

Attachment to Parents and Aggressiveness in Adopted Adolescents:

A Multi-Sample Comparison Study

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Torres-Gomez, B., Alonso-Arbiol, I. and Gallarin, M. (2020), *Attachment to Parents and Aggressiveness in Adopted Adolescents: A Multi-Sample Comparison Study*. **J Res Adolesc**, 30: 46-54. , which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12463>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions. This article may not be enhanced, enriched or otherwise transformed into a derivative work, without express permission from Wiley or by statutory rights under applicable legislation. Copyright notices must not be removed, obscured or modified. The article must be linked to Wiley's version of record on Wiley Online Library and any embedding, framing or otherwise making available the article or pages thereof by third parties from platforms, services and websites other than Wiley Online Library must be prohibited. © 2018 Society for Research on Adolescence

Abstract

This study examined adopted adolescents' levels of attachment security to parents and aggressiveness as compared to those of community nonadopted adolescents and of clinical nonadopted adolescents. Three different subsamples participated ($n = 262$): 101 community nonadopted adolescents (48.5% girls), 80 community adopted teens (65.0% girls), and 81 nonadopted counterparts (35.8% girls) who participated in a treatment program for youth with behavioral problems. There were no differences between community groups in attachment security or aggressiveness, whereas clinical nonadopted adolescents showed less attachment security and more aggressiveness than the other two groups. The implications of these results are discussed in terms of the potential healing impact that living with adoptive families could have on adopted teenagers' risk of maladaptive outcomes.

Key words: Attachment, adoption, adolescence, aggressiveness.

Attachment to Parents and Aggressiveness in Adopted Adolescents:

A Multi-Sample Comparison Study

In addition to the lack/loss of an attachment bond with their biological parents, adopted children have often been early victims of abuse or neglect (Zill & Bramlet, 2014) and/or have experienced previous inappropriate institutional care (Merz & McCall, 2010). Each of these factors alone, and in combination, have been associated with the development of insecure and/or disorganized attachment patterns (Cyr, Euser, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van IJzendoorn, 2010) and other maladaptive outcomes, such as aggression and other behavioral problems in childhood (Teisl & Cicchetti, 2008). Moreover, adolescence, commonly considered a challenging stage of life, could be a particularly difficult time for adoptees considering the special relevance of issues about losses, identity, and origin in this population (Smith, Howard, & Monroe, 2000). However, research on adoption in adopted adolescents has not provided conclusive evidence on attachment deficits and aggression problems for a number of reasons: 1) studies on attachment in adopted adolescents are still sparse (Escobar, Pereira, & Santelices, 2014); 2) changes in adolescents' attachment system may result in different attachment-related outcomes, depending on the distinct measurement approaches in this developmental period; 3) there is a remarkable lack of research into adopted adolescents' aggressiveness despite their being at special risk for aggression problems; and 4) most studies only compared adopted teens with nonadopted pairs, neglecting the fact that differences in adoption outcomes vary depending on type of adoption and age of the adopted adolescent (Palacios, Sánchez-Sandoval, & León, 2005) and comparison groups (Juffer, van IJzendoorn, & Palacios, 2011). Thus, more studies are needed to examine differences in adopted adolescents' attachment security and aggressiveness,

considering not only community nonadopted pairs as the comparison group, but also adolescents being treated for aggressive problems.

Attachment in Adopted Adolescents

In the adoption realm, attachment outcomes seem to change according to developmental periods. For instance, whereas attachment deficits are more prevalent in children adopted after their first year compared to nonadopted ones, differences between adopted and nonadopted individuals seem to disappear in adulthood (van den Dries, Juffer, van IJzendoorn, & Bakermans-Kranenburg, 2009). It is possible that attachment difficulties found in adopted children undergo an improvement during adolescence as a result of the healing influence of the particularly optimal rearing context enabled by the inherent strengths of the adoptive parents in comparison to nonadoptive parents: higher education and socioeconomic status (Hamilton, Cheng, & Powell, 2007), better parenting styles or discipline strategies (O'Brien & Zamostny, 2003), and more security regarding attachment (Raby et al., 2017). However, the available evidence in the case of adopted adolescents is too limited to draw conclusions.

The attachment system undergoes meaningful developmental transformations during adolescence. One of the most salient changes is the transition from attachment relationships with specific individuals to generalized states of mind regarding attachment, which allows for the possibility of assessing a single overarching attachment organization, mainly through interview instruments (Allen, 2008). Focusing on this global organization of the attachment system, however, does not allow for the capture of certain aspects of the attachment system's functioning in adolescents. According to Allen and Miga (2010), what is being assessed with attachment interviews is emotional regulation in the context of a discussion of attachment relationships, but

not the degree of attachment security. Different authors have emphasized the critical relevance of the individual attachment relationship to parents for teenager's well-being (e.g., Allen & Tan, 2016). Nevertheless, most studies of adolescents have investigated their states of mind regarding attachment (Allen & Manning, 2007), neglecting the approach focused on differences in the level of attachment security to parents. That is also the case of research on adopted teenagers, where attachment is considered to be a global disposition, and more insecure attachment organizations are found in adopted adolescents in comparison to nonadopted control groups (e.g., Escobar & Santelices, 2013).

In contrast, only a few studies have specifically compared attachment security to parents in adopted and nonadopted adolescents. Nevertheless, most of them present some methodological shortcomings and/or different conceptualizations that prevent researchers from reaching conclusive evidence. For instance, Rosnati and Marta (1997) intended to study parental attachment in adopted adolescents. A sample of 103 inter-racial late-adopted (16–19 years old) adolescents was compared to 150 nonadopted Italian community teens. No differences between the two groups were observed in support, while adopted adolescents perceived fewer problems in communication with their mothers than their nonadopted pairs. While these results advanced the literature, attachment security to parents was not strictly examined in that study, but rather the perceived quality of communication and support in the adolescent-mother and adolescent-father relationships.

A similar conceptualization/measurement problem may be mentioned in Roskam and Stievenart's (2014) study, which explored whether cumulative effects represented a common pathway to behavioral maladjustment for internationally adopted adolescents ($n = 40$) and sociodemographically matched nonadopted counterparts ($n =$

ATTACHMENT, AGGRESSIVENESS, AND ADOPTION

6

34). Attachment was identified as a risk factor, and no differences in attachment scores were found between adopted and nonadopted teens. However, it must be noted that a questionnaire measuring romantic (nonparental) attachment was employed, which does not provide information about security attachment toward parents.

A few studies have certainly captured the attachment security of adopted adolescents by using the Inventory of Parent-Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). In his unpublished doctoral dissertation, McGinn (2001) examined maternal attachment. The only difference he found was that adopted adolescents displayed a lower level of trust component of maternal attachment than nonadoptees, but not of the other two components—communication and alienation— of attachment security. Nevertheless, the biggest shortcoming derives from the utilized sample: he included only a sample of 30 adopted and 30 nonadopted adolescents that, moreover, had a too wide age range (12–22 years old) so as to make conclusions on adolescents' differential developmental features regarding attachment security. Likewise, McSherry, Malet, and Weatherall (2016) also used the IPPA to compare the attachment of children in adoption, foster care, kinship foster care, on residence order, and living with birth parents. They did not find any differences in attachment security across the five placement groups. However, here again, the adoption sample was rather small ($n = 30$), and it included not only adolescents, but also younger children (9–14 years), where results were not differentiated according to developmental stage.

A newer study by Barroso, Barbosa-Ducharne, and Coelho (2017) used the IPPA to examine attachment relationships with parents in a somewhat bigger sample of only adolescents (12–19 years old): in adopted ($n = 55$), community ($n = 55$), and institutionalized ($n = 55$) paired youth. They did not find any attachment-security differences between adopted and nonadopted community teens, but adopted adolescents

showed better scores than institutionalized teens. Having another sample, institutionalized youth, rather than just community nonadopted adolescents provided an interesting reference for the comparison with adopted adolescents because it represented an at-risk context. However, institutionalization may imply a quite different situation regarding attachment since the adolescents are physically separated from their parents.

Aggressiveness in Adopted Adolescents

Attachment insecurity could foster aggressiveness in adolescents whose inadequate management has been clearly associated to maladjustment in present and future development (e.g., Assink, van der Put, Hoeve, de Vries, Stams, & Oort, 2015). In this vein, some studies noted a very consistent association between attachment insecurity and aggressiveness in adolescents (e.g., Gallarin & Alonso-Arbiol, 2012). The fact that interventions aimed to foster attachment security in adolescents at risk for aggressive behavior are effective in reducing aggression provides further evidence of this link (e.g., Moretti & Obsuth, 2009).

In contrast to the scarce and inconclusive evidence on attachment security differences, some meta-analysis and systematic reviews showed that adopted adolescents tend to have worse outcomes in the externalizing-behavioral problems domain than their nonadopted counterparts (e.g., Juffer & van IJzendoorn, 2005). Given their usual negative preplacement experiences, adopted adolescents may be at higher risk for aggression problems. Bowlby (1988) linked the experiences of separation and abandonment to anger and dysfunctional responses. Furthermore, adopted adolescents are believed to struggle more with identity issues than their nonadopted counterparts, by acting out their anger and frustration as a means of looking for attention from main caregivers (Pace, Di Folco, & Guerriero, 2018). However, we are only aware of a

handful of studies specifically focused on the aggressiveness domain in adoptees; only one (Menlove, 1965) compared adopted and nonadopted participants in a clinical sample; nevertheless, these were children, not adolescents.

Nevertheless, as with attachment security, the improvement associated with living in a protective, supportive, and stable adoptive family environment may exert a buffering effect (Davies & Bledsoe, 2005). Specifically, we think that adequate parenting practices noted in adoptive families (O'Brien & Zamostny, 2003) would be a particularly relevant factor here, given the meta-analytic evidence linking parenting styles to externalizing problems (Pinquart, 2017), and aggression (Kawabata, Alink, Tseng, van IJzendoorn, & Crick, 2011). Certain good parenting practices are associated to attachment security (for a meta-analysis, see Koehn & Kerns, 2017), and there is evidence that attachment security fully mediates the links between parenting socialization practices and aggressiveness in adolescents (Gallarín & Alonso-Arbiol, 2012).

The Present Study

We aimed to enlarge the knowledge of attachment and aggressiveness in community adopted adolescents by overcoming some of the methodological and conceptual/measurement limitations of previous studies: a) including a relatively large sample of only adopted teenagers, b) using a widely reliable self-report instrument of attachment security, and c) incorporating the analysis of aggressiveness in all its domains.

The relevance of taking into account meaningful comparison groups in adoptee outcomes studies (Juffer et al., 2011) has been noted. According to Palacios et al., (2005), unfavorable outcomes for adoptees are usually found when adopted samples are based on clinically referred children and compared to nonadopted peers, but not in

relation to other comparison groups. For example, compared with institutionalized children, adopted ones tend to improve their attachment security (e.g., Juffer et al., 2011) and diminish their problematic behavior (Christoffersen, 2012). In this case, a similar consequence may be expected for adolescents too. Given that parent-child attachment relationships are more problematic in families with adolescents who have behavioral problems (e.g., Hoeve et al., 2012), we included a comparison group of nonadopted adolescents in treatment for behavioral problems, as a more similar group to the adopted teens who had early adverse experiences and the buffering effect of an adoptive family had not been enough to reduce foreseeable attachment and aggression problems.

Given there is evidence showing that adoptive families could offer an especially positive rearing environment to their adopted children (e.g., Bramlett, Radel, & Blumberg, 2007), we expect the following hypotheses to be confirmed:

Adopted adolescents will have higher levels of attachment security to parents than clinical nonadopted adolescents, but they will have similar levels to community nonadopted adolescents (Hypothesis 1).

Adopted adolescents will have lower levels of aggressiveness than clinical nonadopted adolescents, but they will have similar levels to community nonadopted adolescents (Hypothesis 2).

Method

Participants and Procedure

Two hundred and sixty-two secondary and college students between the ages of 14 and 18 years old ($M = 15.84$, $SD = 1.34$) took part. There were three subsamples: 1) 101 community nonadopted adolescents (48.5% girls); 2) 80 community adopted adolescents (65.0% girls), and 3) a sample made of 81 clinical nonadopted adolescents

(35.8% girls) participating in an intervention program for youth with behavioral problems (see Table 1 for characteristics of all three groups).

The following procedure was undertaken for data collection. To recruit adolescents living with birth parents, in the first stage, schools were randomly selected, taking into account their private or public status. Principals were contacted to obtain permission for study participation. Afterwards, questionnaires were administered in the classroom.

Adopted adolescents were recruited through different nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). The associations' managers were informed about the study. Interested adoptive parents were asked to contact the research team. After consents were obtained, the most suitable places (families' homes or the university) and dates for filling in the questionnaires were set up.

To recruit the clinical sample, an agreement was made with the managers of a specific program aimed at ameliorating behavioral problems in adolescents. Once the families' and health staff's consents were obtained, the questionnaires were completed by the adolescents at the clinical center.

All participants were informed about the study, and willingness and anonymity were assured. The study received the approval of the authors' university ethics committee.

Instruments

Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Arnsden & Greenberg, 1987; in its Spanish version, Gallarin & Alonso-Arbiol, 2013). This self-report assesses attachment security toward the mother/father. Each version consists of 16 items to be rated by the individuals on a 5-point Likert scale (from 1 = "never or almost never" to 5 = "always or almost always"). Higher scores are indicative of higher (perceived)

attachment security to the target person/role (mother or father). Cronbach alphas were good: .89 (mother) and .90 (father).

Multifacet Aggressiveness Scale (MAS; Gallarin & Alonso-Arbiol, 2012). This self-report instrument assesses aggressiveness by providing independent scores for four subscales. Indirect aggression (IA) refers to manipulative acts meant to damage the social image or relationship network of the target person, or to types of aggression that do not need to happen face-to-face (e.g., “If I’m angry with someone, I speak about that person with others to make a fool of him/her in front of them”). Direct aggression (DA) taps forms of aggression in which the victim may identify the perpetrator (e.g., “If someone provokes me enough, I can hit him/her”). Cognitive aggressiveness (CA) addresses thoughts or desires related to harming someone (e.g., “I think that there are people who don’t deserve to be respected”). Emotional aggressiveness (EA) represents a difficulty to manage anger or impulsivity in an adaptive or adjusted way (e.g., “I think that I get angry very fast”). Respondents rate all 40 items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = “Not at all” to 5 = “Very much”). Higher scores indicate higher levels of aggressiveness. All Cronbach’s alphas were good: .90 (DA), .86 (IA), .88 (CA), and .90 (EA).

Results

First, we conducted a preliminary analysis in order to examine whether family characteristics (monoparental vs. biparental, parental education, and parental employment status) significantly differed across the three groups. Results showed that the level of parental education in the clinical group was lower than the educational level of parents in the community nonadoptive and adoptive groups; no differences emerged between community nonadopted and adopted groups. Therefore, parental education was included as a covariate in the analysis of group differences on target variables.

Furthermore, we previously examined whether adoption characteristics (domestic vs. international, age at adoption, previous institutionalization, etc.) had any effect on attachment security and aggressiveness.¹ Only age of adoption resulted in significant differences (see Table 2). We compared teens adopted in the first year with adolescents adopted after 12 months. Results showed that teens adopted during their first year of life had less attachment security to parents, especially to the father, and higher levels of aggressiveness, particularly on internal dimensions (cognitive and emotional). We then investigated what happened with adoptees after their first year of life conducting correlation analysis between age at adoption and the target variables (attachment security and aggressiveness). Results showed no significant relationship (range of r correlations: .03 to -.13). Likewise, we examined the association between time in the adoptive family and the target variables of the study. None of the correlations was statistically significant (Pearson correlations ranged between .02 and -.21).

To compare adolescents' levels of attachment and aggressiveness in the three groups (adopted after 12 months,² community nonadopted, and clinical nonadopted adolescents), a multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was conducted on reported attachment security toward the mother and father and on aggressiveness types: DA, IA, CA, and EA, introducing parental educational level and adolescent's gender as covariates. Given that gender differences in aggressiveness had been observed in the literature (e.g., Ručević & Ivana, 2010), and that there were more boys in the

¹ Complete data on comparisons on type of adoption and previous institutionalization are available from authors. Analysis with prior maltreatment could not have been conducted given that a high percentage of families (48.7%) referred lacking this information. The size of the rest of the sample was too small so as to extract reliable conclusions from a comparative analysis.

² Given the differences observed on target variables between adolescents having been adopted at their first year of life and adoptees having been adopted after 12 months, and taking into account that this condition only affected to one of the groups, instead of introduce this variable as a covariate in our analysis, we considered more adequate to conduct the analysis once the small group ($n = 15$) of early adoptees was excluded.

nonadopted clinical group and more girls in the community adopted group, we included the teenagers' gender as a covariate jointly with parental educational level. Differences were observed in all assessed variables when community adopted and nonadopted samples' means were compared to clinical nonadopted ones (see Table 3). No differences between community adopted and nonadopted adolescents appeared in any of the examined variables. Both community nonadopted and adopted adolescents showed more attachment security to the mother and the father than clinical nonadopted teenagers. Clinical nonadopted adolescents also showed more aggressiveness as compared to community adopted and nonadopted teens, especially on the subscale of DA ($d = 1.01$ and 1.23 , respectively). These results confirmed both H1 and H2.

Discussion

In this study, we sought to examine community adopted adolescents' levels of attachment security to parents and aggressiveness as compared to those of two groups of nonadopted teens: community and clinical populations. Supporting our hypotheses, there were no differences in attachment security and aggressiveness in community adopted adolescents as compared to community nonadopted ones, whereas community adopted teens showed higher attachment security and lower aggressiveness than clinical nonadopted adolescents.

Our results are in line with other studies, which have also not found differences in attachment security to parents between community adopted and nonadopted adolescents (Barroso et al., 2017; McGinn, 2001; McSherry et al., 2016), but apparently in contradiction with others that show more insecure attachment organizations in adopted teens (e.g., Escobar & Santelices, 2013). This might be explained by the usual changes in the attachment system during adolescence, in combination with the different features captured by alternative assessment approaches to attachment. Román and

Palacios (2011) noted that attachment representations become more secure with age, suggesting that the attachment catch-up in adoptees would be faster in the behavioral than in the representational domain. Attachment behavioral improvements are likely to be the early result of the changes experienced in the new relationships developed with the adoptive parents, whereas its inclusion in the representational domain could occur later. This could help to explain why studies that used self-report measures do not usually find differences in the attachment security level between adopted and nonadopted adolescents, but those that used interviews found more insecure attachment organizations. Interviews allow researchers to measure overarching attachment organization resulting in the integrative process that is enabled at the developmental stage of adolescence only when the teens' growing capacities for formal operational thinking are consolidated (Allen, 2008). During adolescence, adoptees could have gained a greater level of security with their adoptive parents, as some longitudinal evidence has shown (e.g., Beijersbergen, Juffer, Bakermans-Kranenburg, & van IJzendoorn, 2012); however, it could be too early for them to have achieved the integration of their former experiences with multiple caregivers (birth parents, institutional caregivers, others) into a single state of mind regarding attachment. That improvement would happen later, as the results showing no attachment organization or security differences between adopted and nonadopted adults seem to illustrate (van der Dries et al., 2009).

Some studies of adoptees showed an attachment improvement linked to the passing of time in early childhood (Román et al., 2012) and adolescence (Pace, Di Folco, Guerriero, & Zavattini, 2013), pointing to an increase in the potential healing impact of the adoptive family environment over time. According to that theory, we expected that the improvement in attachment security would become greater the longer

the adoptee lived in the adoptive family. However, like other research (Barroso et al., 2017; van der Dries et al., 2009), we did not find any significant association between time in the adoptive family and attachment security to parents. Given that most of the adopted teens of our study (96.1%) had already spent a long time with their adoptive families (from 5 years to more than 10 years), it is possible that such an extended amount of time might have been sufficient to counteract the early adversities linked to the preplacement period.

In our study, early—during their first year of life—adopted teens showed less attachment security to parents (particularly to the father) and higher aggressiveness (especially cognitive and emotional) than adolescents adopted after their first year of life. Age at adoption is widely recognized as a relevant factor to be considered in relation to adoption outcomes (e.g., Schwarzwald, Collins, Gillespie, & Spinks-Franklin, 2015). However, studies are not homogenous at establishing the age cut-off that makes the difference: 12 months (e.g., van den Dries et al., 2009), 18 months (e.g., Merz & McCall, 2010), or 24 months (e.g., Escobar et al., 2014). Moreover, although not every study confirms that early adoption is associated with better attachment (e.g., Barroso et al., 2017) and behavioral outcomes (e.g., Escobar et al., 2014) in adolescence, our results did not find that to be the case. One possible explanation for the worse outcomes for the adopted teens during the first year in our study might be associated with the fact that a high percentage (33.3%) of this subgroup of adolescents came from a domestic adoption, whereas only 8.3% of late adopted teens were nationally adopted; there is evidence that domestic adoptees have worse outcomes than international adoptees (Juffer & van IJzendoorn, 2005). An alternative explanation falls within a developmental perspective; early adopted children could follow a similar developmental pathway as their community nonadopted pairs: becoming adolescents

they can allow themselves to show the normative distancing from their parents (Allen, 2008) and to be free to feel and think in more aggressive ways (Vaughn & Santos, 2007). In contrast, when later adoptees reach adolescence, they may not be as confident as early adoptees because they may believe they would put their relationship with their adoptive parent at risk s (i.e., fear of loss) if they were to act out.

Our results also point to the already noted relevance of taking into account the type of adoption (Palacios et al., 2005) and the comparison groups used in adoptee outcomes studies (Juffer et al., 2011). Furthermore, it could indicate the possibility that differences between adoptees and comparison adolescents are attributable to inter-individual differences rather than to group differences because of the heterogeneity of the internationally adopted population (Lindblad, Weitoft, & Hjern, 2010). In fact, Roskam and Stievenart's (2014) study provided arguments in favor of the existence of a common pathway to behavioral difficulties for adoptees and nonadopted adolescents: it is the accumulation of risk factors (IQ, attachment, and parenting) in the current characteristics of the adolescents and their families that is significantly associated with maladjustment in both adoptees and nonadoptees.

To conclude, our results provide a more optimistic view about adoption outcomes in adolescence and are in line with the increasing interest in studying positive development, adjustment, and resilience in children who have experienced vulnerable situations (Goldstein & Brooks, 2005). We need to be cautious about the generalizability of our results due the limitations of this study. The nonlongitudinal design and the nonrandom nature of the sample are the main shortcomings to be dealt with in future studies. In the meantime, educators and family counselors may benefit from the advances presented in this study when dealing with adopted adolescents.

References

- Allen, J. (2008). The attachment system in adolescence. In J. Cassidy, & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 419-435). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Allen, J., & Manning, N. (2007). From safety to affect regulation: Attachment from the vantage point of adolescence. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, (117), 23-39. doi:10.1002/cd.192.
- Allen, J., & Miga, E. M. (2010). Attachment in adolescence: A move to the level of emotion regulation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 27, 181-190. doi:10.1177/0265407509360898
- Allen, J. P., & Tan, J. S. (2016). The multiple facets of attachment in adolescence. In J. Cassidy, & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (3rd Ed.) (pp. 399-415). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Armsden, G., & Greenberg, M. (1987). The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 16, 427-451. doi:10.1007/BF02202939
- Assink, M., van der Put, C. E., Hoeve, M., de Vries, S. L., Stams, G. J. J., & Oort, F. J. (2015). Risk factors for persistent delinquent behavior among juveniles: a meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 42, 47-61. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2015.08.002
- Barroso, R., Barbosa-Ducharne, M., & Coelho, V. (2017). Portuguese adopted adolescents' perception of attachment relationships to parents. *Child & Family Social Work*, 1-8. doi:10.1111/cfs.12401

ATTACHMENT, AGGRESSIVENESS, AND ADOPTION

18

- Beijersbergen, M. D., Juffer, F., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2012). Remaining or becoming secure: Parental sensitive support predicts attachment continuity from infancy to adolescence in a longitudinal adoption study. *Developmental Psychology, 48*(5), 1277. doi:10.1037/a0027442
- Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bramlett, M. D., Radel, L. F., & Blumberg, S. J. (2007). The health and well-being of adopted children. *Pediatrics, 119*, S54-S60 (Supplement). doi:10.1542/peds.2006-2089I
- Christoffersen, M. N. (2012). A study of adopted children, their environment, and development: A systematic review. *Adoption Quarterly, 15*(3), 220-237. doi:10.1080/10926755.2012.700002
- Cyr, C., Euser, E. M., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2010). Attachment security and disorganization in maltreating and high-risk families: A series of meta-analyses. *Development and Psychopathology, 22*, 87-108. doi:10.1017/S0954579409990289
- Davies, J. K., & Bledsoe, J. M. (2005). Prenatal alcohol and drug exposures in adoption. *Pediatric Clinics of North America, 52*, 1369-1393. doi:10.1016/j.pcl.2005.06.015
- Escobar, M. J., Pereira, X., & Santelices, M. P. (2014). Behavior problems and attachment in adopted and non-adopted adolescents. *Children and Youth Services Review, 42*, 59-66. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.04.001
- Escobar, M. J., & Santelices, M. P. (2013). Attachment in adopted adolescents. National adoption in Chile. *Children and Youth Services Review, 35*, 488-492. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2012.12.011

- Feigelman, W. (2001). Comparing adolescents in diverging family structures: Investigating whether adoptees are more prone to problems than their non-adopted peers. *Adoption Quarterly*, 5(2), 5-37. doi:10.1300/J145v05n02_02
- Gallarín, M., & Alonso-Arbiol, I. (2012). Parenting practices, parental attachment and aggressiveness in adolescence: A predictive model. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35, 1601-1610. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.07.002
- Gallarín, M., & Alonso-Arbiol, I. (2013). Dimensionality of the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA): Evaluation with the Spanish Version. *Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 16, E55. doi:10.1017/sjp.2013.47
- Goldstein, S. & Brooks, R. B. (2005). *Handbook of resilience in children*. New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/b107978
- Grotevant, H. D., Dulmen, M. H., Dunbar, N., Nelson-Christinedaughter, J., Christensen, M., Fan, X., & Miller, B. C. (2006). Antisocial behavior of adoptees and non-adoptees: Prediction from early history and adolescent relationships. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 16, 105-131. doi:10.1111/j.1532-7795.2006.00124.x
- Hamilton, L., Cheng, S., & Powell, B. (2007). Adoptive parents, adoptive parents: Evaluating the importance of biological ties for parental investment. *American Sociological Review*, 72(1), 95-116. doi:10.1177/000312240707200105
- Hoeve, M., Stams, G. J. J., van der Put, C. E., Dubas, J. S., van der Laan, P. H., & Gerris, J. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of attachment to parents and delinquency. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 40(5), 771-785. doi:10.1007/s10802-011-9608-1
- Juffer, F., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2005). Behavior problems and mental health referrals of international adoptees: A meta-analysis. *JAMA*, 293, 2501-2515.

- Juffer, F., van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Palacios, J. (2011). Recuperación de niños y niñas tras su adopción. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, *34*(1), 3-18.
doi:10.1174/021037011794390102
- Kawabata, Y., Alink, L. R., Tseng, W. L., van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Crick, N. R. (2011). Maternal and paternal parenting styles associated with relational aggression in children and adolescents: A conceptual analysis and meta-analytic review. *Developmental Review*, *31*(4), 240-278. doi:10.1016/j.dr.2011.08.001
- Koehn, A. J., & Kerns, K. A. (2017). Parent–child attachment: meta-analysis of associations with parenting behaviors in middle childhood and adolescence. *Attachment & Human Development*, *20*(4), 378-405.
doi:10.1080/14616734.2017.1408131
- Lindblad, F., Weitoft, G. R., & Hjern, A. (2010). ADHD in international adoptees: A national cohort study. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *19*, 37–44.
doi:10.1007/s00787-009-0038-3
- McGinn, M. F., (2001). Attachment and psychological separation in adopted and non-adopted adolescents. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *62* (02), 4488B (UMI No. 3006167).
- McSherry, D., Malet, M. F., & Weatherall, K. (2016). Comparing long-term placements for young children in care: Does placement type really matter? *Children and Youth Services Review*, *69*, 56-66.
- Menlove, F. L. (1965). Aggressive symptoms in emotionally disturbed adopted children. *Child Development*, *36*(2), 519-532. doi:10.2307/1126474
- Merz, E. C., & McCall, R. B. (2010). Behavior problems in children adopted from psychosocially depriving institutions. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *38*(4), 459–470. doi:10.1007/s10802-009-9383-4

- Moretti, M. M., & Obsuth, I. (2009). Effectiveness of an attachment-focused manualized intervention for parents of teens at risk for aggressive behavior: The Connect Program. *Journal of Adolescence*, *32*, 1347–1357.
doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.07.013
- O'Brien, K. M., & Zamostny, K. P. (2003). Understanding adoptive families: An integrative review of empirical research and future directions for counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *31*, 679-710.
doi:10.1177/0011000003258086
- Pace, C. S., Di Folco, S., & Guerriero, V. (2018). Late-adoptions in adolescence: Can attachment and emotion regulation influence behaviour problems? A controlled study using a moderation approach. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *25*(2), 250-262. doi:10.1002/cpp.2158
- Pace, C. S., Di Folco, S., Guerriero, V., & Zavattini, G. C. (2013). Attachment models of late-adopted children and their adoptive mothers during adolescence: A long-term follow-up. *Medimond International Proceedings*, (Bologna, Italy), 151–154.
- Palacios, J., Sánchez-Sandoval, Y., & León, E. (2005). Adopción y problemas de conducta. *Revista Internacional de Diagnóstico y Evaluación Psicológica*, *19*(1), 171-190.
- Pinquart, M. (2017). Associations of parenting dimensions and styles with externalizing problems of children and adolescents: An updated meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, *53*(5), 873-932. doi:10.1037/dev0000295
- Raby, K. L., Yarger, H. A., Lind, T., Fraley, R. C., Leerkes, E., & Dozier, M. (2017). Attachment states of mind among internationally adoptive and foster parents.

Development and Psychopathology, 29(2), 365-378.

doi:10.1017/S0954579417000049

Román, M., & Palacios, J. (2011). Separación, pérdida y nuevas vinculaciones: el apego en la adopción. *Acción Psicológica*, 8, 99-111.

Román, M., Palacios, J., Moreno, C., & López, A. (2012). Attachment representations in internationally adopted children. *Attachment & Human Development*, 14, 585-600. doi:10.1080/14616734.2012.727257

Roskam, I., & Stievenart, M. (2014). Is there a common pathway to maladjustment for internationally adopted and non-adopted adolescents? *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 35, 215-222. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2013.12.005

Rosnati, R., & Marta, E. (1997). Parent-child relationships as a protective factor in preventing adolescents' psychosocial risk in inter-racial adoptive and non-adoptive families. *Journal of Adolescence*, 20, 617-631. doi:10.1006/jado.1997.0115

Ručević, S., & Ivana, D. (2010). Aggression, parental and peer Attachments, and adolescent self-Esteem. *Psihologijske Teme*, 19(1), 103-121.

Schwarzwald, H., Collins, E. M., Gillespie, S., & Spinks-Franklin, A. I. (2015). Long-term outcomes for children and adolescents after international adoption. In *International Adoption and Clinical Practice* (pp. 41-48). New York, NY; Springer.

Smith, S. L., Howard, J. A., & Monroe, A. D. (2000). Issues underlying behavior problems in at-risk adopted children. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 22(7), 539-562. doi:10.1016/S0190-7409(00)00102-X

Steinberg, L., Dahl, R., Keating, D., Kupfer, D. J., Masten, A. S., & Pine, D. (2006). The study of developmental psychopathology in adolescence: Integrating

affective neuroscience with the study of context. In D. Cicchetti & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology* (2nd ed., pp. 710–741). New York, NY: Wiley.

Teisl, M., & Cicchetti, D. (2008). Physical abuse, cognitive and emotional processes, and aggressive/disruptive behavior problems. *Social Development, 17*(1), 1-23. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00412.x

van den Dries, L., Juffer, F., van IJzendoorn, M. H., & Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J. (2009). Fostering security? A meta-analysis of attachment in adopted children. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*, 410–421. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2008.09.008

Vaughn, B. E., & Santos, A. J. (2007). An evolutionary/ecological account of aggressive behavior and trait aggression in human children and adolescents. In P. H. Hawley, T. D. Little, & P. C. Rodkin (Eds.), *Aggression and adaptation: The bright side to bad behavior* (pp. 31–63). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zill, N., & Bramlet, M. D. (2014). Health and well-being of children adopted from foster care. *Children and Youth Services Review, 40*, 29-40. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.02.008

ATTACHMENT, AGGRESSIVENESS, AND ADOPTION

24

Table 1
Family Characteristics Across Samples and Characteristics of the Adopted Group

	Community adopted (<i>n</i> = 80) %	Community nonadopted (<i>n</i> = 101) %	Clinical nonadopted (<i>n</i> = 81) %
Family type			
One parent	27.3	12.1	31.4
Two parent	72.7	87.9	68.6
Parental education			
No studies	--	--	8.8
Primary	12.0	12.5	35.3
Secondary	28.0	46.9	35.3
University	60.0	40.6	20.6
Parents' employment status			
No employment	4.0	--	9.1
Employed	70.7	68.8	63.6
Pensioner	25.3	31.2	27.3
Adoption type			
International	84.6	--	--
Domestic	15.4	--	--
Age at adoption (years)			
≤ 1	22.1	--	--
2-3	9.1	--	--
> 3	53.2	--	--
Previous institutional care			
Yes	79.5	--	--
Orphanage or similar	83.9	--	--
Other	16.1	--	--
No	20.5	--	--
Previous maltreatment			
Yes	27.6	--	--
No	23.7	--	--
Unknown	48.7	--	--
Time in adoptive family (years)			
< 5	3.9	--	--
5-10	31.2	--	--
> 10	64.9	--	--

ATTACHMENT, AGGRESSIVENESS, AND ADOPTION

Table 2

Mean Differences in Attachment and Aggressiveness Across Adoptees

	Adopted First Year <i>M (SD)</i>	Adopted after First Year <i>M (SD)</i>	<i>t</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Attachment				
Maternal	3.71 (0.86)	3.96 (0.80)	-1.05	.30
Paternal	3.39 (1.16)	3.96 (0.69)	-2.00	.60
Aggressiveness				
Indirect	1.64 (0.54)	1.46 (0.49)	1.28	.36
Direct	1.97 (0.76)	1.73 (0.76)	1.08	.31
Cognitive	2.38 (0.74)	1.93 (0.82)	1.93	.57
Emotional	2.56 (0.68)	2.08 (0.88)	1.95	.60

For Review Only

ATTACHMENT, AGGRESSIVENESS, AND ADOPTION

26

Table 3
Mean Differences in Attachment and Aggressiveness Across Samples

	Community nonadopted	Community adopted	Clinical nonadopted	<i>F</i>	μ^2	Community adopted vs. Community nonadopted	Community adopted vs. Clinical nonadopted	Community nonadopted vs. Clinical nonadopted
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>			Cohen's <i>d</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Attachment								
Maternal	3.92 (0.68)	3.97 (0.79)	3.27 (0.89)	19.41***	.14	.07	.83	.82
Paternal	3.67 (0.83)	3.97 (0.69)	2.94 (1.05)	25.15***	.18	.38	1.16	.78
Aggressiveness								
Indirect	1.46 (0.45)	1.50 (0.58)	1.77 (0.69)	6.57**	.05	.07	.42	.53
Direct	1.64 (0.65)	1.79 (0.80)	2.64 (0.98)	33.74***	.22	.19	.95	1.20
Cognitive	2.17 (0.84)	2.02 (0.91)	2.66 (1.09)	8.54***	.07	.16	.63	.50
Emotional	2.24 (0.80)	2.16 (0.94)	2.93 (0.90)	20.46***	.14	.10	.84	.81

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$