

---

## Interaction between Aggressive and Non-Aggressive Delinquent Behaviors and Attachment in a High-Risk Puerto Rican Population: A Pilot Study

---

Camille Velázquez-Rodríguez<sup>1,2</sup>, Efraín J. Ríos-Ruiz<sup>2,3</sup> & Ernesto Rosario-Hernández<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences, Ponce Health Sciences University

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Translational Research in Behavioral Sciences, Department of Counseling and Psychological Services, University of Puerto Rico at Ponce

---

### Resumen

El artículo describe la interacción entre apego y conducta delictiva (agresiva y no-agresiva). La Escala de Experiencias en Relaciones Cercanas- Versión en Español, fue adaptada para el uso de población puertorriqueña y la Entrevista de Auto-informe de Conducta Delictiva fue traducida al español. Apego, apego paternal, sintomatología psiquiátrica y conducta delictiva fueron medidos. La muestra (n=31) fue recolectada en de un programa de re-educación para agresores de violencia doméstica. One-way ANOVA y MANOVA fueron completados para analizar la interacción entre las variables. Los resultados sugieren que el apego al padre impacta el estilo de apego, síntomas psiquiátricos reportados y conducta delictiva. Recomendaciones para la intervención temprana con los niños y los padres son provistas en el escrito.

*Palabras clave:* Apego, Delincuente, Estilo de crianza, Agresivo, No Agresivo

### Abstract

This article describes the interaction between attachment and delinquent behaviors (aggressive and non-aggressive). The Experiences in Close Relationships Scale –Spanish, was adapted to be used in a Puerto Rican population and the Self-Report Delinquent Interview was translated to Spanish. Attachment, parental bonding, psychiatric symptomology and delinquent behavior were measured in this study. The sample (n=31) was collected from domestic violence aggressors participating in a reeducation program. One-way ANOVA and MANOVA were completed to analyze the interaction between the variables. Results suggest that the fathers' parenting style impacts the participants' attachment style, psychiatric symptomology and delinquent behaviors. Recommendations are made for early intervention with children and parents.

*Keywords:* Attachment, Delinquent, Parenting Style, Aggressive, Non-Aggressive

---

<sup>1</sup> Toda comunicación relacionada a este artículo debe dirigirse a la autora principal al siguiente correo electrónico: [camillelevelazquezphd@gmail.com](mailto:camillelevelazquezphd@gmail.com).

## Introduction

As time goes by, society has pointed to different factors as the cause for delinquent behavior. These factors include, but are not limited to; parental behavior, marital problems between spouses, unemployment, genes, separation from a parent, hormones, abuse and neglect, and living in foster homes. The question becomes, are all delinquent behaviors the same, and if not, what makes one different from the other, and what factors mediate between them?

Burt (2012) states that antisocial behavior includes a broad range of actions and attitudes that violate societal norms and the rights of others. In the past there have been multiple attempts to define and classify antisocial behavior. Researchers have studied this phenomenon through different angles, including classifying these behaviors by age onset (Burt & Klump, 2009; Moffit, 1993), genetics (Wang, Niv, Tuvblad, Raine, & Baker, 2013), sex (Eley, Lichtenstein, & Stevenson, 1999), and personality traits (Hansen, Waage, Eid, Johnson, & Hart, 2011). Until recently, antisocial or delinquent behavior was seen as a category and, for several years now, studies have been focused on viewing delinquency as a dimension and separating aggressive delinquent behavior (ADB) from non-aggressive delinquent behavior, which will be referred to as rule breaking (RB).

As for defining ADB and RB, Burt (2012) establishes:

“Aggressive delinquent behaviors are acts of physical aggression towards others (e.g., hitting, pushing, slapping, biting, kicking, etc.), fighting, threats of physical aggression, oppositionality, defiance, and/or bullying. Rule Breaking ... via nonaggressive... includes property violations such as theft, vandalism, and fire-setting, as well as status violations such as truancy, swearing, running away, and substance use.” (p. 265)

Literature supports the notion that aggressive and non-aggressive rule-breaking constitute separable, though correlated, behavioral dimensions within the broader construct of antisocial behavior. Not many studies exist where ADB and RB are studied separately. The literature available sees delinquency as one broad category.

Because one sole factor cannot explain delinquent behavior on its own, the Risk Factor Model and Attachment framework were used as the models to explain this phenomenon. Day, Wanklyn, & Yessine (2013) combined all the meanings they could find for risk factor and created one definition. They defined it as an antecedent condition that increases the likelihood of a maladaptive outcome. There are many risk factors that may give way to developing delinquent behavior, including low self-esteem, depression, moral judgment, social information processing, childhood temperament, agreeableness and conscientiousness, empathy, impulsiveness, low IQ, and low educational attainment (Murray & Farrington, 2010). Researchers should focus on what can be done in the area that has yet changed with the passing of time, the role played by the family, which includes the attachment style, as a way to decrease the development of delinquent behavior.

One of the risk factors, and the main identity responsible for the attachment development, is family (Cassidy, 2008), which has changed over the past few decades. Vespa, Lewis & Kreider (2013) reported their findings, based on the 2012 Census (USA) for American households, that homes and families have gotten smaller, while married households tended to be older and made up a smaller share of all households.

Attachment, which has also been used to explain delinquency, is a type of social conduct of equal importance to mating and parenting, and it is sustained that it fulfills a concrete biologic function (Bowlby, 1982).

The notion that the quality or organization of attachment behavior in early infancy or childhood might have implications for later socio-emotional development and mental health is arguably one of attachment theory's most well-known and contested predictions (Fearson, Bakermans-Kranenburg, van Ijzendoorn, Lapsley & Roisman, 2010). No studies investigating the relationship between attachment and ADB and RB were found, meaning this is an area that needs to be explored. The main objective of this study is to impact future interventions by finding ways to create a secure attachment between the caregiver and their children. These interventions will not only help the families relate with each other in a healthier way, but can also help prevent future violent or criminal behaviors from developing.

This investigation focused on analyzing what factor or factors mediated between ADB, RB and attachment in a high risk Puerto Rican population. The differences between ADB and RB delinquent behavior have been studied, but there has yet been a study to examine the role played by attachment style. Parenting style (mother and father separately), along with any current symptoms they presented, were measured to observe how this may have impacted their attachment style and played a role in the presence and type of delinquent behavior. Knowing what influences the development of attachment and delinquent behavior can help identify protective factors which may in turn increase the likelihood of a secure attachment and decrease the chance of delinquent behavior developing. This investigation also provided information on the validity and reliability of the Experiences of Close Relationship Revised Questionnaire in a Spanish version (ECR – S), which will facilitate the use of more self-report attachment measurements that measure attachment in a two-way dimensional form in a Puerto Rican population. The Self Report Delinquency

Interview (SR-DI) was also used and was translated to Spanish; it is the first time that either of these instruments will be used in a Puerto Rican population.

### **Theoretical Framework**

In this investigation, two theoretical frameworks were employed; The Risk Factor Research Model, where the accumulation of risk factors explains the development of ADB and RB, and the Attachment theory by John Bowlby.

### **Risk Factor Research Model**

There are many models with a similar definition but different names including chain reactions, snowball, amplification, spillover or progressive effects. This model could explain why some problems in childhood predict widespread difficulties in adulthood, whereas others do not, and also offers a possible explanation for some of the comorbidity that is observed so often for some disorders, such as conduct disorder (Masten & Cichetti, 2010).

In a review about the terminology and concept of a risk factor, Day et al. (2013) took together all the definitions they could find for risk factor and crafted one definition. They defined it as an antecedent condition that increases the likelihood of a maladaptive outcome. The authors report some key elements of a risk factor; these are:

- (1) "the risk factor temporally precedes the outcome; (2) the presence of the risk factor puts an individual at increased risk for a maladaptive outcome compared with a randomly selected individual from a general population; and (3) the relation between a risk factor and an outcome is understood as probabilistic, not deterministic". (Day et al., 2013, p. 99)

Loeber & Farrington (2000) divide the risk factors into five domains: individual

(e.g., aggression, low intelligence, self-esteem); family (e.g., parenting, child maltreatment); peer (e.g., peer pressure, peer rejection); school (e.g., poor academic performance); and community (e.g., community disadvantage, high crime neighborhood). This model proposes that the developmental interchange between the child and the environment in emergent behaviors is played out at multiple levels. Micro-exchanges between a child and parent that occur tells the story of the onset of aggressive coercive acts (Granic & Patterson, 2006).

### **Attachment**

The attachment behavior is a type of social conduct of equal importance to mating and parenting, but we cannot talk about an attachment behavior until it is proven that not only does the baby recognize the mother, but also that he tends to act in a way that keeps her close (Bowlby, 1982). Early attachments have a significant effect on the child's socio-emotional and cognitive development (Ma, 2006).

The attachment theory is an independent model of human development and psychopathology, in which John Bowlby combines elements of psychoanalysis, developmental psychology, social psychology, ethology, and biology in his discussion of attachment (Gold, 2011). The experiences with caregivers contribute to the formation of infant representations; physiological regulatory processes that play important roles in children developing attachment systems (Cassidy, Ehrlich, & Sherman, 2014). Attachment was the area of research that legitimized the study of the role of the environment, and of the role of interpersonal relationships in the development of psychological structures, unconscious mental processes and contents, and psychopathology (Gold, 2011). As a result of the integration of different theories like Darwin's theory of evolution, theory of systems of control, and concepts from the

areas of etiology and cognitive psychology, John Bowlby created a theory of the development of personality that extends through the cycle of life, the attachment theory (Simpson, 1999).

### **Literature Review**

#### **Attachment and Psychopathology**

Dozier, Stovall-McClough & Albus (2008) mention in their chapter in the Handbook of Attachment, that one of the consistent findings in attachment research is that psychiatric disorders are nearly always associated with insecure states of mind (style of attachment). For this reason, attachment theory has been used to explain many different types of diagnoses, the most recent being Borderline Personality Disorder. It is believed that disruptions of the attachment system, along with identity diffusion closely linked to such disruptions, are seen as the core features of Borderline Personality Disorder (Fonagy, Luyte & Strathearn, 2011).

Attachment has been linked to many psychopathologies in childhood and adulthood including conduct disorder, pervasive developmental disorder (DeKlyen & Greenberg, 2008; Fearson et al., 2010), depression (Borellia, Goshinb, Joestlc, Clark, & Byrne, 2010), anxiety disorders (Eng, Heimberg, Hart, Schneier, & Liebowitz, 2001), dissociative disorders, eating disorders and even to more severe diagnoses such as schizophrenia, borderline personality disorder and antisocial personality disorder (Fonagy, Luyten, & Strathearn, 2011; Greenberg, 1999; Ma, 2006). It is beyond proven that a strong link exists between insecure attachment and psychopathology.

#### **Attachment and Delinquency**

Studies that link attachment and delinquent behaviors have been conducted for a few decades, and an example of that is a theory by Sroufe in 1984, where he proposed that even though ambivalent and avoidant children may develop externalizing

behaviors, these can manifest themselves in different ways. He stated that the ambivalent child may be easily over-stimulated and exhibit impulsivity, restlessness, a short attention span and low frustration tolerance. The avoidant child develops a hostile, antisocial pattern in response to a rejecting and emotionally unavailable caregiver, which may be manifested by bullying, lying, blaming and being insensitive to others. In a more recent example of these studies, Deklyen & Greenberg (2008) mention an investigation performed by Greenberg and colleagues, where the authors compared a clinical sample of children who were diagnosed with ODD (Oppositional Defiant Disorder) with children from a non-clinical sample. They found that 80% of the children in the clinical sample were insecurely attached to their mothers compared to 30% of the non-clinical sample.

#### **Accumulation of Risk Factors, Life Stressors, Externalizing Behavior and Delinquency**

Attachment by itself cannot explain delinquent behavior, as has been mentioned, and another example of this is a study done by Belsky and Fearon (2002), where they took the largest available data of attachment classification and found that attachment insecurity was only predictive of problem behavior within the context of a high-risk environment (Delkyn & Greenberg, 2008). The Minnesota Parent Child Project, which has followed a sample from infancy to early adulthood and assessed psychopathology, has been the study that supports a transactional, multiple pathway model revealing that data about both early securities of attachment and later parent child and family relationships may be valuable in predicting later psychopathology.

Many risk factors give way to developing delinquent behavior including low self-esteem, depression, moral judgement, social information processing,

childhood temperament, agreeableness and conscientiousness, empathy, impulsiveness, low IQ, and low educational attainment (Murray & Farrington, 2010). An important risk factor is the fact that antisocial behavior has been shown to peak during adolescence and to decrease rapidly after about 18 years of age (De Wolff & van IJzendoorn, 1997; Fonagy et al., 1997; Moffitt, 1993; Shulman, Steinberg & Piquero, 2013).

Insecure attachment may be one of many pathways that explain delinquent behavior but not with the specific type of behavior (ADB or RB). It was found that insecure attachment might worsen the effects of stress during transitions with parents (i.e. incarceration or divorce) because insecurely attached children are more likely to respond to loss or stress with dysfunctional thoughts and emotions. The authors of the study (Murray & Murray, 2010) found in a Minnesota longitudinal study (a prospective study of approximately 200 children born in an urban environment in the mid-1970s) that psychopathology was predicted best by a combination of early attachment insecurity and later life stresses (this seemed to be particularly true for children with disorganized attachment). As such, children who already have insecure attachment may be especially vulnerable to developing psychopathology, which in this case was following parental incarceration.

Delinquent behavior is also known to be genetically linked, but only those related to ADB (Burt, 2009; Eley et al., 1999; Rutter, 1996). In monozygotic twins, antisocial behavior correlates around 0.80, whereas in unrelated siblings the correlation is about 0.35 (Rutter, 1996). Studies indicate that ADB is more heritable than is RB, whereas RB is influenced more by environmental forces. Eley et al., (1999) found that, after completing bivariate genetic analyses, both genetic and shared environment influences were significant in producing the correlation

between ADB and RB, but the proportion of the correlation due to these two latent factors differed for boys and girls, with the shared environment accounting for the majority in boys, as compared to genetic factors that accounted for the majority in girls.

Delinquent behavior is known to frequently develop after life-altering events, one of them being child abuse, as seen in the extensive review by Malinosky-Rummell & Hansen (1993). This review confirmed that being physically abused as a child predicts later violent and nonviolent offending. The same was found for emotional abuse which has also been linked to aggressive and delinquent behavior (Odhayani, Watson & Watson, 2013). Other life-altering events as early experiences of traumatic events (i.e., death of close family member, victim or witness to assault by stranger, serious accident) were positively related to engaging in violent crime (Grella, Stein & Greenwell, 2005).

The accumulation of risk factors has been made known to generally be more predictive. Keller et al., (2005) indicate that the findings demonstrate that different individual risk factors and combinations of risk factors are differentially associated with the problem outcome. They indicate it is informative to look at specific combinations rather than a cumulative index of risk factors. Even though they do not mention exactly what factors to look at, it would definitely vary depending on the individual.

### **Social Changes in Families**

Families have changed over the past few decades. Vespa et al., (2013) reported their findings based on the 2012 Census (USA) for American households. Today married couples make up most (63 percent) of the family groups with children under the age of 18. They also found that households and families have gotten smaller over time, while married households tended to be older and made up a smaller share of all

households. The increase in living alone and the decline in married households reflect a rising age at first marriage for men and women. They also report that Hispanic children (31 percent) were more likely to live with one parent than non-Hispanic White children (21 percent) or Asian children (13 percent). This last point affects the Puerto Rican population directly as it is a Hispanic population.

In the last 30 years the marriage rate in the Puerto Rican population has decreased from 15.1 to 5.9 for every 1,000, while the divorce rate has decreased to a lesser extent (from 79.9 in 2009 to 78.2 in 2010), meaning that for every 100 marriages 78 end in divorce (Tendenciaspr.com). The rise in single parenthood and the rise of divorce rates makes it very likely for the possibility of children to experience multiple transitions in the structure and functioning of families (Fonagy et al., 1997).

### **Secure Attachment as a Protective Factor**

Mackintosh, Myers, & Kennon (2006), found that children reported fewer behavior problems when they felt more warmth and acceptance from their caregivers. These authors also point out that the less warmth and acceptance felt by the children, the worse their behavior, or alternately, the less they feel their 'caregivers' warmth and acceptance. Even though there is a popular belief that a child needs both parents, research suggests otherwise. Longitudinal research suggests that resilience is promoted by a child having at least one supportive and security-enhancing attachment relationship; that is, a relationship with a person who believes in the child and offers support when needed (Toth, Harris, Goodman & Cicchetti, 2012).

A secure attachment may be seen as a protective factor against developing behavioral problems. Every year more studies prove that attachment can be considered a protective factor against

psychopathology (Fonagy et al., 2011; Ma, 2006; Sroufe, 2005) by instilling positive expectations concerning self and others, and by providing a platform for establishing successful close relationships and a viable social support network (Sroufe, 2005). Cassidy et al., (2014) reported in their meta-analysis that links between attachment quality and behavioral response to threat have been found in children who are securely attached to their mothers showing less fearfulness than insecurely attached children. The notion that the quality or organization of attachment behavior in early infancy or childhood might have implications for later socio-emotional development and mental health is arguably one of attachment theory's most well-known and contested predictions (Fearson et al., 2010). It should be pointed out that Belsky & Fearon (2002) found secure attachment as protective, but only in the context to adverse effects of cumulative contextual risk.

### Research Questions

At the moment, there were no published studies found investigating the interaction between attachment style and aggressive delinquent behavior (ADB) and non-aggressive delinquent behavior or rule breaking (RB). Based on this study, we expect to answer the following research question:

1. Are there differences on aggressive delinquent behavior (ADB) and non-aggressive delinquent behavior or rule breaking (RB) by the attachment style?
2. Are there differences on aggressive delinquent behavior (ADB) and non-aggressive delinquent behavior or rule breaking (RB) by the mother parenting classification?
3. Are there differences on aggressive delinquent behavior (ADB) and non-aggressive delinquent behavior or

rule breaking (RB) by the father parenting classification?

### Method

#### Design

A non-experimental design was used, and according to Hernández, Fernández–Collado & Batista (2006) this type of design is where the variables are not manipulated by the investigator. The variables that were measured; attachment, parenting style, depression or anxiety symptoms and delinquent behavior, are already present in the participants and were not manipulated by any means.

#### Participants

Data was collected from Puerto Rican adults, where 26 were males, who participated from a program focused on rehabilitating aggressors, called Programa de Rehabilitación y Orientación a Personal Agresoras (PROPA). The mean age in participants was 33.9 years old and over half the participants (54.8%) were single. The participants typically arrived to the program through referral by a court of law after they have been charged with a felony related to domestic violence or aggression; even though most of them were legally bound to assist, there were a few participants who went voluntarily. The sample was collected via availability. This program is part of the Centro de Investigación Prevención y Tratamiento de Violencia (CIPTVi) of the Ponce Health Sciences University. PROPA consists of 52 sessions, which divide themselves into 16 individual sessions (which include two (2) individual follow up sessions after the group process has finalized) and 36 group sessions.

#### Instruments

**Experiences of Close Relationship Spanish (ECR –S)** (Appendix A). The ECR was developed to measure adult attachment within romantic relationships in past and present. A 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (disagree strongly) to 7 (agree strongly) and

a middle position 4 (neutral/mixed) is used to score the items. Brennan, Clark & Shaver, (1998) created two 18-item attachment insecurity scales, one to measure attachment-related anxiety, and one to measure attachment-related avoidance. The two scales, like the factors from which they were derived, were orthogonal and exhibited high internal consistency reliability (Alonso-Arbiol, Balluerka & Shaver, 2007). This measure has been used in hundreds of studies since 1998, always with high reliability, where the alpha coefficients are always near or above .90 and test-retest coefficients range between .50 and .75, depending on the time span and the nature of the sample. Also, the correlation between the two scales is often close to zero, as intended (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

The ECR- S was translated to Spanish in Spain by Alonso-Arbiol et al. (2007), and to be able to administer it to a Puerto Rican sample, it was acculturated for this population. The ECR-S has the intended factor structure; its two scales exhibit high internal consistency and appropriate test-retest reliability over a 6-week period (Alonso-Arbiol, 2007). There is no universal agreement on how to adapt an instrument, there is however an agreement that it is inappropriate to simply translate and use a questionnaire in another linguistic context (Gjersing, Caplehorn & Clausen, 2010). These authors also point out that the cross-cultural adaptation process is important when you want to reduce the risk of introducing bias into a study. For this study the ECR-S, adapted to a Puerto Rican population, obtained high reliability and internal consistency (alpha coefficients .90).

#### **Self-Report Delinquent Interview Spanish version (SR-DI S) (Appendix B)**

The interview was developed as a self-report measure of antisocial behavior suitable for children and adolescents (9 – 18 yrs.). The instrument was used with adults,

for whom it was adapted, the reason being that no other instrument was found that directly measured delinquent behavior and separated the behaviors in ADB and RB. The instrument created by Wang, Niv, Tuvblad, Raine & Baker (2013) was adapted from several existing measures, including the Self-Report Delinquency in Adolescence from the Pittsburgh Youth Study (Loeber & Farrington, 1998), which was in turn developed from Elliott's self-report delinquency interview in the National Longitudinal Survey (Elliott & Huizinga, 1989).

The internal consistency was good, with Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.78$  for all items in Wave 1 ( $\alpha = 0.74$  for non-aggressive items and 0.72 for aggressive ones) The SR-DI aggressive and non-aggressive subscales at each of the three waves were each significantly correlated with parent-reported CBCL Delinquency (Rule-Breaking) and CBCL Aggression (Wang et al., 2013). No edition in Spanish was available. The investigator translated the whole questionnaire from English to Spanish, utilizing the back-translation technique.

#### **Parenting Bonding Instrument (PBI) Spanish Version.**

A version of the instrument in Spanish was administered, "Instrumento de Apego Parental", this instrument was translated and validated for Puerto Rican population (Ríos-Ruiz, 2008). Parker, Tupling & Brown (1979) created this measure of parental styles as perceived by the child, which are divided in two domains; parental affection and overprotection, where individuals are asked to recall how they were parented during their first 16 years of life (Murphy, Wickramaratne, & Weissman, 2010). The measure is 'retrospective', meaning that adults (over 16 years of age) complete the measure for how they remember their parents during their first 16 years. The measure is to be completed for



both mothers and fathers separately. There are 25 item questions, including 12 care items and 13 overprotection items. When translated, and adapted for Puerto Rican population, the instrument demonstrated high reliability on all scales, where the alpha coefficients for the father's care scale was .875 and .780 for the overprotection scale, while for the mother's care scale was .896 and .876 for overprotection (Ríos-Ruiz, 2008).

In addition to generating care and protection scores for each scale, parents can be effectively assigned to one of four quadrants. *Affectionate constraint* is when a participant receives high scores on care and protection, *affectionless control* is when there is a high score in protection and a low score in care. *Optimal parenting* is assigned when the participant scores high in care and low in protection, and *neglectful parenting* happens when the participant receives low scores in both care and protection. Assignment to "high" or "low" categories is based on the following cut-off scores: for mothers, a care score of 27.0 and a protection score of 13.5, and for fathers, a care score of 24.0 and a protection score of 12.5.

#### **Symptom Checklist 36 (SCL)**

The SCL (Lista de Síntomas- 36) is a self-report inventory of psychiatric symptomology that consists of 36 items; it was used to screen severe psychopathology. This instrument was developed by McNeil, Greenfield, Atkinsons & Binder (1989), based on the Symptom Checklist 90 that was created by Derogatis, Lipman & Covi in 1977 (Bernal & Bonilla 2003). The authors identified six factors; depression, somatization, phobic anxiety, functioning impediment, hostility/suspiciousness and thinking disturbance.

The Structure of the SCL is based on the factor analysis done by Hoffman and Overall in 1978 and the study done by

Lipman, Covi and Shapiro in 1979, where they created a shorter version of the Symptom Checklist 90 (Bernal & Bonilla, 2003; Bernal, Bonilla & Santiago, 1995). The investigation done by Bernal, Bonilla and Santiago (1995) reports the SCL has an internal consistency of .94 and a factorial structure consistent with past research studies, finding six factors.

#### **Procedure**

Participants were recruited via availability. After they were recruited, they gave authorization to participate by signing the consent form that was given to them; this was done to inform the participant of the purpose, risk and benefits of the present study. Confidentiality, abandonment or leaving the study were discussed as well. The investigator interviewed the participants, and in these interviews the instruments were administered (ECR-S, SR-DI, PBI-S and SCL-90). The administration of these were done in one or two sessions, and took anywhere from 90 – 120 minutes to complete. After the data was recollected it was coded to protect their identity, and this information was kept in a locked cabinet.

#### **Data Analysis**

Statistical analysis was completed using IBM SPSS Version 23. A socio-demographic profile for the participants was created using descriptive statistics, such as means and frequencies. To identify what factors, impact or interact with the quality of attachment of the participants, correlations and One Way ANOVA and Multiple Comparisons tests (MANOVA) were done. These tests were also utilized to identify what factors contribute to presence of RB or ADB such as parenting styles and psychiatric symptomology. Cronbach's Alpha was calculated to measure reliability on the instruments used. Lastly, results were reported and discussed in light of recent literature review.

#### **Results**

Research question 1 examined if there were differences between rule breaking and aggressive behaviors by the attachment classification using a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). As seen on table 1, there were not any statistical significant differences on the mean of rule breaking  $F(3, 27) = 2.49$ ,  $p = .082$ ,  $\eta^2 = .22$  and  $F(3, 27) = .470$ ,  $p = .706$ ,  $\eta^2 = .05$  for Aggressive Behaviors by the attachment type. However, the effect size value for Rule Breaking was close to a large one, suggesting that the style of attachment impacted this behavior.

Table 1: Comparison of the SRDI by type of attachment

| Scale                  | Attachment  | N  | Mean  | SD    | ANOVA<br>F (3, 30) | P<br>Value | Effect<br>Size<br>( $\eta^2$ ) |
|------------------------|-------------|----|-------|-------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Rule<br>Breaking       | Secure      | 8  | 5.88  | 7.568 | 2.485              | .082       | .22                            |
|                        | Dismissing  | 5  | 4.80  | 4.207 |                    |            |                                |
|                        | Fearful     | 13 | 12.38 | 6.850 |                    |            |                                |
|                        | Preoccupied | 5  | 6.40  | 7.127 |                    |            |                                |
| Aggressive<br>Behavior | Secure      | 8  | 3.75  | 5.418 | .470               | .706       | .05                            |
|                        | Dismissing  | 5  | 2.80  | 4.207 |                    |            |                                |
|                        | Fearful     | 13 | 4.31  | 5.391 |                    |            |                                |
|                        | Preoccupied | 5  | 1.40  | 1.949 |                    |            |                                |

As observed above the effect size value for RB was close to a large one, for that reason the effect size between the styles of attachment was calculated to get a more accurate sense of their impact on RB behaviors. The Cohen's effect size value suggested a high significance between Dismissing Attachment ( $M = 4.80$ ,  $SD = 4.20$ ) and Fearful Attachment ( $M = 12.38$ ,  $SD = 6.85$ ), ( $d = 1.33$ ). The same can be determined by Cohen's effect size between Fearful and Secure attachment ( $M = 5.88$ ,  $SD = 7.57$ ), where the effect size is large ( $d = 1.14$ ) and the effect size was also large ( $d = .855$ ) between Fearful and Preoccupied Attachment ( $M = 6.40$ ,  $SD = 7.13$ ).

After calculating Cohen's effect size between ADB and attachment classification, the results suggested a medium significance between Preoccupied Attachment ( $M = 1.40$ ,  $SD = 1.95$ ) and Fearful Attachment ( $M = 4.31$ ,  $SD = 5.39$ ), ( $d = .717$ ). Significant results were determined by Cohen's effect size between Preoccupied and Secure

attachment ( $M = 3.75$ ,  $SD = 5.42$ ), where the effect size was medium ( $d = .577$ ) and between Preoccupied and Dismissing Attachment ( $M = 1.40$ ,  $SD = 1.95$ ) the effect size was small but statistically significant ( $d = .427$ ).

Regarding research question 2, on Table 2 you will find descriptive information and a MANOVA summary table. The mother's parenting style was compared to the type of antisocial behaviors the participants reported (RB or ADB) to observe if there were any statistical significant differences between the means. There were no differences on the rule breaking mean,  $F(3,30) = .543$   $p = .657$ ,  $\eta^2 = .06$  nor on the aggressive behaviors  $F(3,30) = 2.40$ ,  $p = .090$ ,  $\eta^2 = .21$ ; however, the effect size on the latter obtained a medium effect size value, suggesting that mother's parenting style might have an impact on the amount of behaviors they reported.

Table 2: Comparison of the SRDI by Mother's Parenting Classification

| SRDI             | Mom's<br>Parenting<br>Class | Mean  | SD   | MANOVA<br>F (3, 30) | P<br>Value | Effect<br>Size<br>( $\eta^2$ ) |
|------------------|-----------------------------|-------|------|---------------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Aggressive       | Affectionate<br>Constraint  | .583  | .134 | 2.402               | .090       | .211                           |
|                  | Affectionless<br>Control    | .889  | .155 |                     |            |                                |
|                  | Optimal                     | .333  | .155 |                     |            |                                |
|                  | Neglectful                  | 1.000 | .464 |                     |            |                                |
| Rule<br>Breaking | Affectionate<br>Constraint  | .833  | .089 |                     |            |                                |
|                  | Affectionless<br>Control    | 1.000 | .103 |                     |            |                                |
|                  | Optimal                     | .889  | .103 |                     |            |                                |
|                  | Neglectful                  | 1.000 | .308 |                     |            |                                |

The effect size was measured between the different parenting styles for the mother and RB to acquire a more accurate sense if in any way this impacted what type of antisocial behavior was reported. Cohen's  $d$  effect size suggested a high statistical significance for Optimal ( $M = .899$ ,  $SD = .103$ ) and Affectionless Control Parenting ( $M = 1.00$ ,  $SD = .103$ ), ( $d = 1.86$ ). The same can be determined by Cohen's effect size between Affectionate Constraint ( $M = .833$ ,  $SD = .089$ ) and Neglectful Parenting ( $M = 1.00$ ,  $SD = .308$ ), where the effect size is large

( $d = -1.14$ ) and the effect size was also large ( $d = -.920$ ) between Neglectful and Optimal Parenting, as it was between Affectionless Control and Neglectful Parenting ( $d = -.900$ ). Medium effect size was found between Affectionate Constraint and Affectionless Control Parenting ( $d = -.618$ ) and between Optimal and Affectionate Constraint Parenting ( $d = .511$ ).

The effect size was calculated between the different parenting styles for the mother and ADB or aggressive delinquent behaviors. Utilizing Cohen's effect size, a high statistical significance was found for Neglectful ( $M = 1.00$ ,  $SD = .464$ ) and Optimal Parenting ( $M = .333$ ,  $SD = .155$ ), ( $d = -1.89$ ). The same can be determined by Cohen's effect size between Optimal and Affectionless Control Parenting ( $M = .889$ ,  $SD = .155$ ), where the effect size is large ( $d = 1.31$ ) and the effect size was also large ( $d = -1.15$ ) between Neglectful and Affectionate Constraint ( $M = .583$ ,  $SD = .134$ ).

Research question 3 examined if there were differences on rule breaking and aggressive behavior by the father parenting style. Descriptive information and a multiple analysis of variance can be seen on Table 3. The father's parenting style was compared to the type of antisocial behaviors the participants reported (RB or ADB) to observe if there were any statistical significant differences between the means. Rule breaking obtained a not significant result,  $F(3,21) = 1.42$ ,  $p = .264$ ,  $\eta^2 = .17$  and aggressive behavior also obtained a not significant result,  $F(3,21) = .330$ ,  $p = .804$ ,  $\eta^2 = .05$ . However, there was a medium effect size value found for RB and the father's parenting classification.

The effect size was calculated between the different parenting styles for the father and RB to gain a more exact sense if this variable impacted what type of antisocial behavior was reported. Cohen's effect size suggested a high statistical significance for

Affectionate Constraint ( $M = .629$ ,  $SD = 2.53$ ) and Optimal Parenting ( $M = 13.57$ ,  $SD = 2.53$ ), ( $d = 1.13$ ). The same can be determined by Cohen's effect size between Affectionate Constraint and Affectionless Control Parenting ( $M = 11.00$ ,  $SD = 2.74$ ), where the effect size is large ( $d = 1.12$ ) and the effect size medium ( $d = -.624$ ) between Affectionate Constraint and Neglectful Parenting ( $M = 10.80$ ,  $SD = 2.99$ ).

Table 3: Comparison of the SRDI by Father's Parenting Classification

| SRDI          | Dad's Parenting Class   | Mean   | SD    | ANOVA F (3, 30) | P Value | Effect Size ( $\eta^2$ ) |
|---------------|-------------------------|--------|-------|-----------------|---------|--------------------------|
| Rule Breaking | Affectionate Constraint | 6.286  | 2.534 | 1.422           | .264    | .169                     |
|               | Affectionless Control   | 11.000 | 2.737 |                 |         |                          |
|               | Optimal                 | 13.571 | 2.534 |                 |         |                          |
|               | Neglectful              | 10.800 | 2.998 |                 |         |                          |
| Aggressive    | Affectionate Constraint | 2.714  | 1.992 | .330            | .804    | .045                     |
|               | Affectionless Control   | 3.833  | 2.151 |                 |         |                          |
|               | Optimal                 | 5.429  | 1.992 |                 |         |                          |
|               | Neglectful              | 4.600  | 2.357 |                 |         |                          |

The effect size was calculated between the different parenting styles for the father and ADB. After calculating Cohen's effect size, a medium size was found between Affectionate Constraint ( $M = 2.72$ ,  $SD = 1.99$ ) and Optimal Parenting ( $M = 5.43$ ,  $SD = 1.99$ ), ( $d = .541$ ).

The mother's different parenting styles were compared to the psychological symptomology measured by SCL-36 that the participants reported, this was done to observe if there were any statistical significant differences between the means. There were no statistically significant results found. However, when taking into consideration the effect size value, three of variables had statistically significant numbers; Depression, Somatization and Hostility, meaning the mother's parenting style impact the symptoms participants endorse.

The father's different parenting styles were compared to the psychological symptomology measured by SCL-36 that the participants reported, this was done to observe if there were any statistical significant differences between the means.

There were no statistically significant results found. However, once the Effect Size value was calculated, all six scales had statistically significant results, these were: Hostility, Depression, Somatization Disturbance in Functioning, Anxiety and Disturbance in Thinking.

### Discussion

The objective of this study was to examine the variables that could mediate in the development of RB and ADB and the attachment quality in a high risk population. As stated previously, dividing delinquent behavior as aggressive and non-aggressive (rule breaking) is moderately new and has yet to be studied utilizing attachment quality as a mediator between the two. This study measured the reliability of the instruments used, since two of them had not been used with a Puerto Rican population.

One of the main focuses of the study was to explore the reliability of the instruments that were translated (SRDI – Spanish) or adapted to a Puerto Rican population (ECRS – SR). These instruments were found to have a Cronbach's Alpha between good and acceptable, which indicated they have internal consistency and the results obtained are reliable.

The research questions focused on what factors influence the relationship between attachment and delinquent behavior. Parenting was one of the main factors that was assessed in this study, since it is substantial to the development of the attachment quality, and poor parenting skills are usually correlated with deviant and serious delinquent behaviors (Mak, 1990). This current study found that, even though there was no significant correlation between the mother's parenting style and ADB or RB, there was a significant correlation between the father's parenting style and RB. A study done by Hoeve et al. (2012) researched the possibility of parental attachment and delinquency being associated to each other,

with a meta-analysis of 74 published and unpublished manuscripts (N = 55,537). The authors found that poor attachment to parents was significantly linked to delinquency in boys and girls, which supports these findings. They also reported a stronger effect size was found for attachment to mothers than attachment to fathers, similar to the findings of this investigation, where participants tended to classify their mothers more often as an optimal parent than the father, and reported their fathers more neglectful than their mothers.

This study's results indicate a large effect size between those who were classified as having an insecure attachment (Fearful, Preoccupied or Dismissing) and RB, and a medium effect size value between insecure attachment classification and ADB. Kochanska & Kim (2012) conducted two longitudinal studies which reinforced these findings. Their studies supported the model of infant attachment as a potent catalyst that mediates future developmental socialization trajectories. Another study done by Otani et al. (2016), where they used the Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI), reported that those who classified their parents as Affectionless Control impaired their formation of a positive working model of the self and others. This goes along with what was found in this study, where a correlation was found between Overprotection from the father and the Avoidance attachment (model of others).

In this investigation, the participants who reported their parents as Affectionless Control and Neglectful on the PBI, tended to endorse more rule breaking and aggressive delinquent behaviors, especially when the parent was the father. While Kochanska & Kim (2012) found that insecure dyads resulted in parents' increased power-assertive discipline. This power assertion in turn predicted children's rule breaking conduct, as well as aggressive behavior. The

authors stated that this causal chain was absent in secure dyads, as did Steel & Steel (2005). When some of their young participants were experiencing strain in the domains of peer relations, conduct problems and hyperactivity, they reported significantly higher scores on these indices of behavioral issues. These participants had fathers who provided Adult Attachment Interviews (AAI) many years before and were judged insecure (either dismissing or preoccupied). The findings for this current study suggest that the parental bond, especially with their father, is an important factor to the presence or absence of antisocial behaviors, specifically RB.

These findings indicate that the style of attachment and the type of parental bond a person develops are essential in the outcome of our emotional well-being. It has been well established that our emotional state impacts our behaviors. An example of this is provided by Allwood, Baetz, DeMarco & Bell (2012), who reported that depressive cognitions, especially lack of future orientation, were associated with delinquent behaviors and partially mediated the relationship between adverse events and delinquent behaviors. The current study found a strong correlation with disturbance in the thinking process (SCL-36) and RB and a weaker correlation with ADB. A correlation was also found between RB and somatization (SCL-36), supporting these findings done by other studies.

### **Conclusion and Clinical Implications**

This study found that many factors came into play when trying to predict antisocial behaviors in a high-risk population. Results showed that RB and ADB are more common in participants who were classified as having an insecure attachment, specifically the fearful style of attachment. This study also found that parental bond influences greatly antisocial behaviors, as the results established, especially when it was the father who they developed an unhealthy bond to. The parental bond also impacted what

psychological symptoms the participants endorsed. Those who classified their parents as affectionless control and neglectful category, reported more psychological symptoms, the father playing a main role, which impacted all the scales of the SCL – 36. It was found that those who endorsed more symptoms of Disturbance in Thinking reported significantly more RB and ADB, as did those who endorsed more symptoms of Somatization with RB.

As a recommendation for treatment for a high-risk population, since attachment is developed with the caregiver in the first year of life, courses on attachment behavior should be offered as a primary intervention by providing educational classes for new parents. In these courses, the importance of a healthy attachment relationship should be discussed and how to create this type of bond with the child. Steel & Steel (2005) strongly suggest, after doing a 12-year longitudinal study, that parents capable of mentally and emotionally exploring, with balance and coherence, the meaning of their attachment histories are best able to meet their children's emotional needs.

The current interventions available are secondary, these occur after the child has exhibited problems with emotional regulation or issues with conduct, and even though they are beneficial, attachment education at a primary level would impact a larger portion of the population, not only those with severe cases that require professional services and can help avoid children developing delinquent behaviors.

The fact that these results indicate that those who have fearful style of attachment endorse more RB behaviors, and link the father's parenting with RB behaviors, show a trend, suggesting that delinquent behaviors, specifically RB, could be provoked by fear. This subject should be studied further, for this could help therapists link past or present delinquent behaviors in

adults with their past attachment experiences. By exploring their parental bond with the father and their current attachment, this may assist in providing answers on the cause of their behaviors.

### Limitations

This study presents some limitations. First, the small sample size; having a larger number of participants would have made the results stronger, which would allow more statistical tests to be completed and the results could be more generalizable. In addition, no testing could be done to observe what factors mediate between attachment and antisocial behaviors, which was part of the main purpose of this study. Additional factors could have been added to the analysis of factors, such as psychological diagnoses. This information could have assisted in distinguishing those who have personality disorders and who's delinquent behavior is a byproduct of their diagnosis. Another limitation was the instrument used to measure ADB and RB, since the instrument was developed for adolescents and not adults there were key factors missing, as age of onset of delinquent behaviors and more precise measurement of the amount of times a participant reports doing a behavior.

### References

Ainsworth, M., Blehar, M., Waters, E. & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. New York: Halsted Press Division of Wiley.

Allwood, M., Baetz, C., DeMarco, S. & Bell, D. (2012). Depressive Symptoms, Including Lack of Future Orientation, as Mediators in the Relationship between Adverse Life Events and Delinquent Behaviors. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Trauma*, 5 (2), 114-128.  
doi.org/10.1080/19361521.2012.671795

Alonso-Arbiol, I., Balluerka, N., & Shaver, P. (2007). A Spanish version of the Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) adult attachment questionnaire. *Personal Relationships*, 14, 45–63.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 226-244. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226

Belsky, J., & Fearon, R. (2002). Infant–mother attachment security, contextual risk, and early development: A moderational analysis. *Development and Psychopathology*, 14, 293–310.

Bernal, G., & Bonilla, J. (2003). *La Depresión: estudios psicológicos en Puerto Rico y Cuba*. Puerto Rico: Publicaciones Puertorriqueñas.

Bernal, G., Bonilla, J., & Santiago, J. (1995). Confiabilidad interna y validez de construcción lógica de dos instrumentos para medir sintomatología psicológica en una muestra clínica: El Inventario de Depresión de Beck y La Lista de Cotejo de Síntomas – 36. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, Vol 27 (2), pp. 207-229.

Borellia, J., Goshinb, L., Joestlc, S., Clark, J., & Byrne. M. (2010). Attachment organization in a sample of incarcerated mothers: Distribution of classifications and associations with substance abuse history, depressive symptoms, perceptions of parenting competency and social support. *Attachment & Human Development*, 12 (4), 355–374. doi:10.1080/14616730903416971

Bowlby, J. (1982) *Attachment and loss, Volume I attachment* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) New York, NY: Basic Books.

Brennan, K., Clark, C. & Shaver, P. (1998). Self report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview.

- In Simpson, J., & Rholes W. (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford Press.
- Burt, A. (2012). How do we optimally conceptualize the heterogeneity within antisocial behavior? An argument for aggressive versus non-aggressive behavioral dimensions. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 32, 263–279. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2012.02.006
- Burt, A. (2009). Are there meaningful etiological differences within antisocial behavior? Results of a meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 29 (2), 163–178. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2008.12.004
- Burt, A., & Klump, K. (2009). The etiological moderation of aggressive and nonaggressive antisocial behavior by age. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, 12 (4), 343–350. doi: 10.1375/twin.12.4.343
- Cassidy, J. (2008). The nature of the child's ties. In Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. (Eds). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed), (pp. 3-22). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Cassidy, J., Ehrlich, K., & Sherman, L. (2014). Child-parent attachment and response to threat: A move from the level of representation. In Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. (Eds). *Mechanisms of social connection: From brain to group*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/14250008>
- Cha, E., Kim, K., & Erlen, J. (2007). Translation of scales in cross-cultural research: issues and techniques. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 58 (4), 386–395 doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04242.x
- Day, D., Wanklyn, S., & Yessine, A. (2013). A review of terminological, conceptual, and methodological issues in the developmental risk factor literature for antisocial and delinquent behavior. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 43, 97–112 doi: 10.1007/s10566-013-9227-9
- De Wolff, M., & van IJzendoorn, M. (1997). Sensitivity and attachment: a meta-analysis on parental antecedents of infant attachment. *Child Development*, 68 (4), 571-91.
- DeKlyen, M., & Greenberg, M. (2008). Attachment and psychopathology in childhood. In Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. (Eds). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) (pp. 637-665). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Dozier, M., Stovall-McClough & Albus, K. (2008). Attachment and psychopathology in adulthood. In Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. (Eds). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) (pp. 718-744). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Eley, T., Lichtenstein, P., & Stevenson, J. (1999). Sex differences in the etiology of aggressive and nonaggressive antisocial behavior: results from two twin studies. *Child Development* 70 (1), 155-68.
- Eng, W., Heimberg, R., Hart, T., Schneier, F., & Liebowitz, M. (2001). Attachment in individuals with social anxiety disorder: The relationship among adult attachment styles, social anxiety, and depression. *Emotion*, 1(4), 365-380. doi: 10.1037/1528-3542.1.4.365
- Fearson, P., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M., van IJzendoorn, M., Lapsley A., & Roisman, G. (2010) The Significance of Insecure Attachment and Disorganization in the Development of Children's Externalizing Behavior: A Meta-Analytic Study. *Child Development*, 81

- (2), 435–456. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01405.x.
- Fonagy, P., Luyten, P., & Strathearn, L. (2011). Borderline personality disorder, mentalization and the neurobiology of attachment. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 32(1), 47–69. doi: 10.1002/imhj.20283
- Fonagy, P., Target, M., Steele, M., Steele, H., Leigh, T., Levinson, A., & Kennedy, R. (1997). Morality, disruptive behavior, borderline personality disorder, crime, and their relationship to security of attachment. In Atkinson, L., & Zucker, K. (Eds). *Attachment and Psychopathology*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Gjersing, L., Caplehorn, J., & Clausen, T. Cross-cultural adaptation of research instruments: Language, setting, time and statistical considerations. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 10 (13). Retrieved from: <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2288/10/13>
- Gold, J. (2011). Attachment theory and psychotherapy integration: An introduction and review of the literature. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 21(3), 221–231 1053-0479. doi: 10.1037/a0025490
- Granic, I., & Patterson, G. (2006). Toward a comprehensive model of antisocial development: A dynamic systems approach. *Psychological Review*, 113 (1), 101–131. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.113.1.10.
- Greenberg, M. (1999). Attachment and Psychopathology in Childhood. In Cassidy, J. & Shaver, P. (Eds). *Handbook of attachment: Theory research and clinical applications* (pp.115 –139). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Grella, C., Stein, J., & Greenwell, L. (2005). Associations among childhood trauma, adolescent problem behaviors, and adverse adult outcomes in substance-abusing women offenders. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 19 (1), 43-53. doi: 10.1037/0893-164X.19.1.43
- Hansen, A., Waage, L., Eid, J., Johnson, B., & Hart, S. (2011). The relationship between attachment, personality and antisocial tendencies in a prison sample: A pilot study. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 52, 268–276. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2010.00864.x
- Hernández, R., Fernández-Collado, C., & Baptista, P. (2006). *Metodología de la investigación* (4ta ed.) México: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoeve M., Stams G., van der Put C., Dubas J., van der Laan P. & Gerris J. (2012). A meta-analysis of attachment to parents and delinquency. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 40(5):771-85. doi: 10.1007/s10802-011-9608-1
- Keller, T., Spieker, S., & Gilchrist, L. (2005). Patterns of risk and trajectories of preschool problem behaviors: A person-oriented analysis of attachment in context. *Development and Psychopathology*, 17, 349–384. doi: 10.1017/S0954579405050170
- Kochanska, G. & Kim, S. (2012). Toward a new understanding of legacy of early attachments for future antisocial trajectories: Evidence from two longitudinal studies. *Developmental Psychopathology*, 24 (3): 783–806. doi:10.1017/S0954579412000375
- Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. P. (2000). Young children who commit crime: Epidemiology, developmental origins, risk factors, early interventions, and policy implications. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 737–762.



- Ma, K. (2006). Attachment theory in adult psychiatry Part 1: Conceptualisations, measurement and clinical research findings. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*, 12, 440–449. doi: 10.1192/apt.12.6.440
- Mackintosh, V., Myers, B., & Kennon, B. (2006). Children of incarcerated mothers and their caregivers: factors affecting the quality of their relationship. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 15 (5), 581–596. doi: 10.1007/s10826-006-9030-4
- Mak, A. (1990). Testing a psychosocial control theory of delinquency. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 17(2):215-230. doi: 10.1177/0093854890017002005
- Malinosky-Rummell, R., & Hansen, D. (1993). Long-term consequences of childhood physical abuse. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114 (1), 68-79. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.114.1.68
- Masten, A., & Cicchetti, D. (2010). Developmental cascades. *Development and Psychopathology*, 22, 491-495. doi:10.1017/S0954579410000222
- Mikulincer, M. & Shaver, P. R. (2008). Adult attachment and affect regulation. In Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. (Eds). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) (pp. 503 - 531). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, 100 (4), 674–701. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.100.4.674
- Murphy, E., Wickramaratne, P., & Weissman, M. (2010). The stability of Parental Bonding reports: A 20-year follow-up. *Journal Affective Disorders*, 125 (1-3), 307–315. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2010.01.003.
- Murray, J., & Farrington, D. (2010). Risk factors for conduct disorder and delinquency: Key findings from longitudinal studies. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 55 (10), 633- 42.
- Murray, J. & Murray L. (2010). Parental incarceration, attachment and child psychopathology. *Attachment & Human Development*, 12 (4), 289–309. doi:10.1080/14751790903416889
- Odhayani, A. Watson, W., & Watson, L. (2013). Behavioural consequences of child abuse. *Canadian Family Physician*, 59 (8), 831-6.
- Otani, K., Suzuki, A., Matsumoto, Y., Enokido, M. & Shirata, T. (2016). Effects of perceived affectionless control parenting on working models of the self and other. *Psychiatry Research*, 30, (242) 315-8. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2016.05.018
- Ríos-Ruiz, E. (2008). *La interacción entre el apego parental y los eventos de vida estresantes en la etiología de la depresión* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ponce Health Sciences University, Puerto Rico.
- Rutter, M. (1996). Clinical implications of attachment concepts: Retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 36(4), 549-71.
- Sarason, I., Johnson, J., & Siegel, J. (1978). Assessing the impact of life changes: Development of the Life Experiences Survey. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46 (5), 932-946. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.46.5.932
- Shulman, E., Steinberg, L., & Piquero, A. (2013). *Journal Youth Adolescence*, 42, 848–860. doi: 10.1007/s10964-013-9950-4
- Simpson, J. (1999). Attachment Theory in Modern Evolutionary Perspective. Cassidy, J. & Shaver, P.

- (Eds). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications*, (pp. 115 – 139). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Sroufe, A. (2005). Attachment and development: A prospective, longitudinal study from birth to adulthood. *Attachment & Human Development*, 7 (4), 349 – 367. doi: 10.1080/14616730500365928
- Sroufe, A. (1984). Pieces on emotional development: 'Some assembly required'. *PsycCRITIQUES*, 29 (7), 575-576. doi.org/10.1037/023038
- Sroufe, A. (1997). Psychopathology as an outcome of development. *Development and Psychopathology*, 9, 251–268.
- Sroufe, L., Carlson, E., Levy, A., & Egeland, B. (1999). Implications of attachment theory for developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 11, 1–13.
- Steele, H. & Steele, M. (2005). Understanding and resolving emotional conflict: The London parent-child project. In K. E. Grossmann, K. Grossmann & E. Waters (Eds.). *Attachment from infancy to adulthood* (pp. 137-164). New York, NY, U.S.A.: The Guilford Press.
- Toth, S., Harris, L., Goodman, G., & Cicchetti, D. (2012). Influence of violence and aggression on children's psychological development: Trauma, attachment, and memory. In Shaver, P., & Mikulincer, M. (Eds.). *Human aggression and violence: Causes, manifestations, and consequences*. (pp. 351-365). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. DOI: 10.1037/12346-019
- Vespa, J., Lewis, J., & Kreider, R. (2013). America's Families and Living Arrangements: 2012. U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/p20-570.pdf>
- Wang, P., Niv, S., Tuvblad, C., Raine, A., & Baker, L. (2013). The genetic and environmental overlap between aggressive and non-aggressive antisocial behavior in children and adolescents using the self-report delinquency interview (SR-DI). *Journal Criminal Justice*, 41(5), 277-284. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2013.06.011.

## Referencias

- Ahumada, S., Lüttges, C., Molina, T., & Torres, S. (2014). Satisfacción sexual: revisión de los factores individuales y de pareja relacionados. *Revista Hospital Clínico Universidad de Chile*, 25, 278-284. Disponible en <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=80113673003>
- Arrington, R., Cofrancesco, J., & Wu, A.W. (2004). Questionnaires to measure sexual quality of life. *Quality of Life Research*, 13, 1643-1658. doi:10.1007/s11136-004-7625-z
- Auslander, B.A., Rosenthal, S.L., Fortenberry, J.D., Biro, F.M., Bernstein, D.I., & Zimet, G.D. (2007). Predictors of sexual satisfaction in an adolescent college population. *Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology*, 20, 25-28. doi:10.1016/j.jpag.2006.10.006
- Barrientos, J., & Páez, D. (2006). Psychosocial variables of sexual satisfaction in Chile. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 32(5), 351-368. doi:10.1080/00926230600834695

- Basson, R. (2001). Female sexual response: the role of drugs in the management of sexual dysfunction. *American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 98, 350-352. doi:10.1016/S0029-7844(01)01452-1
- Byers, E. S., Demmons, S. & Lawrance, K. (1998). Sexual satisfaction within dating relationships: A test of the interpersonal exchange model of sexual satisfaction. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 15, 257-267. doi:10.1177/0265407598152008
- Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural Equation Modeling with AMOS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Carpenter, L.M., Nathanson, C.A., & Kim, Y.J. (2009). Physical women, emotional men: Gender and sexual satisfaction in midlife. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38(1), 87-107. doi:10.1007/s10508-007-9215-y
- Carrobbles, J.A. & Sanz, A. (1991). *Terapia Sexual*. Madrid: Fundación Universidad-Empresa.
- Christopher, F., & Sprecher, S. (2000). Sexuality in marriage, dating, and other relationships: A decade review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 999-1017. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00999.x
- Darling, C.A., Davidson, J.K., & Jennings, D.A. (1991). The female sexual response revisited: Understanding the multiorgasmic experience in women. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 20(6), 527-540. doi:10.1007/BF01550952.
- DeRogatis, L.R. (2008). Assessment of sexual function/dysfunction via patient reported outcomes. *International Journal of Impotence Research*, 20, 35-44. doi:10.1038/sj.ijir.3901591
- Kline, P. (2000). *The Handbook of psychometric testing*. New York: Routledge.
- Kline, T. J. (2005). *Psychological Testing: A Practical Approach to Design and Evaluation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Littlewood Zimmerman, H.F. & Bernal García, E.R. (2011). *Mi Primer Modelamiento de Ecuación Estructural: LISREL*. Medellín, Colombia: Centro de Investigación en Comportamiento Organizacional (CINCEL).
- Morgan, G.A., & Griego, O.V. (1998) *Easy use and interpretation of SPSS for Windows*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Offman, A., & Matheson, K. (2005). Sexual compatibility and sexual functioning in intimate relationships. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 14, 31-39. Disponible en <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com/>
- Ojanlatva, A., Helenius, H., Rautava, P., Ahvenainen, J., & Koskenvuo, M. (2003). Importance of and satisfaction with sex life in a larger Finnish population. *Sex Roles*, 48, 543-553. doi:10.1023/A:1023579313434
- Parish, W.L., Luo, Y., Stolzenberg, R., Laumann, E.O., Farrer, G., & Pan, S. (2007). Sexual practices and sexual satisfaction: a population based study of Chinese urban adults. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 36, 5-20. doi:10.1007/s10508-006-9082-y
- Pinney, E. M., Gerrard, M., & Denney, N. W. (1987). The Pinney Sexual Satisfaction Inventory. *Journal of Sex Research*, 23, 233-242. doi:10.1080/00224498709551359
- Renaud, C., Byers, E.S., & Pan, S. (1997). Sexual and relationship satisfaction in mainland China. *Journal of Sex Research*, 34, 399-410. doi:10.1080/00224499709551907
- Sánchez, M., Santos, P., & Sierra, J. C. (2014). A systematic review of sexual satisfaction. *International Journal of*

- Clinical and Health Psychology*, 14, 67-75. doi:10.1016/S1697-2600(14)70038-9
- Santos, I. P., Sierra, J.C., García, M., Martínez, A., Sánchez, A., & Tapia, M., I. (2009). Índice de Satisfacción Sexual (ISS): un estudio sobre su fiabilidad y validez. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 9, 259-273. Recuperado de <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=56012878008>
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2010). *A Beginner's Guide to Structural Equation Modeling* (3rd Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Valdés, M., Sapién, J. & Córdoba, D. (2004). Significados de satisfacción sexual en hombres y mujeres de la zona metropolitana. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 6(1), 34-48. Recuperado de <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/314/31406104.pdf>
- Vizcarrondo-Godreau, M.C. (2001). *Construcción y normalización de un inventario de satisfacción sexual dirigido a mujeres*. (Disertación doctoral inédita). Universidad Carlos Albizu, San Juan, Puerto Rico.
- World Health Organization (2010). *Measuring sexual Health: Conceptual and Practical considerations and related indicators*. Disponible en: [http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/70434/1/who\\_rhr\\_10.12\\_eng.pdf](http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/70434/1/who_rhr_10.12_eng.pdf)
- Yela, C. (2000). Predictors and factors related to loving and sexual satisfaction for men and women. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 50(1), 235-242.
- Young, M., Denny, G., Young, T., & Luquis, R. (2000). Sexual satisfaction among married women. *American Journal of Health Studies*, 16, 73-84.
- Young, M., Luquis, R. (1998). Correlates of sexual satisfaction in marriage. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 7, 115-127.

## APPENDIX A

**Escala de Experiencias en Relaciones Cercanas- Versión Español**

**Instrucciones:** Las siguientes oraciones se enfocan en como tú te sientes en una relación de tipo romántica. Estamos interesados en como tú generalmente experiencias relaciones románticas, no solo en lo que está ocurriendo en su relación actual. Contesta cada oración indicando cuán de acuerdo o desacuerdo estás.

**Marca tus contestaciones usando esta escala:**

| 1                         | 2             | 3                    | 4       | 5                    | 6          | 7                      |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|
| Fuertemente en desacuerdo | En desacuerdo | Levemente Desacuerdo | Neutral | Levemente de Acuerdo | De acuerdo | Fuertemente de acuerdo |

1. Prefiero no mostrar a mi pareja cómo me siento por dentro.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

2. Me preocupa que me abandonen.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

3. Me siento muy cómodo/a teniendo un alto grado de intimidad con mi pareja.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

4. Me preocupo mucho por mis relaciones.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

5. Cuando mi pareja comienza a establecer mayor intimidad conmigo, me doy cuenta que me suelo cerrar.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

6. Me preocupa que mi pareja no se interese por mi tanto como me intereso yo por ella.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| 1                         | 2             | 3                    | 4       | 5                    | 6          | 7                      |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|
| Fuertemente en desacuerdo | En desacuerdo | Levemente Desacuerdo | Neutral | Levemente de Acuerdo | De acuerdo | Fuertemente de acuerdo |

7. Me siento incomodo/a cuando mi pareja quiere demasiada intimidad afectiva.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

8. Me preocupa bastante el hecho de perder a mi pareja.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

9. No me siento cómodo/a abriéndome a mi pareja.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

10. A menudo deseo que los sentimientos de mi pareja hacia mi fueran tan fuertes como mis sentimientos hacia él/ella.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

11. Quiero acercarme afectivamente a mi pareja, pero a la vez marco las distancias con él/ella.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

12. A menudo quiero unir completamente con mi pareja, pero me doy cuenta que esto a veces le asusta.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

13. Me pongo nervioso/a cuando mi pareja consigue demasiada intimidad afectiva conmigo.

|                           |               |                      |         |                      |            |                        |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|
| 1                         | 2             | 3                    | 4       | 5                    | 6          | 7                      |
| Fuertemente en desacuerdo | En desacuerdo | Levemente Desacuerdo | Neutral | Levemente de Acuerdo | De acuerdo | Fuertemente de acuerdo |
| 1                         | 2             | 3                    | 4       | 5                    | 6          | 7                      |

14. Me preocupa estar sólo/a.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

15. Me siento a gusto compartiendo mis sentimientos y pensamientos privados con mi pareja.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

16. A veces mi deseo de excesiva cercanía asusta a la gente.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

17. Intento evitar establecer un grado de intimidad muy elevado con mi pareja.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

18. Necesito que mi pareja me confirme constantemente que me ama.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

19. Encuentro relativamente fácil establecer intimidad afectiva con mi pareja.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

20. A veces siento que presiono a mi pareja para que muestre más sentimientos, más compromiso.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

# AGGRESSIVE AND NON-AGGRESSIVE DELINQUENT BEHAVIORS

|                           |               |                      |         |                      |            |                        |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|
| 1                         | 2             | 3                    | 4       | 5                    | 6          | 7                      |
| Fuertemente en desacuerdo | En desacuerdo | Levemente Desacuerdo | Neutral | Levemente de Acuerdo | De acuerdo | Fuertemente de acuerdo |

21. Encuentro difícil permitirme depender de mi pareja.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

22. No me preocupa a menudo la idea de ser abandonado/a.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

23. Prefiero no tener demasiada intimidad afectiva con mi pareja.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

24. Si no puedo hacer que mi pareja muestre interés por mí, me disgusto o me enfado.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

25. Se lo cuento todo a mi pareja.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

26. Creo que mi pareja no quiere estar tan cercana a mí como a mí me gustaría.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

27. Normalmente hablo mis problemas y preocupaciones con mi pareja.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

|                           |               |                      |         |                      |            |                        |
|---------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------|----------------------|------------|------------------------|
| 1                         | 2             | 3                    | 4       | 5                    | 6          | 7                      |
| Fuertemente en desacuerdo | En desacuerdo | Levemente Desacuerdo | Neutral | Levemente de Acuerdo | De acuerdo | Fuertemente de acuerdo |

28. Cuando no tengo una relación, me siento un poco ansioso/a e inseguro/a

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

29. Me siento bien dependiendo de mi pareja.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

30. Me siento frustrado/a cuando mi pareja no esta tan accesible como a mí me gustaría.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

31. No me importa pedirle a mi pareja consuelo, consejo, o ayuda.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

32. Me siento frustrado/a si mi pareja no está disponible cuando la necesito.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

33. Ayuda mucho recurrir a la pareja en épocas de crisis.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

34. Cuando mi pareja me critica, me siento muy mal.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

|                              |                  |                         |         |                         |               |                           |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|---------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| 1                            | 2                | 3                       | 4       | 5                       | 6             | 7                         |
| Fuertemente<br>en desacuerdo | En<br>desacuerdo | Levemente<br>Desacuerdo | Neutral | Levemente<br>de Acuerdo | De<br>acuerdo | Fuertemente<br>de acuerdo |

35. Recorro a mi pareja para muchas cosas, entre otras, consuelo y tranquilidad.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

36. Me tomo a mal que mi pareja pase tiempo lejos de mí.

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|



APPENDIX B

**Entrevista de Auto Informe sobre Conducta Delictiva Agresiva y No Agresiva**

La medida consiste de 33 reactivos que se le pregunta primero si lo han realizado o no. Si la persona indica que, si ha realizado alguno de las conductas enumeradas, se le pregunte cuan frecuente ha sido esta conducta.

**No agresivo**

No ir a clases/Cortar clases/Trabajo  
No ir a la escuela/trabajo por un día entero  
Escaparse de la casa  
Mentirles a sus padres/pareja sobre donde estaba  
Mentir sobre su edad para poder entrar a un sitio o comprar algo  
Hacer llamadas de relajo u obscenas  
Pornografía  
Hacer trampa en un examen/trabajo de la escuela  
Pedir dinero u otras cosas a extraños  
Pedir pon a extraños  
Conducta alterada  
Suspendido de la escuela/trabajo  
Expulsado de la escuela/trabajo  
Graffiti  
Incendio  
Daño a la propiedad  
Evitar pagar por cosas  
Utilizar una tarjeta de crédito sin permiso  
Falsificar un documento  
Bajar cosas de forma ilegal  
Compró, vendió o se quedó con objetos que eran robados.  
Robo en una tienda  
Robo de dinero u otras cosas  
Escalamiento de vehículo o edificio  
Robo de vehículo

**Agresivo**

Amenazado con golpear un adulto  
Golpear un adulto  
Amenazado con golpear a una persona de su edad  
Golpear a una persona de su edad  
Golpear con intención de hacer daño  
Tiró piedras a alguien  
Le hizo daño a animales  
Cargado un arma