6-1-2001

Gang Affiliation in Adolescence and Attachment in Infancy

Joan E. Unis
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Gang Affiliation in Adolescence and Attachment in Infancy

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Psychology

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Joan E. Unis

June 2001

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Psychology University of Nebraska at Omaha

Committee

Brigitte O. Ryals

Bill Wakefield

Rori Reiter-Palmon

Chairperson Joseph O. LaVoie

Date July 26, 2001

Acknowledgments

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people who have contributed in one form or another to the completion of this project. First, wish to individually thank my thesis committee members: Dr. Joseph C. LaVoie, Dr. Brigette Ryalls, Dr. Roni Reiter-Palmon, and Dr. Bill Wakefield. Their suggestions, insights, and support throughout the completion of this venture is greatly esteemed. I am especially appreciative of Dr. LaVoie for his guidance, patience, and leadership. He has allowed me both the autonomy to learn from this experience, as well as the supervision to expand my knowledge base by bringing new and better ways of thinking of problems.

I would also like to thank Brandy Randall for all of her aid, and direction in helping with the statistical analysis; as well as Leslie Christensen, Aryn Bowlby, and Suzi Peklo for their time and flexibility in helping me to collect data. Their friendship is deeply appreciated. In addition, a special thanks is given to The Honorable Juvenile Judge Elizabeth Crnkovitch and the Douglas County Youth Center Staff for granting me permission to complete this project with the detained adolescents.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for all they have given me. My father's refusal to accept mediocrity, and my mother's dedication, have afforded me opportunities to grow personally, professionally, and scholastically. Their unwavering belief in me, has allowed the accomplishment of this endeavor.

Gang Affiliation in Adolescence and Attachment in Infancy

Joan E. Unis, MA

University of Nebraska, 2000

Advisor: Dr. Joseph C. LaVoie

According to Attachment Theory (Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980), infants become attached to their primary caregiver for protection and security. Gang literature reports that individuals join gangs for the companionship and protection a gang can offer (Hochhaus & Sousa, 1987-88; Friedman, Mann, & Friedman, 1975). The aim of this present study was to examine the proposition that individuals who eventually become gang members in adolescence have an insecure attachment to caregivers, a secure attachment to peers, and will have lower scores on constructs related to attachment. The participants in this study were 90 individuals, divided equally into gang and non-gang members. All participants were given four separate attachment measures to assess attachment classification (The Security Scale, The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment, The Behavioral Systems Questionnaire, and the Attachment Style Scale) for both parents and peers, as well as three measures of attachment correlates. There was minimal support for the proposed hypotheses relating to insecure attachment. The results are discussed from the perspective of attachment theory.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter I

Introduction

Gang Affiliation in

Adolescence and Attachment in Infancy

Statement of the Problem

Attachment theory has been used to explain a wide variety of phenomena in infancy, toddlerhood and throughout the pre-school years. Several investigators have been able to identify the role that insecure attachment plays in the development of disruptive behavioral problems (Greenberg, Speltz, & DeKlyen, 1993), hostile-aggressive behavior or externalizing behavior (Lyons-Ruth, Alpern, & Repacholi, 1993; Rothbaum & Weisz, 1994), ego resiliency (Arend, Gove, & Stroufe, 1979; Arend, Frederick, & Stroufe, 1979), and the child's representation of self (Cassidy, 1988). However, the literature extending attachment into adolescence is extremely sparse. Relatively few longitudinal studies follow children who have been classified as secure or insecure during infancy into the adolescent years. Studies that focus on adolescence as it relates to attachment have found that insecure attachment can be related to psychopathology (Allen, Hauser & Borman-Spurrell, 1996; Rosenstein & Harvey, 1996) and a diminished sense of psychological well-being (Nada-Raja, McGee, & Stanton, 1992).

One goal of the present study was to extend the body of adolescent research on attachment. Individual gang members may also experience: conduct problems, hostile behavior, little if any ego resiliency, difficulties with perceived

social competence, problems with self esteem, psychopathology, and a diminished sense of psychological well-being. Therefore, individuals may join gangs because they are seeking some form of attachment in adolescence, and the gang is used as a substitute for the primary caregiver. Investigators who have worked extensively with gangs cite the need of gang members for a "father figure" (Lowney, 1984), believe that the gang serves as a extension of the family (Brown, 1978), and that there is a lack of an adult role model in the gang member's life (Foley, 1983). Although attachment may be one explanation for gang affiliation, social competence also may play a role. A link has been found between social competence and delinquent behavior (Kuperminc, Allen, & Arther, 1996). Therefore a lack of social competence may be a driving force for individuals to join gangs. The primary aim of this study was to examine the proposition that adolescents who are currently involved in gang activity were not securely attached to a primary caregiver.

Review of the Literature

Attachment Theory

John Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) is credited with formalizing a theory of attachment which is described in a three-volume trilogy entitled Attachment and Loss. In the first volume, Bowlby (1969) discussed attachment. He built his theory on the idea of instinctive behaviors, and believed that attachment served a biological function. According to Bowlby (1969), the biological function was proximity to the mother. The theory "postulates that the child's tie to his mother is a product of the activity of a number of behavioral systems that have proximity

to mother as a predictable outcome." (Bowlby, 1969, p.179). Bowlby (1969) used the term 'attachment behavior' to refer to what occurs when a set of behavioral systems becomes activated. These behavioral systems develop as a result of the infant's interaction with his or her environment, particularly his or her interaction with the primary caregiver, usually the mother (Bowlby, 1969). Bowlby further emphasized that during the development of the behavioral systems responsible for attachment, proximity to mother becomes a set-goal.

According to Bowlby's (1969) theory, two attachment systems are in operation. The first system operates in the child, and the second operates in the mother. However, both systems have the same consequence - proximity. The manner in which both systems complement each other is 'attachment behavior'. The behavior of the child that results in proximity is the first component of attachment behavior. Parental behavior, the "reciprocal to attachment behavior of juveniles" (p.182), consists of 'caretaking behavior' which is the second component of attachment behavior. Thus, for Bowlby (1969) attachment is "seeking and maintaining proximity to another individual" (p.194); it is a "dynamic equilibrium between the mother and child pair" (p.236), and attachment towards the mother will persist through adult life.

Bowlby (1969) describes the most obvious proximity maintaining behavior as an infant crying, attempting to follow his or her mother when she leaves the room, and then smiling or approaching the mother when she returns. Another child attachment behavior is clinging to the mother when the child is frightened or alarmed. In addition, the child's behavior is also influenced by the presence

of the mother. If the mother is present, the infant will feel more confident to explore his or her surroundings. If the mother is absent, the infant may be more timid and distressed. Therefore, Bowlby (1969) concluded that the child uses the mother as a secure "base from which to explore" (p. 208). When the mother is present, the child will move away to become familiar with the environment, but he or she will return periodically to confirm the mother's presence. The child's behavioral system will be activated if he or she is hurt or scared or if the mother moves away.

In his second volume, Separation (1973) Bowlby proposed that attachment behaviors serve the biological function of protecting the attached individual from physiological and/or psychological harm. When alarmed, the child will seek the safety of the attachment figure. Although the desire to explore the surroundings may take the child away from the attachment figure, the experience of fear or stress returns the child to the attachment figure. Because the child is both curious and fearful, exploration can occur under relatively safe conditions. When there is no danger, the child can explore away from the caregiver. However, when stress-arousing conditions are present, the attachment system functions to pull the child closer to the attachment figure for protection.

Bowlby (1973) stresses that attachment has adaptive significance in evolutionary terms. For example, it is safer to be with a companion than alone. Therefore, humans should find comfort in companionship, seek it, and experience anxiety when alone. Familiar people and places attract us. Three

points are important to understanding the concept of attachment and anxiety according to Bowlby, (1973). First, compared to someone who is not sure of their attachment figure's presence, an individual who is confident that the attachment figure will be there when needed is less likely to be susceptible to enduring fear. Second, this confidence is built up during infancy, childhood, and adolescence, and this confidence constitutes a critical period for development. The expectations developed during this time will persist throughout the life of the individual. Third, these expectations are an accurate reflection of the experience of the individual.

In summary, the child is guided by the attachment behavioral system, the goal of which is to maintain proximity with the caretaker (Bowlby, 1969). The parent is guided by the caretaking behavioral system in which the goal is to protect the child (Bowlby (1973). If the child is frightened by an event, he or she may begin to cry (attachment behavioral system activation). The mother, hearing the baby cry, will go to the child, pick him or her up, and soothe the child (caretaking behavioral system activation). These systems are complimentary to ensure the safety, protection, and care of the child.

Bowlby (1969) proposed four phases in the attachment process, which were later expanded by Waters, Kondo-Ikemura, Posada, and Richters (1991). The first phase is "orientation and signals without discrimination of a figure" (Waters et al., 1991,p.226), and continues from birth to about 12 weeks. The infant's reflex patterns (i.e., sucking, smiling, crying, and grasping) cause an increase in the time the mother spends with the infant. During this phase the

child learns to interact with his or her environment and learns what can be expected. However, the child does not have the ability to discriminate one caretaker from another. The second phase is "orientation and signals directed toward one (or more) discriminated figure(s)" (Waters et al., 1991, p. 266) which lasts from 12 weeks to 6 months. In this phase the infant focuses on one or a few figures, and the ability to discriminate the preferred figure is present. In this stage reciprocity, effectance, and trust form, usually with the mother, and sometimes with the father. The third stage is "maintenance of proximity to a discriminated figure by means of locomotion as well as signals" (Waters et al., 1991, p.267) which lasts from 6 months until about the third year. During this time, the infant uses the mother as a secure base from which to explore. Strangers are viewed with caution, and they may evoke alarm and withdrawal in the infant. The final stage is the "formation of a goal-corrected partnership" (Waters et al., 1991, p.267), and usually starts after the third year. The child's willingness to take the mother's immediate goals and activities into account characterizes this stage. The child begins to view the mother as an independent figure and therefore his or her own behaviors become more flexible. The child now forms a partnership instead of the earlier symbiotic relationship.

Attachment Classification

Three major patterns of behavior were observed and classified by Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall in 1978. A fourth behavioral pattern classification was created by Main and Solomon (1990). Attachment classification is based on the Strange Situation, which is a laboratory procedure.

In this procedure, the infant is separated from the mother and later both mother and infant are reunified, then resumed exploration from the mother is coded. Group A infants, avoidant attachment, avoid proximity with the caregiver after an absence, and show little to no resistance towards interaction with the mother, little to no distress when the mother is not present, and are often friendly towards the stranger. Although these infants appear to be independent, they are not (Colin, 1996). According to Colin, these children experience distress when their caregivers are absent even if they do not overtly show it. These infants respond to separation with apathy because they are defending against activation of attachment behaviors (Colin, 1996).

Group B infants are secure attached. These infants actively seek proximity to and contact with the primary caregiver if they are distressed. The mother is used as a secure base from which to explore. The secure category can be further divided into four subgroups (see Colin, 1996).

Group C infants have a resistant attachment. These infants may hit, kick, or push the primary caregiver upon reunion with her. They are highly resistant toward the caregiver when contact is initiated, often angry, and they are not easily comforted or soothed when distressed. Group C can be further divided into two subgroups: those characterized by anger, and the other characterized by passivity, helplessness, and sadness.

Group D infants are anxious, disorganized, and disoriented. Babies in this category do not have a strategy for handling separation from the primary caregiver. Group A infants use a defensive strategy of diverting their attention

from anything that would activate attachment behavior, while Group C babies employ a strategy of exhibiting extreme dependence on the attachment figure. Group B babies use the caregiver as a secure base from which to explore. Group D infants may show disordered sequences of behavior or contradictory behaviors at the same time. The infant in this category my freeze in a certain posture, show fear of the caregiver, show attachment behavior towards a stranger, or show a dazed, disoriented, affectless, or depressed facial expression.

Attachment and Social Maladjustment

Mary Ainsworth and John Bowlby began collaborations in 1950, and formulated attachment theory as we know it today (Bretherton, 1992). Since the early development of attachment theory by Bowlby and Ainsworth, a vast literature on attachment has accumulated. For example, Main (1996) presented an overview on the field of attachment, and summarized several findings of other researchers. She reports that children who are securely attached exhibit a greater "ego resilience" (p.238) as well as greater social competence than insecure children. She further noted that children with avoidant attachments victimize other children, namely resistant attachment counterparts who are often their victims. Infants classified as disorganized are currently believed to suffer the most pronounced risk for mental disorder (Main, 1996).

Arend, Frederick, and Sroufe (1979) completed a longitudinal study of ego resiliency and curiosity in pre-school children. Attachment security in infancy and autonomy in toddlerhood were related to ego resiliency and ego

control in pre-school. Ego-resiliency is defined by Block and Block (1980) as the ability to adapt resourcefully to a changing circumstance and environment, to analyze if a behavioral response is appropriate given the situational demands, and to use appropriate social and cognitive problem solving strategies. This construct is viewed on a continuum with ego-resiliency at one end and ego-brittleness at the other, and it deals with the elasticity of boundaries. Ego control can be defined in terms of the ability to delay gratification, contain impulses, express motivation and affect, and protect against environmental distractions. This construct is viewed on a continuum with "overcontrol" at one end and "undercontrol" at the other, and deals with the permeability of boundaries (Block & Block, 1980, p.43). Securely attached infants were more ego resilient at age four and five than insecurely attached infants, and secure pre-schoolers were also more curious. In addition, the secure infant may be more competent then their insecure counterparts (Arend et al., 1979). According to Arend et al., (1979), the competent child is one who: at 18 months, has a positive relationship with the caregiver; can find comfort when needed; uses the caregiver as a secure base; and can master the objects in his or her world; at 24 months, the child has a reciprocal relationship with the caregiver, confronts problems effectively, enjoys mastery, and when needed, can secure caregiver resources; at 4-5-years old, the preschooler is highly involved in school tasks and peers, is appropriately expressive, and can flexibly and persistently solve problems and confront stress.

Cassidy (1988) examined the attachment relationship of six-year-old children to their mother to determine if the quality of the attachment to the mother affects the child's representation of him/herself. According to Cassidy (1988), securely attached children describe themselves favorably, but also have the ability to admit their flaws. They appear confident to explore, and admit to their strengths and weaknesses. Insecurely attached children show a different response pattern. Children classified as avoidant seem to dismiss the importance of the attachment relationship. These children have difficulty recognizing or admitting to their imperfections. Cassidy concludes that avoidance serves as a defense mechanism in that it prevents the child from processing information that may trigger attachment behavior. She suggests that because these children are faced with rejection by the attachment figure, they are fearful that if they admit any flaws, they will be further rejected. Children classified as non-avoidant (either ambivalent or disorganized), often showed hostile and violent behaviors. They often made overt statement about their lack of self worth. She further describes these children as resentful, and distrustful.

Using attachment as the framework from which to look at disruptive behavior, Greenberg, Speltz, and DeKlyen (1993) have identified the risk factors that are involved in the development of disruptive behavior problems. However, Greenberg et al. (1993) warn that attachment is not the only, nor perhaps most important risk factor. Several other variables may play a role, some of which include parental skills, economic status, and environment.

The relationship between insecure attachment (Categories A, C, and D) and social maladjustment has been investigated in a number of studies. Rothbaum and Weisz (1994) performed a meta-analysis of 47 studies to examine the association between parental caregiving and child externalizing behavior, defined as aggression, hostility and noncompliance. An examination of the caregiving variables revealed that approval of parents, guidance from parents, motivational strategies to improve performance, synchrony of both parents, and absence of coercive control were negatively associated with externalizing behavior, and formed a larger construct of "acceptance-responsiveness". Parents who are rejecting and unresponsive increase their children's learning of and motivation to use socially unacceptable behavior such as externalizing.

Stevenson-Hinde and Shouldice (1995) examined relations between maternal style and attachment patterns in early childhood. They found mothers of avoidant children to use less monitoring and planning than mothers of securely attached children, but these mothers of avoidant children viewed themselves in a more favorable light. Mothers of ambivalent (also known as resistant) children reported they were depressed and anxious, and their interactions with their children were characterized by friction. Finally mothers of controlling (also known as dismissing) children rated themselves as least irritable and anxious, but actually affirmed less, and were less sensitive than all other groups of mothers.

Lyons-Ruth, Alpern, and Repacholi (1993) found that the strongest single predictor of deviant levels of hostile behavior among pre-schoolers was the disorganized/disoriented attachment status. Seventy-one percent of hostile preschoolers were classified as disorganized in infancy. Maternal psychosocial problems have an additive effect on negative behavior. Conduct-disordered children may have been classified as having disorganized attachment, and children presenting to clinicians with hostile behavior are likely to experience both maternal psychosocial problems and disorganized attachment relationships.

The adolescent research also contains studies suggesting that secure attachment predicts healthy development, and appropriate social adjustment in later years. Brack, Gay, and Matheny (1993) found that for older adolescents, attachment with family and friends were highly correlated to perceived coping strategies. Strong bonding with parents seemed to be related to greater resourcefulness, which supports the idea that a secure family base facilitates the development of important adaptation skills and coping resources. "Detached youth miss the empowerment of supportive families and are more likely to be buffeted by the winds of adversity surrounding adolescent development" (Brack et al., 1993, p. 214).

Nada-Raja, McGee, and Stanton (1992) noted an important relationship between mental health and attachment to parents. Low perceived attachment was related to greater problems in conduct, inattention, depression, and frequent experience of negative life events. They also found that low attachment to

parents does not appear to be compensated by a high attachment to peers, or that high attachment to parents is compensated by a low attachment to peers. On the other hand, too much independence from parents may be associated with problems in developing self-reliance in early adolescence. As a result, adolescents can be more vulnerable to peer pressure especially when becoming involved in antisocial activity.

Recently, evidence that insecure attachment is linked to problems that occur in adolescence has been provided by Allen, Hauser, and Borman-Spurrell (1996) when they compared psychiatrically hospitalized peers with their sociodemographically matched non-hospitalized peers. The hospitalized peers had a diagnosis of either internalizing disorders (depression, mood disorders etc.) or externalizing disorders (conduct disorder, oppositional defiant disorder). Allen et al. (1996) found that at age 25 most of the hospitalized sample displayed an insecure attachment, but this condition did not occur with the non-hospitalized group. The hospitalized group were insecurely attached, and also more likely to engage in criminal behavior and drug use.

Horowitz (1996) in his study of adolescent psychopathology, reported that adolescents with a dismissing attachment (similar to type A infants) were more likely to be conduct disordered, have a substance use disorder, and possess narcissistic or anti-social personality traits. Adolescents with preoccupied attachment (similar to type C infants) had an affective disorder, obsessive compulsive, histrionic, borderline or schizotypal personality traits.

Social Competence and Delinquent Behavior

In addition to the research on attachment and social maladjustment, there are also studies that indicate a link between social competence and delinquency. Kuperminc, Allen, and Arther (1996) explored the relationship between striving for autonomy from parents, and relatedness to parents with self-reported delinquency acts in an attempt to develop a multidimensional view of social competence. Autonomy striving is defined by these authors as the ability of adolescents to solve interpersonal problems or difficulties by asserting their own needs and interests. Relatedness striving is defined as the ability for adolescents to solve interpersonal problems or difficulties in ways that maintain and affirm their relationships with others. Finally, autonomous-related reasoning is the ability of adolescents to consider both their need for autonomy as well as the importance of maintaining their relationships with others when solving interpersonal problems (Kuperminc et al., 1996).

Kuperminc et al. (1996) had participants respond to a series of hypothetical vignettes that involved interpersonal conflicts between peers, parents, and other adults. They found that adolescent males who had higher levels of autonomous-related reasoning were more academically and socially competent than those with lower levels of autonomous-related reasoning. Furthermore, adolescents were more socially competent when their problem solving strategies had higher levels of relatedness striving. In addition, relatedness to parents and peers caused adolescents to feel more securely connected to their social surroundings and they experienced the ability to be

worthy and capable of love. These adolescents were responsive to the views of others and showed mutual respect for one another.

Kuperminc et al. (1996) conclude that in order to understand delinquent activity, the developmental context in which the adolescent pursues relatedness is important. Adolescents who frequently engage in a delinquent acts do not seem to understand that relationships can foster relatedness and autonomy at the same time. In addition, these adolescents use strategies of minimal effort when pursuing relatedness in social interactions. Thus, when adolescents are able to balance an understanding of how social interactions can be supportive of autonomy and relatedness, with positive expressions of relatedness, they are more likely to avoid delinquent behavior.

Zigler, Taussig and Black (1992) studied several programs that were designed as preventative measures to juvenile delinquency. Based on these studies, Zigler et al. (1992) then infered that early prevention programs have lasting effects on socially competent behavior. They conclude that socially competent individuals do not engage in delinquent behavior. According to Cotterell (1996) many authors link peer rejection in childhood to social deviancy in adolescence. Although there are no direct studies linking gang affiliation with social competence, there are several studies that indicate individuals who engage in delinquent behavior are socially less competent. Given that gangs often engage in delinquent behavior, those individuals who join gangs engage in delinquent behavior and therefore it is likely that they are less socially competent.

Social Maladjustment and Gang Affiliation

Social maladjustment is a strong predictor for gang affiliation and mentality. Commonly cited characteristics of youth who affiliate with street gangs include: lack of financial resources; the child of a single parent home; lack of adequate role models; parents who engage in criminal behaviors; lower intelligence based on IQ tests; lack of or ill-prepared for the educational experience; little to no impulse control or frustration tolerance; use of verbal and physical aggression as coping mechanisms; and increased contacts with the police and legal authorities for criminal behaviors (Klein, 1971). Other characteristics include dysfunctional family systems, low self-esteem, and lack of positive role models (Brown, 1978; Clark, 1992).

Lowney (1984) interviewed 23 gang members of which 21 came from broken homes with multiple divorces and remarriages. The remaining two sets of parents were in "serious conflict". However, these parents were materially indulgent and their estimated family income exceeded twice the national median. He also found that non-gang members came from stable home situations, and seemed to have "normal" relationships with their parents. Friedman, Mann, and Friedman (1975) developed a profile of juvenile street gangs from a stepwise multiple regression analysis of 73 independent variables. The variables consisted of tests and questionnaires to obtain psychological, sociological, demographic, and family background information of youth gang members, and those who were not affiliated with a gang. The most powerful single predictor of gang membership was a "high proclivity for violence", followed by parental

defiance, and alcohol use. They concluded that gang affiliation my be highly dependent on the presence of an available peer group as an alternative to an unrewarding family situation.

O'Hagan's (1976) study of gang characteristics revealed that gangs provide their members with an outlet for delinquent activities. According to O'Hagan, measures taken to remove the gang members from the delinquent setting for a short period of time without attempting to alleviate the broader aspects of the delinquent environment such as family, peer group, and employment are "short sighted" and incomplete. Sheley, Zhang, Brody, and Wright (1995), in a review of the gang literature, found that gangs are relatively specialized in the types of crimes that they report committing. They further found support that gang structure has an impact on the criminal activity of the gang. Gang structure appears to be related to drug sales, robbery, burglary, and gun carrying, but not drug use (Sheley et al., 1995). Gang structure does not seem to influence the individual member's participation in criminal activity, but the individual member's criminal behavior is similar to peers who are also in the gang. That is, "individual gang members behaviors are highly associated with their gang's profile" (Sheley et al., 1995, p.66).

Attachment and Gang Affiliation

Brown (1978) reports that the gang has become the primary reference group for at risk adolescents. Within the gang, the youth establishes a network of attachments to peers as well as sustaining relationships that provide him aid when needed. He also reported that the new gang members and the older

member, who teaches the new affiliate the ropes, will form a close bond and their identity will become one. According to Lowney (1984), adolescents that he interviewed had an increasingly similar attitude about the adults in their lives. Gang members had feelings that adults, particularly father figures, do not care. As a result, gang members reached out to the researcher as a father figure. That is, they believed that they could depend on him for intervention on their behalf, support, and help in solving future problems. Foley (1983) reports that gang members are attracted to gangs because there is a lack of adult role models, and they have little other resources. The displayed aggression of gang members occurs because of the necessity to cope with life on the streets.

According to Clark (1992) adolescents who are at risk for joining a gang because of the reasons previously identified became gang members because it offers an instant "family", providing companionship, loyalty, identity, and status. Companionship, protection, and excitement are among the most salient characteristics of why youth become gang members (Friedman et al., 1975; Honchos & Souse, 1987-88). Through gang participation, adolescents gain a role model who teaches them how to survive in the street, and other behaviors that are essential for them to function safely in the ghetto (Brown, 1978).

The basic structure of the gang seems to be conducive to attachment because this structure is similar in many ways to that of a family. For example, both gangs and the family structure have an identified hierarchy. Three levels of ranks are found in the gang organization. At the top of this hierarchy is the "OG" (Original Gangsta). These individuals are older then most, usually in their early

to late twenties, and have not been killed or incarcerated as a result of their gang activity. It is the OG who is the mastermind behind the scene. He is not actively involved in criminal activities, but he is orchestrating and ordering the other gang members to engage in criminal behavior (e.g. selling drugs, theft, robbery, selling firearms, etc.) He also reaps the benefits of his younger counterpart's work. When apprehended, the younger individual will usually have less severe negative legal consequences. The case will be tried in juvenile court where the sentence is usually mild compared to the same charge tried in adult court. Secondly, the OG has already proven himself, ascended the ranks, and no longer has to place himself at risk.

The second level of the hierarchy is the "YG" (Young Gangsta). These individuals are the money makers of the group and usually range from 16 to 19 years of age. They have more autonomy than the younger members, and usually are not as impulsive. These adolescents have also ascended the rank of the bottom level, and have thus proven themselves worthy of higher levels of responsibility and trust. They are responsible for the majority of the illegal drug distribution. The YG's are able to give orders to the younger gang members, but still have to answer to the OG's. The OG's offer them guidance, advice, support, and monetary advances if needed.

The last members in the hierarchy is the "BG" (Baby Gangsta), who is usually 9 to 15 years of age, but some are as young as five years of age. These members are the most dangerous because of their position in the hierarchy. The BG's have to prove themselves to the older members to be worthy of the

gang, and as a result must do what the OG or YG tells them to do. (e.g. shoot a rival gang member to make a name). These members are usually more aggressive and impulsive based on their desire to become a part of the gang. If a BG refuses to comply with the request of an older member, he may be made an example by beatings or other physical punishment to teach him a lesson as well as to discourage other peers from refusing to comply (personal communications with clients, 1995-1999).

The gang organization parallels that of a family in that the OG's and YG's are like parental figures to the BG's. In the traditional home, the father is the breadwinner (like the YG's) while the mother is left responsible for the household and rearing the family (like the OG's). The traditional father's role is one of silence because the teaching is done by the mother. However, the father is responsible for the punishment of the children when they misbehave. Gangs have rituals: "jumping in" other members to ensure loyalty; punishment for disrespect (getting a "pumpkin head" or a "'mouth shot" depending on the rule infraction); and collection of money for the needs of individual gang members (guns, funerals, bailing out those who are jailed). Similarly, families engage in rituals: the bullying of a younger brother will cause the older males to become protective; children contributing money to buy a gift for a parent; gathering of members to celebrate special events in a family member's life (e.g. birthdays, weddings, graduations) to enhance cohesion and family loyalty. The gang has regularly scheduled meetings to discuss progress, problems, and threats while a family also discusses these issues usually at mealtime.

It is proposed that the gang serves as a secure base as described by Bowlby's theory. Research indicates protection is one reason individuals join a gang. Thus, the gang may serve as a secure base from which it allows its members to explore safely their surroundings. When frightened or threatened by a rival gang, an individual gang member will return to his gang and cause them to retaliate against the rival gang. For example, an individual gang member is shot when a drug sale goes wrong. He then returns to his gang and tells them the story, and they retaliate by shooting up the house of the individual who shot the gang member. This action offers protection to the gang member who was shot by sending a message to others that this type of behavior is unacceptable and will be avenged.

Further, the individual gang member's behavior may be influenced by the presence of the gang, as is the child's behavior is influenced by the presence of his/her mother. Once shrouded by other gang members, it is likely that an individual gang member would be more aggressive, volatile, and "brave" because he knows that the gang will serve as protection against assaults by others. If the gang is absent, the individual may be more timid and distressed. Thus, the individual gang member may use the presence of the gang as a secure base from which to explore. These attachment behaviors may also serve the function of protecting the gang members from physical or psychological harm. When alarmed the gang member seeks the safety of the gang. Many gang members report that they do not feel safe until they are in their own neighborhood (personal communication of clients). Bowlby (1973) indicated that

humans find comfort in companionship, and experience anxiety when alone, thus familiar people and places attract us. The gang, by their support through responding when the individual needs them enables the individual gang member to be less susceptible to enduring fear when out of the presence of the gang. This gang loyalty could be an explanation for why gang members wear certain colors. The gang colors may serve as a reminder to the individual gang member that they are affiliated with a gang, as well as notify others of their gang affiliation. Thus, the colors and the gang response help the individual feel more secure, and reinforce proximity seeking, another infant attachment behavior.

The Current Study.

The discussion to this point has contended that protection and safety underlie infant attachments, and that insecure attachment can lead to later social maladjustment. Socially maladjusted individuals frequently join gangs because gang members can promote protection and safety. Individuals who are not securely attached to a primary caregiver are more likely to be attracted to gang life because of the security and closeness that gangs offer. Through gang affiliation, the adolescent seems to be searching for an attachment that was not formed in infancy. Alternatively, one can argue that individuals who are attracted to gangs join because they are socially incompetent, and the gang is one peer group that will accept them.

This study examined the premise that gang members are seeking an attachment through the gang that was not established in infancy. Several constructs that are known correlates of attachment were examined. These

constructs include attachment classification, attachment styles, self efficacy, social competency, and ego-resiliency.

The participants in the study were a group of detained youth in the Douglas County Youth Center. Both the gang group and the non-gang group were drawn from the population of detained youth in the Douglas County Youth Center.

Based on a review of the literature, the following hypotheses were advanced: (1) when gang members are compared to non-gang members, a greater proportion of gang members will have a less secure attachment or attachment style to parents. Preliminary analysis should reveal no attachment differences with regard to the race or the age of the gang member. The literature review revealed that an insecure attachment leads to problems later in life (Cassidy, 1988; Brack, 1993; Nada-Raja et al., 1992; Greenberg et al., 1993, Rothbaum & Weisz, 1994). Adolescents who are experiencing problems are more likely to engage in delinquent behavior (Allen et al., 1996; Horowitz, 1996). Juvenile delinquents are more likely to join gangs (Brown, 1978; O'Hagan, 1996).

(2) Gang members will have more secure attachments or attachment styles to their peers than non-gang members. The literature revealed that protection and safety are some reasons that individuals join gangs (Friedman et al., 1975; Honchos & Souse, 1987-88). Protection and safety are the underlying biological mechanisms that are responsible for proximity seeking behavior of the child (Bowlby, 1969). Thus, the gang member becomes attached to the gang.

(3) Gang members will have lower scores on ego resiliency, social competence, and self efficacy than non-gang members. Securely attached individuals are more ego-resilient (Arend et al., 1979; Main, 1996), socially competent (Brack et al., 1993; Lyons-Ruth et al., 1993), and have greater self-efficacy (Cassidy, 1988; Steven-Hinde & Shouldice, 1995). Because it is suspected that gang members are insecurely attached, this insecure bond should be reflected in constructs that are known correlates of attachment.

(4) Social Competence accounts for more unique variance in gang affiliation than attachment. Although attachment has been the preferred explanation of gang behavior, it can be alternatively hypothesized that gang members are socially incompetent, and therefore the correlation between gang membership and social competence will be significantly higher than the relationship between gang membership and attachment. Although there is no direct link between social competence and gang membership, there is a link between delinquency and social competence in that individuals who are less socially competent are more likely to engage in delinquent behavior (Kuperminc et al., 1996). There is also a correlation between juvenile delinquency and gang affiliation (Sheley et al., 1995). Thus, it is reasonable to assume that social competency is also related to gang affiliation.

Chapter II

Method

Participants

According to Sundermeier (1995), there are three levels of gang affiliation: associate, member, and hard core. For the purpose of this study, only individuals classified as a member or hard core by the following criteria were considered gang members: (1) engaging in criminal activity, (2) admitting they belong to a gang, (3) having a tattoo or other markings of their gang's insignia, and (4) actively involved in gang retaliation.

A total of 95 participants, all males who are incarcerated, were asked to volunteer. These youth were incarcerated in the Douglas County Youth Center and were charged with criminal violations or status offenses. However, only 90 participants' data were actually used (45 gang members and 45 non-gang members), because four of the participants did not answer all questionnaires before electing to stop participating in the study. An additional data set was not used because the participants responses were unreliable. A total of 10 Hispanic, 33 Caucasian, 40 African-American, 4 Native American, and 3 bi-racial males participated in this study. Of the 10 Hispanic participants, all (100%) met criteria for gang affiliation; of the 33 Caucasian participants 8 (17.8 %) met criteria for gang affiliation; of African American participants, 26 (57.8%) met criteria for gang affiliation; of 4 Native American participants, 1 (2.2%) met criteria for gang affiliation, and for bi-racial participants, none (0%) met criteria for gang affiliation. The remaining 45 males served as a comparison. These

individuals were also incarcerated in the Douglas County Youth Center, but did not have gang affiliation. The comparison group was similar to the gang membership group in terms of socio-economic status, family dynamics, drug and alcohol related problems, and criminal activities.

Measures

Demographic Information. The name of the participant was withheld. However, his race, age and SES (determined by whether the family receives welfare) was recorded. A semi-structured interview enabled the interviewer to ask about substance abuse history, mental health treatment history, educational history, medical history, legal history, and family dynamics. The final question asked the youth to explain why he joined a gang, and how long he has been a gang member. The information was recorded on the semi-structured interview form because use of a tape recorder might arouse suspicion and thus lower honesty levels, (see Appendix H).

Attachment.

The most widely used measure of attachment in the research literature is the Adult Attachment Inventory (AAI) developed by George, Kaplan, & Main (1985). However, this measure was not be available for use in the present study because: (1) the training required to give and interpret the inventory; (2) this assessment is to be given to adults and has not been normed on an adolescent population. In lieu of the AAI, four other measures of attachment were used. There were several reasons for choosing four different measures of attachment for the present study. First, these measures are not as well known as the

Strange Situation, the AAI or the California Q-sort. Thus, this procedure allowed for the cross validation of the measures, and further support for the measures' reliability. Second, the previously mentioned measures of attachment have not been normed on an adolescent population. The AAI can be used for an adult population, while the Strange Situation is used with infants. The California Q-sort is also used with younger children and parents are to give reports based on their observations of their children's behavior. Third, due to the population of adolescents involved in this study, it would have been difficult to obtain parent's reports of their adolescent's behavior. Thus, self-report pen and paper measures of attachment were utilized given the delinquent nature of the population under investigation because they were less intrusive and more easily obtained.

In addition, the four measures of attachment will provide information about the attachment classification of the participant population. Because each of these questionnaire measures a different aspect of attachment, all were utilized to obtain a more comprehensive measure of attachment. One measure looks at the child's relationship with the mother figure and the father figure separately, while the other measures collapse the mother and father information, and only ask about parental relationships. Two of the measures classify the respondent into an attachment classification of secure, preoccupied, or fearful/dismissing which correspond to Ainsworth et al.'s (1978) classification scheme. The final measure of attachment measures the degree of "felt security"

towards parents and peers. Thus, taken together, these measures will give pertinent information about attachment and how it relates to gang membership.

In addition to the measures of direct attachment, additional information about attachment may be obtained if constructs related to attachment are measured. Known correlates of attachment include: social competency (Kuperminc et al., 1996; Ziger et al., 1992; Cotterell, 1996); ego resiliency (Block & Block, 1980); and self-efficacy (Wheeler & Ladd, 1982). Thus, for the current study these constructs were measured as well. This may offer a clearer picture of attachment and further validate the attachment measures. A brief description of the attachment measures and other scales that are known to measure constructs related to attachment are described in the following sections.

Inventory of Peer and Parent Attachment (IPPA). This measure, developed by Armsden and Greenberg (1988), consists of three 5-point Likert-type scales (1-almost always or always true to 5-almost never or never true), each with 25 items (e.g. Talking over problems with my parents makes me feel ashamed or foolish), that assess the degree of attachment toward mother, father and close friends (see Appendix A). The instrument was developed to assess psychological security as discussed by Bowlby and other attachment theorists. Items on this test were designed to measure the adolescent's "felt security." Other items measured anger or emotional detachment toward the attachment figure. Parent attachment items were grouped separately from peer attachment items, and generally a parent item has a corresponding peer item.

According to Armsden and Greenberg (1987), internal reliability was established by a factor analysis using Varimax rotation. Three factors emerged for the parent items as well as the peer items. Three week test-retest reliability's were .86 for the Peer Attachment measure and .93 for the Parent Attachment measure (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). Armsden and Greenberg (1987) reported internal reliability as established by using Cronbach's alpha to be: Parent scales: Trust (10 items; alpha = .91), Communication (10 items; alpha = .91), and Alienation (8 items; alpha = .86); Peer scales: Trust (10 items; alpha = .91), Communication (8 items; alpha = .87), and Alienation (7 items; alpha = .72).

To determine the convergent validity of the IPPA, Armsden and Greenberg (1987) examined the instrument's relationship to other well established measures. They found that the quality of peer and parent attachment in adolescence was highly related to well-being, specifically self-esteem and satisfaction with life. Furthermore, quality of attachment contributed to predicting adolescents' depression/anxiety and resentment/alienation. Parent attachment scores correlated significantly with several indices of family climate including cohesion, expressiveness, family self-concept, and seeking parents in time of need. Peer attachment scores correlated significantly with social self-concept, and were not correlated with measures of the family environment.

For this study, the word "gang" was added to the portion of the IPPA that deals with friend relationship (e.g. My gang/friends don't understand what I am going through these days). The addition of this word did not affect the validity or

reliability of the measure. Internal reliability was established using Standardized Cronbach's alpha, which revealed the following: Parent scales: Trust (9 items; alpha = .91), Communication (10 items; alpha = .86), and Alienation (8 items; alpha = .80); Peer/Gang scales: Trust (10 items; alpha = .90), Communication (8 items; alpha = .87), and Alienation (7 items; alpha = .31). The peer Alienation scale was deleted from further analyses because the alpha value was too low.

The Security Scale. This measure is a 15 item scale developed by Kerns, Klepac, and Cole (1996) that assesses the degree of security of specific attachment relationships (see Appendix B). It was designed to tap three separate areas related to attachment: (1) whether the attachment figure is responsive and available; (2) whether the attachment figure can be relied on in times of stress: and (3) whether the child can communicate easily with the attachment figure. According to Kerns et al. (1996) this measure has adequate reliability in that two week test-retest reliability correlation was $r = .75$. Furthermore, Kerns et al. (1996) reported a statistically adequate range (1.62 - 4.00) and internal consistency: Cronbach's alpha was .84.

The Security Scale showed both convergent and discriminant validity because it significantly correlated with measures that past research indicates are associated with attachment: (self-esteem, $r = .40$; peer acceptance, $r = .30$; behavioral conduct, $r = .36$; scholastic competence, $r = .38$; physical appearance, $r = .32$, all $ps < .01$) and did not correlate with measures it should not have related to attachment (athletic competence, $r = .19$, ns; GPA, $r = .12$) (Kerns et al., 1996).

For the present study, this measure was used twice; once to assess the participant's relationship with his mother (e.g. Some kids find it easy to trust their mom but other kids are not sure if they can trust their mom), and a second time to assess the participant's relationship with his father (e.g. Some kids find it easy to trust their dad but other kids are not sure if they can trust their dad). Participants were asked to choose which half of the sentence is "really true" or "sort of true" for him. The items are rated on a 4-point scale with higher scores indicating a more secure attachment. The responder received one score on a continuous dimension of security. The scores in the current study showed a statistically adequate range (1.33 - 3.80 for dad; 1.67 - 3.80 for mom), and were internally consistent: Cronbach's alpha was .80 for dad and .75 for mom.

Attachment Style Scales. Becker, Billings, Eveleth, and Gilbert (1997) developed three scales to measure preoccupied attachment style, fearful attachment style, and secure attachment style which were modeled after Bowlby's developmental attachment theory (see Appendix C). Respondents were asked to reply to items on a scale from 1 (strongly agree) to 7(strongly disagree). A total of three scores were obtained, with the highest score indicating which type of attachment style the participant had. Becker et al. (1997) obtained the following reliability statistics: Preoccupied Attachment Style Scale has a total of six items with an alpha of .84; the Fearful Attachment Style scale has a total of six items with an alpha of .81; the Secure Attachment Style Scale has a total of seven items with an alpha of .80. Validity was established

by correlating the measure with other instruments known to assess attachment (Becker et al., 1997).

The Attachment Style Scale was slightly modified for the present study. In fact, the scale was given twice to the participant. The words "others" or "people" were replaced with "parents" or "my parents" (e.g. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on my parents) for the first portion of this scale, and "friends/gangs" for the second portion of this scale (e.g. I find it difficult to depend on my gang/friends). The rest of the scale items remained the same except for minor word changes to ensure that the item would be understandable to the participant. It appears as if the changes had no effect on the reliability or validity of this measure as evidenced by the following. The Parents Preoccupied Attachment Style Scale has a total of six items with an alpha of .76. The Parents Fearful Attachment Style scale has a total of six items with an alpha of .82. The Parents Secure Attachment Style Scale has a total of seven items with an alpha of .77. The Friends/Gang Preoccupied Attachment Style Scale has a total of six items with an alpha of .80. The Friends/Gang Fearful Attachment Style scale has a total of six items with an alpha of .83. The Friends/Gang Secure Attachment Style Scale has a total of seven items with an alpha of .77.

Behavioral Systems Questionnaire (BSQ). The BSQ is a 92 item scale designed by Furman (1996) to measure four different types of relationships: friendships, romantic relationships, mother-child relationships and father-child relationships. Respondents are asked to rate on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree) their agreement with the statements about their

relationships. Secure, preoccupied, and dismissing scores are derived from this measure. According to Furman (1996, p. 49) the 8-month test-retest reliabilities were moderately stable (r's = .51 to .80), and "Cronbach alphas of scales are satisfactory (mean alpha = .80); the composite style scores are partially reliable (mean alpha = .88)."

For the present study, only the "my parents" (e.g. "MY PARENTS" act as if I count on them too much) and the "my friends" (e.g. "MY FRIENDS" act as if I count on them too much) sub-scales were used (see Appendix D). Respondents received a total of six scores in that for each relationship, three scores were calculated (secure, pre-occupied, and dismissing). Internal reliability was calculated using Standard Cronbach's alpha. The reliability coefficient for each scale is as follows: Parent - secure, alpha = .77; Parent - preoccupied, alpha = .38; Parent - dismissing, alpha = .70; Friend - secure, alpha = .37; Friend - preoccupied, alpha = .69; and Friend - dismissing, alpha = .72. Although the reliability coefficients for the parent preoccupied subscale and the friend secure subscale were low, these measures were still utilized in the present study.

Attachment Correlates

The Children's Self-Efficacy for Peer Interaction Scale (CSPI). The CSPI is a 22 item scale on which individuals are asked to chose one of four responses (1 - Very Hard, 2 - Hard, 3 - Easy, 4 - Very Easy) that best answer each question. The scale has a built in conflict and non-conflict component (see Appendix E). Wheeler and Ladd (1982) developed this scale to assess children's social self-efficacy for persuasive skills in peer situations. Self

efficacy is defined as "the belief that one can successfully perform behavior required to produce desired outcomes." (p. 795). Self-efficacy is related to attachment in that those children who are securely attached have higher self-efficacy. A principal components factor analysis with oblique rotation, revealed two factors. The conflict items correlated highest with the first factor, and the non-conflict items correlated highly with the second factor (Wheeler & Ladd, 1982). The test-retest reliability of the CSPI over a two week period was .80 for girls and .90 for boys (Wheeler & Ladd, 1982). Wheeler and Ladd (1982) obtained a total of two scores from this measure, one for the 12 conflict items, and the other from the 10 non-conflict items. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients were .85, .73, and .85 for the total scale, non-conflict component, and the conflict component respectively. According to Wheeler and Ladd, 1982, convergent validity analysis revealed correlations between the CPSI and several subscales of the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale. Self-efficacy was negatively related to anxiety, and positively related to general self concept, as well as social and physical self concept. In addition to the Piers-Harris scale, the CPSI was positively related to the Peer Rating of Social Influence, the Play Nominations Sociometric Measures, and the Teacher Rating of social efficacy (Wheeler & Ladd, 1982).

Some of the items on this inventory were not age-appropriate for the adolescents in this study. The situations were not realistic and the wording was not suitable for an adolescent population. Thus, the word "kids" was replaced with the word "teens" and some situations were recreated to be more relevant to

an adolescent population. The following items were modified: Item 1 - "Some kids want to play a game. Asking them if you can play with them is _____ for you" was changed to "Some teens want to play a video game (SEGA, Play Station). Asking them if you can play with them is _____ for you"; Item 3 - "Some kids are teasing your friend. Telling them to stop is _____ for you" was changed to "Some teens are making fun of your friend. Telling them to stop is _____ for you"; Item 4 - "You want to start an game. Asking other kids to join you is _____for you" was changed to "You want to start an activity. Asking other teens to join you is _____for you"; Item 7 - "A kid cuts in front of you in line. Telling the kid to stop is _____for you" was changed to "A teen insults your family member. Telling the teen to stop is _____for you"; Item 11 - "You have to carry things home for your mother. Asking another kid to help you is _____for you" was changed to "You have to go to the store for your mother. Asking another teen to help you is _____for you"; Item 12 - "A kid always wants to be the first to play a game. Telling the kid you are going to be first is _____ for you" was changed to "A teen always wants to be in the front seat when you drive somewhere. Telling the teen you are going to sit in front is _____ for you"; Item 13 - "Your class is going on a field trip, and everyone needs a partner. Asking someone to be your partner is _____ for you" was changed to "Your class is doing a project, and everyone needs a partner. Asking someone to be your partner is _____ for you"; Item 15 - "Some kids are deciding what game to play. Telling them about a game you like is _____ for you" was changed to "Some teens are deciding what party to go to. Telling them about a party you

like is _____ for you"; Item 16 - "You are having fun playing a game, but other kids want to leave. Asking them to stay is _____ for you" was changed to "You are having fun at a party, but other teens want to leave. Asking them to stay is _____ for you"; Item 18 - "Some kids are using you play area. Asking them to move is _____ for you" was changed to "Some teens are taking things that belong to you. Asking them to give them back is _____ for you"; Item 20 - "A group of friends wants you to play a game that you don't like. Asking them to play a game that you like is _____ for you" was changed to "A group of friends wants you to do something that you don't like to do. Asking them to do something that you like is _____ for you"; and finally Item 22 - "A kid is yelling at you. Telling the kid to stop is _____ for you" was changed to - "A teen is yelling and threatening you. Telling the teen to stop is _____ for you".

For the current study, the correlation between the conflict and non-conflict component was .73 which is significant ($p \leq .01$), indicating that these scales are related but distinct. The Cronbach's alpha for the total test was .92; .91 for the non-conflict component and .82 for the conflict component. Thus, it appears as if changes made to the measure for the purposes of this study did not affect the reliability of the measure.

Interpersonal Competence Questionnaire (ICQ). This 40 item self-report questionnaire, developed by Buhrmester, Furman, Wittenberg and Reis (1988), uses a five point rating scale (1 = I am poor at this; I'd feel so uncomfortable and unable to handle this situation, I'd avoid it if at all possible; 2 = I'm only fair at this, I'd feel uncomfortable and would have lots of difficulty handling this

situation; 3 = I'm OK at this, I'd feel somewhat uncomfortable and have some difficulty handling this situation;
4 = I'm good at this; I'd feel quite comfortable and able to handle this situation; 5 = I'm EXTREMELY good at this; I'd feel very comfortable and could handle this situation very well) in which individuals rate themselves on an interpersonal situation (e.g. Carrying on a conversation with someone new whom you think you might like to get to know). (see Appendix F).

Buhrmester et al. (1988) established the validity of this measure through factor analysis, and found that five dimensions of competence underlie the items of the ICQ. They were able to ascertain that competence tends to be context specific in that individuals can be competent in some social settings, and incompetent in others. There was also a degree of generalizability across some domains. By correlating this measure with other known measures of social functioning, concurrent validity, as well as discriminant validity was demonstrated. Use of peer ratings, indicated that the ICQ has sufficient convergent validity. Scores were obtained for each of the dimensions by taking the mean of the eight items on that dimension. Cronbach's alpha revealed satisfactory internal consistency rangin from .77 to .87 with an average of .83. Furthermore, four-week test-retest reliability coefficients for each of the dimensions were: Initiating relationships, $\underline{r}$ = .89; Asserting displeasure with other's actions, $\underline{r}$ = .79; Self-disclosure , $\underline{r}$ = .75; Providing emotional support, $\underline{r}$ = .76; and managing interpersonal conflict, $\underline{r}$ = .69. A total of five scores will be obtained for this measure (Buhrmester et al., 1988).

For the present study, the reliability for each of the five dimensions of interpersonal competence are as follows: initiating relationships (8 items, Cronbach's alpha = .83), self-disclosure (8 items, Cronbach's alpha = .78), asserting displeasure with other's (8 items, Cronbach's alpha = .83), providing emotional support (8 items, Cronbach's alpha = .88), and managing interpersonal conflicts (8 items, Cronbach's alpha =.79). Cronbach's alpha revealed satisfactory internal consistency for each dimension.

Ego-Resiliency Scale (ER89). The ER89 is a fourteen item self-report questionnaire developed by Block and Kremen (1996) to measure ego resiliency (see Appendix G). This scale has respondents reply to items on a four-step continuum: 1 = does not apply at all; 2 = applies slightly if at all; 3 = applies somewhat; and 4 = applies very strongly. Although the authors suggest that it is desirable to intermix ER89 items with other inventory items being administered at the same time; it was not practical for the purposes of this study. The ER89 is scored on a 4-point scale which did not coincide with any of the other scales used in the study. A total score for ego-resiliency was obtained from this measure. For the current study, the coefficient for the scale is .66.

Block and Kremen (1996) found that coefficient alpha for their scale is .76. Across the five years between the two administrations of the test, the correlation was .51 for females and .39 for the male samples. When corrected for attenuation, the correlations were .67 and .51 respectively (Block & Kremen, 1996). Construct validity for the ER89 scale was established by correlating it with the ego resilience items of the California Q-sort (CAQ). The CAQ is based

on observer data. The correlation between these two types of scores is .50 for women and .61 for men. When corrected for attenuation, the scores were .69 and .84 respectively (Block & Kremen, 1996). According to Block and Kremen (1996) the self-report measure and the observational measure provide two approaches to operationally defining ego-resilience, and both display appreciable construct convergence.

Procedure

The interviewers were not permitted access to the files of individuals incarcerated in the Douglas County Youth Center for confidentiality reasons. Thus, the interviewers relied on self-report of the participants who volunteered to participate in the study. To introduce the study and familiarize the participants with the interviewers, the interviewers were escorted on each of the units by Douglas County Youth Center staff. There was a brief introduction, and explanation about the purpose of the study. Detainees were also told that any information that they provided during the interview would be held confidential. In addition, participants were asked if they would be willing to volunteer for the study by a show of hands. The interviewers then left and returned later that week to begin collecting data. Participants who previously volunteered were again asked by the Douglas County Youth Center staff if they were still interested in participating, and each volunteer was then escorted to an isolated interview room.

The purpose of the study was again explained to the participant, and he was told that there would be no negative consequences for refusing to

participate or leaving at any time. He was asked to read and sign the informed consent, and the interviewer answered any questions of the participant. He was also given a copy of the assent form and the participant's rights to keep.

To determine gang affiliation, the participant was asked a series of questions consistent with Sundermeier's, (1995) gang inclusion criteria: "Do you engage in criminal activity?", "Do you belong to a gang?" "Do you have a tattoo, burn, or other marking of your gang?" and "Are you actively involved in gang retaliation?" If the participant said yes to all questions consistent with the hard core classification, and was able to provide examples, they were included in the study and classified as gang members. If the participant admitted to gang affiliation, but answered "no" to the remaining three questions, or were unable to provide examples, they were thanked for their participation, and excused from the study (approximately 20 participants). For the non-gang group, participants denied gang affiliation, and answered no to all three questions.

The demographic information was collected via semi-structured interview, and answers were recorded for each participant. Then each of measures was read to the participant, and answers were recorded by the interviewer. The participant was given copies of the measures to follow along and read, as the interviewer was reading each question to the participant. The measures were presented in the same order for every participant to control for fatigue effects. It is possible that there were order effects as the participant may fatigue after answering the items. However, the fatigue effects should be consistent across participants. After completing the measures, the participant was debriefed.

Chapter III

Results

Overview

In the preliminary analysis, the data were examined with respect to the relationship among the classification variable -- gang membership -- and the dependent variables: attachment classification (trust, communication, and alienation for both parents and peer); degree of attachment (mom and dad); attachment styles (secure, preoccupied, and dismissing/fearful); social competence (initiation of relationships, self-disclosure, asserting displeasure, emotional support, and interpersonal relationships); ego-resilience; and self efficacy (conflict and non-conflict). A frequency analysis was also computed.

The stated hypotheses were then tested: (1) When gang members are compared to non-gang members, a greater proportion of members will be insecurely attached to parents. (2) Gang members will have a more secure attachment or secure attachment styles to their peers than non-gang members. (3) Gang members will have lower scores on ego resiliency, social competence, and self-efficacy that non-gang members. (4) Finally, the alternative hypothesis that gang members are socially incompetent, and therefore the correlation between gang membership and social competence will be significantly higher than the correlation between gang membership and attachment was analyzed.

The descriptive statistic for all variables are reported in Table 1.

Table 1

Means (and Standard Deviations) for all Variables for all Participants

Variable	N	Mini-mum	Maxi-mum	Mean (SD)
Age	90	12.00	18.00	15.70 (1.23)
Ego resiliency	90	22.00	50.00	39.92 (5.39)
CSPI Self Efficacy Non-conflict	90	16.00	40.00	33.27 (5.18)
CSPI Self-Efficacy Conflict	90	28.00	48.00	41.19 (4.83)
ICQ Conflict-management	90	1.00	4.88	3.12 (.77)
ICQ Disclosure	90	1.00	5.00	3.14 (.80)
ICQ Emotional Support	90	1.00	5.00	3.65 (.84)
ICQ Initiation	90	2.13	5.00	3.90 (.65)
ICQ Negative Assertion	90	1.00	5.00	3.78 (.81)
IPPA Parent Communication	89	10.00	50.00	33.24 (8.87)
IPPA Parent Alienation	89	12.00	40.00	20.44 (6.84)
IPPA Parents Trust	90	10.00	47.00	38.37 (9.32)
Security Scale - mom	90	1.67	3.80	3.02 (.51)
Security Scale - dad	65	1.33	3.80	2.36 (.61)
BSQ Parents Dismissing Mean Score	90	1.53	4.2	2.67 (.62)
BSQ Parents Secure Mean Score	90	1.13	4.73	3.28 (.69)
BSQ Parents Preoccupied Mean Score	90	1.57	3.97	2.51 (.42)
Attachment Style - Parents Secure	90	1.00	5.57	4.81 (1.02)
Attachment Style - Parents Preoccupied	90	2.83	7.00	2.96 (.94)
Attachment Style - Parents Fearful	90	1.00	7.00	3.08 (1.20)
IPPA Gang/Peers Communication	89	8.00	36.00	28.22 (6.80)

IPPA Gang/Peers Alienation	88	20.00	35.00	16.24 (3.34)
IPPA Gang/Peers Trust	90	10.00	45.00	39.09 (8.04)
BSQ Gang/Peer Dismissing Mean Score	90	1.27	5.00	2.57 (.56)
BSQ Gang/Peer Secure Mean Score	90	1.60	4.67	3.56 (.50)
BSQ Gang/Peer Preoccupied Mean Score	90	1.00	3.87	2.50 (.47)
Attachment Style - Gang/Peer Secure	90	1.00	5.43	75.55(14.74)
Attachment Style - Gang/Peer Preoccupied	90	2.83	7.00	2.98 (.95)
Attachment Style - Gang/Peer Fearful	90	1.50	7.00	3.27 (1.20)

Analysis of Demographic Data

Demographic information was compiled via a semi-structured questionnaire that was administered to each participant. Table 2 contains the frequencies for these data. The age breakdown revealed that less than 5% of the participants were under 14 years of age, and 55.7% were 15-16 years of age. Approximately 70% of the adolescents admitted to drinking alcohol, 89% admitted to smoking marijuana. A majority of the detainees had behavioral problems, with 90% admitting to being suspended from school. Only 17% of the fathers were actively involved in their sons' lives because they resided together, while 21% of the detainees did not live with their nuclear families. Most adolescents had legal charges prior to being detained; only 21% did not have legal status. A majority of the youth came from broken homes, with only 19% having parents who were still married. Previous treatment interventions had been given to 69% of the adolescents prior to detainment.

Table 2

Demographic Data Frequencies in Percent

Demographic data	percentage	Demographic data	percentage
Age			
12 years old	2.2%	Legal Status	
13 years old	2.2%	diversion	1%
14 years old	11.1%	probation	64%
15 years old	23.3%	parole	14%
16 years old	32.2%	no legal status	21%
17 years old	26.7%	Psychiatric Medication	18%
18 years old	2.2%	Parent Marital Status	
Substance Abuse		parents never married	44%
alcohol use	70%	parents currently married	19%
marijuana use	89%	parents divorced	31%
other drug use	18%	parents re-married	6%
School Status		Treatment Experience	
history of suspension	90%	no intervention	32%
history of expulsion	67%	outpatient services	40%
Residence		residential placement	29%
living with mother	52%		
living with both parents	10%		
Living with father	7%		
living with other family	10%		
living with non family	21%		

Length of Time in Gang		Education Completed	
one to three years	15%	6th grade	3%
four to six years	22%	7th grade	3%
seven to nine years	8%	8th grade	37%
ten to sixteen years	5%	9th grade	30%
		10th grade	16%
Family Receives State Aid	27%	11th grade	8%
		12th grade	3%

Age and Race Analyses

Gang Membership. Two age groups were constructed: younger (ages 12-15) and older (age 16-18). The relationship between gang membership and age was examined with a crosstabulation analysis using Pearson's Chi-Square (see Table 3). The association between age and gang membership approached significance: X^2 (1, N = 90) = 3.79, p < .052. More younger adolescents (62.9%) than older adolescents (41.8%) stated they were not gang members.

Table 3

Gang status by Age (young vs old)

	Younger group (12 - 15)	Older group (16-18)
Non-Gang Member	62.9% (22)	41.8% (23)
Gang Member	37.1% (13)	58.2% (32)

The crosstabulation analysis using Pearson's Chi-Square for race and gang membership showed that 75.8% of the Caucasian participants did not

claim gang affiliation, compared to 35.0% of African American participants: X^2 (1, N = 73) = 12.07, p < .001. More African American participants than Caucasian participants were gang members (see Table 4).

Table 4

Gang status by Race (Caucasion vs African American)*

	Caucasian	African American
Non-Gang Member	75.8% (25)	35.0% (14)
Gang Member	24.2% (8)	65.0% (26)

* values in parenthesis are the members in each group

Attachment Measures. Differences in attachment scores between race and gang membership, and between age and gang membership were analyzed with a one-way analysis of variance (see Table 5). Given the number of analysis that were computed, the significance level was set at .01 to adjust for Type I error.

Table 5

One-way ANOVA for Age and Attachment Measures

Attachment Measures	df	F	Sig
IPPA-peers/gang communication	1, 88	.14	.71
IPPA-peers/gang alienation	1, 88	.71	.40
IPPA -peer/gang Trust	1, 88	1.11	.30
BSQ Friend Dismissing	1, 88	.18	.67
BSQ Friend Secure	1, 88	.33	.57
BSQ Friend Preoccupied	1, 88	.96	.33

Attachment Style Secure gangs/peers	1, 88	1.6	.22
Attachment Style Preoccupied gangs/peers	1, 88	2.24	.14
Attachment Style Fearful gangs/peers	1, 88	.06	.79
IPPA-parents Communication	1, 88	.90	.35
IPPA-parents Alienation	1, 88	.40	.53
IPPA-parents Trust	1, 88	.74	.39
Security scale mom	1, 88	.02	.88
Security scale Dad	1, 88	.26	.62
BSQ-Parents Dismissing	1, 88	.09	.77
BSQ-Parents Secure	1, 88	1.88	.17
BSQ-Parents Preoccupied	1, 88	5.60	.02
Attachment Style Secure Parents	1, 88	.04	.85
Attachment Style Preoccupied Parents	1, 88	.79	.38
Attachment Style Fearful Parents	1, 88	.000	1.0

Note: the significance level was set at .01 to adjust for Type I error.

Race was also divided into two categories: African American and Caucasian. Only these two races were used because the other races did not have a sufficient sample size. Significant differences were found for race and the BSQ-Parent preoccupied subscale, $F(1, 71) = 6.9$, $p < .01$; the BSQ-Parent secure subscale, $F(1, 71) = 7.8$, $p < .007$; the BSQ-Parent dismissing subscale, $F(1, 71) = 16.7$, $p < .000$; and the IPPA-Parent trust subscale, $F(1, 71) = 8.5$, $p < .005$. African-American detainees endorsed more questions consistent with having a preoccupied, dismissing, and secure attachment to parents than Caucasian detainees on the BSQ. Caucasian detainees endorsed more items

consistent with having trust in parents on the IPPA than African-American detainees (see Table 6).

Table 6

One-way ANOVA for Race and Attachment Measures

Attachment Measures	df	F	Sig
IPPA-peers/gang communication	1, 71	.004	.95
IPPA-peers/gang alienation	1, 70	1.82	.18
IPPA -peer/gang Trust	1, 71	.02	.90
BSQ Friend Dismissing	1, 71	1.12	.29
BSQ Friend Secure	1, 71	2.94	.09
BSQ Friend Preoccupied	1, 71	1.12	.29
Attachment Style Secure gangs/peers	1, 71	1.30	.20
Attachment Style Preoccupied gangs/peers	1, 71	5.92	.02
Attachment Style Fearful gangs/peers	1, 71	1.23	.27
IPPA-parents Communication	1, 71	5.86	.02
IPPA-parents Alienation	1, 71	3.35	.07
IPPA-parents Trust	1, 71	8.45	.005**
Security scale mom	1, 71	.96	.33
Security scale Dad	1, 71	.14	.71
BSQ-Parents Dismissing	1, 71	16.72	.000***
BSQ-Parents Secure	1, 71	7.78	.007**
BSQ-Parents Preoccupied	1, 71	6.92	.01**
Attachment Style Secure Parents	1, 71	2.23	.14
Attachment Style Preoccupied Parents	1, 71	.004	.95
Attachment Style Fearful Parents	1, 71	1.34	.25

Note: the significance level was set at .01 to adjust for Type I error.

Attachment correlates- ego resiliency, social competence, and self efficacy. A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to assess age differences in the attachment correlates (see Table7).

Table 7

One-way ANOVA for Age and Attachment Correlates

Attachment correlates	df	F	Sig
Ego Resiliency	1, 89	.061	.81
ICQ Composite Score	1, 89	.19	.67
CSPI Conflict	1, 89	4.73	.03**
CSPI Non-Conflict	1, 89	.47	.49

There was a significant difference between the older and younger adolescents on the conflict subscale of the CSPI, $F(1, 88) = 4.7$, $p < .05$. Older detainees scored higher on measures of peer conflict than younger detainees.

The race analysis for the correlates of attachment showed no significant differences (see Table 8).

Table 8

One-way ANOVA for Race and Attachment Correlates

Attachment Correlates	df	F	Sig
Ego Resiliency	1, 89	.14	.71
ICQ Conflict Management	1, 89	.85	.36
CSPI Conflict	1, 89	2.11	.09
CSPI Non-Conflict	1, 89	1.23	.30

Correlational Analysis

Parent Attachment Measures. A Pearson's Correlational Analysis was applied to all of the attachment measures for parents and peers as well as the attachment correlates. The pattern of relationships is shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Correlations of Parent and Peer Attachment Measures and Attachment Correlates

	Parent											Peer							
	IPPA-Com	IPPA Alien	IPPA Trust	Sec mom	Sec Dad	BSQ Dism	BSQ Secur	BSQ Preoc	AtSty Secur	AtSty Preoc	AtSty Fear	IPPA-Com	IPPA Trust	BSQ Dism	BSQ Secur	BSQ Preoc	At Sty Secur	At Sty Preoc	At Sty Fear
IPPA-Com																			
IPPA Alien	-.60*** (.000)																		
IPPA Trust	.80*** (.000)	-.64*** (.000)																	
Sec mom	.63*** (.000)	-.64*** (.000)	.69*** (.000)																
Sec Dad	.27* (.03)	.12 (.35)	-.19 (.14)	.18 (.15)															
BSQ Dism	-.68*** (.000)	.46*** (.000)	-.61*** (.000)	-.57*** (.000)	-.11 (.39)														

	IPPA-Com	IPPA Alien	IPPA Trust	Sec mom	Sec Dad	BSQ Dism	BSQ Secur	BSQ Preoc	AtSty Secur	AtSty Preoc	AtSty Fear	IPPA-Com	IPPA Trust	BSQ Dism	BSQ Secur	BSQ Preoc	At Sty Secur	At Sty Preoc	At Sty Fear
BSQ	-.70***	-.50***	.69***	.69***	.19	-.77***													
Secur	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.14)	(.000)													
BSQ	.07	-.03	-.004	-.07	.10	-.12	.08												
Preoc	(.50)	(.50)	(.97)	(.53)	(.43)	(.25)	(.44)												
At Sty	.64***	-.65***	.61***	.59***	-.21	-.33**	.49***	.01											
Secur	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.09)	(.002)	(.000)	(.96)											
At Sty	-.31**	.31**	-.35***	-.35***	.15	.08	-.20	.39***	-.45***										
Preoc	(.004)	(.003)	(.000)	(.001)	(.23)	(.44)	(.06)	(.000)	(.000)										
At Sty	-.70***	.58***	-.69***	-.60***	.21	.47***	-.53***	.10	-.79***	.51***									
Fear	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.09)	(.000)	(.000)	(.33)	(.000)	(.000)									
Peer																			
IPPA-	.02	.03	-.06	-.16	-.03	.17	-.03	-.01	.00	-.13	-.03								
Com	(.87)	(.80)	(.58)	(.12)	(.80)	(.12)	(.76)	(.91)	(.98)	(.22)	(.76)								
IPPA	-.02	.30**	-.13	-.14	.12	-.12	.01	.003	-.37***	.29**	.29**								
Alien	(.83)	(.004)	(.23)	(.19)	(.36)	(.28)	(.91)	(.98)	(.000)	(.007)	(.006)								

	IPPA-Com	IPPA Alien	IPPA Trust	Sec mom	Sec Dad	BSQ Dism	BSQ Secur	BSQ Preoc	AtSty Secur	AtSty Preoc	AtSty Fear	IPPA-Com	IPPA Trust	BSQ Dism	BSQ Secur	BSQ Preoc	At Sty Secur	At Sty Preoc	At Sty Fear
IPPA	.02	-.15	.08	-.02	-.03	.12	-.08	-.07	.10	-.27**	-.12	.79***							
Trust	(.83)	(.17)	(.44)	(.85)	(.84)	(.25)	(.46)	(.51)	(.35)	(.01)	(.25)	(.000)							
BSQ	-.09	-.01	.03	.07	-.09	.06	-.07	-.06	-.01	.03	-.08	-.55***	-.36**						
Dism	(.40)	(.94)	(.80)	(.54)	(.47)	(.59)	(.512)	(.59)	(.93)	(.77)	(.44)	(.000)	(.000)						
BSQ	.20	-.03	.19	.21*	.06	-.17	.42***	.11	.18	-.01	-.14	.49***	.27**	-.56***					
Secur	(.06)	(.74)	(.07)	(.05)	(.61)	(.11)	(.000)	(.30)	(.09)	(.93)	(.18)	(.000)	(.010)	(.000)					
BSQ	-.07	.21*	-.15	-.16	.10	.06	-.07	.34***	-.26**	.36***	.24*	-.19	-.29**	.01	-.02				
Preoc	(.52)	(.04)	(.16)	(.12)	(.45)	(.61)	(.51)	(.001)	(.01)	(.001)	(.02)	(.08)	(.006)	(.94)	(.88)				
AttSty	.14	-.32***	.19	.17	.14	.04	.02	-.01	.45***	-.33***	-.31***	.32**	.47***	-.18	.12	-.37**			
Secur	(.18)	(.003)	(.08)	(.12)	(.28)	(.68)	(.88)	(.91)	(.000)	(.002)	(.003)	(.003)	(000)	(.10)	(.26)	(.000)			
AttSty	-.22*	.42***	-.33***	-.39***	-.10	.14	-.18	.11	-.56***	.52***	.43***	-.06	-.20*	.09	-.15	.53***	-.70***		
Preoc	(.04)	(.000)	(.002)	(.000)	(.43)	(.19)	(.10)	(.29)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.56)	(.05)	(.39)	(.16)	(.000)	(.000)		
AttSty	-.05	.22*	-.15	-.12	-.12	-.05	.04	.01	-.26**	.17	.22*	-.45***	-.55**	.28**	-.15	.26**	-.68***	.42***	
Fear	(.63)	(.04)	(.15)	(.24)	(.35)	(.63)	(.74)	(.97)	(.01)	(.12)	(.04)	(.000)	(000)	(.009)	(.16)	(.01)	(.000)	(.000)	

The parent subscales for the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA) were significantly correlated with each other in the expected direction (r's from -.64 to .80). The parent subscales of the Attachment Style Scale also were significantly correlated in the expected direction: (r's from -.79 to .51). The intercorrelations for Behavioral System Questionnaire subscales were not significant with the exception of the Dismissing subscale and the Secure subscale: $r = -.77$ ($p < .000$).

Cross Validation Evidence. Evidence for cross validation of the attachment measures can be found in table 9. The intercorrelations for the security scores for the four attachment measures were significant and positive, and were negatively correlated with the insecure scores of preoccupied and dismissing. The specific insecure scores of the BSQ and Attachment Style scales were also correlated.

Peer Attachment Measures. The intercorrelations between the subscales of the IPPA, and the Attachment Style Scales were significant and in the expected direction. The only significant correlation among the subscales of the BSQ was between the Secure and Dismissing subscales. The correlations between the BSQ Preoccupied and Dismissing and Preoccupied and Secure were nearly zero, suggesting no relationship.

Cross Validation Summary. The secure subscales from the three measures were intercorrelated significantly with the exception of the BSQ Secure subscale and the Attachment Style Secure subscale ($r = .12$). The insecure subscales (preoccupied and dismissing/fearful) for the BSQ and

Attachment Style measures were significantly correlated with the exception of the BSQ Dismissing subscale and the Attachment Style Preoccupied subscale (r = .09). The IPPA secure subscale and the Attachment Style insecure subscales were significant and in the expected direction. The BSQ Secure subscale was negatively correlated with the Attachment Style insecure measures. The correlations between the Attachment Style secure subscale and the BSQ Preoccupied subscale was negative and significant, but the negative correlation with the BSQ Dismissing subscale was not significant.

Intercorrelations - Parent and Peer Attachment. The subscales of the parent and peer Attachment Style Scales were significantly correlated in the expected direction except for the peer fearful subscale and the parent preoccupied subscale. There were also significant correlations between both the parent and peer Attachment Style Scales and the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment in the expected directions. The parent and peer subscales of the Behavioral Systems Questionnaire for Secure, $r = .42$ ($p < .000$) and Preoccupied, $r = -.34$ ($p < .001$) were significantly correlated in the expected direction. The Security Scale - Mother significantly correlated with the peer security subscale of the BSQ, $r = .21$ ($p < .05$) in the expected direction.

Attachment correlates

Ego resiliency significantly correlated with all of the subscales of the Interpersonal Competence Questionnaire (ICQ), (r's from .24 to .38), and the Children's Self-Efficacy for Peer Interaction Scale (CSPI), (r's from -.36 to .44). Only the ICQ Initiation, and ICQ Negative Assertion were significantly correlated

with CSPI conflict, and non-conflict subscales, and the ICQ Disclosure subscale was also significantly correlated with the CSPI non-conflict subscale.

Intercorrelations between attachment measures and attachment correlates. The most consistent patterns of correlations between attachment measures and their assumed correlates seemed to be for the BSQ Dismissing and Secure subscales, and Attachment Style Secure and Preoccupied subscales, and IPPA communication subscales. The most consistently significant correlations among the constructs related to attachment occurred for the ICQ Negative Assertion subscale and the CSPI Conflict subscale.

Correlations Between Composite Measures of Attachment and Attachment Correlates

To further analyze the attachment data, composite scores of specific subscales were computed. The significant intercorrelations between subscales supported this compositing. The composite scores for the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment consists of the Communication and Trust subscales of this measure. The secure subscales of the Behavioral Systems Questionnaire and the Attachment Style Scale were the only measure of security for each of these scales. However, for the BSQ both the Preoccupied and the Dismissing subscales were combined into a composite score for insecure attachment. Similarly, the Preoccupied and Dismissing subscales of the Attachment Style Scale were combined into a composite score for insecure attachment. The composite scores were computed for both parent and peer attachment measures. A total score of interpersonal competency was computed using all of

the subscales of the Interpersonal Competence Questionnaire -- initiating relationships, self-disclosure, asserting displeasure with others, providing emotional support, and managing interpersonal conflicts. The conflict and non-conflict subscales of the Children's Self-Efficacy for Peer Interaction Scale were combined for a total score of self-efficacy. Finally, a total social competency score was computed by combining the composite interpersonal competency score, the ego-resiliency score, and the composite self-efficacy score.

In addition to the composite scores outlined above, a total parent security composite score was computed using the parent IPPA secure composite score, the parent BSQ Secure subscale, the parent Attachment Style Secure subscale, and the mom Security Subscale. The father Security scale was not used because a majority of the population had limited if any contact with their fathers. The insecure attachment scores from the BSQ and the Attachment Style measures were further combined to form a total insecure score. Similar procedures were used to compute total secure and insecure scores for peers.

Parent and Peer Intercorrelations for Composite Scores. A Pearson's Correlational Analysis was applied to all of the attachment composite scores and attachment correlate composite scores. The results of this correlational analysis are shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Correlations of Parent and Peer Composite Attachment Measures and Composite Attachment Correlate Scores

Parent							Peer							Correlates
	IPPA-Sec	BSQ Sec	AttSty Sec	Sec mom	Total Secur	BSQ Insecr	AttSty Insec	Total Insec	IPPA sec	BSQ Sec	AttSty Sec	Total Secur	BSQ Insecr	AttSty Insec
IPPA														
Sec														
BSQ	.74***													
Sec	(.000)													
AtSy	.66***	.49***												
Sec	(.000)	(.000)												
Sec	.70***	.69***	.59***											
mom	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)											
Total	.76***	.76**	.69***	.72***										
Sec	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)										
BSQ	-.58***	-.63***	-.29***	-.54***	-.58**									
Insec	(.000)	(.000)	(.006)	(.000)	(.000)									
ASy	-.65***	-44***	-.74***	-.54***	-.66***	.46***								
Insec	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)								

	IPPA-Sec	BSQ Sec	AttSty Sec	Sec mom	Total Secur	BSQ Insecr	AttSty Insec	Total Insec	IPPA sec	BSQ Sec	AttSty Sec	Total Secur	BSQ Insecr	AttSty Insec
Total	-.71*	-.55***	-.70***	-.63***	-.73***	.69***	.93***							
Insec	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)							
Peer														
IPPA	.04	-.07	.07	-.09	.03	.11	-.16	-.10						
sec	(.74)	(.53)	(.54)	(.40)	(.77)	(.34)	(.14)	(.34)						
BSQ	.21*	.42***	.18	.21*	.22*	-.08	-.13	-.14	.39***					
Sec	(.05)	(.000)	(.09)	(.05)	(.04)	(.43)	(.21)	(.20)	(.000)					
AtSy	.18	.02	.45***	.17	.20	.03	.45***	-.29**	.41***	.12				
Sec	(.08)	(.88)	(.000)	(.12)	(.06)	(.77)	(.000)	(.01)	(.000)	(.25)				
Tot	.05	-.05	.10	.00	-.12	.10	-.46**	-.55***	.99***	.12***	.47***			
Sec	(.62)	(.64)	(.36)	(.99)	(.26)	(.35)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)			
BSQ	-.10	-.10	-.17	-.06	-.11	.17	.22*	.23*	-.54***	-.44***	-.37***	.55***		
Insec	(.34)	(.35)	(.10)	(.60)	(.32)	(.10)	(.04)	(.02)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)		
AtSy	-.23	-.07	-.46***	.28**	-.25**	.07	.43***	.37***	-.42***	-.18	-.82***	-.78***	.46***	
Inecu	(.03)	(.53)	(.000)	(.01)	(.02)	(.50)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.10)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	
Total	-.22*	-.09	-.43	-.25*	-.23*	.12	.42***	.38***	-.51***	-.29**	-.78**	-.55***	.70***	.96***
Insec	(.04)	(.42)	(.000)	(.02)	(.03)	(.28)	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)	(.006)	(.000)	(.000)	(000)	(.000)

	IPPA-Sec	BSQ Sec	AttSty Sec	Sec mom	Total Secur	BSQ Insecr	AttSty Insec	Total Insec	IPPA sec	BSQ Sec	AttSty Sec	Total Secur	BSQ Insecr	AttSty Insec		
ATTACHMENT CORRELATES																
ICQ	.31**	.40***	.32***	.25*	.33**	-.23*	-.25*	-.28***	-.07	.22*	-.26**	-.28**	-.19	-.19		
Com	(.003)	(.000)	(.002)	(.02)	(.003)	(.03)	(.02)	(.008)	(.54)	(.04)	(.01)	(.01)	(.07)	(.07)		
CSPI	.27**	.24*	.27**	.20	.28**	-.19	-.37***	.36***	.27**	.15	-.36***	-.53**	-.26*	.26*	.62***	
Com	(.01)	(.02)	(.01)	(.06)	(.01)	(.07)	(.000)	(.001)	(.01)	(.14)	(.001)	(.002)	(.02)	(.02)	(.000)	
Total	.28**	.26**	.25**	.20	.28**	-.20	-.36***	-.37**	.28**	.18	-.34***	-.47**	-.26**	-.26**	.68***	.98***
S.C	(.009)	(.01)	(.02)	(.06)	(.01)	(.06)	(.001)	(.000)	(.008)	(.10)	(.001)	(.009)	(.01)	(.01)	(.000)	(.000)

No significant correlations were found for the composite parent and peer secure and insecure scores. Parent and peer composite secure scores were positively and significantly correlated with the attachment correlates, and insecure scores were significant and negatively correlated with the attachment correlates. Finally, the composite scores for the attachment correlates were significantly intercorrelated.

Parent Attachment Classification Analysis

Attachment classifications were formed for the BSQ and the Attachment Style Scale parent measures by using the following formulas. If secure score > preoccupied or dismissing/fearful scores, classification is secure. If preoccupied score > secure and dismissing/fearful scores, classification is preoccupied. If dismissing/fearful score > preoccupied and secure scores, classification is dismissing/fearful. A similar procedure was used to construct classification categories for the peer attachment measures. Attachment classifications were not formed for the IPPA scale because the reliability of the peer alienation scale was not adequate. The relationship between gang membership and attachment classification using the parent Attachment Style Scale was examined with a crosstabulation using Pearson's Chi-Square (see Table 11). The analysis revealed no significant differences for the Parent Attachment Style scale: X^2 (2, N = 90) = 3.18, p > .05.

Table 11

Gang status by Parent Attachment Style Scale

	Secure Classification	Preoccupied Classification	Fearful Classification
Non-Gang Member	84.4% (38)	2.2 % (1)	13.3% (6)
Gang Member	68.9% (31)	6.7% (3)	24.41% (11)

The relationship between gang membership and attachment classification using the Behavioral Systems Questionnaire also was examined with a crosstabulation using Pearson's Chi-Square (see Table 12). The analysis revealed no significant differences: X^2 (2, N = 90) = 4.44, p > .05, but the results were in the predicted direction.

Table 12

Gang status by Parent Behavioral Systems Questionnaire

	Secure Classification	Preoccupied Classification	Dismissing Classification
Non-Gang Member	75.6% (34)	0% (0)	24.4% (11)
Gang Member	64.4% (29)	8.9% (4)	26.7% (12)

The attachment classification agreement between the parent Attachment Style scale and the parent Behavioral System Questionnaire was examined with a crosstabulation using Pearson's Chi-Square (see Table 13). The analysis revealed significant differences between attachment classification for both the parent Attachment Style scale and the parent Behavioral System Questionnaire: X^2 (4, N = 90) = 25.40, p < .000. The classification comparison shows general

agreement between the two measures for the secure classification, but not the preoccupied or dismissing classification. Thus evidence for cross-validation only supports secure classification, but not insecure.

Table 13

Parent Attachment Style Scale by Parent Behavioral System Questionnaire

	BSQ Secure	BSQ Preoccupied	BSQ Dismissing
AS Secure	90.5% (57)	1.6% (1)	7.9% (5)
AS Preoccupied	50.06% (2)	25.0 (1)	25.0% (1)
AS Fearful	43.5% (10)	8.7% (2)	47.8% (11)

Peer Attachment Classification Analysis. The relationship between gang membership and attachment classification using the peer/gang Attachment Style Scale was examined with a crosstabulation using Pearson's Chi-Square (see Table 14). The analysis revealed no significant differences: X^2 (2, N = 88) = 4.73, p = .09.

Table 14

Gang status by Peer/Gang Attachment Style Scale

	Secure Classification	Preoccupied Classification	Fearful Classification
Non-Gang Member	75.0% (33)	13.6% (6)	11.4% (5)
Gang Member	77.3% (34)	2.3% (1)	20.5% (9)

The relationship between gang membership and attachment classification using the Behavioral Systems Questionnaire was examined with a

crosstabulation using Pearson's Chi-Square (see Table 15). The analysis revealed no significant differences: X^2 (2, N = 90) = 1.54, p > .05.

Table 15

Gang status by Peer/Gang Behavioral Systems Questionnaire

	Secure Classification	Preoccupied Classification	Fearful Classification
Non-Gang Member	88.9% (40)	2.2% (1)	8.9% (4)
Gang Member	80.0% (36)	2.2% (1)	17.8% (8)

The attachment classification agreement between the Peer/Gang Attachment Style scale and the Peer/Gang Behavioral System Questionnaire was examined with a crosstabulation using Pearson's Chi-Square (see Table 16).

Table 16

Peer/Gang Attachment Security Scale by Peer/Gang Behavioral System Questionnaire

	BSQ Secure	BSQ Preoccupied	BSQ Dismissing
AS Secure	77.0% (57)	8.1% (6)	14.9% (11)
AS Preoccupied	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	0% (0)
AS Fearful	75.0% (9)	0% (0)	25.0% (3

The analysis revealed no significant differences between attachment classification for the Peer/Gang Attachment Security scale and the Peer/Gang Behavioral System Questionnaire: X^2 (4, N = 88) = 6.58, p > .05. The

comparison shows major classification disagreements among the two measures and does not provide evidence for cross-validation.

Analyses of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1, which stated that a greater proportion of gang members than non-gang members will be insecurely attached to parents was evaluated with a crosstabulation analyses which produced a nonsignificant chi square (see table 11 and 12); however the results were in the expected direction. Using the parent subscales of the Attachment Style Scale, 2.2% of the non gang members as opposed to 6.7% of the gang members were classified as preoccupied, and 13.3% of the non gang members as opposed to 27.4% of the gang members were classified as fearful. Combining these two insecure attachment scales, 25.5% of the non-gang members were insecurely attached and 34.1% of the gang members were insecurely attached. Using the parent Behavioral Systems Questionnaire, none of the non gang members compared to 8.9% of the gang members were classified as preoccupied, and 24.4% of the non gang members as opposed to 26.7% of the gang members were classified as dismissing. Combing the two insecure classifications 24.4% of the non gang members and 35.6% of the gang members were insecurely attached. Thus, gang membership does not seem to be associated with insecure attachment to parents.

A one-way ANOVA using gang membership and the parent composite insecure score consisting of the scores of the parent BSQ preoccupied and dismissing subscales, and the parent Attachment Style preoccupied and fearful subscales also revealed no significant differences $F(1, 89) = 1.5$, $p < .223$.

Another one-way ANOVA using gang membership and the parent composite secure score consisting of the parent BSQ secure subscale, parent IPPA communication and trust subscale, the Mom Security Scale and the parent Attachment Style secure subscales also revealed no significant differences $F(1, 89) = .21$, $p < .65$. However, the mean scores for both analyses were in the expected direction. Given these results, hypothesis one was not supported.

The second hypothesis which stated that gang members will have a more secure attachment or secure attachment styles to their peers than non-gang members, was evaluated with a crosstabulation analysis which produced a nonsignificant chi square (see Tables 14 and 15). Using the peer/gang subscales of the Attachment Style Scale, 75.0% of the non gang members as opposed to 77.3% of the gang members were classified as secure. According to the peer/gang Behavioral Systems Questionnaire, 88.9% of the non gang members as opposed to 80.0% of the gang members were classified as secure.

A one-way ANOVA using gang membership and the peer/gang composite security score consisting of the peer/gang IPPA trust and communication subscale, peer/ gang BSQ secure subscale, and the peer/gang Attachment Style security subscale showed no significant differences, $F(1, 89) = .46$, $p < .50$. Another one-way ANOVA using gang membership and the peer/gang composite insecure score consisting of the peer/gang BSQ preoccupied and dismissing subscales, and the peer/gang Attachment Style preoccupied and fearful subscales also revealed no significant differences $F(1, 89) = 1.54$, $p = .22$. The two analyses show no support for the second hypothesis. Contrary to hypothesis

two, no differences in frequency or magnitude of secure attachment were found between the categories of gang status.

The third hypothesis which stated that gang members will have lower scores on ego resiliency, social competence, and self-efficacy than non-gang members, was evaluated with three one-way ANOVA's using gang status and ego resiliency, interpersonal competence and self-efficacy (see table 17).

Table 17

One-way ANOVA's for Gang Status and Attachment Correlates

Attachment Correlates	df	F	Sig
Ego resiliency	1, 89	.085	.771
CSPI Self-Efficacy	1, 89	.397	.53
ICQ Composite Score	1, 89	.07	.79

The ANOVA's revealed no significant differences. A second univariate analysis of variance was performed with gang status using the composite score for social competence which consists of the total score for the ICQ, total score for the CSPI, and ego resiliency. The results for the analysis revealed no significant differences, $F(1, 89) = .12$, $p = .73$. Given these results hypothesis three was not supported.

Hypothesis 4 proposed that gang members are socially incompetent, and therefore the correlation between gang membership and social competence will be significantly higher than the correlation between gang membership and

attachment. This hypothesis was first evaluated with correlational analysis (point biserial). The results of these analysis appear in Table 18.

Table 18

Point Biserial Correlations using Gang Membership and Attachment Correlates

Ego resiliency	Social Comp.	ICQ
-.031 (.77)	-.049 (.65)	.029 (.79)

This hypothesis was evaluated further with a logistic regression. Logistic regression is a procedure by which a variable such as gang membership can be predicted by a set of continuous variables. In the first analysis, gang membership was used as an outcome variable, and the security scores from the four attachment measures - IPPA, Security scale-mom, BSQ, and the Attachment Style scale - were used as predictors. The test for this model produced a nonsignificant chi square, X^2 (N=90, 4) < 1, which shows that the predictors as a set did not distinguish between non gang and gang membership. The variance accounted for was minuscule, Nagelkerke, r^2 = .019. Correct prediction was almost at chance level with only 54.55% of the gang members identified, and an overall success rate of 58.43%. Table 19 shows the regression coefficients, Wald Statistics, significance level and odds ratio for each of the four predictors. According to the Wald statistic none of the four attachment security measures reliably predicted gang membership. A similar pattern of results was found when measures of insecure attachment were used

as predictors, and when the composite secure and composite insecure measures were used as predictors.

Table 19

Regression Summary for Gang Membership and Parent Attachment Security Patterns.

Predictors	B	Wald	df	Significance	Odds Ratio
BSQ Secure	.0014	.0000	1	.9975	1.0014
Security - mom	-.4637	.5089	1	.4756	.6289
Att. Style Secure	.1446	.2952	1	.5869	1.1556
IPPA Secure	-.0131	.7141	1	.3981	.9870
Constant	-1.5554	.7939	1	.3729	
BSQ Insecure	-.3544	1.0431	1	.3071	.7016
Att. Style Insecure	.1674	.1317	1	.2038	1.1822
Constant	.8224	.2660	1	.6060	

A second logistic regression analysis was run with gang membership as the outcome variable and peer attachment security measures - IPPA, BSQ, and the Attachment Style scale as the predictors. The test for this model produced a nonsignificant chi square, X^2 (N=90, 3) < 1, which shows that the predictors as a set did not distinguish between nongang and gang membership. The variance accounted for was minuscule, Nagelkerke, r^2 = .057. Correct prediction was slightly above chance level with only 56.82% of the gang members identified, and an overall success rate of 57.3%. Table 20 shows the regression coefficients, Wald Statistics, significance level and odds ratio for each of the three predictors. According to the Wald statistic none of the three attachment security measures reliably predicted gang membership. A similar pattern of

results was found when measures of insecure attachment were used as predictors, and when the composite secure and composite insecure measures were used as predictors.

Table 20

Regression Summary for Gang Membership and Gang/Peer Attachment Security Patterns.

Predictors	B	Wald	df	Significance	Odds Ratio
BSQ Secure	.2102	.1894	1	.6634	1.2340
Att. Style Secure	.4564	3.0457	1	.0810	1.5784
IPPA Secure	-.0269	2.0549	1	.1517	.9735
Constant	-1.1585	.4016	1	.5263	
BSQ Insecure	-.2524	3.1841	1	.0744	.7770
Att. Style Insecure	.3180	.8772	1	.3490	1.3744
Constant	-.0355	.0006	1	.9812	

The third logistic regression analysis was performed with gang membership as the outcome variable and the three composite scores for social competence - ego resiliency, interpersonal competence, and social efficacy as predictors. The test for this model also produced a nonsignificant chi square, X^2 (N=90, 3) < 1, which shows that the predictors as a set did not distinguish between non gang and gang membership. The variance accounted for was minute, Nagelkerke, r^2 = .012. Correct prediction was almost at chance level with only 55.56% of the gang members identified, and an overall success rate of 52.81%. Table 21 shows the regression coefficients, Wald Statistics, significance level and odds ratio for each of the three predictors. According to

the Wald statistic none of the three attachment correlates measures reliably predicted gang membership. Given all of these analyses, hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Table 21

Regression Summary for Gang Membership and Attachment Correlates.

Predictors	B	Wald	df	Significance	Odds Ratio
Ego resiliency	.0106	.0316	1	.8590	1.0107
ICQ	.0733	.6023	1	.4377	1.0760
Social Comp.	-.0193	.5203	1	.4707	.9808
Constant	.8634	.1847	1	.6673	

Chapter IV

Discussion

Summary of Major findings

The present study focused on attachment of gang members and non gang members to parents and peers. None of the hypotheses were supported. Based on the findings, it does not appear that an insecure attachment to parents predicts gang affiliation in adolescence, nor were gang members found to have a more secure attachment to peers. Furthermore, social competence did not seem to account for more variance than attachment when comparing gang affiliation.

Age, Race, and Attachment

Neither age nor race were expected to play a role in the security of attachment. However, the correlational analysis revealed that older adolescents tended to have a more preoccupied attachment to parents than younger adolescents. Individuals with a preoccupied attachment are described as having a favorable perception of others, but see themselves as unworthy or inadequate (Becker et al, 1997). These individuals are preoccupied with relationships, and gain a sense of self satisfaction through positive interactions with others. It is through the value of others that they gain a sense of themselves. There may be several reasons for the finding that older adolescents scored higher on scales measuring preoccupied attachment. Older participants are struggling with issues of emerging autonomy and separation from parents because they are beginning to enter adulthood. Thus, they may have answered the questions of the Behavioral System Questionnaire in a way that would endorse an insecure

attachment when compared to their younger cohorts. Support of this conclusion can be found in studies by Ryan and Lynch (1989) who found that emotional autonomy in early adolescents was shown to be negatively associated with reported quality of attachment to parents, but not peers. However, emotional autonomy was positively related to experienced parental rejection in later adolescence (Ryan & Lynch, 1989). But, there were no significant differences in age for the other attachment measures which is consistent with literature regarding attachment status. Other researchers (e.g. Greenberg, Siegal, & Leitch, 1983) have reported no significant age differences for attachment status.

Older adolescents scored higher on the conflict subscale of the Children's Self-Efficacy Personality Inventory (an assumed correlate of attachment). Older adolescents are more likely to engage in conflict because they have more life experience than their younger cohorts. Older adolescents also have found that conflict is an effective way to solve problems and get their needs met.

Some unexpected racial patterns were found. African-American adolescents were more likely to have a preoccupied attachment or a secure attachment to parents regardless of gang affiliation than Caucasian adolescents when the BSQ attachment measured was used. However, the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment showed that Caucasian adolescents endorsed more items consistent with trusting parents than African American adolescents. Because Bowlby's (1969) attachment theory was proposed as a universal, biologically based, and evolutionary adaptive theory of human development, no differences between races were expected. Previous research using similar

measures found no significant racial differences. Kuperminc et al., (1996) reported no significant differences between African-American and Caucasian youth when assessing acts of delinquency, autonomy striving, relatedness striving, autonomous related reasoning, and social problem solving competence. In addition, Robins, John, Caspi, Moffitt, and Stouthhamer-Loeber (1996) found that when resilient, overcontrolled, and undercontrolled boys were examined, the results were generalizable across African-American and Caucasian youth.

Several possible explanations for the racial differences can be advanced. One explanation focuses on methodology. The attachment measures may not have been measuring what they were supposed to measure (a validity problem). These measures were not normed on a minority population, or on a vulnerable population of delinquent adolescents. Although the four attachment measures should have assessed the same construct, conflicting results were obtained. The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment indicated that Caucasian participants were more securely attached, while the Behavioral Systems Questionnaire indicated that African American participants were more securely attached. These findings question the cross validation of the measures, because they were used on the same population. The finding that more African American participants claimed gang affiliation was not an unexpected finding, because this relationship has been repeatedly shown in the existing body of research on gang members (Friedman et al., 1975).

Attachment Measures: Construct Validation

The subscales of the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment had expected patterns. The Communication and Trust subscale were positively correlated, but each correlated negatively with Alienation. For the Security Scale, the subscales for mother and father did not significantly correlate with one another. The lack of overall significant results may be due to the lack of participation of fathers in these adolescents lives. Given that only 17% of the sample were residing with their fathers at the time of data collection, a likely conclusion is that these fathers were not involved in their son's lives. The only significant correlation among the parent subscales of the Behavioral Systems Questionnaire was the negative relationship between the Secure subscale and the Dismissing subscale. All of the parental subscales of the Attachment Style questionnaire significantly correlated with one another. As expected, the Secure subscale had a significant inverse relationship with the Preoccupied and Fearful subscales which were positively correlated with one another.

The cross validation analysis showed support for the assumption that self-report attachment measures are assessing the same construct. The security scale for mothers seemed to correlate most consistently across the other three attachment measures. It appears as if this construct may tap the parental relationship between mother and son that existed in the study. Furthermore, this measure is assessing the attachment relationship, in that the father was absent from the picture, and this measure asked specifically about the relationship with mother instead of parents as the other measures did. The correlations between

the insecure scores on the BSQ and Attachment Style scale were significantly intercorrelated.

The cross validation analysis for the peer measures showed a similar pattern to that found for the parents' measures of attachment. But, the lack of significant correlations across the same classification for parent and peer attachment indicates that parent measures of attachment are assessing a different emotional bond than attachment to peers, at least when using the four self-report attachment measures in the study.

The classification analyses shows no evidence that the attachment measures produce similar attachment classifications. Therefore no evidence exists for cross-validation. However, given the overall data on cross-validation, one may be justified in using one of these measures if an attachment score is warrented, but attachment classification is not advised.

When the secure and insecure composite scores of the attachment measures were correlated with one another, the expected patterns emerged, thus lending evidence towards the validity of these measures. Most of the measures had significant correlations in the expected direction. It appears as if the composite scores of all measures are measuring the same constructs. Additional support for the validity of the BSQ and the mom Security scale was found when the composite scores were used in the correlational analysis because these measures positively and significantly correlated with ego-resiliency, interpersonal competence, and self-efficacy, the known correlates of attachment.

Attachment Correlates

When the correlations between the between the attachment measures and the attachment correlates - ego resiliency, social competence, and self-efficacy are examined, there were some significant trends in the expected direction. However, no relationship was found between gang membership status and the attachment correlates. When the composite score was computed for the attachment correlates, they significantly intercorrelated with the attachment measure in the expected direction.

Hypothesis Analysis

Contrary to the stated hypotheses, little to no relationship between secure or insecure attachment classification to parent and peers and gang affiliation was found. There were no significant differences for each individual subscale, or the composite scores. There are some possible reasons for this outcome, both theoretical and methodological. It would be inappropriate to conclude at this juncture that an insecure attachment to parents does not influence gang affiliation. In his theory of attachment, Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) conceptualized that children develop internal working models of the attachment figure, others in the child's environment, and of the self. The child will rely on the internal working model to integrate new information and guide behaviors in a new situation. The internal working models operate outside of the child's awareness, and are not static due to the assimilation of new information, although they are resistant to poignant change. Due to the stressful environment of detainment of the participants in this study, their perception of

attachment to parents and peers during the given time of evaluation may have influenced their responses on the measures. Thus, the participant's internal working models of attachment during the time of assessment might be influenced by their restricted freedom. Different findings may have emerged if the detainees were evaluated in their actual home environment.

An alternative explanation follows from Bowlby's (1973) proposal that individuals who suffer from "emotional disturbances" develop two simultaneously incompatible internal working models of attachment. The first one is "primitive," developed in the early years, and the child is unaware of it, while the second one is developed later, is more "sophisticated," the child is aware of it, and erroneously believes it to be dominant (p. 205). Bretherton and Waters (1985) further explain this concept by stating that children will often dissociate and defend the latter internal working model when the parental figure is rejecting, or is able to convince the child that their behavior is nurturing when it is repudiating, and the child is unable to cope with reality. Thus, Bretherton and Waters conclude that "representational homeostasis, based on the defensive exclusion or representations that cause painful feelings, may provide emotional relief" (p. 15). Certainly, the youth in this sample have emotional disturbances, and as such, it is plausible that they are accessing internal working models that are inconsistent with reality to avoid further emotional vulnerability, and it is those idealistic representations that may have been reported on the measures of attachment. It is also conceivable that all delinquents suffer to the same degree. from an insecure attachment

Hypothesis two predicted that gang members would be more securely attached to peers when compared to non gang members. However, the data showed that more gang members had a preoccupied attachment (e.g. the gang members devalue themselves and have positive perceptions of others) to peers as compared with non gang members when the Attachment Style Scale was used. That is, more gang members were insecurely attached to peers than non gang. Becker, Billings, Eveleth and Gilbert (1997) propose that the preoccupied attachment classification also corresponds to the anxious/ambivalent classification described by Ainsworth (1978). According to Becker et al. (1997) the preoccupied attachment classification implies that an individual sees himself or herself as unworthy or incapable, and has a negative view of self. They see others as better than themselves and view them positively. This view of self and others forces individuals with a preoccupied attachment to gain acceptance for themselves by obtaining acceptance of others whom they value (Becker et al., 1997). If the gang member devalues himself, and values others, specifically those in his gang, one would expect him to have a preoccupied attachment. This attachment style may draw him to the gang and to participate in gang activity. Finally, a finding that is emerging across attachment literature, specifically in a clinical setting, is that an insecure attachment is indicative of behavioral disorders. For example, Rosenstein and Horowitz (1996) found that a majority of their population of conduct/oppositional disordered adolescents had a dismissing attachment classification.

Hypothesis three suggested that gang members would score lower on measures of ego resiliency, social competence, and self-efficacy which are assumed correlates of attachments. There were no significant differences between these correlates of attachment and gang membership with the exception of the Negative Assertion scale of the Interpersonal Competence Questionnaire. Negative assertion can be viewed as the assertion of personal rights and the displeasure with others. It can also be classified under assertiveness skills. This finding is not surprising considering that gang members tend to be more aggressive than their non gang member counterparts. Friedman et al. (1975) found that having a "high proclivity for violence" was the strongest single predictor of gang membership. Thus, it is reasonable to expect gang members to have higher scores on a subscale that measures assertion given that gang members tend to be more aggressive and violent than those who are not involved in gangs.

No support was found for the alternative hypothesis that stated gang members are socially incompetent, and therefore the correlation between gang membership and social competence would be significantly higher than the correlation between gang membership and attachment. According to the measures of social competence used in this study, gang members are as socially competent as non-gang members.

Limitations of the Study

Methodological concerns include the sample population. The responses were only from the detainees. Given that the adolescents were in the Douglas

County Youth Center because of criminal behavior, they may have purposefully attempted to mislead the interviewers when answering the questions. For example, one of the detainees with whom the evaluator had prior contact because he was a former client, lied about his gang affiliation to another interviewer. Thus, his responses were not used in the sample because they were considered unreliable. If this situation occurred on at least one occasion during the study, it is reasonable to assume it may have occurred more frequently. Thus, the results can be viewed as tentative at best. To test this assumption, the study should be repeated on the same population to compare the findings.

Another methodological limitation is that in this study is that only the adolescents' responses were recorded. Perhaps the adolescents viewed themselves differently than others in their environment, specifically their parents or their peers. For example, parents may see their children as securely attached while the child perceives himself as insecurely attached, and peers could see the individual as insecurely attached while the individual sees himself as securely attached. Thus, a more accurate picture of attachment may have been obtained if parents also had been questioned about the participants' attachment classification.

There were nine measures used in this study and completion of all measures averaged approximately one hour per participant. All of the measures were given to each participant in the same order. Although this increases the likelihood of order effects because the measures were not

counterbalanced, the risk is specific in that participants will become fatigued when answering questions, causing a decrease in performance. It was anticipated that all participants would have experienced fatigue effects based on the length of time it took to complete the measures, and the number of measures the participants were required to complete. Thus, if the measures were presented in the same order to each participant, the fatigue factor should be equal across all participants.

Several problems have been associated with the use of self-report measures. Given that self-report measures rely largely on the honesty and ability to recall information accurately by the participant, it is possible that the adolescents were not being completely truthful. Participants may have attempted to present themselves in a favorable light, or may not be able to make accurate self-reports based on the memory's ability to reconstruct events. Among these well known problems, this study seemed to amplify the existing difficulties because the questionnaires were read to the participant. Although this method was chosen to reduce the likelihood that participants would not complete all of the questionnaires without reading them, and also to allow those individuals who had reading difficulties an opportunity to participate in the study, it also may have created a response bias. Participants may not have been as honest when answering directly in the presence of the interviewer, than would have occurred if they had responded anonymously. To prevent the bias, a computer could have been set up for each participant, and when the interviewer

read the item, the individual could have recorded his responses confidentially on the computer without the knowledge of the interviewer.

In addition, reading the items to the participant did not guarantee that they understood the content of the question. It appeared as if several of the participants had difficulty understanding the questions, because on some of the questionnaires, the wording is confusing because double negatives are used. If those questionnaires been written in more simple language consistent with the developmental age of the participants, they may have been better able to understand what was being asked. Also the measures used may not have been age appropriate for this population of adolescents. In addition to the confusing language, most of the questionnaires asked about the participant's relationship with his "parents." Given that a majority of the participants (83.0%) did not reside with their fathers, and fathers were not actively involved in the participants lives, the questionnaires may not have accurately reflected the relationship of the participants with his primary caregiver because the father was excluded from the data collected.

Finally, the most accurate measure of attachment is to use the Strange Situation developed by Ainsworth et al., (1978). This measure was specifically developed to determine attachment classification. Use of the Adult Attachment Inventory, which is based on the Ainsworth measure, may have given different results.

Directions for Future Research

Future research should study attachment from a longitudinal perspective. If this method is used when the participants are infants, and they are followed into adolescence and then asked about gang affiliation, the results would be more reliable and accurate. To obtain a population, the investigators could seek the infants of those individuals who already profess to be affiliated with gangs, because gang status can be traced through the generations. These participants could then be matched to individuals in the same neighborhoods who do not claim gang affiliation. Differences between the two groups could then be determined at different developmental stages, and useful information about gang affiliation obtained.

In addition, a more reliable measure of attachment is needed for an adolescent population. There are some difficulties with the attachment measures used in this study as evidenced by the correlational analyses and the cross-validation evidence. If this measure is a pencil an paper instrument, then it should include gathering information from the participants' parents' perspective, and his peers' perspective.

Conclusions

On a final note, although there was minimal empirical evidence for attachment predicting gang affiliation, consistent with Bowlby's (1969, 1973, 1980) theory, interview responses of gang members were suggested of some type of attachment relationship. As a part of the semi-structured interview gang members were asked why they joined a gang. The responses to this question

were varied, but several of the participants mentioned security, protection, and safety as reasons for joining a gang. The responses are conceptually congruent with the earlier argument that gang members join because of the tenets that Bowlby (1969, 1973, 1980) outlined in his theory. The following are a few excerpts of reasons that gang members gave for joining a gang. " "Cause I was always around them . . . they're there to help out when I need it . . . protection;" "Cuz when I was younger, my mom was at work and my dad was never around, so I used to kick it with the big homies who showed me love. . . let me go with them . . . buy me things . . . only ones who care about me. . . love me;" "lookin' for protection;" "Wanted people to stop pickin' on me . . .I grew up around gangs and no one picked on them, so I joined;" "Because, so they can have my back;" "for protection;" "I didn't think I had anything else out there . . . like nobody cared;" "because for the friends and basically . . . you know . . . just the. . . if I ever need help I got someone to go to;" "grew up around it . . . cousins and family members in it . . . part of me . . . it's 'bout family . . . They're my family;" "'cause I liked it. . . it was fun. . . people to hang out with. . . get whatever I wanted whenever I wanted. . . it's like my family. . . became my family. . . if my parents were around, I probably would not be in a gang;" and finally "Because different situations got deep in my life and I wanted to belong to something. . . wanted to be recognized. . .people to be like-he's 'bout it, he's down."

This anecdotal data supports the notion that attachment-like feelings are present in gang relations. However, the bond that is established between the gang members and others in the gang may be quite different from the

attachment bond that is commonly assessed between parent and child. Although the measures of attachment used in this study did not support the contention that gang members join gangs for the attachment opportunities gang membership offers, the participants' verbalizations seem to support it. Thus, it is possible that adolescents join gangs for attachment purposes, but the measures are not sensitive to this type of attachment. It is also possible that the attachment measures were unable to assess attachment as it relates to a delinquent population. There is ample evidence that adolescents who are psychologically maladjusted have insecure attachments. Specifically, a delinquent population has been shown to have insecure attachments (Allen et al, 1996; Rosenstein & Horowitz, 1996).

References

Ainsworth, M. D., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of Attachment: A psychological study of the Strange Situation. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Allen, J. P., Hauser, S. T., & Borman-Spurrell, E. (1996). Attachment Theory as a framework for understanding sequelae of sever adolescent psychopathology: An 11year follow up study. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64,(2), 254-263.

Arend, R. , Gove, F. L., & Sroufe, A. (1979). Continuity of individual adaptation from infancy to kindergarten: A predictive study of ego-resiliency and curiosity in preschoolers. Child Development, 50, 950-959.

Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in Adolescence. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16, (5), 427-454.

Becker, T. E., Billings, R. S., Eveleth, D.M., & Gilbert, N.W. (1997). Validity of scores on the three attachment style scales: Exploratory and confirmatory evidence. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57(3), 477-493.

Block J. H., & Block, J. (1980). The role of ego-control and ego-resiliency in the organization of behavior. In W. A. Collins (Ed.), Development of cognition, affect, and social relations: The Minnesota symposia on child psychology (pp. 39-101). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Block, J. B., & Kremen, A. M. (1996). IQ and Ego-resiliency: Conceptual and empirical connections and separateness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70, (2), 349-361.

Bowlby, J. (1969). Attachment and Loss Volume I: Attachment. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Bowlby, J. (1973). Attachment and Loss Volume II: Separation, Anxiety and Anger. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment and Loss Volume III: Loss, Sadness and Depression. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Brack, G., Gay M. F., & Matheny, K.B. (1993). Relationship between attachment and coping resources among adolescents. Journal of College School Development, 34(3), 212-215.

Bretherton I., & Waters, E. (1985). Points of Attachment Theory and Research. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50, (5-35).

Bretherton, I. (1992). The origins of attachment theory: John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth. Developmental Psychology, 28(5), 759-775.

Buhrmester, D., Furman, W., Wittenberg, M. T., & Reis, H. T. (1988). Five domains of interpersonal competence in peer relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55(6), 991-1008.

Brown, W. K. (1978). Black gangs as family extensions. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 22 (1), 23-45.

Cassidy, J. (1988). Child-mother attachment and the self in six-year-olds. Child Development, 59, 121-134.

Clark, C. M. (1992). Deviant adolescent subcultures: Assessment strategies and clinical intervention. Adolescence, 27(106), 283-293.

Colin, V. L. (1996). Human Attachment. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Cotterell, J. (1996). Social Network and Social Influences in Adolescence. New York: Routledge.

Foley, M. (1983). Coping strategies of street children. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 27(1), 5-20.

Friedman, C. J., Mann, J., & Friedman, A. S. (1975). A profile of juvenile street gang members. Adolescence, 10(40), 563-607.

Furman, W. (1996). Individual differences in friendship quality and their links to child-mother attachment. In W. M. Bukowski, A. F. Newcomb, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), The Company they Keep: Friendship in childhood and Adolecsence (pp 137-157). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Greenberg, M. T., Speltz, M. L., & DeKlyen, M. (1993). The role of attachment in the early development of disruptive behavioral problems. Development and Psychopathology, 5, 191-213.

Greenberg, M. T., Siegel, J. M., Leitch, C. J. (1983). The nature and importance of attachment relationships to parents and peers during adolescence. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 12(5), 373-386.

Hochhaus, C., & Sousa, F. (1987-88). Why children belong to gangs: A comparison of expectations and reality. High School Journal, 71 (2), 74-77.

Kerns, K. A., Klepac, L., & Cole A. K. (1996). Peer relationships and preadolescents' perceptions of security in the child-mother relationship. Developmental Psychology, 32(3), 457-466.

Klein, M.W. (1971). Street Gangs and Street Workers. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kuperminc, G. P., Allen, J. P., & Arthur, M. W. (1996). Autonomy, relatedness, and male adolescent delinquency: Toward a multidimensional view of social competence. Journal of Adolescent Research, 11 (4), 397-420.

Lowney, J. (1984). The wall gang: A study of interpersonal process and deviance among twenty-three middle class youths. Adolescence, 19 (75), 527-538.

Lyons-Ruth, K., Alpern, L., & Repacholi, B. (1993). Disorganized infant attachment classification and maternal psychosocial problems as predictors of hostile-aggressive behavior in the preschool classroom. Child Development, 64, 572-585.

Main, M., & Solomon, J. (1990). Procedures for identifying infants as disorganized/disoriented during the Ainsworth Strange Situation. In M. Greenberg, D. Cicchetti, & M. Cummings (Eds.), Attachment in the preschool years: Theory research and intervention (pp. 121-160). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Main, M. (1996). Introduction to the special section on attachment and psychopathology: 2. Overview of the field of attachment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64 (2), 237-243.

Nada-Raja, S., McGee, R., & Stanton, W.R. (1992). Perceived attachments to parents and peers and psychological well-being in adolescence. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 17(4), 305-314.

O'Hagan, F.J. (1976). Gang characteristics: An empirical study. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines, 17(4), 305-314.

Pedhauzur, Elazar, J. (1982). Multiple Regression in Behavioral Research (2nd ed.) New York: Dryden Press.

Robins, R. W., John, O. P., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1996). Resilient, overcontrolled, and undercontrolled boys: Three replicable personality types. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 70(1). 157-171.

Rosenstein, D.S. & Horowitz, H.A. (1996). Adolescent attachment and psychopathology. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychopathology. 64(2). 244-253.

Rothbaum F., & Weisz, J.R. (1994). Parental caregiving and child externalizing behavior in nonclinical samples: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 116(1). 55-74.

Ryan R. M., & Lynch, J. H. (1989). Emotional autonomy versus detachment: Revisiting the vicissitudes of adolescence and young adulthood. Child Development, 60. 340-356.

Sheley, J.F., Zhang, J., Brody, C.J., Wright, J.D. (1995). Gang organization, gang criminal activity, and individual gang members' criminal behavior. Social Science Quarterly, 76,(1), 53-68.

Stevenson-Hinde, J. & Shouldice, A. (1995). Maternal interaction and self-reports related to attachment classification at 4.5 years. Child Development, 66, 583-596-

Sundermeier, J. Sgt. (1995, Nov). Gang Awareness Conference. Conference held at the Peter Kiewit Center, Omaha, NE.

Waters, E., Kondo-Ikemura, K., Posada G, & Richters, J.E. (1991). Learning to love: Mechanisms and milestones. Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology, 23, 217-255.

Wheeler, V. A. & Ladd, G. W., (1982). Assessment of children's self efficacy for social interactions with peers. Developmental Psychology, 18,(6), 795-805.

Zigler, E., Taussig, C. & Black, K. (1992). Early childhood intervention: A promising preventative for juvenile delinquency. American Psychologist, 47 (8) 997-1006.

Appendix A

I.D. _____

For each of the items, please circle the number that best describes your response:

1 = almost always or always true
2 = often true
3 = sometimes true
4 = seldom true
5 = almost never or never true

The following questions are about your relationship with your parents:

1. My parents respect my feelings.
   1 2 3 4 5
2. I feel my parents are successful as parents.
   1 2 3 4 5
3. I wish I had different parents.
   1 2 3 4 5
4. My parents accept me as I am.
   1 2 3 4 5
5. I have to rely on myself when I have a problem to solve.
   1 2 3 4 5
6. I like to get my parent's point of view on things that I am concerned about.
   1 2 3 4 5
7. I feel it's no use letting my feelings show.
   1 2 3 4 5
8. My parents sense when I am upset with something.
   1 2 3 4 5
9. Talking over problems with my parents makes me feel ashamed or foolish.
   1 2 3 4 5
10. My parents expect too much from me.
    1 2 3 4 5
11. I get upset easily at home.
    1 2 3 4 5
12. I get upset a lot more than my parents know about.
    1 2 3 4 5
13. When we discuss things, my parents consider my point of view
    1 2 3 4 5
14. My parents trust my judgment.
    1 2 3 4 5
15. My parents have their own problems, so I do not bother them with mine.
    1 2 3 4 5
16. My parents help me understand myself better.
    1 2 3 4 5
17. I tell my parents about my problems and troubles.
    1 2 3 4 5
18. I feel angry with my parents.
    1 2 3 4 5
19. I don't get much attention at home.
    1 2 3 4 5
20. My parents encourage me to talk about my difficulties.
    1 2 3 4 5
21. My parents understand me.

1 2 3 4 5

22. I don't know whom I can depend on these days.
1 2 3 4 5
23. When I am angry about something, my parents try to be understanding.
1 2 3 4 5
24. I trust my parents.
1 2 3 4 5
25. My parent's don't understand what I am going through these days.
1 2 3 4 5
26. I can count on my parents when I need to get something off of my chest.
1 2 3 4 5
27. I feel that no one understands me.
1 2 3 4 5
28. If my parents know something is bothering me, they ask me about it.
1 2 3 4 5

The following questions are about your relationship with your friends:

1. I like to get my gang/friend's point of view on things that I am concerned about.
1 2 3 4 5
2. My gang/friend sense when I am upset about something.
1 2 3 4 5
3. When we discuss things, my gang/friends consider my point of view.
1 2 3 4 5
4. Talking over problems with my gang/friends make me feel ashamed and embarrassed.
1 2 3 4 5
5. I wish I had a different gang/friends.
1 2 3 4 5
6. My gang/friends understand me.
1 2 3 4 5
7. My gang/friends encourage me to talk about my difficulties.
1 2 3 4 5
8. My friends accept me as I am.
1 2 3 4 5
9. I feel the need to be in touch with my gang/friends more often.
1 2 3 4 5
10. My gang/friends don't understand what I am going through these days.
1 2 3 4 5
11. I feel alone or apart when I am with my gang/friends.
1 2 3 4 5
12. My gang/friends listen to what I have to say.
1 2 3 4 5
13. I feel my gang/friends are good friends.
1 2 3 4 5
14. My gang/friends are fairly easy to talk too.
1 2 3 4 5
15. When I am angry about something, my gang/friends try to be understanding.
1 2 3 4 5
16. My gang/friends help me understand myself better.
1 2 3 4 5
17. My gang/friends are concerned about my well-being.
1 2 3 4 5
18. I feel angry with my gang/friends.
1 2 3 4 5
19. I can count on my gang/friends when I need to get something off my chest.

1 2 3 4 5

20. I trust my gang/friends.
1 2 3 4 5
21. My gang/friends respect my feelings.
1 2 3 4 5
22. I get upset a lot more then my gang/friends know about.
1 2 3 4 5
23. It seems as if my gang/friends are irritated with me for no reason.
1 2 3 4 5
24. I tell my gang/friends about my problems and troubles.
1 2 3 4 5
25. If my gang/friends know something is bothering me, they ask me about it.
1 2 3 4 5

I.D. _____

Which Kids I Am Like

Now we're going to ask you some questions about you and your mom. We are interested in what each of you is like, what kind of a person you are like. First let me explain how these questions work. Each question talks about two kinds of kids, and we want to know which kids are most like <u>you</u>. Here is a sample question.

Really True for me	Sort of True for me			Sort of True for me	Really True for me
☐	☐	Some kids would rather play outdoors in their spare time.	**BUT** Other kids would rather watch T.V.	☐	☐

What I want you to decide first is whether you are more like the kids on the left side who would rather play outdoors, or more like the kids on the right side who would rather watch T.V. Don't mark anything yet, but decide which kid is most like you and go to that side of the sentence. Now, decide whether that is <u>sort of true for you</u>, or <u>really true for you</u>, and check that box.

For each sentence you will only check <u>one</u> box, the one that goes with what is true for you, what you are most like.

Now we're going to ask you some questions about you and your mom. If you have both a mom and a stepmom, tell us about the one you live with.

Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
☐	☐	Some kids find it easy to trust their mom.	**BUT**	Other kids are not sure if they can trust their mom.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids feel like their mom butts in a lot when they are trying to do things.	**BUT**	Other kids feel like their mom lets them do things on their own.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids find it easy to count on their mom for help.	**BUT**	Other kids think it's hard to count on their mom.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids think their mom spends enough time with them.	**BUT**	Other kids think their mom does not spend enough time with them.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids do not really like telling their mom what they are thinking or feeling.	**BUT**	Other kids do like telling their mom what they are thinking or feeling.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids do not really need their mom for much.	**BUT**	Other kids need their mom for a lot of things.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids wish they were closer to their mom.	**BUT**	Other kids are happy with how close they are to their mom.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids worry that their mom does not really love them.	**BUT**	Other kids are <u>really</u> sure that their mom loves them.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids feel like their mom really understands them.	**BUT**	Other kids feel like their mom does not really understand them.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids are really sure their mom would not leave them.	**BUT**	Other kids sometimes wonder if their mom might leave them.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids worry that their mom might not be there when they need her.	**BUT**	Other kids are sure their mom will be there when they need her.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids think their mom does not listen to them.	**BUT**	Other kids do think their mom listens to them.	☐	☐

Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
☐	☐	Some kids go to their mom when they are upset.	**BUT**	Other kids do not go to their mom when they are upset.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids wish their mom would help them more with their problems.	**BUT**	Other kids think their mom helps them enough.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids feel better when their mom is around.	**BUT**	Other kids do not really feel better when their mom is around.	☐	☐

Now we're going to ask you some questions about you and your dad. If you have both a dad and a stepdad, tell us about the one you live with.

Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
☐	☐	Some kids find it easy to trust their dad.	**BUT**	Other kids are not sure if they can trust their dad.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids feel like their dad butts in a lot when they are trying to do things.	**BUT**	Other kids feel like their dad lets them do things on their own.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids find it easy to count on their dad for help.	**BUT**	Other kids think it's hard to count on their dad.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids think their dad spends enough time with them.	**BUT**	Other kids think their dad does not spend enough time with them.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids do not really like telling their dad what they are thinking or feeling.	**BUT**	Other kids do like telling their dad what they are thinking or feeling.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids do not really need their dad for much.	**BUT**	Other kids need their dad for a lot of things.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids wish they were closer to their dad.	**BUT**	Other kids are happy with how close they are to their dad.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids worry that their dad does not really love them.	**BUT**	Other kids are <u>really</u> sure that their dad loves them.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids feel like their dad really understands them.	**BUT**	Other kids feel like their dad does not really understand them.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids are really sure their dad would not leave them.	**BUT**	Other kids sometimes wonder if their dad might leave them.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids worry that their dad might not be there when they need him.	**BUT**	Other kids are sure their dad will be there when they need him.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids think their dad does not listen to them.	**BUT**	Other kids do think their dad listens to them.	☐	☐

Really True for me	Sort of True for me				Sort of True for me	Really True for me
☐	☐	Some kids go to their dad when they are upset.	**BUT**	Other kids do not go to their dad when they are upset.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids wish their dad would help them more with their problems.	**BUT**	Other kids think their dad helps them enough.	☐	☐
☐	☐	Some kids feel better when their dad is around.	**BUT**	Other kids do not really feel better when their dad is around.	☐	☐

Appendix C

I.D.

_____

Please circle the answer the best describes your response to the question.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
very strongly agree	strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	strongly disagree	very strongly disagree

Parents

I find that my parents are reluctant to get as close to me as I would like.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am not sure that I can always depend on my parents to be there when I need them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Sometimes my parents do not want to get close to me because I want so much to be close with them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on my parents.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am nervous when my parents get too close.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am uncomfortable being without my parents, but I sometimes worry that my parents do not value me as much as I value them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to my parents.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I want to be emotionally close to my parents, but I find it difficult to trust them completely.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am comfortable depending on my parents.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I often want to get closer to my parents than they want to get to me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Parents are never there when you need them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I know that my parents will be there when I need them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I find it difficult to trust my parents completely.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I do not often worry about my parents getting close to me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I do not often worry about my parents letting me down.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I want to be completely honest with my parents, but I often find that my parents are reluctant to get as close as I would like.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I find it relatively easy to get close to my parents.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

My desire to join sometimes scares my parents away.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to my parents.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Gangs/Friends

I find that my gang/friends are reluctant to get as close to me as I would like.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am not sure that I can always depend on my gang/friends to be there when I need them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Sometimes my gang/friends do not want to get close to me because I want so much to be close with them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on my gang/friends.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am nervous when my gang/friends get too close.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am uncomfortable being without my gang/friends, but I sometimes worry that they do not value me as much as I value them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to my gang/friends.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust my gang/friends completely.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am comfortable depending on my gang/friends.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I often want to get closer to my gang/friends than they want to get to me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Gang/friends are never there when you need them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I know that my gang/friends will be there when I need them.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I find it difficult to trust my gang/friends completely.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I do not often worry about my gang/friends getting close to me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I do not often worry about my gang/friends letting me down.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I want to be completely honest with my gang/friends, but I often find that they are reluctant to get as close as I would like.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I find it relatively easy to get close to my gang/friends.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

My desire to join sometimes scares my gang/friends away.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to my gang/friends.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

ID # ____ ____ ____ ____

MY PARENTS

For this questionnaire we are interested in how you TYPICALLY feel and act in your relationships with your parents. By parents, we mean all the people you consider to be parental figures; these figures may include natural, adopted, or stepparents--whomever you consider to be parental figures. Of course, your answers may be more influenced by the parent or parents that is/are more important to you. Some of these questions may not apply to all of your parental figures, but consider how they TYPICALLY apply. Please use the following scale.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither Disagree Nor Agree	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree

1. "MY PARENTS" act as if I count on them too much.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I consistently turn to "MY PARENTS" when upset or worried.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I am afraid that I turn to "MY PARENTS" more often than they want me to.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I seek out "MY PARENTS" when something bad happens.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I'm often still bothered after talking to "MY PARENTS" about a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
6. It's easy for me to turn to "MY PARENTS" when I have a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I do not often ask "MY PARENTS" to comfort me.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I feel that "MY PARENTS" believe that I depend on them too often.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I rely on "MY PARENTS" when I'm having troubles.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I worry that "MY PARENTS" think I need to be comforted too much.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Sometimes it is hard to know if "MY PARENTS" will be available when I turn to them.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I rarely feel like I need help from "MY PARENTS."	1	2	3	4	5
13. I rarely turn to "MY PARENTS" when upset.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I feel that "MY PARENTS" do not take my concerns or worries seriously.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I seek out "MY PARENTS" for comfort and support.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I worry that "MY PARENTS" will not understand what I need when I am bothered.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I am not the kind of person who quickly turns to "MY PARENTS" in times of need.	1	2	3	4	5
18. When I'm upset, "MY PARENTS" are often not able to comfort me.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I do not like to turn to "MY PARENTS" when I'm bothered about something.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I am afraid that "MY PARENTS" think I am too dependent.	1	2	3	4	5

The following statements refer to caring for your parents. Again, we are interested in what is typical of you. Please circle only one response for each statement.

1. I would rather "MY PARENTS" work out their problems by themselves.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I am not comfortable dealing with "MY PARENTS" when they are worried or bothered about a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I enjoy being able to take care of "MY PARENTS."	1	2	3	4	5
4. I often help "MY PARENTS" more than they need or want.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I do not like having to comfort or reassure "MY PARENTS."	1	2	3	4	5
6. I find it easy to be understanding of "MY PARENTS" and their needs.	1	2	3	4	5

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither Disagree Nor Agree	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree

7. I get too wrapped up in my "MY PARENTS'" worries.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I feel comfortable with "MY PARENTS" coming to me for help.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I do not like "MY PARENTS" to depend on me for help.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I create difficulties by taking on "MY PARENTS'" problems as if they were mine.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I am comfortable with the responsibilities of caring for "MY PARENTS."	1	2	3	4	5
12. It is relatively easy to respond to "MY PARENTS'" needs.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I want "MY PARENTS" to be independent and not need me.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I get over-involved in "MY PARENTS" problems.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Sometimes I try to comfort "MY PARENTS" more than the situation calls for.	1	2	3	4	5

The following statements refer to other feelings in relationships with your parents. Again, we are interested in what is typical of you. Please circle only one response for each statement.

1. I contribute more to making our relationship work than "MY PARENTS" do.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Both "MY PARENTS" and I make frequent efforts to see or talk with each other.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Spending time together is more important to me than to "MY PARENTS."	1	2	3	4	5
4. Truthfully, my relationships with "MY PARENTS" are just not that important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I do not want to put much energy into my relationship with "MY PARENTS."	1	2	3	4	5
6. "MY PARENTS" and I jointly make the important decisions in our relationship.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I want to do more things with "MY PARENTS" than they want to.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I do not put much effort into trying to have good relationships with "MY PARENTS."	1	2	3	4	5
9. "MY PARENTS" and I both contribute a lot to our relationship.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Our relationship is valued by both "MY PARENTS" and me.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I find that "MY PARENTS" are reluctant to get as close as I would like.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I am not that invested in my relationships with "MY PARENTS."	1	2	3	4	5
13. I want to be closer to "MY PARENTS" than they want to be with me.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I am not that interested in making my relationships with "MY PARENTS" the best they could be.	1	2	3	4	5
15. "MY PARENTS" and I really try to understand each others' points of view.	1	2	3	4	5

****

In this questionnaire we asked you to talk about your relationships with different parents. Different people may have been thinking about different parental figures. You may have thought mostly of one figure or several figures.

I was mostly thinking about: (check all that apply)

____ A natural/adopted mother	____ A natural/adopted father
____ A step-mother	____ A step-father
____ Other _____	____ Other _____

ID # ____ ____ ____ ____

MY FRIENDS

For this questionnaire we are interested in how you TYPICALLY feel and act in your relationships with your friends. We are not interested in a specific friend but how you usually act in your relationships with your friends. Therefore, we want you to consider both your past and present friends when answering this questionnaire. Of course, your answers may be more influenced by the relationships that are/were more important to you. Some of these questions may not apply to all of your relationships, but consider how they TYPICALLY apply. Please use the following scale.

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither Disagree Nor Agree	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree

1. "MY FRIENDS" act as if I count on them too much.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I consistently turn to "MY FRIENDS" when upset or worried.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I am afraid that I turn to "MY FRIENDS" more often than they want me to.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I seek out "MY FRIENDS" when something bad happens.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I'm often still bothered after talking to "MY FRIENDS" about a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
6. It's easy for me to turn to "MY FRIENDS" when I have a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I do not often ask "MY FRIENDS" to comfort me.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I feel that "MY FRIENDS" believe that I depend on them too often.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I rely on "MY FRIENDS" when I'm having troubles.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I worry that "MY FRIENDS" think I need to be comforted too much.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Sometimes it is hard to know if "MY FRIENDS" will be available when I turn to them.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I rarely feel like I need help from "MY FRIENDS."	1	2	3	4	5
13. I rarely turn to "MY FRIENDS" when upset.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I feel that "MY FRIENDS" do not take my concerns or worries seriously.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I seek out "MY FRIENDS" for comfort and support.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I worry that "MY FRIENDS" will not understand what I need when I am bothered.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I am not the kind of person who quickly turns to "MY FRIENDS" in times of need.	1	2	3	4	5
18. When I'm upset, "MY FRIENDS" are often not able to comfort me.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I do not like to turn to "MY FRIENDS" when I'm bothered about something.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I am afraid that "MY FRIENDS" think I am too dependent.	1	2	3	4	5

The following statements refer to caring for friends. Again, we are interested in what is typical of you. Please circle only one response for each statement.

1. I would rather "MY FRIENDS" work out their problems by themselves.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I am not comfortable dealing with "MY FRIENDS" when they are worried or bothered about a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I enjoy being able to take care of "MY FRIENDS."	1	2	3	4	5
4. I often help "MY FRIENDS" more than they need or want.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I do not like having to comfort or reassure "MY FRIENDS."	1	2	3	4	5
6. I find it easy to be understanding of "MY FRIENDS" and their needs.	1	2	3	4	5

1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither Disagree Nor Agree	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree

7. I get too wrapped up in my "MY FRIENDS'" worries.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I feel comfortable with "MY FRIENDS" coming to me for help.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I do not like "MY FRIENDS" to depend on me for help.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I create difficulties by taking on "MY FRIENDS'" problems as if they were mine.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I am comfortable with the responsibilities of caring for "MY FRIENDS."	1	2	3	4	5
12. It is relatively easy to respond to "MY FRIENDS'" needs.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I want "MY FRIENDS" to be independent and not need me.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I get over-involved in "MY FRIENDS" problems.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Sometimes I try to comfort "MY FRIENDS" more than the situation calls for.	1	2	3	4	5

The following statements refer to other feelings in relationships with friends. Again, we are interested in what is typical of you. Please circle only one response for each statement.

1. I contribute more to making our relationship work than "MY FRIENDS" do.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Both "MY FRIENDS" and I make frequent efforts to see or talk with each other.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Spending time together is more important to me than to "MY FRIENDS."	1	2	3	4	5
4. Truthfully, my relationships with "MY FRIENDS" are just not that important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I do not want to put much energy into my relationship with "MY FRIENDS."	1	2	3	4	5
6. "MY FRIENDS" and I jointly make the important decisions in our relationship.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I want to do more things with "MY FRIENDS" than they want to.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I do not put much effort into trying to have good relationships with "MY FRIENDS."	1	2	3	4	5
9. "MY FRIENDS" and I both contribute a lot to our relationship.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Our relationship is valued by both "MY FRIENDS" and me.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I find that "MY FRIENDS" are reluctant to get as close as I would like.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I am not that invested in my relationships with "MY FRIENDS."	1	2	3	4	5
13. I want to be closer to "MY FRIENDS" than they want to be with me.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I am not that interested in making my relationships with "MY FRIENDS" the best they could be.	1	2	3	4	5
15. "MY FRIENDS" and I really try to understand each others' points of view.	1	2	3	4	5

****

In this questionnaire we asked you to talk about your relationships with different friends. Different people may have been thinking about friend(s) from the past, or those in the present, or a mix of the two. How did you complete this questionnaire?

1. I was mostly thinking about:
   A. Friend(s) of the same sex **B.** Friend(s) of the opposite sex **C.** Both same and opposite sex

2. I was mostly thinking about:
   A. Friend(s) in the present **B.** Friend(s) in the past **C.** Some present and some past

3. I was mostly thinking about:
   A. One best friend **B.** 2 or 3 close friends **C.** A group of friends

Appendix E

I.D. _____

Please fill in the blank with the corresponding number that best answers each question for you:

(1) = Very Hard
(2) = Hard
(3) = Easy
(4) = Very Easy

1. Some teens want to play a video game (SEGA, Play Station). Asking them if you can play with them is _____ for you.

2. Some teens are arguing about how to play a game. Telling them the rules is _____ for you.

3. Some teens are making fun of your friend. Telling them to stop is _____ for you.

4. You want to start an activity. Asking other teens to join you is _____ for you.

5. A teen tries to take your turn during a game. Telling the teen it's your turn is _____ for you.

6. Some teens are going to lunch. Asking if you can sit with them is _____ for you.

7. A teen insults your family member. Telling the teen to stop is _____ for you.

8. A teen wants you to do something that will get you in trouble. Asking the teen to do something else is _____ for you.

9. Some teens are making fun of someone in your classroom. Telling them to stop is _____ for you.

10. Some teens need more people to be on their teams. Asking to be on a team is _____ for you.

11. You have to go to the store for your mother. Asking another teen to help you is _____ for you.

12. A teen always wants to be in the front seat when you drive somewhere. Telling the teen you are going to sit in the front is _____ for you.

13. Your class is doing a project and everyone needs a partner. Asking someone to be your partner is _____ for you.

14. A teen does not like your friend. Telling the teen to be nice to your friend is _____ for you.

15. Some teens are deciding what party to go to. Telling them about a party you like is _____ for you.

16. You are having fun at a party, but other teens want to leave. Asking them to stay is _____ for you.

17. You are working on a project. Asking another teen to help is ____ for you.

18. Some teens are taking things that belong to you. Asking them to give them back is _____ for you.

19. Some teens are deciding what to do after school. Telling them what you want to do is _____ for you.

20. A group of friends want to do something that you don't like to do. Asking them to do something that you like is _____ for you.

21. Some teens are planning a party. Asking them to invite a friend is _____ for you.

22. A teen is yelling and threatening you. Telling the teen to stop is _____ for you.

Appendix F

I.D. _____

Please rate yourself using the following scale in the following interpersonal situations:

1 = I am poor at this; I'd feel so uncomfortable and unable to handle this situation, I'd avoid it if at all possible

2 = I'm only fair at this, I'd feel uncomfortable and would have lots of difficulty handling this situation.

3 = I'm OK at this, I'd feel somewhat uncomfortable and have some difficulty handling this situation.

4 = I'm good at this; I'd feel quite comfortable and able to handle this situation.

5 = I'm EXTREMELY good at this; I'd feel very comfortable and could handle this situation very well.

_____ 1. Asking or suggesting to someone new that you get together and do something, (e.g., go out together)

_____ 2. Telling a companion you don't like a certain way he or she has been treating you.

_____ 3. Revealing something intimate about yourself while talking with someone you're just getting to know.

_____ 4. Helping a close companion work through his or her thoughts and feelings about a major life decision, e.g., a career choice.

_____5. Being able to admit that you might be wrong when a disagreement with a close companion begins to build a serious fight.

_____6. Finding and suggesting things to do with new people whom you find interesting and attractive.

_____7. Saying "no" when a date/acquaintance asks you to do something you don't want to do.

_____8. Confiding in a new friend/date and letting them see your softer more sensitive side.

_____9. Being able to patiently and sensitively listen to a companion "let off steam" about an outside problem s/he is having.

_____10. Being able to put begrudging (resentful) feelings aside when having a fight with a close companion.

_____11. Carrying on a conversation with someone new whom you think you might like to get to know.

_____ 12. Turning down a request by a companion that is unreasonable.

_____ 13. Telling a close companion things about yourself that you're ashamed of.

_____ 14. Helping a close companion get to the heart of a problems/he is experiencing.

_____ 15. When having a conflict with a close companion, really listening to his or her complaints and trying not to "read" his or her mind.

_____ 16. Being an interesting and enjoyable person to be with when first getting to know people.

_____ 17. Standing up for your rights when a companion is neglecting you or being inconsiderate.

_____ 18. Letting a new companion get to know the "real you."

_____ 19. Helping a close companion cope with family or roommate problems.

_____ 20. Being able to take a companion's perspective in a fight and really understand his or her point of view.

_____ 21. Introducing yourself to someone you might like to get to know (or date).

_____ 22. Telling a date or acquaintance that he or she is doing something that is embarrassing you.

_____ 23. Letting down your protective "outer shell" and trusting a close companion.

_____ 24. Being a good and sensitive listener for a companion who is upset.

_____ 25. Refraining from saying things that might cause a disagreement to build into a big fight.

_____ 26. Calling (on the phone) a new date/acquaintance to set up a time to get together and do something.

_____ 27. Confronting your close companion when he or she has broken a promise.

_____ 28. Telling a close companion about the things that secretly make you feel anxious or afraid.

_____ 29. Being able to do and say things to support a close companion when s/he is feeling down.

_____ 30. Being able to work through a specific problem with a companion without resorting to global accusations ("you always do that")

_____ 31. Presenting a first good impressions to people you might like to become friends with (or date).

_____ 32. Telling a companion that he/she has done something to hurt your feelings.

_____ 33. Telling a close companion how much you appreciate and care for him or her.

_____ 34. Being able to show genuine and empathetic concern even when the companion's problem is uninteresting to you.

_____ 35. When angry with a companion, being able to accept that he/she has a valid point of view even if you don't agree with that point of view.

_____ 36. Going to parties or gatherings where you don't know the person well in order to start up new relationships.

_____ 37. Telling a date/acquaintance that he or she has done something that made you angry.

_____ 38. Knowing how to move a conversation with a date/acquaintance beyond superficial talk to really get to know each other.

_____ 39. When a close companion needs help and support, being able to give advice in ways that are well received.

_____ 40. Not exploding at a close companion (even when it is justified) in order to avoid a damaging conflict.

Appendix G

I.D. _____

Please circle the answer that best describes your response to the following questions.

1	2	3	4
does not apply at all	applies slightly if at all	applies somewhat	applies very strongly

1. I am generous with my friends.
   1 2 3 4

2. I quickly get over and recover from being startled.
   1 2 3 4

3. I enjoy dealing with new and unusual situations.
   1 2 3 4

4. I usually succeed in making favorable impressions on people.
   1 2 3 4

5. I enjoy trying new foods that I have never tasted before.
   1 2 3 4

6. I am regarded as an energetic person.
   1 2 3 4

7. I like to take different paths to familiar places
   1 2 3 4

8. I am more curious than most people.
   1 2 3 4

9. Most of the people I meet are likable.
   1 2 3 4

10. I usually think carefully about something before acting.
    1 2 3 4

11. I like to do new and different things.
    1 2 3 4

Structured Questionnaire

Initials:

Race: White Black Hispanic Bi-racial

Age:

Does the family receive Public Assistance: Yes No

Substance Abuse History: Does Client use?
Alcohol Marijuana Both Neither Other

Past Treatment:
Out-Patient Counseling Residential Treatment

Education:
Last grade completed
Grades: Above Average Average Failing
Suspended Expelled

Physical Health:
Good Needs Improvement
Taking medication: yes no

Legal problems:
Diversion Probation Parole
How many different crimes have they committed?
How many times in the Youth Center or other Detainment
How many times have they been caught?

Family:
Reside with: Mom Dad Both family non-relatives
Do they have contact with biological parents:
Parents: married divorced re-married

Why did you join a gang?

How long have you been a gang member?