

## Development, reliability and validity of a multidimensional scale for forensic social reports in Social Work (ISP.TS)

Milton Andrés Contreras Sáez<sup>1</sup>

Recibido: 28/09/2020; Revisado: 14/10/2020; Aceptado: 21/04/2021

**Abstract.** This article focuses on the development, reliability and validity of a multidimensional Scale of Expert Social Reports in Social Work (ISP.TS). The Social Expert Report is one of the instruments most used by Social Workers in the world in different legal matters. The dimensions studied were the concept of family, family relationships, family resilience, protective and risk factors, life project and family environments. The study was carried out with all the registered and active Social Worker Experts of the Regional Defensoría del Maule in Chile (15). Reliability was evaluated with internal consistency analysis using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, as well as by analyzing the homogeneity of its items examining the correlation item - corrected total. Validity was analyzed through expert judgment and through Pearson's correlation coefficient. The Scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.904 and the validity of the instrument was made by means of expert judgment. The ISP.TS Scale is a valid and reliable measure for the evaluation of Expert Social Reports that can be used in different contexts.

**Keywords:** social report; social expertise; Social Work; multidimensional scale for forensic social reports in Social Work.

**Summary:** Introduction. 1. Method. 1.1 Participants. 1.2 Instrument. 1.3 Procedure. 1.4 Data Analysis. 2. Results. 2.1 Reliability Analysis. 2.2 Instrument Validity. 3 Conclusions and Discussion. 4. References.

**Cómo citar:** Contreras Sáez, M. A. (2021) Development, reliability and validity of a multidimensional scale for forensic social reports in Social Work (ISP.TS). *Cuadernos de Trabajo Social*, 34(2), 367-379.

### Introduction

In the historical context of Social Work, it has been noted that Social Reports are one of the most ambiguous instruments in the discipline. This is based on the fact that Social Reports have become one of the most frequently used and requested instruments in researches to intervene in any scope of action where Social Workers perform their role (Robles, 2013; Quintero, 2014; Méndez, 2015; Honores & Quizhpe, 2019).

One of the most intricate Social Reports, which requires a high level of expertise from Social Workers, is the so-called Forensic Social Report (hereinafter ISP for its acronym

in Spanish), which is a written document containing the results of Social Assessments and is exclusively developed by a Social Worker. This document exposes a person's social condition, family and the relation to their environment from a technical perspective. This is generally a technical, scientific and expert report that allows to make decisions as to a certain scenario (criminal or protection case), thus requiring the ethical principles of the discipline. It has been demonstrated that ISPs must be produced based on various techniques, strategies and instruments, which are not always part of Social Work, but generally relate to different disciplines of Social, Human and Health Sciences.

<sup>1</sup> Universidad de Talca; Chile.  
E-mail: [milton.contreras.saez@gmail.com](mailto:milton.contreras.saez@gmail.com)

Academic and scientific training on Social Work in Spanish-speaking countries in Latin America has been characterized by teaching ISPs and their items from a generational perspective in classroom contexts and in relation to teaching, practical and professional experiences. Nonetheless, training on this type of report has not been delivered from the perspective of evidence-based learning, although it is part of a discipline that is known for its scientific work and claims to systematize forensic practices (Hernandez, 2017; Quintero, 2017). As an example, when trying to make a systemic review of scientific literature on ISPs with a wide range of conceptualization and methodology objectives, the results are not promising. At a first stage to identify literature, and as stated by Sapiro & Ward (2019), considering the keywords “Social Report” and “Social Assessment” (as a topic) in the specialized databases Web of Science, Proquest, Scopus, Scielo and Dialnet Plus (without year limitation), the search generated only eight results on Social Report (1 in Proquest, 7 in Dialnet Plus), which are review papers. Social Assessment also shows 8 results (1 in Proquest, 1 in Scielo and 6 in Dialnet Plus), which correspond to seven review papers and one empirical paper.

This search evidences that focusing on ISPs of any type requires not only disciplinary recognition, but also showing scientific results. ISPs have traditionally been considered a methodological descriptive instrument of a certain reality or scenario. These were developed by means of observation/research with interviews, home visits and document reviews to finally produce a report as end product, which would provide truthful content (Antón, 2014; Casas & Niño, 2015; Lijterman, 2015).

ISP results are obtained thanks to the careful work of the experts in charge of the assessment, to how they make use of different techniques, strategies and instruments, and the application of those in both the final text and the trial, respectively. Given the complexity and diversity of the cases where Social Work is constantly involved, producing an ISP which captures dimensions that match the ‘person’s situation allows for better decision-making at an institutional level and in the judicial system (Quintero, 2014).

There are a few international guidelines, such as the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), which suggests that Social Workers can take over the leadership in terms of the

best evidence available in order to optimize practices by means of research and assessments that can help make progress towards an evidence-based model to design, implement, monitor and assess interventions in matters related to Forensic Social Work. However, this requires a joint effort, which is still scarce in practice (Rubin, 2008; Maschi, 2017).

Unfortunately, Social Work as a discipline lacks measurement instruments of its own that help understand the multiple dimensions addressed in the social assessment process. For this reason, this study underlines the creation and validation of a questionnaire that addresses fundamental dimensions to understand each scenario and approach the writing process of an ISP. This must be understood from a complex perspective that is based on the fundamentals of Social Work, such as the pursuit of social justice, the recognition of diversity and the creation of intervention proposals for a sustainable social development.

For that purpose, it is vital to align with the statement proposed by the International Federation of Social Workers:

Social work is a practice-based profession and an academic discipline that promotes social change and development, social cohesion, and the empowerment and liberation of people. The principles of social justice, human rights, collective responsibility and respect for diversity are fundamental to social work. Backed by theories of social work, the social sciences, the humanities, and indigenous knowledge, social work engages people and structures to meet life’s challenges and increase well-being (International Federation of Social, 2014).

This statement allows to make a sociohistorical outline where the guiding principles (based on practice) gradually prevail in any research and intervention proposal and where the ISP must demonstrate it. In order to achieve this, some authors claim that it is necessary to consider integrating, specialized and collaborative approaches in Social Work practices. These approaches arise in populations that are affected to a certain extent by political decisions and legal matters from a scientific perspective that avoids value judgments (Maschi & Killian, 2009, 2011; Policarpo, 2017).

Developing this scale seems to be pivotal for Social Work as it has always intended to improve intrafamily relations, life conditions

as a family and intervention strategies on family matters, especially with target groups of children, adolescents and their families at social risk (White, 2007). Therefore, this evidence-based work aims at considering multiple dimensions that help understand different individual and family scenarios, thus encouraging to comprehensively and globally include these dimensions in future interventions on any family matter (Dierckx et al., 2020).

The Multidimensional Scale for Forensic Social Reports in Social Work (ISP.TS) for Forensic Social Workers is an instrument developed as part of two Innovation and Development Projects in Academic Teaching of Universidad Autónoma de Chile, which has helped focus on establishing clear and accurate guidelines as to the analysis and approach of dimensions that interact with each other in any legal matter. In order to choose the dimensions, a specialized search was conducted in the aforementioned databases and technical guidelines of judicial systems in South America and Spain were analyzed. Additionally, scholars and researchers on the matter were interviewed. Finally, six dimensions were chosen:

1. **Concept of family:** it relates to how to capture the definition of family of the assessed person and their family, where personal and family identity is developed (Cinamon & Rich, 2002; Gonzalez, 2013). Therefore, the scale includes each assessed person's experience, the use of conceptualization of family from the perspective of other disciplines (from the legal perspective to the Social Work perspective), and the recognition of strengths, weaknesses and potential that families show in their behavior.
2. **Family resilience:** it refers to a set of processes that a family resorts to when facing stress (Granic et al., 2003; Muñoz, 2005; Oliva, 2006) during, and after the transition. Boys (n = 149 families). This study focuses on verifying whether potential, overcoming capacities, the pursuit of individual and family self-regulation are noted as well as the assessed person's goal achievement.
3. **Family resilience:** it refers to a set of processes that a family resorts to when facing stress (Gómez & Kotliarenco, 2010; Villalba, 2003). This study focuses on verifying whether potential, overcoming capacities, the pursuit of individual and family self-regulation are noted as well as the assessed person's goal achievement.
4. **Protective and risk factors:** it refers to situations that foster or jeopardize the optimal development of a person or their family, as well as the relations involved (Bartolomé et al., 2010; Montañés & Bartolomé, 2007). In this sense, it considers relevant bonds in the family, communication styles, conflict resolution styles, links with external networks and identifying both historical (static) and current (dynamic) risk factors.
5. **Life project (individual and as a family):** it refers to a person's (or a family's) desire at a certain moment, influenced by personal, family and context experience (Contreras, 2018, 2020; Medán, 2013; Santana-Vega et al., 2019). In this case, it approaches the possibilities, viability and opportunities in their sociocultural context of having a life project, as well as self-expression and self-development areas. Given the population in which the assessments are conducted, a statement is included in relation to whether alternative sentencing allows for a life project.
6. **Familial environment:** it refers to micro and exosystemic spaces where an individual and their family develop and interact, which can affect or compromise their biopsychosocial development (Calvete et al., 2011; Oliva et al., 2007). This study considers the assessed person's risks in their environment and neighborhood, their housing stability, social relations and civic involvement.

In Latin America, no instrument has been yet produced or validated to analyze Forensic Social Reports. This study aims at contributing to the discipline as a formative process in family matters, in particular for intervention experts. The purpose was to evaluate the reliability of the items included in the measurement instrument in order to demonstrate that there is a strong correlation to each other and that they are valid when effectively measuring each variable in an ISP (DeVellis, 1991). This was accomplished by means of the Multidimensional Scale for Forensic Social Reports in Social Work (ISP.TS). A self-report scale with Likert-type response mode was chosen considering the aforementioned areas, which must be analyzed in research and intervention processes, whatever the subject matter. Additionally,

extensive scientific literature that supports them and expert judgment were employed to validate the content. Moreover, we encourage the use of this scale to improve the understanding of Forensic Social Reports in future studies and in any corner of the world.

## 1. Method

### 1.1. Participants

The participants of this study are Forensic Social Workers. In order to define the sample, all those registered and actively working in the Public Criminal Defense Office in El Maule Region were contacted. This decision is based on the fact that this is the public institution that provides services on different legal matters and was made in order to select experts who are evaluated in accordance with high quality standards in relation to their academic experience, qualifications and years of experience.

Nine Forensic Social Workers took part in the pilot process. These work as freelancers and, as inclusion criterion.

They should have been actively working in Forensic Social Assessments for 5 years at the least. After analyzing the data, four academic experts on the subject from Chile and Argentina collaborated to make changes in relation to language. As a result, two statements related to resilience and two in familiar environment were excluded.

After the modifications, the respondents included in the final study were contacted. These were fifteen Forensic Social Workers registered and actively working in the Public Criminal Defense Office in El Maule Region (all of them participated). 80% of these identify as women, while the remaining 20% identify as men. In relation to their actual work in the area, 7% reports between 6 months and 1 year, 13% reports between 1 and 2 years, 7% between 3 and 4 years, 13% between 4 and 5 years, and 60% reports more than 5 years of experience. The scale was applied via e-mail and completed by each respondent.

### 1.2. Instrument

Multidimensional Scale for Forensic Social Reports in Social Work (ISP.TS) (Annex 1). This instrument was designed to evaluate the

use of the dimensions included in Social Assessments and was created in the context of two academic innovation and development funds between 2018 and 2020. It is a self-report scale with Likert-type response format, where each item provides four choices (never, sometimes, almost always, always). It contains 32 items grouped into 6 subscales:

- A. Concept of family (6): historical and social experiences, conceptualization from the perspective of other disciplines, the conception of the families, conceptualization from the perspective of Social Work, observation of strengths and legal conceptualization.
- B. Family relations: family roles, parenting, emotional and social bonds, dynamics and conflicts, interaction patterns and communication.
- C. Family resilience (4): potential, overcoming processes, sources of strength, recognition of potential.
- D. Protective and risk factors (6): bonds and communication, static risk factors, support networks, personal and social skills, dynamic risk factors, and abilities.
- E. Life project (6): viability and opportunities, possibilities, network restoration, background, sociocultural context, self-expression and self-development areas.
- F. Familiar environment (4): neighborhood, housing stability, interaction with others, connection to the environment.

In order to ensure the content validity and applicability of the first version of this instrument, a literature review was initially conducted over a period of four months, where the most relevant content for the ISP study was established (1). Next, the variables most identified and requested for the assessment were selected within a period of three months (2). These were finally subject to a selection process by means expert judgment, which took two months (3). As a criterion, experts should have both academic and practical experience on ISPs, a postgraduate degree or be active researchers on the matter, be native speakers of Spanish, and have the availability to take part in remote or face-to-face meetings. Finally, 4 academic experts on Social Assessments took part, 3 of them from Chile and 1 from Argentina, which allowed us to increase the complexity of theoretical perspectives, choose the



appropriate variables and analyze the adequacy of each item in relation to the area under observation by means of a 4-point Likert scale. Experts discussed the different dimensions to exclude the most problematic items (Cabe-ro & Infante, 2014; Escobar-Pérez & Cuevo-Martínez, 2008). From a statistical point of view, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.904, which is excellent (George & Mallery).

### 1.3. Procedure

Data collection was conducted through an anonymous, self-administered questionnaire, which was previously subject to a pilot test. The Public Criminal Defense Office of El Maule Region authorized Forensic Social Workers to take part in the study, who voluntarily agreed to answer the questionnaire. Upon signing an informed consent, respondents answered the questionnaire via web on Google Forms (a platform that provides a secure privacy policy). After agreeing to take part in the study, respondents provided their socio-demographic information (gender, commune, years of experience as forensic social workers), followed by the aforementioned areas of the instrument.

### 1.4. Data Analysis

The statistical analysis was conducted by means of SPSS 25.0. The reliability evaluation was based on the internal consistency analysis obtained through Cronbach's alpha coefficient, as well as the homogeneity analysis of the corresponding items through the observation of corrected item-total correlation. Content validity was analyzed by means of expert judgment and reliability was examined through Pearson correlation coefficient.

## 2. Results

The first part consisted in checking that the respondent answered the entirety of the questionnaire. Subsequently, a univariate descriptive statistical data analysis of the items was conducted, grouped into their different dimensions. Correlations were then analyzed by concept among the items in the initial scale. This analysis showed that 32 items were not significantly correlated (see Annex 2).

Specifically in the concept of family, there are 6 items that stand out due to their low cor-

relation. The items related to historical and social experience with conceptualization from the perspective of Social Work show a more significant positive relation compared to the other correlations (0.60). As to the relation to the remaining items, the study shows no significant results except for the items of legal conceptualization. In family relations, 6 items have non-significant correlations to the rest of the dimensions, except for the parenting item with dynamics and conflicts, where it shows a direct relation of 0.92. Protective and risk factors and life project have 6 items each, while family resilience and familiar environment have 4 items respectively. While some items show negative correlations, these are not significant; however, there are positive correlations that are also positive among items such as family relations (parenting) with protective and risk factors (dynamic risk) and the concept of family (legal) with familiar environments (interaction with others and connection to the environment).

### 2.1. Reliability Analysis

The reliability analysis of each dimension and the questionnaire as a whole was conducted by means of an internal consistency analysis applied to the ISP.TS, specifically through Cronbach's alpha coefficient, whose value reached 0.904, which is excellent. As general criterion, George & Mallery (2019) make the following suggestions to evaluate Cronbach's alpha coefficients: alpha coefficient  $> .9$  is excellent;  $> .8$  is good;  $> .7$  is acceptable;  $> .6$  is questionable;  $> .5$  is deficient; and  $< .5$  is unacceptable.

Table 1 shows the homogeneity analysis of the items, conducted by means of corrected item-total correlations. More than 90% of the items showed a correlation greater than or equal to 0.25-0.30, which evidences a good discriminatory capacity and significantly adds to the total score of ISP.TS. As shown in the same table, it is not necessary to exclude items related to the concept of family, agents and strengths, resilience, data collection, protective factors, risk factors and life project, which show less discriminatory capacity, since excluding them would not result in a significant impact on the reliability (Cronbach's alpha) of the instrument as a whole. This supports the previous work carried out by experts in relation to content validity.

Table 1. Statistics of total elements of the ISP.TS

	Items in ISP.TS	M.E.S.	V.E.S.	C.E.C.	A.C.S.
1	I include the historical and social experience of individuals concerned in order to understand how they shape their own conceptualization of family.	113.27	114.781	.319	.903
2	During the interview, I use conceptualizations of family from the perspective of other disciplines in order to align them to those that families have.	113.60	111.971	.334	.904
3	I consider the conception of family of the individuals concerned to carry out the Forensic Social Assessment.	113.40	115.686	.129	.906
4	During the interview, I use conceptualizations of family from the perspective of Social Work in order to align them to those that families themselves have.	113.53	112.552	.297	.904
5	I identify the strengths, potential and weaknesses that families show within its own dynamics.	113.13	119.124	-.250	.907
6	I use conceptualizations of family from a legal perspective and I align them to those that the affected individual has.	113.60	101.829	.818	.894
7	I focus on family members' roles with an emphasis on emotional bonds that people establish in their family context.	113.13	116.124	.286	.904
8	I examine parental practices, decision making and bonds existing within the families when applicable.	113.33	111.524	.471	.901
9	I observe emotional and social relations within the family system of sharing a home.	113.33	109.810	.612	.899
10	I analyze how new family dynamics arise and potential conflict areas paying attention to the relations among family members in association with their external environment.	113.73	103.781	.801	.895
11	I focus on the significance of interaction patterns that family members develop and examine their habits, values and belief systems.	113.47	110.552	.654	.899
12	I ponder on the communication, support and mutual affection, as well as the hostile or conflictive situations within the family system of the individual concerned.	113.20	114.314	.444	.902
13	I focus on collecting information and turn it into grounds that foster the capacities of the individual concerned, which I underline in my professional judgment.	113.13	117.838	-.022	.906
14	I understand the individual's resilience as a process to overcome adversity and pursue self-fulfillment.	113.13	114.838	.520	.903
15	I carry out my analysis based on sources of strength, support and family resilience of the individual concerned.	113.27	110.495	.817	.898
16	As guiding principle, I organize the information of the individual concerned with the recognition of each person's potential to reach their goals.	113.33	111.524	.471	.901
17	I ponder on the significance of bonds within the family, communication styles, conflict resolution styles and bonds to external networks.	113.13	114.838	.520	.903
18	I present statements considering the identified static risk factors.	113.67	106.667	.459	.903
19	I focus on finding support networks that help address the lawbreaker's risk factors.	113.53	108.552	.400	.904

20	When collecting individual, family and criminal background information, I focus my efforts on strengthening the lawbreaker's personal and social skills.	113.20	113.457	.560	.901
21	I present statements based on the identified dynamic risk factors.	113.67	103.667	.655	.897
22	I consider the significance of recognizing protective factors so they foster the abilities of the individual concerned.	113.33	115.524	.149	.906
23	I ponder on the possibilities, viability and opportunities to shape the life project of the individual concerned.	113.40	108.400	.700	.898
24	In my opinion, being subject to alternative sentencing helps a lawbreaker develop their life project.	113.67	102.810	.766	.895
25	As a Forensic Social Worker, I think I can contribute to restore the networks that people subject to alternative sentencing require to make their life projects reality.	114.07	106.210	.440	.904
26	I ponder on the story of the individual's life and their expression of what they aspire to in the future when producing the Forensic Social Assessment.	113.13	114.838	.520	.903
27	In Forensic Social Assessments, I ponder on the life project of the individual concerned based on their own sociocultural context.	113.20	116.886	.101	.905
28	I envision self-expression and self-development areas, interpersonal relations, social relations and professional life of the individual concerned.	113.40	112.543	.371	.903
29	I see the risks in the environment and neighborhood as life circumstances where the family of the individual concerned is immersed.	113.47	108.124	.704	.898
30	I ponder on the significance of housing stability as a protective factor for the individual concerned.	113.67	109.095	.375	.904
31	I observe family social relations of the individual concerned in their interaction with others and in different spaces of the same environment.	113.47	103.552	.723	.896
32	I consider that the connection to their environment allows for greater impact on civic, cultural and decision-making matters.	113.47	106.124	.643	.898

*M.E.S.*: Scale mean if the item was excluded. *V.E.S.*: Scale variance if the item was excluded. *C.E.C.*: Total correlation of corrected items. *A.C.S.*: Cronbach's alpha if the item was excluded.

### 2.2. Instrument Validity

Instrument validity based on expert judgment was determined thanks to the fact that it did not show available data in relation to scales that could evaluate Forensic Social Reports. Additionally, experts represented Chile and Argentina and were physically distributed. The experts' perspective on Forensic Social Reports was analyzed based on questions and progress reviews of the instrument, which allowed us to obtain and filter information, as well as agree on the items to be included in the Scale. On the other hand, it was positive to receive feedback and procedures on a regular basis (Cabero &

Infante, 2014). As a result, the systematic work conducted before creating, developing and implementing the instrument allowed ISP.TSs to have a significant reliability and be a promising future field of study.

### 3. Conclusions and Discussion

The Multidimensional Scale for Forensic Social Reports in Social Work (ISP.TS) showed a good design, appropriate reliability and validity. This study confirms that the instrument has excellent psychometric properties for Social Workers that conduct Forensic Social As-

assessments, as well as satisfactory internal consistency and outstanding homogeneity among their items.

As to its reliability (*Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient* 0.904), although it is an excellent result, it is still not comparable to other studies since this is the first scale that measures the content of Forensic Social Reports ever. For this purpose, Social Workers who produce Forensic Social Reports will be able to use one or more dimensions of the instrument as a practical tool and based on the different matters to be approached, as there is a wide range of areas where ISPs can be applied to socio-legal contexts. However, in the context of a research, it is advised to use all the observed dimensions since Cronbach's alpha is outstanding as a whole and not separately.

The limitations of this study relate to the fact that it was conducted on a certain population of the country (El Maule Region) with high technical requirements (Forensic Social Workers who are registered and actively working for the Public Criminal Defense Office). Despite the reduced sample size (15), this must be taken into account in future studies when using the scale in relation to either its language or context. Increasing the sample size would require working in different regions of the country or including Forensic Social Workers who are freelancers. As an additional limitation, the use of the information collected by means of a self-report scale can raise concerns, although the review, changes and contrast with the pilot test are supported by expert judgment. This, however, does not render its use invalid, since the aforementioned psychometric properties were outstanding, which is why it could also be administered to greater Forensic Social Workers samples. In this case, the instrument would still be able to measure relevant dimensions that should be included in Forensic Social Reports on any legal matter. Another limitation is that, as this is the first scale ever, advanced psychometric analysis must be improved checking the scale structure with exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, for example.

Given the historical experience of Social Workers in social and legal areas without an instrument that helps understand the main dimensions to be analyzed in the context of forensic work and in spite of the fact that the ISP.TS scale is innovative, the scale is still not able to describe a cut-off score. For this

reason, an interesting approach would be to increase the scale complexity and conduct studies that determine a cut-off score to clearly distinguish the dimensions that require more specialization from Forensic Social Workers, as well as emphasizing those included in Social Assessments. Moreover, this would allow to distinguish which dimensions should be the most frequently used in different contexts, e. g., child and adolescent protection, restoration of rights, grounds for penalties, sentence revocation or alternative sentencing of an accused person. Additionally, it is important that the respondents of this questionnaire understand that the scale does not aim at evaluating the quality of the job they perform, but the ISP content itself.

This instrument contributes to study Forensic Social Assessment in depth, specifically Forensic Social Reports, which are a historical disciplinary resource that requires greater complexity based on the evidence. This will also be helpful to check metric aspects and the practical use of this scale. Additionally, it could support the design of a more specialized academic approach based on emerging scenarios with Social Work students worldwide, as well as with professionals who are actively working. Therefore, it contributes to look into literature searches of similar studies and to encourage professional Social Workers and researchers to examine this construct. In this sense, while this work was conducted by means of a scale, it does not only necessarily approach the topic from a quantitative perspective, but also from a qualitative point of view, either comprehensively or separately.

Finally, the results of this study confirm that the Multidimensional Scale for Forensic Social Reports in Social Work (ISP.TS) is a valid and reliable instrument to evaluate Forensic Social Reports, and considers dimensions that interact on any legal matter (concept of family, family relations, family resilience, protective and risk factors, life project and familiar environment) considering that its reliability was outstanding (*Cronbach's alpha coefficient* of 0.904). All the same, we recommend to improve the method in the used procedure, so it allows to reduce subjectivity. We also expect that the content is considered to be related to the evaluation of Forensic Social Report content and not to Social Workers' performance. Additionally, we encourage experts to carry out studies in both socio-legal and sociocultural contexts.



#### 4. References

- Antón, Y. (2014). Trabajo Social en los juzgados de familia [Social Work in the family courts]. *Trabajo Social Hoy*, 71 (Primer Cuatrimestre), 97–114. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.12960/tsh.2014.0006>
- Bartolomé, R.; Montañes, M.; Rechea, C., & Montañez, J. (2010). Los Factores de Protección frente a la Conducta Antisocial: ¿Explican las diferencias en violencia entre chicas y chicos? *Revista Española de Investigación Criminológica (REIC)*, 7(8), 1–15. Retrieved from: <http://www.criminologia.net/pdf/reic/ano7-2009/a72009art3.pdf>
- Cabero, J. & Infante, A. (2014). Empleo del método Delphi y su empleo en la investigación en comunicación y educación. *EduTEC. Revista Electrónica de Tecnología Educativa*, 48, 1–16. Retrieved from: <http://www.edutec.es/revista/index.php/edutec-e/article/view/187>
- Calvete, E.; Orue, I., & Sampedro, R. (2011). Violencia filio-parental en la adolescencia: Características ambientales y personales. *Infancia y Aprendizaje*, 34(3), 349–363. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1174/021037011797238577>
- Casas, A. & Niño, M. (2015). Incorporación del peritaje social desde el análisis de género a los procedimientos en materia familiar, interacciones de un trabajo social contemporáneo. *Revista Trabajo Social*, 0(9), 59–71.
- Cinamon, R.G. & Rich, Y. (2002). Profiles of attribution of importance to life roles and their implications for the work-family conflict. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49(2), 212–220. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.49.2.212>
- Contreras, M. (2018). Dimensiones del Proyecto de vida en Intervenciones Familiares. Investigación/Intervención desde perspectiva adolescente en Centros Residenciales de la Región del Bio Bio. *Revista Electrónica de Trabajo Social*, 18, 94-103. Retrieved from: <http://www.revistatsudec.cl/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/9-Dimensiones-del-Proyecto-de-vida-en-Intervenciones-Familiares.pdf>
- Contreras, M. (2020). Proyecto de vida: Propuesta de Investigación/Intervención Psicoeducativa no normativa en adolescentes. En: P. Concha y F. García (eds.), *La adolescencia hoy: Problemas y soluciones para terapeutas* (pp.57-75). Nueva Mirada Ediciones.
- DeVellis, R. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. California: Sage Publications.
- Dierckx, M.; Devlieghere, J., & Vandembroeck, M. (2020). Proportionate universalism in child and family social work. *Child and Family Social Work*, 25(2), 337–344. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12689>
- Escobar-Pérez, J. & Cuervo-Martínez, Á. (January, 2008). Validez De Contenido Y Juicio De Expertos: Una Aproximación a Su Utilización. *Avances En Medición*, 6, 27–36.
- George, D. & Mallery, P. (2019). *IBM SPSS Statistics 26 step by step: A simple guide and reference*. London: Routledge.
- Gómez, E. & Kotliarenko, M.A. (2010). Resiliencia Familiar: Un Enfoque de Investigación e Intervención con Familias Multiproblemáticas. *Revista de Psicología [revista en Internet]* 2010 19(2): 103-131. *Revista de Psicología*, 19, 103–131. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5354/0719-0581.2010.17112> [Retrieved: december, 2019,2];
- Gonzalez, H. (2013). La producción científica sobre la familia en Chile: miradas desde la antropología feminista. *La Ventana*, 4(38), 88–119. Retrieved from: [http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S1405-94362013000200005%0Ahttps://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/RASO/article/download/52629/48375%0A%0A](http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1405-94362013000200005%0Ahttps://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/RASO/article/download/52629/48375%0A%0A)
- Granic, I.; Hollenstein, T.; Dishion, T.J., & Patterson, G.R. (2003). Longitudinal Analysis of Flexibility and Reorganization in Early Adolescence: A Dynamic Systems Study of Family Interactions. *Developmental Psychology*, 39(3), 606–617. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.39.3.606>
- Hernández, A. (2017). Los Trabajadores Sociales como Peritos-Forenses. Actuación desde el ejercicio liberal de la profesión. En Amaro, S. & Krmpotic, C., (2017) *Diccionario Internacional de Trabajo Social en el Ámbito Socio-Jurídico* (pp. 613-618). Nova Casa Editorial.
- Honores, B.A. & Quizhpe, J.M. (2019). El peritaje desde la perspectiva del trabajo social. *Revista Conrado*, 15(68), 267-274. Retrieved from: <http://conrado.ucf.edu.cu/index.php/conrado>
- International Federation of Social Workers. (July 2014). Global Definition of Social Work. *International Federation of Social Workers*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ifsw.org/what-is-social-work/global-definition-of-social-work>
- Lijterman, E. (2015). *¿Quiénes escriben los informes sociales? Un análisis de la conflictividad y el malestar en el despliegue de la 'técnica': sistematización de una experiencia de intervención* (pp.241–261).

- Maschi, T. (2017). Trabajo Social Forense: Conceptos fundamentales. En: S. Amaro & C. Krmpotic, *Diccionario Internacional de Trabajo Social en el Ámbito Socio-Jurídico* (pp. 223-262). Nova Casa Editorial.
- Medan, M. (2012). ¿"Proyecto de vida"? tensiones en un programa de prevención del delito juvenil. *Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales, Niñez y Juventud*, 10, 79-91.
- Méndez, M. (2015). *Trabajo Social con Personas y Familias: Modelo Clínico de Intervención*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editorial Espacio.
- Montañés, M., & Bartolomé, R. (2007). Conducta antisocial en adolescentes: Diferencias entre chicos y chicas. *Ensayos: Revista de La Facultad de Educación de Albacete*, 22, 279-294.
- Muñoz, A. (2005). La Familia como contexto de desarrollo infantil: dimensiones de análisis relevantes para la intervención educativa y social. *Portularia: Revista de Trabajo Social*, 5, 147-163.
- Oliva, A. (2006). Relaciones familiares y desarrollo adolescente. *Anuario de Psicología*, 37(3), 209-223.
- Oliva, A.; Parra, Á.; Sánchez-Queija, I., & López, F. (2007). Estilos educativos materno y paterno: evaluación y relación con el ajuste adolescente. *An. Psicol*, 23, 49-56.
- Policarto, A., (2017). La familia en la contemporaneidad: Reflexiones para la actuación profesional en el campo sociojurídico. En: S. Amaro & C. Krmpotic, *Diccionario Internacional de Trabajo Social en el Ámbito Socio-Jurídico* (pp.167-186). Nova Casa Editorial.
- Quintero, A. (2017). El Trabajo Social Forense en el hemisferio iberoamericano: tradiciones, matices y constructos epistemológicos. En: S. Amaro & C. Krmpotic, *Diccionario Internacional de Trabajo Social en el Ámbito Socio-Jurídico* (pp.245-262). Nova Casa Editorial.
- Quintero, A. (2014). Peritaje social: Contexto no clínico en la intervención socio-familiar. *Revista de La Facultad de Trabajo Social*, 30(30), 25-40.
- Rubin, A. (2008). *Practitioners guide to using research for evidence-based practice*. Nova York: Wiley Publishers.
- Robles, C. (2013). *El informe social forense. Aciertos y debilidades de la intervención profesional. Trabajo Social en el Campo Jurídico*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Editorial Espacio.
- Santana-Vega, L.E.; Medina-Sánchez, P.C., & Feliciano-García, L. (2019). Proyecto de vida y toma de decisiones del alumnado de Formación Profesional. *Revista Complutense de Educación*, 30(2), 423-440. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5209/rce.57589>
- Sapiro, B. & Ward, A. (2019). Marginalized Youth, Mental Health, and Connection with Others: A Review of the Literature. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 1-15. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-019-00628-5>
- Villalba, C. (2003). El concepto de resiliencia individual y familiar. Aplicaciones en la intervención social. *Psychosocial Intervention*, 12(3), 283-299.
- White, W. L. (2007). Selected Papers of William L. White. *Journal of Addictive Diseases*, 19(2), 1-10. Retrieved from: [www.williamwhitepapers.com](http://www.williamwhitepapers.com)

**Annex 1. Instrument**

		ISP.TS						
		Never 1	Sometimes 2	Almost Always 3	Always 4			
Concept of family	1	I include the historical and social experience of individuals concerned in order to understand how they shape their own conceptualization of family.			1	2	3	4
	2	During the interview, I use conceptualizations of family from the perspective of other disciplines in order to align them to those that families have.			1	2	3	4
	3	I consider the conception of family of the individuals concerned to carry out the Forensic Social Assessment.			1	2	3	4
	4	During the interview, I use conceptualizations of family from the perspective of Social Work in order to align them to those that families themselves have.			1	2	3	4
	5	I identify the strengths, potential and weaknesses that families show within its own dynamics.			1	2	3	4
	6	I use conceptualizations of family from a legal perspective and I align them to those that the affected individual has.			1	2	3	4
Family relations	7	I focus on family members' roles with an emphasis on emotional bonds that people establish in their family context.			1	2	3	4
	8	I examine parental practices, decision making and bonds existing within the families when applicable.			1	2	3	4
	9	I observe emotional and social relations within the family system of sharing a home.			1	2	3	4
	10	I analyze how new family dynamics arise and potential conflict areas paying attention to the relations among family members in association with their external environment.			1	2	3	4
	11	I focus on the significance of interaction patterns that family members develop and examine their habits, values and belief systems.			1	2	3	4
	12	I ponder on the communication, support and mutual affection, as well as the hostile or conflictive situations within the family system of the individual concerned.			1	2	3	4
Family resilience	13	I focus on collecting information and turn it into grounds that foster the capacities of the individual concerned, which I underline in my professional judgment.			1	2	3	4
	14	I understand the individual's resilience as a process to overcome adversity and pursue self-fulfillment.			1	2	3	4
	15	I carry out my analysis based on sources of strength, support and family resilience of the individual concerned.			1	2	3	4
	16	As guiding principle, I organize the information of the individual concerned with the recognition of each person's potential to reach their goals.			1	2	3	4

Protective and risk factors	17	I ponder on the significance of bonds within the family, communication styles, conflict resolution styles and bonds to external networks.	1	2	3	4
	18	I present statements considering the identified static risk factors.	1	2	3	4
	19	I focus on finding support networks that help address the lawbreaker's risk factors.	1	2	3	4
	20	When collecting individual, family and criminal background information, I focus my efforts on strengthening the lawbreaker's personal and social skills.	1	2	3	4
	21	I present statements based on the identified dynamic risk factors.	1	2	3	4
	22	I consider the significance of recognizing protective factors so they foster the abilities of the individual concerned.	1	2	3	4
Life project	23	I ponder on the possibilities, viability and opportunities to shape the life project of the individual concerned.	1	2	3	4
	24	In my opinion, being subject to alternative sentencing helps a lawbreaker develop their life project.	1	2	3	4
	25	As a Forensic Social Worker, I think I can contribute to restore the networks that people subject to alternative sentencing require to make their life projects reality.	1	2	3	4
	26	I ponder on the story of the individual's life and their expression of what they aspire to in the future when producing the Forensic Social Assessment.	1	2	3	4
	27	In Forensic Social Assessments, I ponder on the life project of the individual concerned based on their own sociocultural context.	1	2	3	4
	28	I envision self-expression and self-development areas, interpersonal relations, social relations and professional life of the individual concerned.	1	2	3	4
Familiar environment	29	I see the risks in the environment and neighborhood as life circumstances where the family of the individual concerned is immersed.	1	2	3	4
	30	I ponder on the significance of housing stability as a protective factor for the individual concerned.	1	2	3	4
	31	I observe family social relations of the individual concerned in their interaction with others and in different spaces of the same environment.	1	2	3	4
	32	I consider that the connection to their environment allows for greater impact on civic, cultural and decision-making matters.	1	2	3	4



**Annex 2. Correlation Analysis Table [C.F: Concept of family. R.F: Family relations. F.P.R: Protective and risk factors. P.V: Life project. E: Familiar environment].**

C.F.1	1	0.32	-0.28	.60	-0.13	0.26	-0.13	.53	-0.19	.53	-0.13	0.16	0.05	-0.13	.68	0.10	0.29	0.03	-0.23	0.00	.60	-0.15	-0.13	0.29	0.28	0.49	.56	0.15	0.16				
C.F.2	0.32	1	.51	0.42	-0.19	0.28	0.17	-0.02	0.07	.53	-0.01	0.17	-0.19	0.32	-0.02	-0.19	0.29	0.22	.52	0.11	0.14	0.36	0.23	-0.08	-0.19	-0.01	.51	0.42	0.11	0.19	0.09		
C.F.3	-0.28	.51	1	0.26	-0.14	-0.08	0.29	-0.26	0.13	0.23	0.22	0.43	-0.14	0.00	0.13	-0.03	0.11	-0.11	.52	0.43	-0.12	0.10	-0.14	0.43	.62	0.18	-0.11	-0.12	-0.14	-0.14			
C.F.4	.60	0.42	0.26	1	-0.17	0.13	-0.17	0.02	-0.30	0.03	0.03	0.29	0.19	-0.17	0.13	0.18	-0.17	0.43	0.07	0.29	-0.02	0.02	0.26	0.29	-0.17	.56	.72	.63	0.27	0.12	0.02		
C.F.5	-0.13	-0.19	-0.14	-0.17	1	-0.16	-0.07	-0.12	-0.22	-0.21	-0.10	-0.07	-0.07	-0.13	-0.12	-0.12	-0.14	-0.18	-0.24	-0.07	-0.10	-0.14	-0.14	-0.10	-0.14	-0.17	0.11	-0.12	-0.13	-0.13			
C.F.6	0.26	0.28	-0.08	0.13	0.16	0.14	0.37	.77	.54	.58	0.42	0.14	.74	.82	.64	.74	0.23	0.17	0.42	.57	-.01	.54	.70	.42	.74	.42	.59	0.33	.92	.92			
R.F.1	-0.13	0.17	0.29	-0.17	-0.07	0.14	1	-0.12	0.34	0.45	0.32	-0.10	-0.07	-0.07	.53	-0.12	0.42	.68	0.11	.80	.74	.42	0.24	-0.07	-0.10	0.29	-0.17	-0.16	-0.12	-0.13			
R.F.2	0.05	-0.02	-0.26	0.02	-0.12	0.37	-0.12	1	0.18	.63	0.09	0.16	-0.12	0.34	0.34	0.18	0.34	0.29	.74	-.02	0.13	0.21	.53	0.34	-0.18	-0.06	0.26	0.07	0.44	0.34			
R.F.3	-0.23	-0.02	0.13	-0.30	-0.12	.77	0.34	0.18	1	.63	.56	0.50	-0.12	.80	.63	.59	.80	-0.04	0.01	0.16	0.44	0.18	.52	.47	.63	.80	-0.18	-0.06	0.19	.78			
R.F.4	0.00	0.07	0.23	0.03	-0.22	.54	0.45	.63	0.45	.63	0.34	0.45	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64	.64			
R.F.5	0.27	.53	0.22	0.03	-0.21	.58	0.32	0.09	.56	.51	1	0.08	-0.21	0.32	.61	0.09	0.32	.58	0.17	0.48	0.34	0.09	0.45	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68			
R.F.6	-0.19	-0.01	0.43	0.29	-0.10	0.42	-0.10	0.16	0.50	0.41	0.08	1	-0.10	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68	.68			
R.1	.53	0.17	-0.14	0.19	-0.07	0.14	-0.07	-0.12	-0.22	-0.21	-0.10	-0.10	1	-0.07	-0.13	0.34	-0.07	-0.15	-0.13	-0.10	-0.16	-0.12	0.24	-0.07	-0.10	0.29	-0.17	-0.16	-0.12	0.20			
R.2	-0.13	-0.19	-0.14	-0.17	-0.07	.74	-0.07	0.34	.80	.45	0.32	.68	-0.07	1	.53	.80	1.00	-0.15	-0.13	-0.10	0.39	-0.12	0.29	0.42	0.48	1.00	-0.10	-0.14	-0.12	0.20			
R.3	0.16	0.32	0.00	0.13	-0.13	.82	.53	0.34	.63	.63	.61	0.29	-0.13	.53	1	0.34	.53	0.36	0.45	.78	.56	.83	.79	.30	.53	.80	0.16	0.32	0.26	.58			
R.4	0.05	-0.02	0.13	0.18	-0.12	.64	-0.12	0.18	.59	0.34	0.09	.84	0.34	.80	1	.80	1	-0.27	-0.22	-0.18	0.19	-0.01	0.32	0.34	.53	.80	0.16	0.32	0.26	.78			
F.P.R.1	-0.13	-0.19	-0.14	-0.17	-0.07	.74	-0.07	0.34	.80	.45	0.32	.68	-0.07	1	.53	.80	1	-0.15	-0.13	-0.10	0.39	-0.12	0.29	0.42	0.48	1.00	-0.10	-0.14	-0.12	0.20			
F.P.R.2	.68	0.29	-0.11	0.43	-0.15	0.23	0.10	0.29	-0.04	0.41	.58	-0.23	-0.15	1	.53	.80	1	-0.15	-0.13	-0.10	0.39	-0.12	0.29	0.42	0.48	1.00	-0.10	-0.14	-0.12	0.20			
F.P.R.3	0.10	0.22	-0.03	0.07	-0.13	0.17	0.42	.68	0.16	0.41	0.48	-0.15	-0.10	-0.13	0.45	-0.22	-0.13	0.46	1	.62	.79	.25	0.42	0.30	0.38	-0.13	-0.19	0.13	-0.01	0.09	-0.07		
F.P.R.4	0.29	.52	0.11	0.29	-0.10	0.42	.68	0.16	0.41	0.48	-0.15	-0.10	-0.10	.78	-0.18	-0.10	.53	.62	1	0.37	0.50	.76	.62	0.00	-0.10	-0.15	0.43	0.38	0.16	0.26	0.04		
F.P.R.5	0.03	0.11	-0.11	-0.02	-0.16	.57	0.11	.92	0.44	.79	0.34	0.09	0.16	-0.12	0.34	-0.01	-0.12	-0.04	0.25	0.50	-0.04	1	.71	0.21	0.10	-0.12	0.16	.52	-0.11	-0.29	-0.21	-0.23	
F.P.R.6	-0.23	0.14	.52	0.02	-0.12	-0.41	.80	-0.21	0.18	0.34	0.09	0.16	-0.12	0.34	-0.01	-0.12	-0.04	0.25	0.50	-0.04	1	.71	0.21	0.10	-0.12	0.16	.52	-0.11	-0.29	-0.21	-0.23		
P.V.1	0.00	0.36	0.43	0.26	-0.14	.54	.74	0.42	0.21	0.47	.57	.68	0.45	0.43	-0.14	0.29	.83	0.32	0.29	0.21	0.42	.76	.35	.71	1	.63	0.30	0.29	0.11	.62	0.36	0.28	
P.V.2	.60	0.23	-0.12	0.29	-0.18	.70	0.42	0.21	0.47	.57	.68	0.45	0.43	-0.14	0.29	.83	0.32	0.29	0.21	0.42	.76	.35	.71	1	.63	0.30	0.29	0.11	.62	0.36	0.28		
P.V.3	-0.15	-0.08	0.10	-0.17	-0.24	0.48	0.24	.53	.63	.69	0.12	0.35	0.24	0.48	0.30	.53	0.48	-0.11	0.38	0.00	.63	0.10	0.30	0.20	1	0.20	0.42	0.17	0.25	.54	.52	0.51	
P.V.4	-0.13	-0.19	-0.14	-0.17	-0.07	.74	-0.07	0.34	.80	.45	0.32	.68	-0.07	1	.53	.80	1	-0.15	-0.13	-0.10	0.39	-0.12	0.29	0.42	0.48	1.00	-0.10	-0.14	-0.12	0.20	0.20		
P.V.5	0.29	-0.01	0.43	.56	-0.10	-0.23	-0.10	-0.18	0.16	0.08	0.42	-0.10	-0.14	0.28	0.32	-0.14	0.11	0.19	0.43	0.00	.52	.62	.25	0.10	-0.14	0.43	1	0.43	0.38	0.37	-0.17	-0.19	
P.V.6	0.28	.51	.62	.72	-0.14	0.16	0.29	-0.06	-0.06	0.23	0.00	0.43	0.29	-0.14	0.28	0.32	-0.14	0.11	0.19	0.43	0.00	.52	.62	.25	0.10	-0.14	0.43	1	0.43	0.38	0.37	-0.17	-0.19
E.1	0.49	0.42	0.18	.63	-0.17	.59	-0.17	.59	0.38	-0.17	0.26	0.49	0.26	0.49	0.26	0.49	0.26	.68	0.13	0.38	0.39	-0.11	0.36	.54	0.00	0.26	0.38	0.36	1	.73	.69	0.49	
E.2	.56	0.11	-0.11	0.27	0.11	0.33	-0.16	0.07	0.19	0.26	.62	-0.04	-0.16	0.11	0.21	-0.04	0.11	.79	-0.01	0.16	0.19	-0.29	0.00	.52	-0.12	0.11	0.37	-0.11	.73	1	0.43	0.29	
E.3	0.15	0.19	-0.12	0.12	-0.12	.92	-0.12	.92	0.48	.55	0.49	-0.12	.79	.72	.58	.79	0.25	0.09	0.26	.58	-0.21	0.38	.55	0.34	.79	-0.17	0.00	.69	0.43	1	.91	.91	
E.4	0.16	0.09	-0.14	0.02	-0.13	.92	-0.13	.92	0.42	.53	0.20	.86	.58	.78	.86	0.03	-0.07	0.04	0.47	-0.23	0.28	0.51	.53	.86	-0.19	0.00	0.49	0.29	.91	1	1	1	