 2007). In this study, Conscientiousness was negatively correlated with bullying, reinforcing findings by Volk et al. (2018) and consistent with Rosen et al. (2017), who stated that bullies tend to act impulsively.

Openness to Experience pertains to curiosity and appreciation for aesthetics (Lee et al., 2013). Individuals scoring high in this trait enjoy novelty and creative activities, while those with low scores may avoid such experiences. In this study, Openness to Experience was positively correlated with bullying behavior, possibly reflecting a desire for novel experiences, including harmful ones. This result contrasts with Pronk et al. (2021), who found a negative correlation, potentially due to cultural differences.

The results regarding mindfulness and bullying tendencies showed that: (1) All mindfulness facets had significant negative correlations with overall bullying. (2) Most facets, except non-judging, were negatively correlated with physical and social bullying. (3) Most facets, except non-reacting, were negatively correlated with verbal bullying. (4) Acting with awareness had the strongest correlations with verbal, social, and overall bullying, while describing was most strongly correlated with physical bullying.

Overall, a negative correlation between mindfulness and bullying was found, suggesting that more mindful individuals are less likely to engage in bullying. Bullying often involves impulsive behavior and a lack of empathy (Abid et al., 2017). Mindfulness enhances empathy (Naik et al., 2013) and interrupts automatic emotional reactions, thereby reducing aggressive behavior (Faraji et al., 2019).

Limitations & further research

One of the limitations of this study was the absence of a screening process for selecting respondents. As a result, the students who participated as respondents were not necessarily individuals who had engaged in bullying behavior. In future studies, it is recommended to include data that distinguish respondents as either perpetrators or victims of bullying, since this study did not provide such classification. Further research is also encouraged to examine the effectiveness of mindfulness-based training programs in reducing bullying tendencies, given that this study found a significant negative correlation between mindfulness and bullying behavior.

Conclusions

Based on the results of the study, it was concluded that among the six HEXACO personality traits, only Agreeableness (H4) was not significantly related to bullying, while the other five traits and mindfulness (H1, H2, H3, H5, H6, and H7) were found to be significantly associated with bullying tendencies in adolescents in Jakarta. Furthermore, among all personality traits, verbal bullying, social bullying, and overall bullying were most strongly correlated with the Honesty-Humility trait, while physical bullying showed the strongest correlation with the Emotionality trait. Additionally, it was concluded that among all mindfulness facets, verbal bullying, social bullying, and overall bullying had the strongest correlations with the Acting with Awareness facet, whereas physical bullying was most strongly correlated with the Describing facet.

Funding/Financial Support

Other Support/Acknowledgement

Competing Interests

References

Abid, M., Irfan, M., & Naeem, F. (2017). Relationship between mindfulness and bullying behavior among school children: An exploratory study from Pakistan. *Journal of Postgraduate Medical Institute*, *31*(3), 256–259.

Anasori, E., Bayighomog, S. W., & Tanova, C. (2020). Workplace bullying, psychological distress, resilience, mindfulness, and emotional exhaustion. *Service Industries Journal*, *40*(1–2), 65–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2019.1589456

APA. (2013). *"Bullying."* American Psychological Association. https://www.apa.org/topics/bullying#

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *11*(2), 150–166. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868306294907

Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using self-report assessment methods to explore facets of mindfulness. *Assessment*, *13*(1), 27–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191105283504

Borualogo, I. S., & Gumilang, E. (2019). Kasus Perundungan Anak di Jawa Barat: Temuan Awal Children's Worlds Survey di Indonesia *[Bullying cases among children in West Java: Preliminary findings from the Children's Worlds Survey in Indonesia]*. *Psympathic : Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, *6*(1), 15–30. https://doi.org/10.15575/psy.v6i1.4439

Darmayanti, K. K. H., Kurniawati, F., & Situmorang, D. D. B. (2019). Fenomena Bullying di Sekolah: Apa dan Bagaimana? [Bullying phenomenon in schools: What and how?] *Pedagogia*, *17*(1), 55. https://doi.org/10.17509/pdgia.v17i1.13980

de Vries, R. E., Tybur, J. M., Pollet, T. V., & van Vugt, M. (2016). Evolution, situational affordances, and the HEXACO model of personality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *37*(5), 407–421. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2016.04.001

Dewi, P. Y. A. (2020). Perilaku School Bullying Pada Siswa Sekolah Dasar *[School bullying behavior among elementary school students]*. *Edukasi: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar*, *1*(1), 39. https://doi.org/10.55115/edukasi.v1i1.526

Diyantini, N. K., Yanti, N. L. P. E., & Lismawati, S. M. (2015). Hubungan Karakteristik dan Kepribadian Anak dengan Kejadian Bullying pada Siswa Kelas V Di SD "X" di Kabupaten Badung [The relationship between children's characteristics and personality with bullying incidents among fifth grade students at Elementary School "X" in Badung Regency]. *COPING Ners Journal*, *3*(3), 93–99. http://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/coping/article/viewFile/13933/12680

Erismon, E., & Karneli, Y. (2021). Efektivitas pendekatan Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy untuk mengatasi perilaku bullying siswa [The effectiveness of Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy approach in addressing students' bullying behavior]. *Jurnal EDUCATIO: Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, *7*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.29210/120212694

Fachrosi, E. (2016). *Validasi modul "kepedulian terhadap sahabat" untuk meningkatkan intensi prosocial saksi bullying kelas 4-5 sekolah dasar [Validation of the "caring for friends" module to increase prosocial intention of bullying witnesses in 4th–5th grade elementary school students]*. Universitas Gadjah Mada.

Faraji, M., Talepasand, S., & Boogar, I. (2019). Effectiveness of mindfulness-based cognitive therapy for child on bullying behaviors among children. *International Archives of Health Sciences*, *6*(1), 52. https://doi.org/10.4103/iahs.iahs_54_18

Farrell, A. H., Della Cioppa, V., Volk, A. A., & Book, A. S. (2014). Predicting Bullying Heterogeneity with the HEXACO Model of Personality. *International Journal of Advances in Psychology*, *3*(2), 30. https://doi.org/10.14355/ijap.2014.0302.02

Garret, L. (2014). The Student Bullying of Teachers: An Exploration of the Nature of the Phenomenon and the Ways in which it is experienced by Teachers. *Aigne, UCC Peer Reviewed Journal*, 19–40. https://doi.org/10.1140/epja/i2003-10002-x

Hartati, S., Safitri, D., Marini, A., & Wahyudi, A. (2020). Bullying Behavior in Early Childhood: Study at Early Childhood Education Institution in East Jakarta in Indonesia. *Talent Development & Excellence*, *55*(1), 55–63. http://www.iratde.com

Hidayati, L. N., & Amalia, R. (2021). Psychological Impacts On Adolescent Victims Of Bullying: Phenomenology Study. *Media Keperawatan Indonesia*, *4*(3), 201. https://doi.org/10.26714/mki.4.3.2021.201-207

Hidayati, N. (2018). Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) untuk Resiliensi Remaja yang Mengalami Bullying *[Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) for the resilience of adolescents experiencing bullying]. Proceeding National Conference Psikologi UMG*, 40–46.

Ijazah, F. (2020). *How to talk to your children about bullying: Tips for parents*. UNICEF. https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/child-protection/how-talk-your-children-about-bullying

Ilham, R., Hunawa, R. D., & Hunta, F. I. (2021). Kejadian Bullyng Pada Remaja dan Faktor yang Berhubungan [Incidents of Bullying in Adolescents and Related Factors]. *Jambura Nursing Journal*, *3*(1), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.37311/jnj.v3i1.9834

Komisi Perlindungan Anak Indonesia. (2017). *KPAI Terima Aduan 26 Ribu Kasus Bully Selama 2011-2017* [KPAI Received 26 Thousand Complaints of Bullying Cases During 2011-2017]. https://www.kpai.go.id/publikasi/kpai-terima-aduan-26-ribu-kasus-bully-selama-2011-2017

Kuykendall, S. (2012). *Bullying: Health and Medical Issues Today*. Greenwood - ABC CLIO LLC.

Lee, K., Ashton, M. C., Wiltshire, J., Bourdage, J. S., Visser, B. A., & Gallucci, A. (2013). Sex, Power, and Money: Prediction from the Dark Triad and Honesty-Humility. *European Journal of Personality*, *27*, 169–184. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.1860

Lesmana, T., & Febrianto. (2020). Hubungan Harga Diri dan Prasangka Gender Dengan Kecenderungan Perilaku Cyberbullying Pelajar Jakarta [Relationship between Self-Esteem and Gender Prejudice with Cyberbullying Behavior Tendency of Jakarta Students]. *Jurnal Psikologi TALENTA, 5*(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.26858/talenta.v5i1.9765

Mardhiah, D. R., & Lutfi, I. (2019). Trust, Literasi Media, Kepribadian Hexaco dan Husnudzon Terhadap Kecenderungan Menggunakan Media Sosial [Trust, Media Literacy, Hexaco Personality and Husnudzon Towards Tendency to Use Social Media]. *TAZKIYA: Journal of Psychology, 7*(2), 200–218. https://doi.org/10.15408/tazkiya.v7i2.13479

Mishna, F. (2012). *Bullying: a guide to research, intervention, and prevention*. Oxford University Press Inc.

Mujtahidah. (2018). Analisis perilaku pelaku Bullying dan upaya penanganannya (studi kasus pada siswa Man 1 Barru) [Analysis of Bullying Perpetrator Behavior and Handling Efforts (Case Study of Man 1 Barru Students)]. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Science (IJES), 1*(1), 25–31. https://doi.org/10.31605/ijes.v1i1.128

Naik, P., Harris, V., & Forthun, L. (2013). Mindfulness: An Introduction: FCS2335/FY1381, 9/2013. *EDIS*, *2013*(8). https://doi.org/10.32473/edis-fy1381-2013

Natasha, C., Kirana, K. C., & Vivi. (2017). Perbedaan dimensi kepribadian hexaco six-factor model pada emerging adults perokok dan non-perokok [Differences in the dimensions of the hexaco six-factor model of personality in emerging adults who are smokers and non-smokers]. *Jurnal Psikologi Klinis Indonesia*, *2*(1), 82-98. https://jurnal.ipkindonesia.or.id/index.php/jpki/article/view/jpki-1-1-2017-82-98

Nurfadilah, A., & Listiyandini, R. A. (2017). Peran Trait Mindfulness dan Empati terhadap Perilaku Bullying pada Remaja SMA di Jakarta [The Role of Trait Mindfulness and Empathy on Bullying Behavior in High School Adolescents in Jakarta]. *Prosiding Konferensi Nasional III Psikologi Kesehatan - Fakultas Psikologi YARSI*, 392–405.

Olpin, M., & Hesson, M. (2021). *Stress Management for Life: A Research-Based, Experiential Approach* (5th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Pertiwi, C. (2019). Kecenderungan perilaku bullying ditinjau dari tipe kepribadian big five [Spiritual Intelligence and Bullying Tendency in Junior High School Students]. *Anfusina: Journal of Psychology*, *2*(1), 79–90.

Pertiwi, V. S., & Nasrori, H. F. (2011). Kecerdasan Spiritual dan Kecenderungan Bullying pada Siswa Sekolah Menengah Pertama [Spiritual Intelligence and Bullying Tendency in Junior High School Students]. *Jurnal Psikologi*, *7*(1), 14–22.

Pronk, J., Olthof, T., Vreis, R. E. de, & Goossens, F. A. (2021). HEXACO personality correlates of adolescents' involvementin bullying situations. *Aggressive Behavior*, *47*(3), 320–331. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21947

Putri, H. N., Nauli, F. A., & Novayelinda, R. (2015). Faktor-Faktor Yang Berhubungan Dengan Perilaku Bullying Pada Remaja [Factors Associated with Bullying Behavior in Adolescents]. *Jurnal Online Mahasiswa (JOM)*, *2*(2), 12–17.

Rigby, K. (2002). *New perspective on bullying*. Jessic Kingsley.

Rosen, L.H., Scott, S.R., DeOrnellas, K. (2017). An Overview of School Bullying. In: Rosen, L., DeOrnellas, K., Scott, S. (eds) Bullying in School. Palgrave Macmillan, New York. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-59298-9_1

Solberg, M. E., & Olweus, D. (2003). Prevalence Estimation of School Bullying with the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior*, *29*(3), 239–268. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.10047

Volk, A. A., Schiralli, K., Xia, X., Zhao, J., & Dane, A. V. (2018). Personality and Individual Differences Adolescent bullying and personality: A cross-cultural approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *125*, 126–132. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.01.012

Wahyuni, N., Wahyuni, S., & Damanik, S. R. H. (2019). Tingkat Pengetahuan Guru Sekolah Menengah Pertama Negeri Tentang Bullying Di Kota Pekanbaru [Level of Knowledge of Public Junior High School Teachers About Bullying in Pekanbaru City]. *Jurnal Ners Indonesia*, *9*(2), 21. https://doi.org/10.31258/jni.10.1.21-37

Wiguna, T., Ismail, R. I., Sekartini, R., & Limawan, A. (2016). 3.55 Bullying Among Adolescents in Jakarta, Indonesia: A Nowadays Portrait. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *55*(10), S159. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2016.09.187

Yusuf, A., Habibie, A., Efendi, F., Kurnia, I. & Kurniati, A. (2022). Prevalence and correlates of being bullied among adolescents in Indonesia: results from the 2015 Global School-based Student Health Survey. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, *34*(1), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijamh-2019-0064

Zhang, Y., Li, Z., Tan, Y., Zhang, X., Zhao, Q., & Chen, X. (2021). The Influence of Personality Traits on School Bullying: A Moderated Mediation Model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*(May), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.650070

About the Authors

Teguh Lesmana is a Psychologist with PhD degree in industrial and organizational psychology, specializing in positive psychology approach. He currently works as a psychology lecturer at the Universitas Pelita Harapan undergraduate program.

Mutiara Mirah Yunita is currently a PhD student in psychology who is in the process of completing his final assignment at Universitas Persada Indonesia. She is currently work as a psychology lecturer at the Universitas Bunda Mulia undergraduate program.

Kornelis Seralarat is an educational psychology scholar with PhD degree in educational psychology, with research interest in positive relationship and positive education. He currently works as a psychology lecturer at the STPAK St. Yohanes Penginjil Ambon.

Corresponding Author's Contact Address[TOP]

M.H. Thamrin Boulevard No.1100, Kelapa Dua,
Tangerang Regency, Banten 15811
Email: teguhlesmana73@gmail.com