

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RISK BEHAVIOR OF PUBESCENTS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR FAMILY ENVIRONMENT

^aMARCELA VEREŠOVÁ, ^bKRISTÍNA MUJKOŠOVÁ

Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Faculty of Education, Tr. A. Hlinku 1, 94974 Nitra, Slovakia
 email: ^amveresova@ukf.sk, ^bkristina.mujkosova@ukf.sk

Abstract: The aim of article and research is to identify and analyze characteristics of the family environment of early adolescents in relation to particular types of risk behavior with emphasis on research in this area. We focus on the family environment of pubescents in relation to particular types of risk behavior of children and adolescents - the abuse of addictive substances, delinquency and bullying (perception of self as a victim) of pubescents. Our research group consists of 287 pubescents (153 boys and 134 girls) attending 6., 7., and 8. grade of elementary schools in the region of Trenčín and Nitra in the Slovak republic. To collect data we used three questionnaires, those being the Family Environment Scale, The Revised Family Communication Pattern Instrument and the questionnaire Occurrence of Risk Behavior in Adolescent age. We found significant relationship between the family characteristics "cohesion", "expressiveness", "organization", "conversation orientation", "conflict", "intellectual-cultural orientation", "independence" and drug use; significant relationship between the family characteristics "cohesion", "expressiveness", "organization", "conversation orientation", "conflict", "intellectual-cultural orientation", "moral-religious orientation" and delinquency; and significant relationship between the family characteristics "cohesion", "organization", "conflict", "moral-religious orientation" and bullying (self-perceived victimhood).

Keywords: Risk Behavior, Drug Use, Delinquency, Bullying, Family Environment, Family Characteristics, Pubescents.

1 Introduction

Family might be characterized as one of the most essential factors regarding protectivity or riskiness as an aspect of particular forms of risk behavior in childhood and in adolescence (for instance Verešová and Hušvétyová, 2005; Dolejš, 2010; Nielsen Sobotková et.al., 2014; and others). Adolescence is a transitional period between childhood and adulthood, the beginning of which is assigned to the 11th/12th year of life and the end to 18 up to 21 year of age. In our study we center primarily on the first phase of adolescence (11/12 to 14/15 years), which is identified as pubescence (Vágnerová, 2000; Čerešník, and Gatiaľ, 2014; Dolejš, and Orel, 2018; several publications talk about adolescence as the whole stage from 11/12 to 19/20 years of age, for instance Zgourides, 2000; Shaffer and Kipp, 2010; and others). Some authors (for instance Jessor, 1991; Arnett, 2000; Verešová, 2004; Balloccchini, Chiamenti, and Lamborghini, 2013) state that, in terms of occurrence and manifestation of risk behavior, adolescents are the riskiest in comparison to younger or older age groups.

Risk behavior/problem behavior of adolescents (including pubescents) includes drug use/addictive behavior, risk sexual behavior, aggressive behavior, violence, injury and bullying, academic unsuccessfulness/ failing and dropping out of school, delinquent behavior, criminality, inappropriate eating habits/impulsive eating and insufficient physical activity/physical inactivity, risk traffic behavior, gaming and gambling (Jessor, 1991; Arnett, 2000; Verešová, 2004; Newman et.al., 2008; Čerešník, and Gatiaľ, 2014; Suchá et al., 2018). According to findings, the most frequent risk behavior in adolescence is risky sexual behavior, violence, accidents and drug use (Balloccchini, Chiamenti, and Lamborghini, 2013). In our research we focus on 3 risk forms of behavior – the abuse of addictive substances, delinquency and bullying.

In correspondence with Kobiláš and Novotný (2007), the abuse of addictive substances represents maladaptive use of psychoactive substances, which causes interpersonal or legal issues, interferes with the fulfillment of the individual's duties, threatens or alternatively harms the health of the consumer. Based on a relatively wide range of existing research findings, Rioux et.al. (2016) summarizes risk factors of drug use tied to family environment as follows: problem practices and educational approaches, including coercive practices, very low or no parental control and absence of monitoring in childhood and adolescence, high level of conflict between parents and

children, poor parent-child relationships, marital conflict, divorce of parents. In the context of protective factors of drug use tied to family environment, Wood et. al. (2013) identifies that family environments characterized with high cohesion, low level of conflict and absence of parental problems with alcohol and drugs acts protectively and at the same time significantly correlates with prosocial behavior.

Delinquent and antisocial behavior of adolescents is characterized by repeated violations of socially prescribed rules and standards in various contexts (for instance in public, at home and in school) and includes physical or verbal harm to another person, damage or theft of property or covert behavior of juveniles without victims such as truancy, drug use and others (Hofmann, and Müller, 2018). Adolescents deliberately act against rules, values and social norms. Delinquency borderlines with criminality, where socially undesirable behavior is associated with the violation of legal norms declared in the laws of the state. We speak of this type of delinquent behavior only in connection with adolescents above the age of 15, at which point a person becomes criminally liable. Research suggests that children and youth, who have experienced ill-treatment in the family, are at greater risk of delinquent behavior and criminality when living in the context of other cumulative risks, such as drug use, mental health problems, abuse, neglect or bullying, while parental control and monitoring and positive relationships with parents are protective factors against delinquency and criminality (Van Wert et.al., 2018).

Bullying is a form of aggressive behavior aimed at harming others. On one side is the actor of bullying and on the other side is the victim of bullying. Kolář (2009) states that bullying belongs to violent and addictive relationships when one or more students intentionally and repeatedly harm others. Research of age trends (Melton et al., 1998) suggests that the probability of bullying is higher among adolescents in primary schools (pubescents) compared to adolescents in secondary schools.

Passive victims of bullying tend to be insecure, quiet and introverted, often experience loneliness, often feel guilty, have an increased risk of depression and anxiety, are aware of their otherness and are perceived by peers as such (for instance health handicap, overweight, different race, culture, etc.) (Georgiou, and Stavrinides, 2008; similarly also Řičan, 1998). Active victims of violence and bullying / aggressive victims are, based on existing research (Hymel, Swearer, 2015), characterized as impulsive, unstable, experiencing more rejection by peers, have many problems at school and a highly stressful or very harsh home environment. According to the findings of Georgiou and Stavrinides (2008), they have the highest levels of depression, are often victims of serious crimes and experience anxiety with severe physical symptoms. According to Melton et al. (1998), adolescent violence and bullying are linked to rates of family disruption, ethnic diversity and poverty. Trust in parents and open communication with them are absent elements in an unhealthy dysfunctional family. A research study conducted on twins has demonstrated that a positive emotional relationship with the mother (but also the sibling) and a positive family atmosphere are key factors involved in coping with bullying (the victim of bullying), showing that it is an environmental rather than a genetic effect (Bowes et.al., 2010).

In accordance with experts, we consider important characteristics of the family environment, which must also be researched in relation to the above-mentioned risky forms of behavior or in relation to the health of adolescents (in the direction of protection and riskiness) to be as follows: cohesion (for instance Oravcová, Ďuricová and Bindasová, 2007; Matilla et.al., 2010; Rattay et.al, 2018), expressiveness (for instance Oravcová, Ďuricová and Bindasová, 2007; Habib et.al., 2010; Hessler and Katz, 2010), organization (for instance Habib et.al., 2010), control and monitoring (for instance Azimi, Vaziri, and Kashani, 2012; Nielsen Sobotková et al., 2014; Mehusa et.al.,

2018; Van Wert et.al., 2018), conflict (for instance Hušvétyová, and Sarmány Schuller, 2004), conversation orientation (for instance Ryan, Roman, and Okwany, 2015). Hacek (2017) also mentions the family's conformity orientation, which creates a space in which children are encouraged to acquire and maintain the same attitudes, values, beliefs as their parents. In dialogue orientation, parents create an open environment where children are encouraged to discuss together with their parents (Hacek, 2017). Adequate parental control and monitoring and positive relationships with parents are protective factors against delinquency and criminality, as well as other risk forms of behavior (for example, school failure or truancy - Li et.al., 2015; Malczyk, and Lawson, 2016).

In our research, we assume a statistically significant negative relationship between the examined characteristics of the family environment (cohesion, expressiveness, organization, conversation orientation, control) and the examined risky forms of pubescent behavior (drug use, delinquency, bullying - perception of self as a victim). We assume a statistically significant positive relationship between the examined characteristics of the family environment (conflict) and the examined risky forms of pubescent behavior (drug use, delinquency, bullying - perception of self as a victim). With this in mind, we have not found any relevant research findings on the possible existence of a relationship between other characteristics of the family environment contained in our research problem, we ask research questions about the existence of a relationship between other characteristics of pubescent families: intellectual-cultural orientation, active-recreational orientation, moral-religious orientation, independence, success orientation, conformity orientation and researched forms of risky behavior (drug use, delinquency and bullying - perception of self as a victim).

2 Methods

Three questionnaires focused on the identification of individual research variables were used in the conducting of the research:

1. Family environment scale (Hargašová and Kollárik, 1986). The scale represents a method for quantifying the discrepancy between family members; in our research we used it exclusively for the pubescent perception of the family. The scale contains 90 statements concerning the family environment. It is divided into 10 factors - characteristics of the family environment: 1. Cohesion (COH), 2. Expressiveness (EXP), 3. Conflict (CON), 4. Independence (IND), 5. Success orientation (SUO), 6. Intellectual-cultural orientation (ICO), 7. Active-recreational orientation (ARO), 8. Moral- religious orientation (MWO), 9. Organization (ORG), 10. Control (CNT). The first three represent relational dimensions, the factors 4 to 8 dimensions of personal growth, and the last two dimensions of system maintenance.
2. The Revised Family Communication Pattern Instrument (Ritchie and Fitzpatrick, 1990). The questionnaire consists of 26 items aimed at assessing the perception of pubescents about communication in the family environment and is divided into 2 scales: Conformity orientation (CNO), Conversation orientation (CVO).
3. Occurrence of risky behavior of adolescents (from the Czech original "Výskyt rizikového chování u adolescentů (VRCHA)", Dolejš and Skopal, 2015). The questionnaire contains 18 items grouped into three subscales: drug use (DRU), delinquency (DEL) and bullying (experience with bullying behavior as the object of bullying, BUL).

The JASP statistical program was used for statistical data processing. To describe the research data, we used descriptive statistics - median (M), standard deviation (SD), minimum (Min.) and maximum (Max.) measured values. The relationship between the examined characteristics of the family environment and the examined forms of risk behavior of pubescents was determined using Pearson's correlation coefficient (the normality of the distribution in individual variables was identified in advance).

Our research sample consisted of N = 287 pubescents attending the 6th, 7th and 8th grade at primary schools in the Trenčín and Nitra regions of the Slovak Republic. Of the total number of respondents, 153 were boys and 134 were girls. 67 pubescents were attending the 6th grade (23.35%), 107 pubescents were attending the 7th grade (36.93%), and 114 pubescents were attending the 8th (39.72%). We had 152 pubescents in urban primary schools and 135 pubescents in rural primary schools.

3 Results

Table 1 provides an overview of the descriptive characteristics of the observed variables.

Table 1 Descriptive statistics - family characteristics and selected types of risk behaviour of pubescents

	M	SD	Min.	Max.
DRU	0.540	1.040	0	6
DEL	1.345	1.583	0	6
BUL	0.742	1.015	0	4
COH	6.652	1.941	0	9
EXP	5.756	1.888	1	9
CON	2.610	2.241	0	9
IND	5.348	1.464	1	9
SUO	5.544	1.516	0	9
ICO	3.826	1.727	0	9
ARO	5.240	1.940	0	9
MWO	4.561	1.367	0	8
ORG	5.941	1.613	1	9
CNT	4.899	1.706	0	9
CNO	33.139	5.844	17	55
CVO	48.443	9.421	15	71

Note: DRU = drug use; DEL = delinquency; BUL =bullying; COH = cohesion, EXP = expressiveness, CON = conflict, ORG = organization, IND= independence, SUO = success orientation, ICO = intellectual-cultural orientation, ARO = active recreational orientation, MWO = moral-worldview orientation, CNT = control; CNO = conformity orientation CVO = conversation orientation).

Table 2 Relationship between family characteristics and selected types of risk behaviour of pubescents

		DRU	DEL	BUL
COH	r	-0.172 **	-0.230 ***	-0.213 ***
	p	0.004	< .001	< .001
EXP	r	-0.116 *	-0.145 *	-0.110
	p	0.049	0.014	0.064
CON	r	0.149 *	0.288 ***	0.301 ***
	p	0.011	< .001	< .001
IND	r	0.152 *	-0.026	-0.088
	p	0.010	0.656	0.139
SUO	r	0.062	-0.001	0.028
	p	0.299	0.984	0.640
ICO	r	-0.169 **	-0.139 *	0.004
	p	0.004	0.018	0.943
ARO	r	0.053	-0.020	-0.023
	p	0.369	0.732	0.692
MWO	r	0.091	-0.143 *	-0.185 **
	p	0.125	0.015	0.002
ORG	r	-0.254 ***	-0.300 ***	-0.146 *
	p	< .001	< .001	0.013
CNT	r	0.013	-0.069	0.064
	p	0.825	0.247	0.283
CNO	r	0.007	0.039	0.017
	p	0.904	0.510	0.771
CVO	r	-0.171 **	-0.159 **	-0.121 *
	p	0.004	0.007	0.040

Note: r = Pearson correlation; p = statistical significance: * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001; DRU = drug use; DEL = delinquency; BUL =bullying; CON = conflicts, COH = cohesion, EXP = expressiveness, ORG = organization, CVO = conversational orientation, CNT = control, IND= independence, SUO = success orientation, ICO = intellectual-cultural orientation, ARO = active recreational orientation, MWO =

moral-worldview orientation, CNO = conformity orientation CVO = conversation orientation).

Table 2 presents the results of analyses of the relationship between the observed characteristics of the family environment and the observed risky forms of behavior in early adolescents/pubescents.

As a part of the verification of our scientific assumptions for cohesion and risky forms of behavior in pubescents, we found the existence of a statistically significant negative relationship with substance use ($r=-0.172$; $p=0.004$), delinquency ($r=-0.230$; $p<.001$), perception of self as a victim of bullying ($r=-0.213$; $p<.001$). The higher the perceived cohesion of family members, the less risky behavior in the form of drug use, delinquent behavior and self-perception a victim of bullying is represented in pubescents.

As part of the verification of our scientific assumptions based on expressiveness and risky forms of behavior in pubescents, we found the existence of a statistically significant negative relationship with substance use ($r=-0.116$; $p=0.049$), delinquency ($r=-0.145$; $p=0.014$). If pubescents perceive higher expressiveness within the family, they less use drug and manifest delinquent behavior.

As part of the verification of our scientific assumptions related to conflict and risky forms of behavior in pubescents, we found the existence of a statistically significant positive relationship with substance use ($r=0.149$; $p=0.011$); delinquency ($r=0.288$; $p<.001$) as well as perception of self as a victim of bullying ($r=0.301$; $p<.001$). We found that the higher the family conflict perceived by pubescents, the riskier is their drug use, the more delinquent behaviors they represent in their behavior, and the higher their perception of themselves as the victims of bullying.

As part of the verification of our scientific assumptions related to family organization and risky forms of behavior in pubescents, we found the existence of a statistically significant negative relationship with drug use ($r=-0.254$; $p<.001$), delinquency ($r=-0.300$; $p<.001$) and bullying - perception of self as a victim of bullying ($r=-0.146$; $p=0.013$). We found that the higher the family organization is perceived by pubescents, the less their use of addictive substances, delinquent behavior and perception of themselves as victims of bullying.

As part of the verification of our scientific assumptions related to family control and risky forms of behavior in pubescents, we did not find the existence of a statistically significant negative relationship with any type of risky behavior.

As part of the verification of our scientific assumptions related to family orientation to conversation and risky forms of behavior in pubescents, we found the existence of a statistically significant negative relationship with drug use in pubescents ($r=-0.171$; $p=.004$), with delinquent behavior ($r=-0.159$; $p=.007$) and with the perception of themselves as a victim of bullying ($r=-0.121$; $p=.040$). We found that the higher the perceived orientation of family members to conversation within the family by pubescents, the less their use of addictive substances, delinquent behavior and perception of themselves as victims of bullying.

In the area of other relationships between the observed characteristics of the family environment and the monitored risk forms of behavior, we identified the following statistically significant relationships:

- moderately negative relationship between intellectual and cultural orientation of the family and substance use in adolescents ($r=-0.169$; $p=0.004$);
- weak negative relationship between intellectual-cultural orientation of the family and delinquency ($r = -0.139$; $p=0.018$);
- weak positive relationship between independence in the family environment and drug use in pubescents ($r=0.152$; $p=0.010$);

- weak negative relationship between moral-worldview orientation of the family and delinquency of pubescents ($r=-0.143$; $p=0.015$);
- moderately negative relationship between the moral-worldview orientation of the family and the perception of self as a victim of bullying in pubescents ($r = -0.185$; $p = 0.002$).

4 Discussion and Conclusion

According to our conclusions, characteristics of the family environment - cohesion, expressiveness, organization, conversation orientation, conflict, intellectual-cultural orientation and independence have significant connection with drug use among pubescents. The family characteristic "cohesion" within the meaning of the expression of interest, support, and assistance among family members has proved to be significant in relation to substance use, which supports the conclusions of Oravcová, Ďuricová and Bindasová (2007) and Matilla et.al. (2010). The more cohesive family members are, the lower the risk of drug use and misuse among adolescents is. Oravcová, Ďuricová and Bindasová (2007), Habib et.al. (2010), Hessler and Katz (2010) emphasized the importance of the ability to manage and express the emotional expressions of individuals in relation to drug use, which is clearly linked to the characteristics of the family environment "expressiveness" within the meaning of open manifestations of emotions and allowing honest behavior among family members. Emotional manifestations are very important in the family; their presence contributes to the reduction of risky drug use among adolescents. The family characteristics "organization" within the meaning of clearly defined responsibilities and rules has also proved to be significant in relation to drug use among the age cohort of pubescents. The bigger order and organization of the family rules are, the less the likelihood of the occurrence of these risk behaviors is. Our finding is in accordance with the authors of Habib et.al. (2010) write about the importance of high organization of the family environment in terms of lower alcohol consumption. The family characteristic "conversational orientation" within the meaning of open communication about children's activities during the day, goals for the future, feelings and emotions, non-specific topics, or issues, for example, related to school has proved to be important in relation to drug use among pubescent. The more parents communicate and discuss with their children, showing them respect and esteem for their opinions, the lower the risk of drug use is. The importance of communication in the family was also expressed by the authors Ryan, Roman, and Okwany (2015). In relation to drug use among pubescents, we found out the importance of the family characteristic "intellectual-cultural orientation". The more family members focus on activities of a social, intellectual, cultural, or political nature, the lower the risk of the occurrence of risky drug use is. The family characteristic "conflict" within the meaning of open manifestations of aggression, anger, and conflicting interactions between family members has proved to be significant in relation to drug use among pubescents. The higher family conflict represents a high risk of the occurrence of this form of risky behavior among pubescents. Our conclusions support the findings of Hušvetyová and Sarmány Schuller (2004). Regarding the characteristics of the family environment "independence" and its link to drug use, we found out, that the more family members make decisions for themselves and be exclusively self-sufficient in solving their problems, the greater risk of emergence of pubescent drug use is. "Control" as another characteristic of the family environment within the meaning of the degree of control between family members has proved to be insignificant in our research in relation to drug use among pubescents. In this regard, we did not support the findings of Ryan, Roman, and Okwany (2015). This discrepancy in the findings may be related to differences in the nature of the control. Ondrušková, Pružinská, and Pavelová (2016) write about the fact that parents control especially their children's leisure time, while the items related to control in our questionnaire were related to control among family members only within their family environment, and therefore not to activities that perform pubescent voluntarily outside the family.

Among the characteristics of the family environment such as "success orientation" (highlighting competitiveness and better results in the family), "active-recreational orientation" (involving the family in sports and leisure activities), "moral-religious orientation" (dealing with the worldview and ethical values and problems) and drug use among pubescent, we did not reveal any significant links.

According to our findings, the characteristics of the family environment, such as cohesion, expressiveness, organization, conversation orientation, conflict, intellectual-cultural orientation, and moral-religious orientation, have a significant relationship with the delinquent behavior of pubescents. The family characteristic of "cohesion" within the meaning of expressing interest, support, and help among family members has proved to be important in relation to delinquency, thus we are expressing a unified finding with Nielsen Sobotková et.al. (2014). The greater the coherence between family members is, there is a lower risk of delinquent behavior among pubescents. Hessler and Katz (2010) talk about the importance of regulating emotions in terms of delinquency, which is also related to our examined family characteristic "expressiveness" within the meaning of open manifestations of emotions and enabling honest behavior among family members. Emotional manifestations are very important in the family, their presence contributes to the reduction of delinquency of pubescents, and it has a protective character. The family characteristics "organization" within the meaning of clearly defined responsibilities and rules has also proved to be significant in relation to the delinquency of pubescents. The greater order in the family is, there is the less the likelihood of the occurrence of this risky form of behavior in this age cohort. Our finding is in accordance with the authors Nielsen Sobotková et.al. (2014), who state the importance of clearly determined rules in the family environment in relation to problems in adolescent behavior. Equally at the level of the family characteristic "conversation orientation", we confirmed if parents talk to children and discuss with them, if they verbally show respect and esteem to each other, the risk of the occurrence of delinquent behavior among pubescents living in such families is lower. The importance of communication between family members in a protective direction is also described by Ryan, Roman and Okwany (2015). In our research, we also identified the importance of the relationship between family characteristics "intellectual-cultural" orientation and delinquent behavior in the direction that, the more family members focus on activities of social, intellectual, cultural or political nature, the risk of pubescent delinquency is lower, so it has protective importance. The "moral-worldview orientation" has an equal protective attitude towards delinquent behavior (the more family members deal with the worldview and ethical values and problems, the risk of the occurrence of pubescent delinquency is lower). The family characteristic "conflict" within the meaning of open manifestations of aggression, anger, and conflicting interaction between family members has proved to be significant in relation to pubescent delinquency. The higher family conflict represents a high risk of the occurrence of this form of risky behavior among pubescents, which supports the findings of Hušvetyová and Sarmány Schuller (2004) and Verešová and Hušvetyová (2005). "Control" as another characteristic of the family environment within the meaning of the degree of control among family members, it proved to be insignificant in connection with the delinquency of pubescents. In this regard, we do not support the claims of Van Wert et al. (2018), Gottfredson and Hirshi (1990, in Ondrušková, Pružinská, and Pavelová, 2016), who write about the importance of control in the prevention of delinquent behavior of children and adolescents. This discrepancy in the findings may be related to differences in the nature of the control. Ondrušková, Pružinská, and Pavelová (2016) write about the fact that parents control especially their children's leisure time, while the items related to control in our questionnaire were related to control among family members only within their family environment, and therefore not to activities that perform pubescent voluntarily outside the family. According to our findings, among the characteristics of the family environment such as "independence" (mutual encouragement in independence, decision-making, and self-

sufficiency in solving one's own problems), "success orientation" (highlighting competitiveness and better results in the family), "active recreational orientation" (involvement of the family in sports and recreational activities) and pubescent delinquency, there is no significant relationship.

Characteristics of the family environment - cohesion, organization, conversation orientation, conflict and moral-worldview orientation have a significant relationship with bullying in the sense of perception of self as the victim of bullying in the age cohort of pubescents. We confirmed protective nature of family cohesion (similar to Cluver, Bowes, and Gardner, 2010), family organization (similar to Nielsen Sobotková et.al., 2014), conversational orientations (similar to Ryan, Roman, and Okwany, 2015), moral-worldview orientation in relation to delinquent manifestations of behavior of pubescents. Contrarily, we confirmed the risk dimension of the conflict in family, which is manifested by anger, aggressive manifestations of family members in the direction of strengthening the probability of perceiving the pubescent as a victim of bullying in the school environment. In our research, we did not confirm any significant relationships between perception of self as victims of bullying among pubescents and family control, independence in decision-making and self-sufficiency in solving problems in the family, family success orientation, intellectual-cultural orientation of family member, as well as the active-recreational orientation of the family.

Our research, as well as the research in the contribution of the mentioned experts, underlines the importance of monitoring factors that are related (correlative, mediative or predictive) to risk behavior or its individual types. It can be clearly stated that the characteristics of family environment play a significant role in protectiveness and promote protection of the health of adolescents (especially open and empathetic communication between family members centered on mutual respect and esteem; healthy family rules and adequate control behavior; coherence in expressing interest, support and assistance among family members; expressiveness and congruent expression of emotions and feelings in the family environment; and others), while others act as risk factors and their accumulation or strong action promotes manifestations of risky behavior or its individual types (for example, increased family conflict or the high independence of family members, which can lead to autonomous but high individualized decisions and actions independent of decisions and actions of the potential of other family members). Time, society, perception and functioning of the family, values are constantly changing and evolving in a different direction, so we highly recommend conducting research of this nature in the future, so that we have scientific knowledge as up-to-date as possible with emphasis on the influence of the family and its characteristics on risky behavior in adolescents. In the context of our findings and the little research in the field of characteristics of the family environment, such as independence, intellectual-cultural orientation and moral-worldview orientation, we consider it to be important to pay attention to research in a broader sense so that we can confirm or discuss our findings with the cohort pubescents, as well as with younger and older age cohorts.

Literature:

1. Arnett, J. J.: Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 2000, Vol.55, Issue 5, p.469-480, ISSN 0003-066X.
2. Azimi, L., Vaziri, S., Kashani, F.: Relationship between Maternal Parenting Style and Child's Aggressive Behavior. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2012, Vol. 69, p.1286-1281, ISSN 1877-0428.
3. Ballochchini, E., Chiamenti, G., Lamborghini, A.: Adolescents: which risks for their life and health? *Journal of Preventive Medicine and Hygiene*, 2013, Vol.54, Issue 4, p. 191-194, ISSN 2421-4248.
4. Cluver, L., Bowes, L., Maughan, B., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E. & Arseneault, L.: Families promote emotional and behavioural resilience to bullying: evidence of an environmental

- effect. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry*, 2010, Vol. 51, p. 809-818, ISSN 1469-7610.
5. Čerešník, M., Gatial, V.: *Rizikové správanie a vybrané osobnostné premenné dospievajúcich v systéme nižšieho sekundárneho vzdelávania*. Nitra: Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa, 2014, 109p, ISBN 978-80-558-0658-7.
 6. Dolejš, M.: *Efektívni včasná diagnostika rizikového chování u adolescentů*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, 2010, 190p. ISBN 978-80-244-2642-6.
 7. Dolejš, M., Orel, M.: *Rizikové chování u adolescentů a impulzivita jako prediktor tohoto chování*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2018, 105p., ISBN 978-80-244-5252-4.
 8. Dolejš, M., Skopal, O.: *Výskyt rizikového chování u adolescentů (VRCHA)*, 1. vydání. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, 2015, 62p.
 9. Georgiou, S.N., Stavrinides, P.: Bullies, Victims and Bully-Victims: Psychosocial Profiles and Attribution Styles. *School Psychology International*, 2008, Vol.29, p.584-589, ISSN 1461-7374.
 10. Habib, C. et.al.: The importance of family management, closeness with father and family structure in early adolescent alcohol use. *Addiction*, 2010, Vol. 105, Issue 10, p. 1750-1758, ISSN 1360-0443.
 11. Hacek, J.: Rodinné komunikačné vzorce. *Psychologie a její kontexty*, Vol. 8, Issue 1, p. 19 – 30.
 12. Hargašová, M., Kollárik, T.: *Škála rodinného prostredia*. Bratislava: Psychodiagnostické a didaktické testy, š. p., 1986.
 13. Hessler, D., Katz, L. F.: Brief Report: Associations between Emotional Competence and Adolescent Risky Behavior. *Journal of Adolescence*, 2010, Vol. 33, Issue 1, p. 241–246, ISSN 0140-1971.
 14. Hofmann, V., Müller, Ch. M.: Avoiding antisocial behavior among adolescents: The positive influence of classmates' prosocial behavior. *Journal of Adolescence*, 2018, Vol. 68, p. 136-145, ISSN 0140-1971.
 15. Hušvétyová, J., Sarmány Schuller, I.: Štýly rodinnej výchovy a ich možný dopad na vznik problémového správania detí. In *Svět žen a svět mužů. Polarita a vzájemné obohacování: sborník z konference Psychologické dny 2004*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci. Available from: <http://cmps.ecn.cz/pd/2004/texty/pdf/husvetyova.pdf>.
 16. Hymel, S., Swearer, S.M.: Four Decades of Research on School Bullying. *American Psychologist*, 2015, Vol. 80, Issue 4, p.293-299, ISSN 0003-066X.
 17. Jessor, R.: Risk behavior in adolescence: A psychosocial framework for understanding and action. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 1991, Vol. 12, Issue 8, p.598-605, ISSN ISSN: 1054-139X.
 18. Kolář, M.: Diagnostika a léčba šikanování v praxi. In Philippová, L., Janošová, P. (Eds.) *Šikana jako etický, psychologický a pedagogický problém*. Praha: Tribun EU, 2009, pp.13-26, ISBN 978-80-7367-817-3.
 19. Kolibáš, E., Novotný, V.: *Alkohol – drogy – závislosti*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, Vydavateľstvo UK, 2007, 260p., ISBN 978-80-223-2315-4.
 20. Li, S.J., Roslan, S., Abdullah, M. Ch., Abdullah, H.: Commuter Families: Parental Readiness, Family Environment and Adolescent School Performance, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2015, Vol. 182, p.686-692, ISSN 1877-0428.
 21. Malczyk, B.R., Lawson, H.A.: Parental monitoring, the parent-child relationship and children's academic engagement in mother-headed single-parent families. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 2018, Vol. 83, p.284-282, ISSN 0190-7409.
 22. Mattila, M-L. et.al.: Sense of coherence and health behavior in adolescence. *Acta Paediatrica*, 2011, Vol. 100, Issue 12, p. 1590- 1595, ISSN 0803-5253.
 23. Mehusa, Ch. J., Forster, M., Chan, G., Hemphilld, S.A., Toumbourou, J.W., McMorris, B.: Longitudinal, reciprocal relationships between family management and antisocial peer associations. *Journal of Adolescence*, 2018, Vol. 68, p. 146-151, ISSN 0140-1971.
 24. Melton, G. B., Limber, S. Flerx, V. Cunningham, P., Osgood, D.W., Chambers, J., Henggler, S., Nation, M.: *Violence among rural youth. Final report to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*. 1998, 196 p., ISBN 1-879953-05-6.
 25. Newman, K., Harrison, L., Dashiff, C., Davies, S.: Relationships between parenting styles and risk behaviors in adolescent health: an integrative literature review *Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem*, 2008, Vol. 16, Issue 1, p.142-150, ISSN 1518-8345.
 26. Nielsen Sobotková, V. a kol.: *Rizikové a antisociální chování v adolescenci*. Praha: Grada Publishing, a.s., 2014, 152s., ISBN 978-80-247-4042-3
 27. Ondrušková, E., Pružinská, J., Pavelová, E.: *Rodina, voľný čas, psychoaktívne látky a delikvencia*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského, Vydavateľstvo UK, 2016, 208p., ISBN 978-80-223-4236-0.
 28. Oravcová, J., Ďuricová, L., Bindasová, O.: *Psychológia rodiny*. Banská Bystrica: Univerzita Mateja Bela, Fakulta humanitných vied, 2007, 365p., ISBN 978-80-8083-490-6.
 29. Rattay, P., Lippe, E., Mauz, E., Richter, F., Hölling, H., Lange, C., Lampert, T.: Health and Health Risk Behaviour of adolescents-Differences According to Family Structure. Results of the German KiGGS Cohort Study. *PLoS ONE*, 2018, Vol. 13, Issue 3, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0192968, eCollection.
 30. Rioux, Ch., Castellanos-Ryan, N., Parent, S., Séguin, J.R.: The interaction between temperament and the family environment in adolescent substance use and externalizing behaviors: Support for diathesis-stress or differential susceptibility? *Developmental Review*, 2016, Vol. 40, p.118-150, ISSN 0273-2297.
 31. Ritchie, L.D., Fitzpatrick, M. A.: Family Communication Patterns: Measuring Intrapersonal Perceptions of Interpersonal Relationships. *Communication Research*. 1990, Vol. 17. Issue 4, p.523-544, ISSN 0093-6502.
 32. Ryan, J., Roman, N. V., Okwany, A.: The Effects of Parental Monitoring and Communication on Adolescent Substance Use and Risky Sexual Activity: A Systematic Review. *The Open Family Studies Journal*. 2015, Vol. 7, p.12-27, ISSN 1874-9224.
 33. Řičan, P.: *Agresivita a šikanovanie medzi deťmi*. Martin: Educatio, 1998, 85 p., ISBN 80-967-5322-3.
 34. Suchá, J., Dolejš, M., Pipová, H., Maierová, E., Cakirpaloglu, P.: *Hraní digitálních her českými adolescenty*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2018, 188 p., ISBN 978-80-244-5428-3.
 35. Shaffer, D. R., Kipp, K.: *Developmental Psychology: Childhood and Adolescence*, Eighth Edition. Belmont: Wadsworth, 2010, 785 p., ISBN 978-0-495-60171-5.
 36. Vágnerová, M.: *Vývojová psychologie I. Dětství a dospívání*. Praha: Karolinum, 2012, 531 p., ISBN 978-80-246-2153-1
 37. Van Wert, M., Mishna, F., Trocmé, N., Fallon, B.: Which maltreated children are at greatest risk of aggressive and criminal behavior? An examination of maltreatment dimensions and cumulative risk. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 2018, Vol. 69, p. 49-61, ISSN 0145-2134.
 38. Verešová, M.: *Mediátory užívania drog. Cesta k efektívnej prevencii drogových závislostí*. Nitra: FSVaZ UKF, 2004, 394p., ISBN 80-8050-767-8.
 39. Verešová, M., Hušvétyová, J. (2005). Štýly rodinnej výchovy a rizikové správanie dievčat a chlapcov v období puberty. *Psychológia a patopsychológia dieťaťa*, Vol. 40, Issue 1, p.18-29, ISSN 0555-5574.
 40. Wood, A.P., Dawea, S., Gullo, M.J.: The role of personality, family influences, and prosocial risk-taking behavior on substance use in early adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 2013, Vol. 36, p. 881-881, ISSN 0140-1971.
 41. Zgourides, G.: *Developmental Psychology*. Foster City CA: IDG Books Worldwide, Inc., 2000, 158 p. ISBN 0-7645-8614-9.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AM, AN