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ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to determine the relationship, as a correlation, between family violence and resilience in adolescents in medium-open youth centers in Lima, 2019. The research was developed under a quantitative approach, with an applied cross-sectional design in 132 adolescents whose ages range between 15 and 21 years of age. The results determined that the presence of abuse in the family environment is weak and significant related to the ability to overcome adversity (r = -0.356), that is, the greater the violence within the family group, the lower the individual's ability to overcome unfavorable situations. Furthermore, the relationship is weak and significant between family violence and resilience factors, except for those which refer to models, learning and generativity. The same thing happens with resilience in the dimensions of family violence: physical and psychological. Therefore, a comparison between violence and resilience according to age was made, obtaining as a result that there are significant differences in relation to resilience according to age (p = 0.025). Similarly, there are differences between identity, autonomy, satisfaction, pragmatism and networks in favor of the elderly. It is concluded that there is a statistically significant and inverse relationship between family violence and resilience.

1. INTRODUCTION

At present, the Peruvian society is plagued by various types of violence which are visible not only in statistical figures, but also in our own environment, and even within the family dynamic. Thus, it is important to emphasize that the family circle is the means of direct learning where each member of the family embraces traditions, habits in a shared manner. Therefore, the education that is provided by parents or guardians is the most significant in the integral development of children and adolescents. However, the presence of abuse within the family group implies physical and emotional damage to all family members, especially the most vulnerable. Many minors face traumatic situations as a consequence of family violence. Nevertheless, only some manage to highlight resilient skills to overcome adversity. Because of this, violence has become an “infectious network” that is transmitted from generation to generation, that is why it is important to reexamine and expand the knowledge related to this social problem, avoiding seeing violence as an accepted situation by the fact of having lived with it for a long time.

In the results of the survey on gender equality and men of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (2014-2017), carried out in countries of Africa and Asia, it was found that the male population that has witnessed acts of violence from their father towards their mother during their childhood, showed a high probability of acting in the same or similar way with their partners in their adulthood. As in Lebanon, the possibility of physical violence is three times higher among men who visualized their father abusing their mother during childhood than for those who did not perceive violence. Likewise, in Latin America, the executive secretariat of the national public security system of the State of Mexico presented a report on the
number of complaints, in which a 72% increase in cases of violence in the family environment was witnessed in the last four years (United Nations Development Programme (2014)).

Faced with this problem, 13 countries in Latin America were involved in adopting a specific law in order to reduce the levels of domestic violence. Consequently, in our country, Law 30364 was enacted in response to the need to prevent, condemn and reduce violence against women and family members, especially those who are vulnerable due to age, physical condition, children, adolescents, older adults and people with disabilities. Likewise, the Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations – MIMP, through a national program against family and sexual violence, presents means such as line 100, chat 100. Women's Emergency Centers (CEM) to provide urgent attention to situations of violence against the most vulnerable members. However, according to the figures of the Inei (2017), of the number of cases attended by the CEM, 87% were women. These data have shown that, unlike the previous year, there is an increase of 46% of family violence in Peru and, according to the age range, 26% of reports of family and sexual violence occur in children and adolescents under 17 years old.

The population of this study, mentioned above, is composed of adolescents between the ages of 15 and 21. For Casas y Ceñal (2015), adolescence is a stage of maturing transition between childhood and adulthood. This stage includes physical, psychological and social changes, whose changes will not be homogeneous and present a variability of the maturation in each adolescent, either by biological, intellectual, emotional or social factors that do not allow a homogeneous maturation rhythm. This may stagnate or retreat according to external factors such as stressors. Casas y Ceñal (2015) refer to adolescence in 3 phases: Early, middle and late adolescence.

On one hand, there are general theoretical models such as Bronfenbrenner's ecological model (1979) which indicates that the person interrelates with the environment in a dynamic way and this dynamism influences it generating factors for the development of the individual. This model presents a structure of systems, in which each system is included with more factors. The microsystem includes the emotional, biological and innate components in the personal history of each individual and their relationship with their closest context such as family, friends. The mesosystem includes the contexts where the individual is actively involved in school, work, among others. The exosystem includes the relationships with the community, where the individual resides or maintains an active contact, such as participation or involvement in social groups, bars among others. Finally, the macrosystem explores the context in a general way; It goes beyond the direct environment of the individual, includes lifestyles, organizations, culture, etc. That is, since we are born we are never alone; there are these external factors which will influence the personal development of the individual. In other words, if the child's family environment is unfavorable to his development and the social environment is the opposite, it does not ensure that this individual will be able to face risk situations in a favorable way. That is why development does not depend on one factor but on the system in general. Ehresfatt and Tousignant (2003), mention based on the ecological model that the individual consists of internal peculiar characteristics, being the ontosystem the one under the interaction of such systems allowing the individual to strengthen his capacities, weaknesses and competences.

On the other hand, with respect to family violence, the WHO (2013) defines family violence as physical, psychological, sexual and other forms of abuse caused within the family circle, generally towards the most vulnerable members.

Barudy (2001) refers to the fact that while family members perceive violence as something causal and not as an act that causes pain and suffering, individuals will become used to a hostile environment, causing them to act violently in various circumstances and creating new victims, in such a way that a trans-generational cycle of never ending violence is created. Likewise, there are theoretical models that attempt to explain violence through the following theories; Lorenz, aggressive behavior as part of the survival instinct, this is reinforced with the Darwinian Theory, indicating that aggression is spontaneous and according to the context is not totally harmful. However, for humanity the opposite is true, that is, aggression according to the conditions of the environment can be unfavorable, and since it is spontaneous it could become a pathological symptom. This theory is in line with the social reality in which we are involved every day, from countless shameless and unbearable children to adults with various pathological issues. This means that the relationship of aggressive behavior between man and animals is only reactive and innate; though, it could be modified through learning (Lorenz, 1935). However, Bandura (1977) proposes through his social learning theory that all behavior is originated by the observation of
environmental factors and the relationship of the individual with such behaviors, i.e., that aggression is a socially learned behavior.

In this way, whether it is innate or learned, Galtung (2016) manifests the presence of violence in the environment, basing it on three types: In a visible way, direct violence, which implies physical, verbal and psychological abuse. In an invisible way, there is structural violence that manifests itself internally in political, social and economic systems; and cultural violence where violence is expressed through symbols, ideology and language. Thus, it can be stated that the presence of violence is determined by both biological factors as mentioned in the previous postulates and by social factors in which people live together within a triangle of violence.

On the other hand, resilience, according to Saavedra and Villalta (2008), is defined as the strength of the individual in the face of adverse situations, maintaining adaptive behavior and allowing development beyond the present level of functioning. Theoretical postulates, such as Grothberg's theory of psychosocial development (1995), refer to the fact that the resilient component in people depends on the dynamism that occurs among the various social factors. It manifests resilience as the evolutionary process that should be encouraged from the first stage of human development and making it less difficult to overcome conflicts during its development.

In Steven Wolin and Sybil Wolin's theory of challenge (1995), according to the research carried out by the authors, individuals who have the capacity to recover from misfortunes have seven pillars. The first is introspection, which refers to the internal observation that the individual makes of himself through self-reflection, interdependence, which is the ability to separate his emotions with other factors and establish limits between oneself to avoid conflicts; the capacity to relate is the art of relating healthily to one's social environment. The initiative, will allow you to develop your activities in an independent way based on the personal responsibility that the individual exercises in himself. Humor and creativity, that is to say, finding grace in conflictive situations, and in such a way to increase the state of mind by product of adversities. Finally, ethics, using the commitment to grow based on values and provide welfare to those around us.

Finally, it is important to mention that some manifestations arise in young people such as the formation of gangs which are an expression of identity, territoriality, which arise as a response to structural violence manifested by economic inequalities, ethnic, linguistic and even cultural discrimination, which have been existing in certain areas of the city characterized by precariousness, lack of privacy and violent culture to which these people would have been exposed, and thus, would lead to a violent response. All this even generates a culture where a higher status is achieved due to certain personal characteristics, such as educational level, appearance, mode of expression; others which are more social, like the skills to generate networks, and others more linked to criminal activities, such as being skilled while handling a knife, and resisting beatings and torture. It is important to note that there is an inverse link between unemployment in a country and manifestations of violence, that is, the higher the unemployment, the greater the manifestations of violence (National Youth Secretariat, SENAJU, 2013). Although the study group is not located at this level of violence and crime, it is important to indicate that working with this human group would provide relevant information to take immediate action.

Therefore, the objective of this research is to determine the relationship between resilience and family violence in Peruvian adolescents from youth rehabilitation centers.

2. METHOD

DESIGN AND TYPE OF RESEARCH

The research was developed under the quantitative approach, through the collection of information and analysis of real cases involving knowledge of the reason for the individual's social behavior. (Kerlinger, 2002; Monje, 2011; Vara, 2012; Valderrama, 2017). The design is non-experimental-transverse, due to the fact that there is not any manipulation of the variables, in addition the data collection is done in one opportunity (Kerlinger, 2002; Arnau and Bono, 2008; Alarcón, 2013); Descriptive-correlational because this research refers to the relationship between two or more study variables (Souza, Drieessnack and Mendes, 2007).

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The study population was made up of 372 adolescents from youth centers of partial open modality who are in conflict with the criminal law and who are part of the MINJUSDH (Ministry of Justice and Human Rights). As
minors, they are included in the system of reinsertion of open modality; their ages range from 15 to 21 years old of both sexes.

The program G*Power (version 3.1.9.7) was used. Cárdenas and Arancibia (2014) consider the use of the program G*Power relevant for the research because it allows the calculation of the sample in an efficient manner, since a bivariate correlation was worked out and contrasted with a bilateral hypothesis, a significance level of .05; a statistical power of .80, for this investigation 0.95 of confidence level was taken and a size of the effect was taken of .20 Ferguson (2009) with which a sample of 132 subjects was obtained. A significant correlation of 0.282 (p<0.01) was taken as reference (Palacios and Sanchez, 2016)

SAMPLING

Non-probability sampling was used for convenience, due to the limitations of access evident among participants. (Supo, 2014).

MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS

The instruments used for data collection were the questionnaire of family violence - VIFA of Peruvian origin elaborated by Altamirano and Castro in 2012, which contains 20 items that measure the level of family violence. Through a pilot study, psychometric analyses were carried out to evaluate the evidence of content validity (V of Aiken), observing that the instrument is clear, pertinent and relevant; with respect to its reliability it obtains a α=.903 and a Ω=.913.

In addition, the SV-RES resilience scale created in 2008 by Saavedra and Villalta was used to measure the level of resilience. A pilot study was also carried out to obtain a reliability of α=.972 and a Ω=.972.

3. RESULTS

Kolmogorov Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk normality distribution tool was used for the analysis, and in both cases the significance level is less than 0.05 (p<.05) which indicates that the data do not fit the normal distribution; Razali and Wah (2011) state that Shapiro-Wilk's test is more powerful to evaluate the normality distribution and independently the sample size; after analyzing this it was decided to use non-parametric statistics, this indicates that the sample is not large enough eliminating the assumption of normality in the population. (Bologna, 2011).

Therefore, the correlation analysis was performed, observing in table 1 that the correlation between family violence and resilience is inverse, weak and significant (r= -.333; p<0.05). Likewise, it is demonstrated as a result r² =0.126 determining that the effect size is small (Cohen, 1988; Frias, Llobell& Garcia, 2000)

Table 1 shows the correlations between overall family violence and resilience factors, with a weak and significant inverse correlation between family violence and resilience factors: identity p(rho)= -.281, autonomy p(rho)= -.302, satisfaction p(rho)= -.358, pragmatism p(rho)= -.349, links p(rho)= -.344, goals p(rho)= -.262, affectivity p(rho)= -.348 and self-efficacy p(rho)= -.277. No significant correlations were found between family violence and model resilience, learning, and generativity factors. At the same time, the effect sizes are small because they are less than .20 determining (Cohen, 1988; Frias, Llobell& Garcia, 2000).

A weak and significant inverse correlation is also observed between resilience and the dimensions of family violence: physical (r= -.338), and psychological (r= -.301). At the same time, the effect sizes are small because they are less than .20 determining (Cohen, 1988; Frias, Llobell& Garcia, 2000).

Significant and inverse correlations are also observed between factors of resilience and the components of violence. It is found that physical violence significantly correlates with all components of resilience; however in the case of psychological violence, it is observed that this one significantly and inversely correlates with identity, autonomy, satisfaction, bonds, networks, models, goals, affectivity and self-efficacy. No significant correlations are found among psychological violence and pragmatism, learning and generativity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Violence</th>
<th>Violence components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=132) Resilience</td>
<td>p(rho)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.356*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2 presents the results of the comparative analysis of the study variables by age, finding differences in identity, autonomy, satisfaction, pragmatism and networks with respect to age, in this case the differences are in favor of the older ones; in all cases a minimum value was recommended to affirm potential differences, assuming that a larger sample could evidence statistical differences (Domínguez-Lara, 2017).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study variables</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Cohen's d</th>
<th>Minors (n=56)</th>
<th>Adults (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Violence</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Violence</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Violence</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
<td>-0.570</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>0.036*</td>
<td>-0.480</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>0.031*</td>
<td>-0.422</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatism</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td>0.017*</td>
<td>-0.451</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>0.038*</td>
<td>-0.322</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afectivity</td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.327</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfefficacy</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generativity</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>0.025*</td>
<td>-0.402</td>
<td>243.5</td>
<td>249.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< 0.05

Table 2. Comparative analysis between variables by age

And finally, the descriptive analysis was carried out, in which it was found that 72% of adolescents present a low indicator of family violence, 17.4% present a medium indicator of family violence and 10.6% present a high indicator of family violence. It was also found that 2.3% of adolescents present a medium indicator of resilience and 97.7% present a high indicator of resilience.
4. DISCUSSION

Until now, there has not been much evidence of research related to family violence and resilience in adolescent offenders in conflict with criminal law in open youth centers; however, the results obtained in this research can widen this gap in knowledge, in terms of determining the relationship between family violence and resilience in adolescents. It was found that the presence of abuse in the family is weakly but significantly related to the individual's ability to cope with adversity, that is, the greater the violence within the family group, the lesser the individual's ability to overcome unfavorable situations, which is consistent with the ideas of Perez, Guevara, Canales and Matta (2018) who stated that in an adolescent population, the existence of a moderate relationship between family functioning and the resilient characteristics present in the study population is decisive. It concludes that in the study sample mild family dysfunction predominated and therefore the resilient characteristics in the adolescents were moderate. One of the areas that presented greater difficulty in family functioning was the demonstration of affection, Likewise, Alva (2016) in his study with adolescent offenders of the criminal law in a northern province of Lima, obtained a direct and significant correlation between the facilitating dimension of family functioning and resilience as a result. This could be based on Bronfenbrenner's (1971) proposal, who explains that the development of every individual depends on the influence of the systems in which they are interacting, which means that the family is a very important area that is closely related with the individual’s development, who from his first years absorbs everything that he perceives around him, the better the family environment, the more favorable it will be for the person; then the learning will be guided by the school environment, where an authority figure emerges, and that is the teacher, who establishes the rules of coexistence in the classroom and which adds an important role to the family which is the main axis of human development; This is also present in Grotberg's theory (1995) which states that the human being is capable of going out in the face of adversity without caring about the factors that will come up in the way of its development, referring, as well, that it will depend on the circumstances in which the individual interrelates to develop resilient attitudes.

The theories described above differ from the postulate of Casas and Ceñal (2015), who explain in their studies that adolescents face a transition between childhood and adulthood through various changes: physical, psychological and social aspects. Within the social changes it is described how adolescents in their early stage, with the intention of modifying rules and limits previously established by the family at their convenience, vaguely express through gestures or attitudes the need to make their own decisions. This also affects the tendency of adolescents not to visualize the consequences of their decisions. During the middle stage of adolescence there is the presence of thoughts of power, that is, they believe they can have control over everything. However, this
exaggerated self-confidence generates a greater vulnerability to involvement in risk factors such as alcohol dependency, drug use, early pregnancy, and sexually transmitted diseases, among other aspects. To these, it should be added that in this stage it is crucial for adolescents to get opinionstowards the search for acceptance amongpeer adolescents. To be able to face the risk factors, the family has a fundamental role for the adolescent to overcome this stage in a positive way. However, if there is not an adequate family bond between parents and children or the presence of some authority figure that facilitates the transition of this stage, the probability that the individual can develop adequately will be low.

Likewise, in a research carried out by Quispe and Gutiérrez (2019) with the objective of determining the relationship between family violence and resilience in high school seniors, they were able to determine that there is no relationship between family abuse and the dimensions of resilience capacity, causing a conjecture of the objective found in this research. At the same time, it was obtained that the family functioning is weakly and significantly related to the factors that imply the development of resilience, that is to say, an adequate environment in the family exercises a good perception of the children on themselves, establishing a good self-esteem in the adolescent, who in front of situations of mistreatment or bullying would not be significantly affected. In the same way this would cause a greater security within himself and of towards his socio-cultural environment. The better the relationship between the families, the more satisfied the children would be with their lives. In other words, in the face of any problem, the adolescent will have someone to turn to and communicate with without fear or anxiety, and will therefore have better guidance in the presence of a good model, allowing them to make good decisions in comparison to following the advice or guidance of their peers. Nevertheless, the affective factor is also significant to prevent repression of what he feels, wants or thinks. When parents satisfy this need, the relationship would instill less rigidity in the upbringing of their children, thus adolescents would recognize their emotions and recognize in themselves how self-effective they are, (Saavedra and Villalta, 2008). Concurrently, the development of social and adaptation skills modulates the manifestations of violence, as well as spirituality. The protective role of the mother, the values of religiosity and family senssation moderates the exposure to community violence and psychological distress (Mariscal, 2020; Jocson&Ceballo, 2020).

In contrast, it is unlikely that we are not subjected to conflictive relationships between family members due to our spontaneous nature of being aggressive. In a study conducted in more than 130 young people in four different countries, where they sought to determine the factors related to resilience under a violent family circle, it was estimated that 47% of women and 53% of men have suffered violence within their family circle and these people by having a partner or having children are more likely to exercise the same style of parenting in which they lived (Romero &Abril, 2015). As long as family members perceive violence as something causal and not as an act that causes pain and suffering, individuals will be adapted to a hostile environment and will act violently in diverse circumstances, creating new victims, in such a way that a transgenerational cycle of never ending violence is created. This determines the growing number of cases attended by CEM, when 87% of the figures involve women. These data have shown that, unlike the previous year, there is an increase of 46 percentage points of family violence in Peru and according to the age range 26% of reports on family and sexual violence happen in children and adolescents under 17 years old, (Inei, 2019)

In this research, there has been a comparison to determine whether abuse and resilience are different according to age. Differences in elements related to resilience primarily have been found. In previous research, this aspect was not taken into account, though they did identify that there were no significant differences by sex, but differences in socio-economic conditions in which they develop. Therefore, the author highlights the importance of protective factors such as support network of family, friends, empathy, vision, good school environment, as some factors that would allow greater protection against violence.(Romero and Abril (2015)

According to what has been stated, it is evident that children or adolescents who are victims of family abuse, either physically or psychologically, show a lower level of resilience than those who have not had experiences of abuse within their family group, that is, a hostile environment where threats, offenses or aggressions would determine the level of resilience of the person. Likewise, there is little evidence that people are exposed to violence among their family members, which is why the relationship is weak, that is, the presence of other factors could determine a stronger relationship with the individual's ability to cope. However, it is important to mention that sex, age, sexism and self-esteem predict the appearance of violent behaviors when having a partner (Dosil, Jaureguizar, Bernaras&S bicigo, 2020).
It is possible that child victimization and severe punishment were associated with higher levels of child adjustment problems that could be sustained in the future unless the caregiver possessed the ability to be resilient (Miller-Griff, Scheid, Brown, & Greing, 2020). Accordingly, having had negative experiences in childhood is associated with the emergence of pathologies in the future (McLaughlin, Colich, Rodman & Weissman, 2020). This is a situation where the presence of a history of parental trauma and negative parental behavior may be a factor in maintaining the cycle of violence (Scheid, Miller-Griff, & Guzman, 2020). Belonging to a particular community or microsystem may make events of abuse more likely, and community violence may be associated with negative manifestations in the health and well-being of young people (Oriol, Miranda & Unanue, 2020; Woods-Jaeger, Siedlik, Adams, Piper, O'Connor, & Berkley-Patton, 2020); however, the space that is considered critical is the family, because there is a lack of emotional support, supervision of behavior, and perspective of future time. If we do not work on programs to strengthen families, the difficulties of young people could increase (Murta, Vinha, Nobre-Sandoval, Rocha; Duailibe, Gomes & Foxcroft, 2020). Despite this, resilience is often activated before situations of violence as a mental strength adding support to the family and the community. (Chamratrithrong, Lucktong, Jampaklay et al., 2020).

Young people describe family contexts and cultural aspects that impact how resilience manifests itself, highlighting trust, self-determination, and connectedness as key factors within these difficult contexts; family routines uniquely protected family-related distress through conceptualizations of resilience (Woods-Jaeger, Siedlik, Adams, Piper, O'Connor, & Berkley-Patton, 2020; Thakur & Cohen, 2020). Results indicate that youth who assumed their family was resilient were also more individualized and suffered less anxiety in the face of safety stresses (Sianko, Mece, & Abazi-Morina, 2019; Finkenstein, Pagorek-Eshel & Lauffer, 2020). In spite of the favorable aspects of the family, one can also have a parental figure that uses for a long time a set of aggressive behaviors to harm the child and the other parental figure (Harman, Kruk & Hines, 2018). Finally, violence of all kinds, including family violence, has a new tool to be executed and it is related to information technologies, since through these virtual spaces family violence can be interpreted (Markwick, Bickerdike, Wilson-Evered & Zeleznikow, 2019). All these criteria could somehow emphasize the link between family violence and the appearance of resilience as a means of adaptive response to manage the situation faced by the person.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the relationship between family violence and resilience in adolescents in the youth rehabilitation centers of Lima is confirmed, so that the greater the family violence the individual is exposed to, the lesser will be the capacity of the adolescent to confront adversity. One resulting finding is that there is a relationship between family violence and resilience factors, which implies identity, autonomy, satisfaction, bonds, networks, models, affectivity and self-efficacy in adolescents. Likewise, there is a relationship between resilience and physical and psychological violence in adolescents, which implies that resilient attitudes are related to the family climate where the adolescent is integrated.

There is no evidence of significant differences between adolescent victims of family violence according to their age; however, there are significant differences with resilience. No significant differences between family violence and resilience in males and females were evident. 72% of the adolescents present a low level of family violence, 17.4% of the adolescents present a medium level of family violence and 10.6% face a high level of family violence, that is to say there are fewer incidences of adolescent victims of family violence. Finally, it became evident that no adolescent has presented a low index of resilience, 2.3% present a medium level of resilience and finally 97.7% present a high level of resilience, which implies that all adolescents present resilient attitudes.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

To carry out new research under other study variables that would contribute to the development of the reininsertion system of the youth centers of medium open modality, to use SEM models to enter more variables and to raise an explanatory model. For new research with this study sample, there would be a longer period to obtain more data.
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