The Role of Sociodemographic Variables, Dating Violence, Psychopathy and Antisocial and Law-Violating Behaviors in Predicting Filial Violence Among Adolescents

Alba Espuig , Laura Lacomba-Trejo * , Francisco González-Sala

Posted Date: 16 January 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

Keywords: Adolescents; Dating violence; Psychopathy; Antisocial and law-violating behaviors; Filial violence

Article

The Role of Sociodemographic Variables, Dating Violence, Psychopathy and Antisocial and Law-Violating Behaviors in Predicting Filial Violence Among Adolescents

Alba Espuig [1], Laura Lacomba-Trejo [2,*] and Francisco González-Sala [3]

[1] Universitat de València, Facultat de Psicologia i Logopèdia, València, Spain; alesa3@alumni.uv.es

[2] Department of Developmental and Educational Psychology, Universitat de València, Facultat de Psicologia i Logopèdia, València, Spain; laura.lacomba@uv.es

[3] Department of Developmental and Educational Psychology, Universitat de València, Facultat de Psicologia i Logopèdia, València, Spain; Francisco.gonzalez-sala@uv.es

* Correspondence: laura.lacomba@uv.es

Abstract: Introduction: Sex, age, dating violence, psychopathy traits, and antisocial and law-violating behaviors play a crucial role in predicting adolescent-perpetrated filial violence, highlighting key factors associated with aggression towards parents. The aim of this study is to analyze the role of sex, age, dating violence, psychopathy traits, and antisocial and law-violating behaviors in predicting filial violence among adolescents, aiming to identify key factors that contribute to aggression towards parents. Methods: This research engaged 136 Spanish adolescents aged 15-18 (mean age = 16.47; 51% female). Assessments included Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI) for dating violence, the Psychopathy Content Scale (P-16) for psychopathy, the Antisocial and Criminal Behavior Scale in Adolescents (ECADA) for antisocial and law-violating behaviors, and the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2) for filial violence. The study utilized linear regression and Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) to explore predictive factors. Results: Females experienced more verbal violence, exhibited less delinquency, and showed more filial violence towards mothers. Correlational analyses revealed positive associations between age, psychopathy, antisocial and law-violating behaviors, and verbal violence received. Filial violence towards mothers was linked to psychopathy, antisocial and law-violating behaviors, and verbal violence, while violence towards fathers correlated with psychopathy, delinquency, and maternal violence. Linear regression indicated that violence towards mothers was associated with older age, being female, verbal violence exposure, and psychopathy (47% variance explained), while violence towards fathers was linked to younger age and psychopathy (28% variance explained). QCA models highlighted how combinations of experienced violence and psychopathic traits predict filial violence towards both parents. Conclusions: The study underscores the need to consider multiple psychological and sociodemographic factors in predicting adolescent filial violence. Addressing these risk factors and enhancing protective factors are crucial for preventing violence and fostering adolescent well-being.

Keywords: Adolescents; Dating violence; Psychopathy; Antisocial and law-violating behaviors; Filial violence.

1. Introduction

According to the World Health Organization [1], adolescence, spanning ages 10 to 19, marks the transition from childhood to adulthood. This is a critical period for emotional and physical development, making early coping strategies and affective relationships essential for healthy adaptation to changes, optimal development, and the challenges characteristic of this stage. The

 doi:10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

potential for optimal development during adolescence is significantly influenced by experiences in earlier life stages [2].

Considering the various criminological theories on the progression of delinquent behavior during adolescence, which suggest an increase starting around age 14, peaking at ages 16-17, and subsequently declining in incidence, adolescence emerges as a critical period for identifying variables relevant to predicting violence [3–5]. In this sense, antisocial behavior is defined by actions that go against the integrity of others, violate legal or social norms, and are frequent, intense, or severe [6]. These behaviors include aggression, breaking social or legal norms, drug abuse, and pre-antisocial and law-violating behaviors, understood as actions outside societal norms [7].

Therefore, psychopathy is understood as a syndrome characterized by antisocial, impulsive, manipulative, and callous behavior [8], along with a lack of empathy and grandiosity. Despite its similarities to antisocial personality disorder, psychopathy includes narcissistic, borderline, and histrionic personality traits and is not considered a mental health disorder [9]. The expression of psychopathic traits differs between men and women [10] , which may underlie the disparities in the perpetration of various types of offenses [11]. Women tend to exhibit fewer physically violent behaviours, instead demonstrating a higher prevalence of verbal aggression, whereas men are more frequently associated with acts of physical violence [12–14]. This gender-related distinction is partially linked to a higher incidence of psychological aggression by women towards their mothers, whereas males exhibit a greater frequency of physical aggression towards both parents [15]. The relationship between psychopathy and antisocial behaviors, including criminal acts and parental violence, is well established across the life cycle, particularly in adolescents [16], with psychopathy serving as a significant predictor of violent behaviors [17]. This relationship has also been observed by Shaffer et al. [18] in the context of dating violence. As with other forms of violent behavior, gender differences are evident in the typology of these actions. Specifically, within adolescent romantic relationships, women are more likely to engage in verbal aggression, whereas men are more frequently involved in severe physical aggression [19].

In this sense, filial violence (FV) encompasses physical, psychological, or economic abuse by children or adolescents towards their parents, aiming to gain control or power over them [20]. Prevalence rates of FV vary significantly depending on informants, definitions of the phenomenon, instruments used, and the sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of the samples [21]. In Spanish adolescents, psychological violence ranges from 79.5% to 92%, and verbal violence from 7.2% to 19.10% [21–23]. Data from the 2022 report of the State Attorney General's Office indicate that 4,332 cases of FV were recorded [24].

Studies consistently show that exposure to family violence is a key risk factor for the development of FV [21] as well as delinquent and pre-antisocial and law-violating behaviors [25], and dating violence [26–28]. Nevertheless, sociodemographic variables such as gender and age can also influence FV. Regarding gender, a higher prevalence of females involved in filial violence among adolescents has been reported [29]. Girls tend to exhibit more verbal or psychological violence, especially towards their mothers, who are generally the primary recipients of such violence [21]. However, being male is considered a risk factor for the perpetuation of delinquent behaviors [30,31]. And it has been observed that within the context of adolescents in the judicial system, the prevalence of filial violence is higher among males, whereas in community settings, gender differences are less pronounced [32]. Regarding age, a longitudinal study exhibits a general decline in FV as adolescents grow older, with aggression peaking between the ages of 13 and 15 before decreasing during late adolescence [25]. This trajectory highlights the influence of age-related developmental dynamics on the frequency of FV.

To the best of our knowledge, although the existing literature on the relationship between filial violence, dating violence, psychopathy and antisocial and law-violating behaviors is extensive, there are few studies that address these issues jointly. Furthermore, most of these studies predominantly employ linear prediction methodologies. Therefore, this study aims to combine the use of linear and non-linear prediction methodologies, such as Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), to enhance

 doi:10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

the understanding of these phenomena. Given the profound impact that multiple exposures to violence—whether as a victim or a perpetrator—can exert on development during the critical period of adolescence, it is of particular interest to examine the interrelations among different forms of violence and their predictive value for other violent behaviors, considering both sociodemographic and psychopathological factors.

Thus, the present study aims to predict filial violence towards both fathers and mothers separately, through the variables of age, gender, received physical and verbal-emotional violence (dating violence), psychopathy, and antisocial and law-violating behaviors in Spanish adolescents. This objective will be addressed using two statistical methodologies: linear regressions and QCA models. Similarly, we aim to understand the associations between the variables under study (age, dating violence, FV, psychopathy, and antisocial and law-violating behaviors) as well as to determine if there are gender differences in both dependent and independent variables. Our first hypothesis (H1) posits that there will be a positive relationship between dating violence, FV, psychopathy, and antisocial and law-violating behaviors. Hypothesis 2 (H2) suggests that being younger and female will be associated with these variables. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 (H3) posits that filial violence in both cases will be predicted by younger age, being female, high levels of psychopathy, high levels of antisocial and law-violating behaviors and having experienced physical and verbal-emotional violence from the partner (dating violence).

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Participants

This research involved 136 Spanish adolescents aged 15-18 (mean age = 16.47; 51% female). The sample was drawn from public educational institutions (57.50%) and semi-private or private institutions (42.50%) and included students in the 3rd (48.90%) and 4th (40.30%) years of Compulsory Secondary Education and in the Baccalaureate program (10.90%) in the Valencian Community, Spain. Informed consent was obtained from both the participants and their parents.

2.2. Variables and Instruments

Sociodemographic variables (gender and age) were assessed using a custom scale. In addition, the following variables were assessed with questionnaires validated for the study sample:

- **Psychopathy:** evaluated using The Psychopathy Content Scale (P-16) developed by Salekin et al. [33]. This instrument was created based on The Millon Adolescent Clinical Inventory (MACI), a 160-item self-report measure of personality and psychopathology in adolescents. In developing the P-16, Salekin et al. [33] identified the MACI items that theoretically aligned with the Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (PCL-R) and also fit into Cooke and Michie's [33] and Frick et al. [34] models for psychopathy. The resulting scale comprises 16 dichotomous items (True / False), that are grouped in three different subscales: callousness, egocentricity, and antisociality. The sum of the subscales can be used to obtain the total score, which is the one used in this study. In the scale construction study, the observed internal consistency was α = .86. And the corresponding alphas for the subscales of callousness, egocentrism, and antisociality were .62, .61, and .56, respectively [33]. In this study, Cronbach's alpha was α = .64.
- **Antisocial and law-violating behaviors:** measured using the Antisocial and Criminal Behavior Scale in Adolescents (ECADA) [7]. The scale comprises 25 dichotomous items (True / False) that evaluate the presence of antisocial and law-violating behaviors. The items are grouped into the following 5 dimensions: preantisocial and law-violating behaviors, vandalistic behaviors, property offenses, violent behavior, alcohol and drug use. The total score, used in

 doi:10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

this study, is obtained by sum the subscales. Higher scores indicate a greater presence of antisocial and antisocial and law-violating behaviors. The ECADA scale has shown adequate psychometric properties, with internal consistency indices ranging from α = .82 to .86 [7,35,36]. In this study, Cronbach's alpha was α = .79.

- **Filial violence:** assessed using the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2) – children to parents' version [37,38]. In this study the adaptation by the Lisis Group [39] was used to assess filial violence towards parents. The scale consists of 10 items that are answered separately for the mother and the father. Responses are recorded on a five-point scale, ranging from 0 (Never) to 4 (Many times). The scale provides an overall index of child-to-parent violence, as well as scores for three specific factors: verbal violence, physical violence, and economic violence. In this study, the total score is derived by adding together the subscale scores. This version has shown adequate psychometric properties, with an internal consistency index ranging from α = .66 to .85 across subscales [39]. In this study, Cronbach's alpha was .67 for the total score of violence towards the mother and .69 for the scale of violence towards the father.
- **Dating violence**: evaluated using a brief version of the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI) [40,41]. The scale adaptation by the Lisis Group [42] used comprises 34 items, with 17 items pertaining to violence perpetrated and the remaining 17 items addressing violence received. The items are grouped into the three factors: Relational Violence, Verbal-Emotional Violence and Physical Violence. Responses are recorded on a four-point scale, ranging from 0 (Never) to 3 (Frequently, on six or more occasions.). In this study, to assess dating violence, only received physical violence and received verbal-emotional violence were evaluated. In the original scale the internal consistency was α = .83 [40] and in the Spanish adaptation α = .86 [41]. In this study, Cronbach's alpha was α = .93.

2.3. Procedure

After selecting assessment tools, a letter was sent to the chosen educational centers outlining the research project. The directors were then contacted by phone or email. Interviews were arranged with those who agreed to participate, where the project was detailed further, and informed consents from the Regional Ministry of Education were provided, along with parental permissions for adolescents to fill out various surveys. After administering the surveys in a session lasting about an hour, responses were entered into a database for statistical analysis. Results were then extracted for interpretation and conclusion formulation. The study adhered to ethical standards required in human research, respecting principles laid out in the updated Helsinki Declaration, including informed consent and information rights, data protection and confidentiality, non-discrimination, no charge, and the option to withdraw at any stage. Additionally, a pilot group of university students evaluated the surveys for difficulty and time required, helping to identify issues and refine the final questionnaire. This research was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Valencia (REF 2024-PSILOG-3592610).

2.4. Design

The study employed a non-experimental, cross-sectional approach, gathering data at one point in time to explore and describe the phenomena.

2.5. Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS 28.0. Descriptive statistics characterized the sample based on sociodemographic and clinical variables. Pearson correlations were used to assess relationships between dating violence (experienced physical and verbal violence), psychopathy,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

criminal behavior, age, and parental violence towards both mother and father. Additionally, linear regressions and QCA models were implemented to predict parental violence, separately towards the father and the mother, considering factors such as age, gender, experienced physical violence, verbal violence, criminal behavior, and psychopathy. Fuzzy set analysis (fsQCA) was conducted, which involved eliminating any missing data and assessing all conditions or variables. Values were recalibrated between 0 and 1. For binary variables, 0 indicated the absence and 1 indicated the presence of a characteristic. For continuous variables, fsQCA software automatically recalibrated them, setting three thresholds: 0% to represent a low level or complete exclusion from the set, 50% for an intermediate level or partial membership, and 90% for a high level or full inclusion in the set [43]. To compute total scores, scales were recalibrated and items multiplied to derive the total score [44]. Descriptive statistics for these recalibrated conditions were generated using SPSS v28.

The fsQCA approach defines necessary conditions, which are always required for an outcome to occur, and sufficient conditions, which can produce an outcome but are not always required. QCA models quantify the explained variance and assess the proportion of cases where the model fits, termed coverage, along with indicators of model accuracy, termed consistency [44,45]. A condition is deemed necessary if its consistency is ≥.90, and a model is considered sufficiently informative if its consistency is around or exceeds .74 [44,45].

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive Analysis and Mean Differences

Descriptive analyses showed low levels of physical (M = .29; SD = 1) and verbal-emotional (M = 3.85; SD = 5.51) violenced received, and medium-low values of psychopathy (M = 4.02; SD = 2.55), antisocial and law-violating behaviors (M = 6.54; SD = 3.70), and filial violence towards the father (M = 3.06; SD = 3.39) and the mother (M = 3.69; SD = 3.39) (Table 1)

It was observed that females experienced more verbal-emotional violence, engaged in fewer antisocial and law-violating behaviors compared to males, and exhibited more filial violence towards the mother. The effect sizes were substantial (Table 1).

Table 1. Comparison of means between female and male adolescents in physical violence received, verbal-emotional violence received, psychopathy and antisocial and law-violating behaviors.

		Women	Man	*t*	*p*	*d*
	M (SD)	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*			
Physical violence received	.29 (1)	.31 (.96)	.26 (1.06)	-.33	.74	.06
Verbal-Emotional violence received	3.85 (5.51)	5.49 (6.56)	2.12 (3.40)	-3.79	< .001***	.64
Psychopathy	4.02 (2.55)	3.87 (2.63)	4.18 (2.47)	.71	.48	.12
Antisocial and law-violating behaviors	6.54 (3.70)	5.77 (3.44)	7.36 (3,81)	2.56	.01**	.44
Filial violence father	3.06 (3.39)	3.21 (3.23)	2.39 (3.57)	-.549	-.58	.09
Filial violence mother	3.69 (3.39)	4.26 (3.69)	3.09 (2.95)	-2.03	.04*	.35

Note: *t* = *t* value; *p* = *p* value; *d* = Cohen's *d*; *$p \leq .05$; **$p \leq .01$; ***$p \leq 0.001$.

3.2. Correlational Analysis

Age was positively associated with more verbal-emotional violence received, higher levels of psychopathy, and more antisocial and law-violating behaviors. Psychopathy was positively associated with more verbal-emotional violence received and increased filial violence towards both the mother and father. Parental violence towards the mother was associated with more verbal-emotional violence received, higher levels of psychopathy, more antisocial and law-violating behaviors and increased parental violence towards the father. In contrast, parental violence towards the father was associated with higher levels of psychopathy and more antisocial and law-violating behaviors. More information can be found in Table 2.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

Table 2. Correlations between age, physical violence received, verbal violence received, psychopathy and antisocial and law-violating behaviors.

	Age	Physical violence received	Verbal violence received	Psychopathy	Antisocial and law-violating behaviors	Filial violence father	Filial violence mother
Age	1						
Physical violence received	-.04	1					
Verbal-emotional violence received	.21*	.23**	1				
Psychopathy	.21*	-.07	.27**	1			
Antisocial and law-violating behaviors	.25**	.06	.28**	.48**	1		
Filial violence father	-.13	.02	.15	.47**	.19*	1	
Filial violence mother	-.03	.04	.41**	.57**	.38**	.66**	1

Note: *$p \leq .05$; **$p \leq .01$.

3.3. Predictive Analysis

3.3.1. Hierarchical Regression Models

The predictive power of the variables was analyzed through a hierarchical regression model. The criterion variables were Filial violence against the mother and Filial violence against the father. The predictive dimensions included age, gender, physical violence received, verbal-emotional violence received, psychopathy, and antisocial and law-violating behaviors. The model was structured in two steps: the first step included age, gender, physical violence received, and verbal-emotional violence received; the second step added psychopathy and antisocial and law-violating behaviors.

In the first step, the predictors significantly increased the variance of Filial violence against the mother ($\Delta R^2 = 0.18$, $p \leq 0.001$), but not against the father ($\Delta R^2 = 0.05$, $p > 0.05$). Age ($\beta = -0.21$, $t = 3.2$, $p \leq 0.01$) and verbal-emotional violence received ($\beta = 0.22$, $t = 2.92$, $p \leq 0.01$) were significant predictors of violence against the mother. Age ($\beta = -0.24$, $t = -3.10$, $p \leq 0.01$) was the only significant predictor of violence against the father in this step.

In the second step, where psychopathy and antisocial and law-violating behaviors were incorporated, the variance of Filial violence against the mother increased significantly ($\Delta R^2 = 0.28$, $p \leq 0.001$), as did the variance of Filial violence against the father ($\Delta R^2 = 0.23$, $p \leq 0.001$). Psychopathy was a significant predictor of violence against both the mother ($\beta = 0.48$, $t = 6.33$, $p \leq 0.001$) and the father ($\beta = 0.52$, $t = 5.93$, $p \leq 0.001$). Antisocial and law-violating behaviors were also a significant predictor of violence against the mother ($\beta = 0.18$, $t = 2.30$, $p \leq 0.05$), but not against the father ($\beta = -0.00$, $t = -0.01$, $p > 0.05$).

Overall, the final model explained 44% of the variance in Filial violence against the mother (R^2 adj = 0.44, $p \leq 0.001$) and 25% of the variance in Filial violence against the father (R^2 adj = 0.25, $p \leq$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

0.001). The Durbin-Watson statistic was 1.73 for the model predicting violence against the mother and 2.06 for the model predicting violence against the father, indicating no issues with autocorrelation. Table 3 presents the detailed results of the hierarchical regression model.

Table 3. Hierarchical regression model.

	Filial violence against the mother				Filial violence against the father			
Predictors	ΔR^2	ΔF	β	t	ΔR^2	ΔF	β	t
Step 1	.18***	7.40***			.05	1.74		
Older (age)			-.21	.32**			-.24	-3.10**
Women			.17	2.31*			-.06	.73
Physical violence received			-.01	-.141			.04	.53
Verbal-emotional violence received			.22	2.92**			.03	.35
Step 2	.28***	34.20***			.23***	20.97***		
Psychopathy			.48	6.33***			.52	5.93***
Antisocial and law-violating behaviors			.18	2.30*			-.00	-.01
Durbin-Watson	1.73				2.06			
R^2_{ajd}	.44***				.25***			

Note: ΔR^2 = change on R^2; R^2 adj= $R^2_{adjusted}$; β = regression coefficient; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.01$.

3.3.2. Fuzzy Set Qualitative Comparative Fuzzy Set Analysis (fsQCA)

Analysis of Necessary Conditions

First, the main descriptors and calibration values for the study variables are presented (Table 4). Based on the results obtained, there were no necessary conditions for high and low levels of Filial violence against the mother and father, as the consistency was lower than 0.90 in all cases (Table 5) (Ragin, 2008).

Table 4. Descriptive analysis and calibration values of the fsQCA.

	Age	**Physical violence received**	**Verbal-emotional violence received**	**Antisocial and law-violating behaviors**	**Psychopathy**	**Filial violence against the mother**	**Filial violence against the father**
M	16.47	0.29	3.85	6.54	4.02	3.69	3.06
SD	0.90	1.00	5.51	3.70	2.55	3.39	3.39
Min.	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Max.	18.00	7.00	30	17.00	12.00	19.00	22.00
P10	15.00	0.00	0.00	1.70	1.00	0.00	0.00
P50	16.00	0.00	2.00	6.50	4.00	3.00	2.00
P90	18.00	1.00	13.00	12.00	8.00	7.00	7.00

Table 5. Need analysis of filial violence against the mother and the father.

	High levels of Filial violence against the mother		**Low levels of Filial violence against the mother**		**High levels of Filial violence against the father**		**Low levels of Filial violence against the father**	
	Cons.	Cov.	Cons.	Cov.	Cons.	Cov.	Cons.	Cov.
Older	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.03	1.00	0.03	-30.82	1.00
Younger	-30.59	1.00	-31.30	1.00	-31.06	1.00	1.00	0.03
Women	1.00	0.33	1.00	0.51	1.00	0.33	1.00	0.33

 doi:10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

Men	-1.02	1.00	-1.04	0.68	-1.03	1.00	-1.03	1.00
High physical violence received	0.74	0.68	0.73	0.33	0.75	0.68	0.75	0.69
Low physical violence received	0.64	0.71	0.65	1.00	0.66	0.73	0.65	0.72
High verbal-emotional violence received	0.59	0.73	0.43	0.52	0.56	0.68	0.49	0.60
Low verbal-emotional violence received	0.61	0.52	0.78	0.65	0.67	0.57	0.74	0.63
High antisocial and law-violating behaviors	0.68	0.71	0.50	0.66	0.67	0.69	0.53	0.55
Low antisocial and law-violating behaviors	0.53	0.52	0.71	0.71	0.56	0.54	0.70	0.68
High psychopathy	0.67	0.77	0.48	0.53	0.67	0.75	0.50	0.56
Low psychopathy	0.59	0.54	0.79	0.70	0.61	0.55	0.78	0.70

Analysis of Sufficiency Conditions

In the sufficiency analysis, the combination of conditions that led to high and low levels of Filial violence against the mother and father were calculated (Table 6). According to the premise that in fsQCA, a model is informative when the consistency is around or above 0.74 (Eng & Woodside, 2012), all models obtained were consistent.

In the prediction of high levels of filial violence towards the mother, three pathways were identified, collectively explaining 63% of the variance (overall consistency = .79; overall coverage = .63). The first pathway accounted for 46% of the cases through the combination of being female, having experienced verbal-emotional violence from the partner, and exhibiting antisocial and law-violating behaviors. The second pathway accounted for 41% of the cases through the combination of being female, having experienced verbal-emotional violence from the partner, and having high levels of psychopathy. The third pathway accounted for 41% of the variance through the combination of being female, having high levels of psychopathy, and exhibiting high levels of antisocial and law-violating behaviors, accompanied by low levels of physical violence from the partner.

With reference to low levels of filial violence towards the mother, one pathway was identified, explaining 55% of the cases (overall consistency = .84; overall coverage = .55). This pathway resulted from the combination of being older, being female, and presenting low levels of antisocial and law-violating behaviors, experienced verbal-emotional violence, and psychopathy.

In explaining high levels of filial violence towards the father, three pathways were identified, collectively explaining 72% of the cases (overall consistency = .75; overall coverage = .72). The first pathway explained 55% of the variance through the combination of being female and exhibiting antisocial and law-violating behaviors and psychopathy. The second pathway also explained 55% of the variance through the combination of being female, exhibiting psychopathy, and having experienced physical violence from a dating partner. The third pathway, explaining 40% of the cases, resulted from the combination of being female, having experienced verbal-emotional but not physical violence from a partner.

Regarding the prediction of low levels of filial violence towards the father, two models were identified, collectively predicting 61% of the cases (overall consistency = .79; overall coverage = .61). The model that explained the most (50% of the variance) did so through the combination of being older, being female, and not exhibiting antisocial and law-violating behaviors psychopathy or having experienced verbal-emotional violence from a partner. The second model predicted 30% of the

 doi:10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

variance through the combination of being older, being female, having experienced verbal-emotional but not physical violence, and not exhibiting psychopathic traits.

Table 6. Summary of the main sufficient conditions for the intermediate solution of high and low levels of filial violence against mother and father in adolescence.

Frequency cut-off: 1	**High levels of Filial violence against the mother** *Consistency cut-off: .82*			**Low levels of Filial violence against the mother** *Consistency cut-off: .88*	**High levels of Filial violence against the father** *Consistency cut-off: .81*			**Low levels of Filial violence against the father** *Consistency cut-off: .85*	
	1	**2**	**3**	**1**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**1**	**2**
Older				●				●	●
Women	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●
Physical violence received			○		●		●		○
Verbal-emotional violence received	●	●		○	●			○	●
Psychopathy		●	●	○		●	●	○	○
Antisocial and law-violating behaviors	●		●	○		●		○	
Raw coverage	.46	.41	.41	.55	.40	.55	.55	.52	.30
Unique coverage	.09	.04	.13	.55	.09	.08	.05	.31	.09
Consistency	.82	.85	.85	.84	.81	.80	.82	.81	.82
Overall solution consistency			**.79**	**.84**			**.76**		**.79**
Overall solution coverage			**.63**	**.55**			**.72**		**.61**

Note: Vector according to Fiss nomenclature (2021). For high levels of filial violence against mother and father: 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1; for low levels of filial violence against mother and father: 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0.

4. Discussion

The present study provides a comprehensive analysis of the predictors of filial violence, emphasizing the roles of sociodemographic variables, dating violence, psychopathy and antisocial and law-violating behaviors among Spanish adolescents. The findings offer significant insights into the complex interplay of these variables, with nuanced differences based on gender and the parental target (mother or father). The results largely align with our hypothesis, introducing novel implications for both theoretical frameworks and practical interventions.

In the first instance, Hypothesis 1 posited that a positive relationship would be found between dating violence, psychopathy, antisocial and law-violating behaviors and FV. The outcomes obtained substantially support this hypothesis, underscoring the interconnected nature of these variables in shaping aggressive behavior among adolescents.

Psychopathy exhibited strong correlations with FV towards both parents. This finding reinforces prior research demonstrating that psychopathy is consistently linked to a wide spectrum of violent and aggressive behaviors [17]. The construct of psychopathy, characterized by traits such as callousness, impulsivity, and a lack of empathy, appears to facilitate the expression of violence not only in peer or romantic relationships but also within the family unit [8]. This may suggest that adolescents with elevated psychopathy scores may struggle with emotional regulation and exhibit reduced empathy, making them more prone to perpetrating violence against their parents.

Similarly, antisocial and law-violating behaviors were positively correlated with FV, particularly towards mothers. This relationship reinforces the idea that antisocial tendencies—such as property

 doi:10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

offenses, substance use, and acts of vandalism—extend beyond peer or community settings to influence familial interactions [25]. Adolescents who frequently engage in such behaviors may adopt aggression as a normative strategy for exerting control or managing conflicts, thus increasing the likelihood of violence directed at their parents.

The study also found significant correlations between exposure to verbal-emotional violence in dating relationships and FV. This finding is particularly noteworthy, as it underscores the cascading effects of victimization in one relational domain on aggression in another. Adolescents exposed to verbal-emotional violence in their romantic relationships may internalize aggressive communication styles or develop maladaptive interaction patterns, such as hostility or coercion, which they subsequently enact in interactions with their parents [26]. This suggest the notion that experiences in romantic relationships during adolescence are deeply interconnected with behaviors in the family domain. Interestingly, while verbal-emotional violence showed robust correlations with FV, physical violence in dating relationships was less strongly associated. This distinction may reflect differences in the psychological impact of these forms of violence. Verbal-emotional violence, which often involves sustained patterns of manipulation, humiliation, or control, may have a more enduring influence on the adolescent's behavioral and emotional development compared to isolated incidents of physical aggression.

Hypothesis 2 posited that being younger and female will be associated with these variables. Regarding age, the findings suggest a possible negative relationship, as older adolescents exhibit lower levels of FV towards both mothers and fathers. These findings align with previous research that highlights adolescence as a critical period for FV, with younger individuals being more likely to exhibit aggressive behaviors towards their parents. Younger adolescents may find it more challenging to manage conflicts with authority figures like parents, particularly fathers, who are often perceived as enforcers of rules and boundaries. Calvete et al. [25] noted that FV tends to decrease as adolescents mature, likely due to developmental improvements in emotional regulation and conflict-resolution skills. This trajectory reflects the transition from dependency and emotional volatility in early adolescence to greater autonomy and emotional stability in later stages.

Concerning gender, it was found that being female was associated with higher levels of received verbal-emotional violence and greater propensity for filial violence towards the mother. This aligns with the existing literature, suggesting that girls engage in more verbal-emotional violence (in contrast to boys, who prevail in physical violence) and perpetrate such aggression more frequently towards the maternal figure compared to the father [21,46,47].

Lastly, Hypothesis 3 posited that filial violence would be predicted by younger age, female gender, experiences of physical and verbal-emotional violence within dating relationships, elevated levels of psychopathy, and increased antisocial and law-violating behaviors. The findings largely support this hypothesis, aligning with the relationships between variables observed and explained in Hypotheses 1 and 2, while presenting variations in predictors depending on the parental target (mother or father).

In the regression models, the variance explained was notably higher for FV towards mothers (44%) compared to fathers (25%), suggesting a stronger influence of these predictors in mother-directed violence. Specifically, the predictors for FV towards mothers included older age, being female, verbal-emotional violence, psychopathy, and antisocial behaviors, whereas physical violence was not a significant factor. In contrast, FV towards fathers was predicted only by younger age and psychopathy. The QCA offered additional insights by identifying pathways involving combinations of predictors. For FV towards mothers, key pathways included being female, high psychopathy, and verbal-emotional violence exposure in dating relationships. Meanwhile, FV towards fathers was associated with combinations involving psychopathy, antisocial and law-violating behaviors, exposure to dating violence (in this case including physical violence) and being female and younger. In conclusion, the results emphasize the predictive power of dating violence, psychopathy, and antisocial and law-violating behaviors, due to their association with deficits in emotional regulation and the development of maladaptive and aggressive strategies in interactions with others [8,17,18,26].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

As well as being younger and female, reflecting the developmental stage, maturation and family interaction, as previously explained [21,25,47].

4.1. Theoretical and Practical Implications

These findings have important theoretical and practical implications. On a practical level, the results highlight the need for early interventions that focus on improving emotional regulation, empathy, and conflict resolution in adolescents, particularly those with elevated psychopathy traits. Addressing these deficits could reduce aggression within families and beyond, reflecting the theoretical importance of incorporating personality traits into models of FV.

Equally critical is the need to address verbal-emotional victimization in dating relationships, which fosters maladaptive communication patterns that spill over into family dynamics, particularly in interactions with mothers. Prevention programs teaching healthy communication in romantic contexts could disrupt these patterns, aligning with the theoretical understanding of how external relational stressors shape aggression within the family.

Tailored interventions based on age and gender are also essential. Younger adolescents would benefit from strategies to manage authority-related tensions with fathers, while mothers, who face higher levels of verbal-emotional aggression, require support in reducing relational strain. These measures align with the theoretical nuances of FV, which vary depending on parental roles and dynamics.

By integrating these approaches, interventions can effectively address the interconnected factors driving FV, fostering healthier family relationships and equipping adolescents with constructive tools to navigate conflicts.

4.2. Limitations and Future Research

The present study, while offering valuable insights, is not devoid of limitations, which should be considered when interpreting the findings and provide a solid foundation for future research directions. Firstly, the sample was drawn exclusively from educational institutions, where the prevalence of both dating violence and filial violence was moderate to low. Additionally, the sample size, although adequate for preliminary observations, could benefit from expansion. While this setting allowed for the investigation of these phenomena within a general adolescent population, it may have excluded adolescents experiencing more severe or high-risk behaviours. Future research should aim to include larger and more diverse samples, incorporating participants from varied contexts such as juvenile detention centers or community-based organizations, where the incidence and dynamics of these behaviours may differ significantly. Expanding the sample in this way would improve the generalizability of the findings and potentially uncover additional risk factors or protective factors.

Secondly, the cross-sectional design of this study limits the ability to establish causal relationships between the variables investigated. Although the findings support predictive relationships, longitudinal studies are needed to confirm these associations and explore the temporal development of filial violence. For example, longitudinal research could help identify how psychopathy traits, antisocial behaviours, or experiences of dating violence evolve over time and interact to influence the onset or escalation of filial violence. Such studies could also explore potential mediators and moderators, such as family dynamics or peer influences, that shape these trajectories.

Another limitation lies in the reliance on self-reported data. While self-reports are instrumental in capturing adolescents' subjective experiences, they are inherently vulnerable to biases, including social desirability and recall inaccuracies. To address this, future studies should incorporate multi-informant approaches, gathering data from parents, teachers, or other caregivers to validate and complement adolescents' self-reports. This would not only enhance the reliability of the data but also provide a more comprehensive perspective on the behaviours and experiences of the adolescents involved.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202501.1168.v1

Finally, this study primarily focused on individual-level variables, such as psychopathy and antisocial behaviours, which, while essential, do not fully capture the broader ecological context of filial violence. Future research should consider familial and community-level factors to provide a more nuanced understanding of the phenomenon. For instance, examining the role of family dynamics, including interparental violence, attachment styles, or parenting practices, could yield valuable insights. Similarly, exploring the influence of community-level factors, such as neighbourhood violence, socio-economic conditions, or access to support systems, would further contextualize the findings and highlight the systemic influences on filial violence.

In conclusion, while this study makes a significant contribution to understanding the predictors of filial violence, addressing these limitations in future research will advance the field further. Expanding the diversity of samples, adopting longitudinal designs, incorporating multi-informant data, and examining ecological and developmental contexts will provide deeper insights into the mechanisms driving filial violence. Such advancements are essential for designing more effective interventions and prevention strategies, ultimately reducing the prevalence of filial violence and fostering healthier family relationships.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, this study provides valuable insights into the predictors of FV among adolescents, emphasizing the roles of psychopathy traits, antisocial and law-violating behaviours, and experiences of verbal-emotional dating violence, as well as the influence of age and gender. The findings reveal that these factors not only exhibit significant relationships with FV but also serve as reliable predictors, with notable variations depending on the parental target.

These results highlight the need for practical interventions that are both multi-faceted and targeted. Programs focused on emotional regulation, conflict resolution, and healthy communication could mitigate the impact of relational victimization, while gender-sensitive and age-specific strategies would address the distinct challenges posed by developmental and relational contexts. By integrating individual, relational, and contextual factors into both theoretical models and practical strategies, this study offers a comprehensive framework for understanding and mitigating filial violence. These efforts are crucial not only for reducing adolescent aggression but also for fostering healthier family relationships and promoting the well-being of all family members.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, F.G.-S.; methodology, L.L.-T.; software, L.L.-T.; validation, L.L.-T., A.E., and F.G.-S.; formal analysis, L.L.-T., A.E., and F.G.-S.; investigation, L.L.-T.; resources, F.G.-S.; data curation, L.L.-T.; writing—original draft preparation, L.L.-T. and A.E.; writing—review and editing, L.L.-T.; visualization, L.L.-T.; supervision, F.G.-S.; project administration, F.G.-S. and L.L.-T. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding, but Alba Espuig is a beneficiary of the Aid for Collaboration in Research from the Universitat de València (2024) and the Aid for Collaboration from Ministry of Education (2025).

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Ethics Committee of Universitat de València (2024-PSILOG-3592610).".

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all participants involved in the study.
Data Availability Statement: Data from the study can be made available upon reasoned request to the corresponding author.

Public Involvement Statement: No public involvement in any aspect of this research beyond the role of study participants who completed the surveys.

Guidelines and Standards Statement: This manuscript was drafted against the STROBE (Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology) guidelines for observational research [Von Elm, E., Altman, D. G., Egger, M., Pocock, S. J., Gøtzsche, P. C., & Vandenbroucke, J. P. (2007). The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *PLOS Medicine*, *4*(10), e296].

Use of Artificial Intelligence: In the present work, artificial intelligence has been used to revise and refine the English of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments: The authors of the manuscript would like to thank all the participants in the study for their collaboration. Their altruistic participation contributes to improving our understanding and prevention of filial violence, aiding in the development of effective interventions and support systems for affected families.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. World Health Organization (WHO) Available online: https://www.who.int/es/health-topics/adolescent-health#tab=tab_1 (accessed on 14 July 2024).
2. Márquez-Cervantes, M.C.; Gaeta-González, M.L. Desarrollo de Competencias Emocionales En Pre-Adolescentes: El Papel de Padres y Docentes. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado* **2017**, *20*, 221–235, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/reifop.20.1.232941.
3. Hirschi, T.; Gottfredson, M. Age and the Explanation of Crime. *American Journal of Sociology* **1983**, *89*, 552–584.
4. Farrington, D.P. Age and Crime. *Crime and justice* **1986**, *7*, 189–250.
5. Farrington, D.P. Developmental and Life-Course Criminology: Key Theoretical and Empirical Issues. *Criminology* **2003**, *41*, 221–225, doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2003.tb00987.x.
6. Landazabal, M.G. Conducta Antisocial Durante La Adolescencia: Correlatos Socio-Emocionales, Predictores y Diferencias de Género. *Psicol Conductual* **2005**, *13*, 197–215.
7. Andreu, J.M.; Peña, M.E. Propiedades Psicométricas de La Escala de Conducta Antisocial y Delictiva En Adolescentes. *Anales de Psicologia* **2013**, *29*, 516–522, doi:10.6018/analesps.29.2.135951.
8. De Brito, S.A.; Forth, A.E.; Baskin-Sommers, A.R.; Brazil, I.A.; Kimonis, E.R.; Pardini, D.; Frick, P.J.; Blair, R.J.R.; Viding, E. Psychopathy. *Nature Reviews Disease Primers* **2021**, *7*, 49, doi:https://doi.org/10.1038/s41572-021-00282-1.
9. Sarkar, S.; Clark, B.S.; Deeley, Q. Differences between Psychopathy and Other Personality Disorders: Evidence from Neuroimaging. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment* **2011**, *17*, 191–200, doi:10.1192/apt.bp.107.004747.
10. Carabellese, F.; Felthous, A.R.; Rossetto, I.; La Tegola, D.; Franconi, F.; Catanesi, R. Female Residents with Psychopathy in a High-Security Italian Hospital. *J Am Acad Psychiatry Law* **2018**, *46*, 171–178.
11. Felthous, A.R.; Saß, H. International Perspectives on Psychopathy Research: An Introductory Essay. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law* **2021**, *39*, 507–511, doi:10.1002/bsl.2549.
12. Wynn, R.; Høiseth, M.H.; Pettersen, G. Psychopathy in Women: Theoretical and Clinical Perspectives. *International journal of women's health* **2012**, *4*, 257–263.
13. Kreis, M.K.F.; Cooke, D.J. Capturing the Psychopathic Female: A Prototypicality Analysis of the Comprehensive Assessment of Psychopathic Personality (CAPP) Across Gender. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law* **2011**, *29*, 634–648, doi:10.1002/bsl.1003.
14. Eisenbarth, H.; Osterheider, M.; Nedopil, N.; Stadtland, C. Recidivism in Female Offenders: PCL-R Lifestyle Factor and VRAG Show Predictive Validity in a German Sample. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law* **2012**, *30*, 575–584, doi:10.1002/bsl.2013.
15. Calvete, E.; Orue, I.; González-Cabrera, J. Violencia Filio Parental: Comparando Lo Que Informan Los Adolescentes y Sus Progenitores. *Revista de Psicología Clínica con Niños y Adolescentes* **2017**, *4*, 9–15.
16. Allen, C.H.; Gullapalli, A.R.; Milillo, M.; Ulrich, D.M.; Rodriguez, S.N.; Maurer, J.M.; Aharoni, E.; Anderson, N.E.; Harenski, C.L.; Vincent, G.M.; et al. Psychopathy Scores Predict Recidivism in High-

Risk Youth: A Five-Year Follow-up Study. *Res Child Adolesc Psychopathol* **2024**, doi:10.1007/s10802-024-01169-x.

17. Sewall, L.A.; Olver, M.E. Psychopathy and Treatment Outcome: Results from a Sexual Violence Reduction Program. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment* **2019**, *10*, 59–69, doi:10.1037/per0000297.
18. Shaffer, C.S.; Gatner, D.T.; McCuish, E.; Douglas, K.S.; Viljoen, J.L. The Role of Psychopathic Features and Developmental Risk Factors in Trajectories of Physical Intimate Partner Violence. *Psychol Violence* **2021**, *11*, 549–558, doi:10.1037/vio0000313.
19. Muñoz-Rivas, M.J.; Graña, J.L.; O'Leary, K.D.; González, M.P. Aggression in Adolescent Dating Relationships: Prevalence, Justification, and Health Consequences. *Journal of Adolescent Health* **2007**, *40*, 298–304, doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2006.11.137.
20. Molla-Esparza, C.; Aroca-Montolío, C. Menores Que Maltratan a Sus Progenitores: Definición Integral y Su Ciclo de Violencia. *Anuario de Psicología Jurídica* **2018**, *28*, 15–21, doi:10.1016/j.apj.2017.01.001.
21. Cano-Lozano, M.C.; León, S.P.; Contreras, L. Child-to-Parent Violence: Examining the Frequency and Reasons in Spanish Youth. *Fam Relat* **2021**, *70*, 1132–1149, doi:10.1111/fare.12567.
22. Del Hoyo-Bilbao, J.; Gámez-Guadix, M.; Calvete, E. Castigo Físico de Padres y Madres a Hijos e Hijas y Violencia Filio-Parental Entre Adolescentes Españoles. *Anales de Psicologia* **2018**, *34*, 108–116, doi:10.6018/analesps.34.1.259601.
23. Rico, E.; Rosado, J.; Cantón-Cortés, D. Impulsiveness and Child-to-Parent Violence: The Role of Aggressor's Sex. *Span J Psychol* **2017**, *20*, E15, doi:10.1017/sjp.2017.15.
24. Fundación Amigó. *La Violencia Filio-Parental En España (Datos 2022)*; 2023;
25. Calvete, E.; Orue, I.; Fernández-González, L.; Chang, R.; Little, T.D. Longitudinal Trajectories of Child-to-Parent Violence through Adolescence. *J Fam Violence* **2020**, *35*, 107–116, doi:10.1007/s10896-019-00106-7.
26. Izaguirre, A.; Calvete, E. Exposure to Family Violence as a Predictor of Dating Violence and Child-to-Parent Aggression in Spanish Adolescents. *Youth Soc* **2017**, *49*, 393–412, doi:10.1177/0044118X16632138.
27. Carrascosa, L.; Cava, M.J.; Buelga, S. Violencia de Pareja En Menores Infractores Por Violencia Filio-Parental. *Derecho y cambio social, 52(1), 1-14.* **2018**, *52*, 1–14.
28. Martí, A.; Gabarda, C.; Cava, M.J.; Buelga, S. Relaciones Entre La Violencia Filioparental y Otras Conductas Violentas En Adolescentes. *Behavioral Psychology* **2020**, *28*, 415–434.
29. Cuervo, K.; Villanueva, L.; González, F.; Carrión, C.; Busquets, P. Characteristics of Young Offenders Depending on the Type of Crime. *Psychosocial Intervention* **2015**, *24*, 9–15, doi:10.1016/j.psi.2014.11.003.
30. Gottfredson, M.R.; Hirschi, T. *A General Theory of Crime*; Stanford University Press, 1990; ISBN 9781503621794.
31. Tittle, C.R.; Paternoster, R. *Social Deviance and Crime: An Organizational and Theoretical Approach*; Roxbury Publishing Company: Los Angeles, CA, 2000;
32. Ibabe, I.; Jaureguizar, J. ¿Hasta Qué Punto La Violencia Filio-Parental Es Bidireccional? *Anales de Psicología* **2011**, *27*, 265–277.
33. Salekin, R.T.; Ziegler, T.A.; Larrea, M.A.; Anthony, V.L.; Bennett, A.D. Predicting Dangerousness with Two Millon Adolescent Clinical Inventory Psychopathy Scales: The Importance of Egocentric and Callous Traits. *J Pers Assess* **2003**, *80*, 154–163, doi:10.1207/S15327752JPA8002_04.

34. Frick, P.J.; Bodin, S.D.; Barry, C.T. Psychopathic Traits and Conduct Problems in Community and Clinic-Referred Samples of Children: Further Development of the Psychopathy Screening Device. *Psychol Assess* **2000**, *12*, 382.
35. García, N.D.; Moral-Jiménez, M. de la V. Alcohol Consumption, Antisocial Behavior and Impulsivity in Spanish Adolescents. *Acta Colombiana de Psicologia* **2018**, *21*, 121–130, doi:10.14718/ACP.2018.21.2.6.
36. Penado, M.; Andreu, J.M.; Peña, E. Agresividad Reactiva, Proactiva y Mixta: Análisis de Los Factores de Riesgo Individual. *Anuario de Psicologia Juridica* **2014**, *24*, 37–42, doi:10.1016/j.apj.2014.07.012.
37. Straus, M.A.; Douglas, E.M. A Short Form of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales, and Typologies for Severity and Mutuality. *Violence Vict* **2004**, *19*, 507–520.
38. Gámez-Guadix, M.; Straus, M.A.; Carrobles, A.; Muñoz-Rivas, M.J.; Almendros, C. Corporal Punishment and Long-Term Behavior Problems: The Moderating Role of Positive Parenting and Psychological Aggression. *Psicothema* **2010**, *22*, 529–536.
39. Grupo Lisis Available online: https://lisis.blogs.uv.es/instrumentos-2013-2016/ (accessed on 19 July 2024).
40. Wolfe, D.A.; Scott, K.; Reitzel-Jaffe, D.; Wekerle, C.; Grasley, C.; Straatman, A.L. Development and Validation of the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory. *Psychol Assess* **2001**, *13*, 277–293.
41. Fernández-Fuertes, A.A.; Fuertes, A.; Pulido, R.F. Evaluación de La Violencia En Las Relaciones de Pareja de Los Adolescentes. Validación Del Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI)-Versión Española 1. © *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology* **2006**, *6*, 339–358.
42. Grupo Lisis. Available online: https://lisis.blogs.uv.es/instrumentos-2013-2016/ (accessed on 19 July 2024).
43. Woodside, A.G. Moving beyond Multiple Regression Analysis to Algorithms: Calling for Adoption of a Paradigm Shift from Symmetric to Asymmetric Thinking in Data Analysis and Crafting Theory. *J Bus Res* **2013**, *66*, 463–472, doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.12.021.
44. Ragin, C.C. *Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond*; University of Chicago Press., 2008;
45. Eng, S.; Woodside, A.G. Configural Analysis of the Drinking Man: Fuzzy-Set Qualitative Comparative Analyses. *Addictive Behaviors* **2012**, *37*, 541–543, doi:10.1016/J.ADDBEH.2011.11.034.
46. Calvete, E.; Orue, I.; Gámez-Guadix, M. Child-to-Parent Violence: Emotional and Behavioral Predictors. *J Interpers Violence* **2013**, *28*, 755–772, doi:10.1177/0886260512455869.
47. Loinaz, I.; Barboni, L.; Ma-De-sousa, A. Gender Differences in Child-to-Parent Violence Risk Factors. *Anales de Psicologia* **2020**, *36*, 408–417, doi:10.6018/analesps.428531.