Introduction

Impulsivity has been linked to various types of psychopathology (Whiteside, Lynam, Miller, & Reynold 2005). It has also been shown to predict institutional misconduct, such as aggression, in adult psychiatric inpatients (Ferguson, Rhoades, & Gruber, 2005). Within adolescents, impulsivity has been correlated with misconduct in school (Vogel & Barton, 2013) and externalizing behaviors such as substance use (Wulfer Block, Santa Ana, Rodriguez, & Colsman, 2002). These relationships may be especially pronounced among atrisk youth with histories of externalizing behaviors, suc as those residing in a residential boot camp facility. Additionally, sex differences have been found in selfreported patterns of impulsivity-related traits (Cyders, 2013); therefore, it is also important to understand how impulsivity-behavior associations may vary between boys and girls.

The current study assessed impulsivity and its connection to misconduct at a boot camp facility for atrisk adolescents. It was hypothesized that impulsivity would positively correlate with the number of incidents misconduct. It was also hypothesized that there would significant gender differences in the pattern of associations between facets of impulsivity and types of misconduct.

Methods

Sample

- 196 at-risk adolescents solicited from a residential boot camp facility in the southeastern U.S.
- 83% male, average age of 16.8 (SD = 0.77)
- 62% Caucasian, 33% African-American, 4% Multiracial, and 1% Other.

Procedure

- Part of a larger data collection at residential facility
- Computerized administration of the UPPS-P (Whiteside & Lynam, 2001) to assess impulsivity.
- Disciplinary records were collected and misconduct was coded into one of the following categories: Peer Physical Aggression, Peer Verbal Aggression, Defiance, Rule Breaking, and Disruption.

Impulsivity and Institutional Misconduct in At-Risk Adolescents Margaret R. Bullerjahn, Nora E. Charles¹, and Christopher T. Barry² ¹University of Southern Mississippi ² Washington State University

Results

		S-P Scores and					
UPPS-S Means		Male (N = 163) (M, SD)	Female (N = 33) (M, SD)	t-valu	e p(tv	vo-taileo	
Negative	e Urgency	2.69, .628	2.85, .650	-1.30	0	.200	
-	Premeditation	1.94, .623	2.17, .676	-1.79	4	.080.	
Lack of	Perseverance	1.90, .498	2.15, .533	-2.46	9	.018*	
Sensation Seeking		3.01, .620	2.74, .751	1.956	6	.057	
Positive Urgency		2.54, .744	2.37, .727	1.162	2	.251	
Citations	S						
Total		12.4, 14.2	12.4, 14.2 7.12, 6.68		6 .001*		
Peer Physical Aggression		1.14, 1.88	.480, .795	4.645	5	.000*	
Peer Verbal Aggression		1.70, 2.41	.880, 1.58	2.465	5	.016*	
Defiance	Э	2.46, 4.73	1.27, 2.25	2.200	D	.030*	
Rule Breaking		3.56, 4.66	3.18, 3.16	.571		.570	
				.011		.010	
Disruption Signif 3.276 One s	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely S, p=.001). Significant sex diffe	3.38, 5.19 ces were presen to receive infrac	1.18, 1.29 It (Table 1). Most r ctions than their fe	4.741 notably, n emale cou	1 nale cad unterpart	.000* ets wei ts (<i>t</i> =	
Disruption Signif 3.276 One s Perse Table 2	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely 5, p=.001). significant sex difference subscale	3.38, 5.19 ces were present to receive infrace erence was presence $(t=-2.469, p=-0)$	1.18, 1.29 It (Table 1). Most rections than their fe	4.741 notably, n emale cou	1 nale cad unterpart	.000* ets wei ts (<i>t</i> =	
Disruption Signif Signif 3.276 One s Perse Table 2 Correla	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely 5, p=.001). significant sex difference subscale everance subscale	3.38, 5.19 ces were present to receive infrace erence was presence (<i>t</i> = -2.469, <i>p</i> = .0	1.18, 1.29 It (Table 1). Most r ctions than their fe ent in impulsivity 018).	4.74 notably, n emale cou scores or	1 nale cad unterpart	.000* ets wei ts (<i>t</i> =	
Disruption Signif 3.276 One s Perse Table 2	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely 5, p=.001). significant sex difference subscale	3.38, 5.19 ces were present to receive infrace erence was pres (t=-2.469, p=-0) <u>S-P Scores, Impuls</u> Total F Number of Ph	1.18, 1.29 It (Table 1). Most rections than their fe	4.741 notably, n emale cou	1 nale cad unterpart	.000* ets wei ts (<i>t</i> =	
Disruption Signif Signif 3.276 One s Perse Table 2 Correla	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely 5, p=.001). significant sex difference subscale everance subscale	3.38, 5.19 ces were present to receive infrace erence was pres (t=-2.469, p=.0) <u>S-P Scores, Impuls</u> Total F Number of Ph Citations Agg	1.18, 1.29 It (Table 1). Most rections than their fe ent in impulsivity 018).	4.74 notably, n emale cou scores or	1 nale cad unterpart n the Lac <u>Miscondu</u> Rule	.000* ets wei ts (<i>t</i> = ck of <u>ict</u> <i>Disrupt</i>	
Disruption Signif Signif 3.276 One s Perse Table 2 Correla Sex	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely b, p = .001). significant sex difference everance subscale <u>tions Between UPPS</u> <u>UPPS-S</u>	3.38, 5.19 ces were present to receive infrace erence was pres (t=-2.469, p=.0) <u>S-P Scores, Impuls</u> Total F Number of Ph Citations Agg .121 .2 .100	1.18, 1.29 It (Table 1). Most in ctions than their fe ent in impulsivity 018). <u>sivity Means, and In</u> Peer Peer Verbal sysical Aggression ression 200* .095 030 .078	4.741 notably, n emale cou scores or <u>stitutional</u> Defiance	1 nale cad unterpart n the Lac <i>Miscondu</i> <i>Rule</i> <i>Breaking</i> .126 .056	.000* ets wei ts (<i>t</i> = ck of <u>of</u> <i>Disrupt</i> .015 .151	
Disruption Signif Signif 3.276 One s Perse Table 2 Correla Sex	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely 5, p= .001). significant sex difference everance subscale dions Between UPPS UPPS-S	3.38, 5.19 ces were present to receive infrace erence was present (t = -2.469, p = .0 <u>S-P Scores, Impuls</u> <u>Total</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Number of</u> <u>Agg</u> .121 .100 .105	1.18, 1.29 It (Table 1). Most restions than their features than their features that their features that the sector of the sector	4.741 notably, n emale cou scores or <u>stitutional</u> Defiance	1 nale cad unterpart n the Lac <u>Miscondu</u> Rule Breaking .126 .056 .082	.000* ets wer ts (<i>t</i> = ck of <u>of</u> <i>Disrupt</i> .015 .151 .150	
Disruption Signif Signif 3.276 One s Perse Table 2 Correla Sex	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely 5, p= .001). significant sex difference everance subscale <u>tions Between UPPS</u> <u>UPPS-S</u> Negative Urgency Lack of Premeditation Lack of Perseverance Sensation Seeking	3.38, 5.19 Ses were present to receive infrace erence was present (t = -2.469, p = .0 S-P Scores, Impuls Total F Number of Ph Citations Agg .121 .1 .100 .105 .1	1.18, 1.29t (Table 1). Most restions than their featurections than their featureent in impulsivity018).sivity Means, and In Peer Peer Verbal sysical Aggression200*.095030.078.07.080.052.077	4.741 notably, n emale cou scores or <u>stitutional</u> Defiance	1 nale cad unterpart n the Lac <i>Miscondu</i> <i>Rule</i> <i>Breaking</i> .126 .056 .082 .055	.000* ets wei ts (<i>t</i> = ck of <u>of</u> .015 .151 .150 .151	
Disruption Signif Signif 3.276 One s Perse Table 2 Correla Sex	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely 5, p= .001). significant sex difference everance subscale dions Between UPPS UPPS-S Negative Urgency Lack of Premeditation Lack of Perseverance Sensation Seeking Positive Urgency	3.38, 5.19 Ses were present to receive infrace erence was present (t = -2.469, p = .0 S-P Scores, Impuls Total F Number of Ph Citations Agg .121 .1 .100 .1 .105 .1 .208** .2	1.18, 1.29t (Table 1). Most restions than their featureent in impulsivity018).sivity Means, and InPeerPeerPeer VerbalysicalAggressionression200*.095030.07.080052.077198*.110	4.741 notably, n emale cou scores or <u>stitutional</u> Defiance	1 nale cad unterpart n the Lac <i>Miscondu</i> <i>Rule</i> <i>Breaking</i> .056 .082 .055 .082 .055 .217**	.000* ets wei ts (<i>t</i> = ck of .015 .151 .150 .151 .150 .155	
Disruption Signif Signif 3.276 One s Perse Table 2 Correla Sex	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely ficantly more likely for p= .001). fignificant sex difference severance subscale dions Between UPPS UPPS-S Negative Urgency Lack of Premeditation Lack of Perseverance Sensation Seeking Positive Urgency Negative Urgency	3.38, 5.19 Ses were present to receive infrace erence was present (t = -2.469, p = .0 S-P Scores, Impuls Total F Number of Ph Citations Agg .121 .2 .100 . .105 . .208** .2	1.18, 1.29t (Table 1). Most restions than their featurections than their featurecent in impulsivity018).sivity Means, and InPeerPeerPeerPeerPeer VerbalsysicalAggression200*.095030.078007.080052.077198*.110216	4.741 notably, n emale cou scores or <u>stitutional</u> Defiance .115 .006 .013 .069 .125 .346*	1 nale cad unterpart n the Lac <i>Miscondu</i> <i>Rule</i> <i>Breaking</i> .126 .056 .082 .055 .082 .055 .217**	.000* ets wei ts (<i>t</i> = ck of .015 .015 .151 .150 .029	
Disruption Signif Signif 3.276 One s Perse Table 2 Correla Sex	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely ficantly	3.38, 5.19 Ses were present to receive infrace erence was present (t = -2.469, p = .4 S-P Scores, Impulse Total F Number of Ph Citations Agg .121 .2 .100 .105 .2 .208** .4 .343 .2 .343 .2	1.18, 1.29t (Table 1). Most restions than their featureent in impulsivity018).sivity Means, and InPeerPeerPeer VerbalysicalAggressionression200*.095030.07.080052.077198*.110	4.741 notably, n emale cou scores or <u>stitutional</u> Defiance	1 nale cad unterpart n the Lac <i>Miscondu</i> <i>Rule</i> <i>Breaking</i> .056 .082 .055 .082 .055 .217**	.000* ets wer ts (<i>t</i> =	
Disruption Signif Signif 3.276 One s Perse Table 2 Correla Sex	ficant sex difference ficantly more likely ficantly more likely for p= .001). fignificant sex difference severance subscale dions Between UPPS UPPS-S Negative Urgency Lack of Premeditation Lack of Perseverance Sensation Seeking Positive Urgency Negative Urgency	3.38, 5.19 Ses were present to receive infrace erence was present (t=-2.469, p=.0) S-P Scores, Impuls Total F Number of Ph Citations Agg .121 .2 .100 .105 .2 .208** .2 .343 .2 .368* .2 .077 .2	1.18, 1.29 t (Table 1). Most not the stress of th	4.741 notably, n emale cou scores or scores or <i>stitutional</i> <i>Defiance</i> .115 .006 .013 .069 .125 .346* .253	1 nale cad unterpart n the Lac <i>Miscondu</i> <i>Rule</i> <i>Breaking</i> .126 .056 .082 .055 .217** .332 .251	.000* ets wer ts (<i>t</i> = ck of .015 .151 .151 .150 .029 .347*	

- Overall, impulsivity was positively correlated with both male and temale institutional misconduct (Table 2).
- Among males, there were correlations between both urgency subscales and several types of misconduct; in contrast, results for females showed more associations involving sensation seeking and lack of premeditation.
- Results relating impulsivity to physical aggression were only significant among males, though the magnitude and direction of the association involving negative urgency was similar in the smaller sample of females.

Results are consistent with previous research suggesting that impulsivity is related to externalizing and other problem behaviors (e.g., Whiteside & Lynam, 2003; Lynam & Miller, 2004; Derefinko, DeWall, Metze, Walsh, & Lyman, 2011). Significant sex differences were also present within the sample, supporting existing literature (Waldeck & Miller, 1997; Cyders, 2013). More specifically, the results showed higher correlations between misconduct and positive urgency for males, which is congruent to Cyders' (2013) findings; however, females displayed more significant correlations with misconduct and sensation seeking. This finding is interesting considering previous research has found that females engage in less sensation seeking impulsivity than males (Costa, Terracianno, & McCrae, 2001; Cyders, 2013). Therefore it is suggested that although females engage in less sensation seeking impulsivity, when they do, it is more likely to result in problematic behavior. Findings surrounding sex differences in problematic behavior is also consistent with previous literature, providing evidence to the theory that boys are more likely engage in physical aggression whereas girls are more likely to engage in relational aggression such as verbal aggression and defiance (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995).

- Significant sex differences amongst the sample imply that interventions may need to differ between male and female youth to target different facets of impulsivity.
- More specifically, interventions should be targeted for reducing positive urgency impulsivity in males, and reducing sensation seeking and lack of premeditation impulsivity in females.



Discussion

Implications

Significant correlations between impulsivity and misconduct suggest that decreasing impulsivity in adolescents is a relevant point of intervention when trying to reduce problematic behaviors in at-risk youth.