University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

6-1-1996

Family Factors in the Delinquency Puzzle

Jessie L. Krienert
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Krienert, Jessie L., "Family Factors in the Delinquency Puzzle" (1996). *Student Work*. 2184.
https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2184

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

FAMILY FACTORS IN THE DELINQUENCY PUZZLE

A Thesis

Presented to the Department of Criminal Justice

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

Jessie L. Krienert

June 1996

UMI Number: EP73726

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI EP73726

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

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 Master of Arts, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Name	Department
Bill Wakefield	Criminal Justice
D. Wayne Osgood	Sociology

Chairperson

June 27, 1996

Date

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to evaluate the impact of different family factors on juvenile delinquency. Specifically, this thesis examined parental monitoring, attachment to parents, and family structure by investigating their single and combined effects on delinquency. In addition, the current study addresses the effects family factors have on different levels of delinquent behavior.

Four hypotheses were tested. The first one, suggests that children living in single-parent homes will exhibit higher levels of self reported delinquency than those in two-parent families. The second states that attachment to both mothers and fathers will have an impact on delinquency. The third proposes that high levels of parental monitoring will lead to lower levels of self-reported delinquency. The final hypothesis involves a combined model, including attachment and monitoring as a better predictor of delinquency than family status.

Data was collected from a sample of 5,935 eighth-grade students attending public schools in eleven different sites across the country, during the spring of 1995. Results of regression analysis strongly supported three hypotheses and yielded limited support to the fourth. Specifically, children from single-parent homes reported higher levels of self-reported delinquency than did children from two-parent homes. Moreover, strong attachments and high parental monitoring revealed lower levels of delinquency. In addition, a model

containing both parental attachments and monitoring was a better predictor of delinquency than family status alone. However, the significance of single parent families did not drop significantly with the addition of the new variables.

The discussion provides possible explanations for the family differences that were found. The present study reemphasizes the need to examine the combined impact of family factors on delinquent behavior.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FAMILY FACTORS IN THE DELINQUENCY PUZZLE

INTRODUCTION

A statement made by Becker in 1963, perhaps most thoroughly describes the problems with many delinquency studies:

> There are simply not enough studies that provide us with facts about the lives of delinquents. Many studies correlate the incidence of delinquency with such factors as kind of neighborhood, kind of family life or kind of personality. Very few tell us in detail what a juvenile delinquent does in his daily round of activity, and what he thinks about himself, society, and his activities (Becker, 1963: 166).

Prior research has shown that socio-economic status, sex, age, race, and a variety of alternative factors can contribute to delinquency (e.g., Canter, 1982; Cernkovich and Giordano, 1987; Elliott and Ageton, 1980; Hirschi and Gottfredson, 1983; Seydlitz, 1991). Although there is no clear consensus on what factors directly cause delinquency, many believe the answer lies in the family. Only after family relationships have been properly examined, can the effects of other factors be sorted out (Rankin & Kern, 1994: 513). This is not to say other factors do not have importance in the area of delinquency. However, the family holds a great influence over a child's behavior. Therefore, it is clear

that the family is not the only variable that affects a child's behavior, but perhaps the most prominent one.

The connection between family and delinquency has become popular in journal articles, clinical writing, social welfare case studies, police reports and popular literature (Geismar and Wood, 1986). Many of these sources report the connections between disturbed family situations and the delinquent behavior of young people. If such a vast field of disciplines has examined family and delinquency, a question then forms as to why there is not an established discipline formed solely to examine the area of family and delinquency. Although many disciplines have sub-areas devoted to family and delinquency, no discipline exists that only examines the intricate workings of the family-delinquency relationship. If one existed, perhaps more studies would exist, examining the individual and combined impact of different family and delinquency factors and the policy implications they may hold.

One reason for the lack of concise research in this area is the separation between the family and criminal justice disciplines. The information found in the clinical family studies, the majority done in psychology, is not readily shared with what is found in the criminological area, and vice versa. Many times, the different terminologies and methodological differences cause a breakdown in interdisciplinary communication (Geismar and Wood, 1986).

Another reason for the lack of consistent study in this area, has been the belief that family is more important in predicting female delinquency than male (Nye, 1973: 49). Since the majority of past studies have focused on male delinquency, this has minimized the importance of family factors. This, along with the belief that family variables are not as important as peer relations, school

behavior, and other structural factors, has led to a lack of reliable family and delinquency information (Cernkovich and Giordano, 1987).

The belief that family is the responsible party in the causation of delinquency is not new. The juvenile justice system was founded in part on this belief. In a series of reports written in 1820, Codwaler Colden, Mayor of New York City, and presiding judge of the municipal court penned his concern that many children who came before his court had not received proper care from their parents (Bernard, 1992: 61). The child saving movement in the late 1800's also stressed the importance of family, introducing the absence of parental supervision as a leading factor toward deviance (Platt, 1977: 82).

The "*Parens Patriae*" doctrine provides that the state is authorized to "act in 'loco parentis' for the purpose of protecting the property interests and the person of the child" (Geiger and Fischer, 1995: 17). This was the underlying philosophy behind the first juvenile court, established in 1899. According to Judge Mack (Geiger and Fischer, 1995: 17):

> The conception of the state as the higher parent has a specific obligation to step in when the natural parent either through viciousness or inability fails so to deal with the child that it no longer goes along the right path that leads to good, sound, adult citizenship.

In recent times, several perspectives have come forth. One idea pertains to the family's influence on delinquency , stressing its role as a socioeconomic unit. This role affects the child's opportunities, including good schools, services,

occupations and status (Van Voorhis, *et al.*, 1988: 239). Several researchers have focused on structural differences such as broken homes, family size, or birth order (Gove and Crutchfield, 1982; Rahav, 1981; Wilkinson *et al.*, 1982). Still others have chosen to examine measures of parental identification and attachment (Hirschi, 1971; Nye, 1973; Rankin and Kern, 1994).

The link between family and delinquency has been explored on many levels. Empirically, family factors have generally shown a significant effect on delinquency. In fact, the basic relationship between family and delinquency has been found to be significant literally hundreds of times [1]. Delinquency is generally found at a higher rate in families with marital problems, a lack of control over child behaviors, little or no attachment between children and parents, poor communication and excessive or lenient punishment (Bahr, 1979; Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986; Patterson, 1982; Wells and Rankin, 1985; 1988). The goal of the present study is to examine both the separate and combined impacts of family factors and their effects on self-reported delinquency[2]. In this investigation, three main components will be examined as delinquency causing factors: (1) family structure, (2) parental attachment , and (3) discipline or direct social control.

---

[1]See Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986, for a partial listing.

[2]This research is supported under award #94-IJ-CX-0058 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

FAMILY STRUCTURE

The internal make-up of the family has been considered a salient factor in delinquency causation for over a century (Geismar and Wood, 1986: 14). Structural differences in family settings that are commonly linked with juvenile delinquency include: family size, birth order, broken homes, and working mothers.

FAMILY SIZE

The quality of family relationships is often found to have a greater influence on delinquency than family structure. The correlation of family size and delinquency is consistent with this finding. In a large family, parents spend less time, energy, and other resources per child. Therefore, children in larger families spend more time socializing with each other than with a parent. This puts other siblings into the roles of teachers and socializers of their brothers and sisters. Younger siblings will turn to older brothers or sisters as sources to model or imitate in the process of learning appropriate behavior. This is a cause for concern since research has shown that family size may be linked to delinquency due to the increased possibility of having at least one delinquent sibling in a larger family. Brownfield and Sorenson (1994) found that the chances of having a delinquent sibling increase from 25 percent among boys with one to two siblings, to 58 percent among boys with three or more.

Family size has also been linked to delinquency in conjunction with social class. Wilson and Herrnstein (1985) found that family size was closely associated with economic deprivation. This would cause more stress in large families that were trying to divide resources among many children. The

increased stress is one area that could be a factor contributing to the higher rate of abused children coming from larger families as compared with smaller families (Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985). Another variable closely related to social class and family size is educational attainment. Powell and Steelman (1990) found that larger families are less likely to achieve higher levels of educational attainment when compared to smaller families. However, Brownfield and Sorenson (1994) still found a significant correlation between delinquency and family size when controlling for social class.

Other disadvantages found with larger families include lower family income, greater likelihood of receiving welfare assistance, younger maternal age, greater likelihood of parental criminality, and increased chances of living in a broken home (Morash and Rucker, 1989). It is important to note, however, that even when controlling for each one of the stated variables, a significant relationship between family size and delinquency still remains (Brownfield and Sorenson, 1994).

BIRTH ORDER

Order of birth is another area that has been examined in relation to delinquency. Children occupying different positions in birth order experience different patterns of interaction with both parents and siblings (Rahav 1981). Most research finds that first born children are less likely to commit delinquency than the middle or youngest children (Stein *et al.*, 1988). First born children have a one-on-one relationship with the parents in early childhood. According to Brownfield and Sorenson (1994), this helps to ensure a more complete and conventional socialization. Kanmeyer (1967) found that first born children are

more likely to identify with their parents and internalize parental values. In addition, the oldest child receives more time and economic resources in the beginning than do middle or youngest children. However, it has also been found that oldest children have increased parental expectations and responsibilities later on in childhood (Stein *et al.,* 1988). This could be a partial explanation of contrary findings such as those by Stein *et al.,* (1988), which show the first born has a tendency to indulge in delinquent behavior at a higher rate than the middle or younger child.

Some research has shown that middle children are over represented in the delinquent population (Glueck and Glueck, 1950: 120; Nye, 1973: 37). According to Nye (1973), the youngest and middle children are more likely to become delinquents. Similarly, some theorists believe that middle children get squeezed out of a family and into a more delinquent subculture, since parents pay more attention to the oldest and youngest offspring (Geismar and Wood, 1986). Another factor in higher middle child delinquency is proposed by Rahav (1981). He theorizes that there is always a higher number of siblings at home for the middle child than for the first or last born. Therefore, the middle child always receives proportionately less of the families resources, both economic and social, that are available. Hirschi (1971: 241), however, disagrees, believing there is only an erratic relationship between delinquency and ordinal family positions when family size is controlled.

WORKING MOTHERS

In 1955, 60 percent of all households in the United States consisted of a working father, a housewife mother and two or more school age children. By

1985, only seven percent of all households fit this profile (Geiger and Fischer, 1995: 18). Some researchers believe the increase in working mothers is a direct factor relating to child delinquency. The theory behind working mothers as a causal factor of child delinquency relies upon the traditional belief that the mother should stay home as a full time nurturer for her children (Geismar and Wood, 1986: 18). This theory suggests that mothers who work will fail in the areas of socialization and nurturing, thus increasing the likelihood of producing a delinquent child. Although many researchers have claimed significant links between working mothers and delinquent children, when broken homes, child supervision, attachment and other prominent variables are controlled, working mothers as a causal factor inevitably loses statistical significance (Nye, 1973; Hirschi, 1971; Glueck and Glueck, 1957). Supporting these findings, McCord (1991) found that the stability of the family environment canceled out the negative effects of maternal employment. In fact, only among unstable families did employment of the mother contribute to delinquent behavior.

BROKEN HOMES

The two-parent home has been long considered an American standard. Although it may be tradition, it is no longer the norm for a growing number of families in the United States. An increasing number of single parent homes exist. Supporting evidence shows that the number of divorces in relation to marriages has risen from 10.8 percent in 1916 to 25.8 percent in 1960, to 50 percent in 1991 (US Statistical Abstracts, 1993: 73). The term broken home refers to a family structure "broken" by divorce, widowhood, or separation. Broken homes have been looked upon as a major factor in the delinquency

problem for many years. The United States Children's Bureau published statistics from 1928 showing that 29 percent of all boys and 48 percent of all girls brought to court were not living with both parents. The 1923 Census Bureau Statistics also indicated the same trend, with 46 percent of all children in institutions coming from broken homes (Geismar and Wood, 1986: 15).

With the decreasing number of intact nuclear families, there has been an increase in conservative ideological support for keeping the traditional nuclear family as the main socialization institution (Wells and Rankin, 1985). This "family values" attitude has caused much of delinquency to be explained away by the broken home philosophy.

Although a relationship between family structure and delinquency has been found to exist, the relationship is modest when measured by official data and weak when measured by self-report data (Van Voorhis *et al.*, 1988: 236). In addition, differing results occur when type of delinquent behavior (Canter, 1982; Wells and Rankin, 1985) and sample size (Wells and Rankin, 1985) are taken into consideration. However, studies have consistently shown that children who are processed through the juvenile justice system are disproportionately likely to come from broken homes (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; McCord, 1991; Smith and Walters, 1978).

One explanation for this disproportionate measure is the "paternalistic, self-fulfilling and biased" response of the juvenile justice system to children from broken homes (McCord, 1991). Johnson (1986) found that both school and justice officials discriminate on the basis of family structure alone. It surfaced that officials perceive daughters of single mothers to be in great need of official intervention, believing the single mother is not competent enough to care for her

child. Results from Johnson's study show that girls from mother only homes are more likely to be suspended from school, picked up by police, and sent to juvenile court. These results point to the idea that broken homes may be producing official delinquents without producing more delinquent behavior (Johnson, 1986).

Another view suggests that broken homes are not only missing a role model, but also have fewer emotional and economic resources than a two-parent home would have (Burgess, 1980). Johnson (1986) also theorized that family break-up would reduce the quality of parent-child relationships, which would in turn increase the likelihood of delinquent behavior.

Although the broken home scenario has long been considered a worthy explanation of delinquent behavior, recent studies have shown a clearer picture. The quality of family life plays an important role in delinquency. Since intact nuclear families still produce juvenile delinquents, other explanations have come forth to describe the broken home/delinquency relationship. McCord and McCord (1959) found that delinquency was much higher in two-parent homes containing high conflict and neglect, than in broken homes (Van Voorhis, *et al.*, 1988: 240). Nye (1973) found consistent results that unhappy and dysfunctional homes are stronger correlates of delinquency than broken homes. Gove and Crutchfield (1982) found both marital status and marital conflict to be predictors of delinquency.

The methodology in many family structure studies, include broken homes as a variable, but do not examine the interrelationships between family structure and other strong functional characteristics (Van Voorhis, *et al.*, 1988: 237). Recent studies have found broken home variables to be nonsignificant in

explaining delinquency. Cernkovich and Giordano (1987) found the areas of communication, identity, support, control, supervision, and conflict to be related to child delinquency in all structure situations. Rosen (1985) also found the broken home to be an unimportant factor in the area of delinquency.

In summary, past research has revealed a fairly consistent trend relating family structure to delinquent behavior. Children coming from larger and/or single-parent homes have a greater likelihood of reporting delinquency than those from smaller or intact households (Brownfield and Sorenson, 1994; Morash and Rucker, 1989; Van Voorhis et al., 1988; Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985).

Additional structural factors including working mothers and ordinal position in the family have also been linked with delinquency, although not as consistently as broken homes and large family size (Geismar and Wood, 1986; Rahav, 1981). The following section will discuss literature focusing on parental attachments.

ATTACHMENT

The attachment component is also a front runner in the area of family and delinquency. Attachments are defined as the affective ties that children form with significant others, especially family and parents (Rankin and Kern, 1994: 496). According to Hirschi (1971), attachments refer to how strongly a child cares about the opinions and expectations of his or her parents. The broad category of attachment is made up of several subcomponents, including indications of affection and love, interest and concern, support and help, trust,

encouragement, lack of rejection, desire for physical closeness, amount of interaction or positive communication, and identification (Rankin and Wells, 1990: 142).

Hirschi (1971: 85-94) noted three major areas of parent-child attachments:

1. Affectional identification--the love and respect children have for their parents.
2. Intimacy of communication--the sharing of personal concerns and opinions with their parents.
3. Supervision--the "psychological presence" of parents when opportunities for delinquency arise.

AFFECTIONAL IDENTIFICATION

Even early research by Bowlby (1952) portrayed the mother-child relationship as the main element in human development. Bowlby found that if a child does not receive warm feelings from the mother-child relationship, maternal deprivation occurs. He further went on to cite maternal deprivation as a significant indicator of later delinquency. The Gluecks (1950) also found that more hostility and less affection between parent and child occurred more often in the delinquent than nondelinquent group. Similarly, Nye (1973) found that rejection of the child by the parent, or parent by the child relates strongly to juvenile delinquency. Although many studies have supported this relationship, Johnson (1979) did not find a significant relationship between affective parent-child ties and delinquent behavior.

INTIMACY OF COMMUNICATION

This occurs when parents achieve positive communication with their children. This entails the sharing of their feelings and the reasoning behind household rules with their children. Furthermore, the children must also share their plans, thoughts, and opinions with their parents for this to be accomplished (Seydlitz, 1993: 245). Intimacy of communication is therefore a reciprocal relationship between parents and children within the attachment category. Once positive communication is established, the level of supervision may also increase. The combined effect of the parents' "psychological presence" along with intimacy of communication may work together to lessen delinquency.

INTERNALIZED SUPERVISION

This component of attachment is highly related to the two other attachment components. When the child identifies with the parent and communicates his or her thoughts and feelings with that parent, he or she is then more likely to internalize the parent's beliefs and feelings. It would then follow that when a situation arose where a deviant path could be followed, the child would clearly consider the thoughts and opinions of his or her parents before committing a delinquent act, regardless of the parent's physical presence.

Strong parent-child attachments will result in fewer delinquent behaviors, since the children do not want to upset existing parent-child relationships (Rankin and Wells, 1994). Strong attachments encourage children to spend time with the family as opposed to criminal settings, thereby reducing the chance of delinquent activity. In addition, strongly attached children are more likely to have

internalized their parents' beliefs and values. It then follows that these internalized parental beliefs would govern children's behavior. This leads to the idea of having parents "psychologically present", watching over their children's behavior even when they are not physically present (Van Voorhis, *et al.*, 1988: 239).

Juveniles who are not strongly attached to their parents may not have the same internalized beliefs as those with strong attachments. This could make children insensitive to their parents' opinions and rules. It would then follow that children with weak attachments would be less likely to follow their parents' norms or to take their parental feelings into consideration when deciding whether or not to commit delinquent acts (Rankin and Wells, 1990: 142). If the children are not bound by the parents' conventional norms, they are then free to commit deviant acts.

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

Empirical research generally finds a significant relationship between weak parental attachment and a high probability of delinquency (Canter, 1982; Rankin and Kern, 1994; Wells and Rankin, 1988). It has been consistently shown that low degrees of parental support or attachment are strong predictors of delinquency, substance abuse and other deviant behaviors (Jang and Krohn, 1995: 168). In fact, regardless of how delinquency and parent-child relationships are defined or measured, or what population is studied, research consistently shows that poor parent-child relationships are associated with higher levels of delinquency (Rosen, 1985: 560).

AGE AND GENDER

Both age and gender effects have been found in the area of attachment. Although Johnson *et al.* (1995) found that female adolescents are less susceptible to deviance or delinquency than males, female delinquency is still believed to be influenced more by family factors than is male delinquency (Gove and Crutchfield, 1982; Rosenbaum, 1987). Hagan *et al.* (1990) found gender effects on minor forms of delinquency to be strongly related to the parent-child relationship. The impact of parental attachment on delinquency can vary by age, with stronger attachments found earlier in childhood (Jang and Krohn, 1995: 168). In similar studies, it was found that younger females who are less attached to their parents are less likely to internalize rules and less likely to view rules as legitimate than males of the same age, or older children of either sex (Seydlitz, 1993: 267).

ONE- VS TWO-PARENT ATTACHMENT

Does strong attachment to both parents have an additional impact on delinquency beyond strong attachment to only one parent? Attachment studies almost exclusively focus on only attachment to the mother or the father, or an aggregate measure of attachment to both mother or father. Few studies have examined the combined impact of attachment to both mother and father, or controlled for different types of delinquency (Rankin and Kern, 1994). It is important to find out if mothers or fathers have a greater impact on their child's delinquency. Or, if a strong attachment to both mother and father could have an additional effect on delinquency.

According to Hirschi (1971: 104), knowing attachment attitudes towards both parents does not add predictive power in the area of delinquency. However, other researchers have had conflicting results. Johnson (1987) found that the father's role was greater than the mother's in predicting delinquency. On the other hand, Krohn and Massey (1980) found attachment to the mother to be a better predictor of delinquency than ties with the father.

Rankin and Kern (1994: 505) found that attachment to one parent can prevent delinquency as well as two attachments. Additionally, they also found that strong attachment to both parents was associated with a lower probability of committing delinquency than strong attachment to only one parent. The underlying explanation for less delinquency with two strong attachments lies in the idea that the child would then have an even greater stake in conformity. Rankin and Kern (1994) suggest that the child with two attachments would risk losing the affection and respect of both parents, instead of only one. They further note that strong attachment to a second parent does not reduce the probability of committing delinquency in half, rather the combined attachment makes the probability stronger than only a single attachment. An additional reason for less delinquency occurring when attachments to both parents exist involves the addition of a second role model. With two attachments, the internalized rules and beliefs could theoretically become much stronger. This could then lead to a greater chance of reducing the likelihood of delinquent behavior.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING ATTACHMENT STUDIES

Questions in relation to attachment fall in the area of perception and positive versus negative attachment. For instance, studies show that children of psychiatrically impaired parents, especially substance abusers or those with depression disorders, have a greater risk of alcohol and drug use (Jang and Krohn, 1995: 168). Therefore, although the child may have a strong attachment to one or both parents, the rules the parent has socialized the child to follow may not be the rules of conformity. For instance, if the parent promotes illegal activity, the child could then form a strong attachment with the parent by committing the admired illegal activity.

It is also important in an attachment study to capture both the parent and the child's perception of the attachment. It follows that the closer the attachment of the parent to the child, the more likely the parent is to care about the child's behaviors, and, in turn, supervise and monitor the child's behavior (Smith *et al.*, 1991). It is also possible that delinquent behavior by the child will influence the attachment the parent has for the child. When mutual parent-child attachment does not exist, less trust occurs, as does a lower level of rule internalization. This means children will be more likely to view both the rules themselves and the reasons for why the rules are imposed as illegitimate, thus increasing delinquent behavior (Seydlitz, 1993: 265).

In summary, numerous researchers have found evidence to support an inverse relationship between parental attachment and delinquency. Weak parent-child attachment has consistently been associated with higher levels of delinquent behavior (Rosen, 1985). In addition, this relationship is believed to

vary with both age and gender. Attachment is found to be stronger in both females and younger children (Seydlitz, 1993). Another category of attachment involves one- and two-parent attachments. Conflicting results have been found as to which parent better predicts delinquency, and if attachment to both parents can further reduce delinquent behavior (Rankin and Kern, 1994). The following section will review literature on the different aspects of direct social control.

DISCIPLINE/DIRECT SOCIAL CONTROL

Social control can include many different controls and restrictions over children's behaviors. Direct control is control imposed by discipline, restriction and punishment (Seydlitz, 1991: 603). It is the level of use of reinforcement techniques to direct or channel children's behaviors (Rosen, 1985: 555). Examples include regulation over owning a car, freedom to date, amount of time spent with friends, and the type of punishment or reward used to enforce parental rules and regulations (Wells and Rankin, 1988: 264). By using direct control, parents control their children by controlling their time allowed away from home, their choice of companions, and their types of activities (Nye, 1973: 7). Parents also utilize direct control when promising and delivering punishment, and when rewarding conformity (Seydlitz, 1991). Two main categories exist under the broad component of social control. They are supervision or monitoring, and punishment.

SUPERVISION OR MONITORING

Monitoring is made up of several parental activities. The level of monitoring depends on how well known children's actions and activities are both

in the home and out. It includes components such as knowing children's friends and whereabouts. Neglect is an area which falls under the category of inadequate monitoring. Neglect can be described by poor monitoring of the children's activities both inside and especially outside of the home. Parents who do not spend enough time positively interacting with their children are very likely unaware of delinquent acts their children commit. In addition, spending little time together and being unaware of their children's behaviors does not allow the parents' consistent opportunities to discipline their children. Neglect or child maltreatment also lessens the bonds formed in socialization, and, in turn, weakens the effect of parental reinforcement (Van Voorhis et al., 1988: 239). Hirschi (1971) reported that children who believe their parents are unaware of their whereabouts are very likely to commit delinquent acts. Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) found nine different studies where lack of supervision was significantly related to delinquency. In fact, the summary of their comprehensive review concluded that lax supervision is the most powerful parenting predictor of delinquent behavior (Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986).

Gender and Age Differences. Gender and age differences have been found in supervision. The degree of supervision parents exercise over daughters as compared to sons is not equal. Females are encouraged to stay closer to home. In addition, their behaviors and activities are more likely to be monitored highly by their parents than are the behaviors or activities of males (Hagan *et al.*, 1990; Nye, 1973:199). Younger children are also more closely monitored and

supervised than older children, thus affecting the potential of older children to commit delinquency (White *et al.*, 1987).

Chesney-Lind and Shelden (1992) also found this trend. They found that through mid-adolescence, girls continue to be closely monitored by their parents because parents become increasingly concerned about their daughter's future. This is fostered by the belief that increased supervision will protect the females by increasing parental control. Males, on the other hand, are given more leeway, and less control, following the belief that they should be more independent and require less supervision. However, Stockardt and Johnson (1992) found that later in adolescence parents lose control over both males and females, which then reduces the behavioral gender differences (Johnson, et al., 1995: 193).

The finding that females are more likely to be supervised than males may lead to a partial explanation in the difference of male versus female delinquency rates (Johnson et al, 1995: 193). It has also been found that poor supervision is significantly related to boys' association with delinquent peers and, furthermore, that poor supervision and delinquent peers are directly related to delinquency (Patterson, 1986). It would seem likely that children who wander the streets with no adult supervision and who also associate with delinquent peers have a greater risk of serious and higher rates of delinquency than those with supervision (Stockardt and Johnson, 1992).

PUNISHMENT

Punishment is defined as "applying negative unwanted sanctions to misbehavior and deviation" (Wells and Rankin, 1988: 265). It is composed of the consequences given by parents for children's rule violations. Loeber and

Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) found that delinquent children were more likely to have a parent who avoided disciplining. They also found that less consistent discipline was related to delinquent behavior, as was harsh discipline. Similarly, Glueck and Glueck (1950) found that boys with the highest level of delinquent behavior experienced "overly strict, erratic, or lax paternal discipline." Their findings also revealed that nondelinquent behavior was related to firm but kind discipline. In turn, physical punishment was found more often in delinquent than in nondelinquent children. A comprehensive review of the literature by Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber in 1986, found that in prior studies, physical punishment was generally associated with delinquency. The same finding was also true for child abuse. Children from abused homes were disproportionately likely to engage in delinquent activities. McCord and McCord (1959) disagreed, with their findings showing that consistency has a greater impact on a children's behavior than the type of discipline being utilized. Therefore, if strict or lax punishment was predominately used, no differences in delinquent behavior should occur.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING DIRECT SOCIAL CONTROL

Although measures of direct control have been found to be associated with delinquent behavior, it is still unclear how much of a role it plays. The main criticism of direct control falls under physical limitations. Direct control can only be applied to the child if he or she is in the direct proximity to the parent. Therefore, if a child is outside the parental house, without the parent, the impact of direct control is lost. This leads back to the area of indirect controls, especially parental attachment having a major impact in the family delinquency equation (Wells and Rankin, 1988: 266).

In summary, evidence supporting the link between social control and delinquency has been found by numerous researchers. Poor supervision has been consistently found to predict delinquency (Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber 1986). Both gender and age differences have been found in relation to supervision. As with parental attachment, females and younger children report higher levels of parental monitoring (Hagan *et al.*, 1990; White *et al.*, 1987).

In addition, punishment both too harsh and too lenient has been linked with delinquent behavior. In general, however, physical punishment has been a strong predictor of delinquency (McCord 1959; Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber 1986). The following section will discuss the interactions of different family components in relation to delinquency.

COMPONENT INTERACTIONS

Although family and delinquency can be examined in three separate components, it is equally important to examine them as interrelating factors within the discipline. Many studies show that multiple family problems will increase the likelihood of adolescent deviance (Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986; Cernkovich and Giordano, 1987). Rankin and Wells (1990) found interactions among parental attachment and direct parental controls with delinquency. Direct controls are better inhibitors of delinquency when children are more attached to their parents. A combination of low parental attachments and high direct control has been found to lead to increased delinquency (Seydlitz, 1993). Interactions are also found when examining direct control or attachment in relation to family structure. For instance, if parents are in conflict,

or not living under the same roof, it may lessen supervision on children. In addition, parental attachment has been found to influence parental monitoring of children's behaviors, which may interfere with the detection of delinquent behavior.

In conclusion, examinations of the interactions between attachment, structure, and direct controls have shown to be better predictors of delinquency than only examining single family factors (Seydlitz, 1993). However, much more research is needed to examine the complexity of the relationship between family variables and delinquency.

In addition, different methodologies need to be examined. Most studies are based on information that children provide about their parents and about their own delinquent behavior. These studies don't distinguish the causes from the effects. A question of validity also arises when using self-reported data. Relying on children to report on their parents' child-rearing behavior assumes the children have correctly perceived, accurately recalled, and honestly reported the behavior of their parents (McCord, 1991). Although many positive findings exist in the area of self-reported data, questions still remain as to the level of validity achieved when using self-reports (Huizinga & Elliott 1986).

THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study examines the direct and indirect influences of several family factors, including structure, attachment, and direct social control, through the use of parental monitoring, on self-reported delinquency. In order to thoroughly examine family factors relating to delinquency, the impact of attachment will be evaluated both by sex of the child, and attachment to the mother and the father separately. In addition, structural and supervision variables will be used to judge the effects of parental attachment on delinquency.

As is the trend with much family and delinquency research, the present study will make use of self-reported attachment and delinquency variables. However, unlike much of the existing literature, this study examines different levels of delinquency, including status offenses and crimes against persons.

The current study is significant, since it is one of relatively few that focuses on the interaction effects between competing components of family and delinquency. Of even more importance, this study allows for examination of gender and race effects using a national sample.

The study uses data from the national evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T. (Gang Resistance Education And Training) program. G.R.E.A.T. is a gang prevention program currently taught in schools across the country. The program consists of nine 45-60 minute class periods administered to seventh grade students in public schools by a uniformed police officer. Lessons cover various topics, including

cultural sensitivity and prejudice, conflict resolution, drugs and gangs, and other skill building areas.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Cross-sectional data gathered during the Spring of 1995 are used. The sample consists of 5,935 eighth-grade students attending public schools in eleven sites across the country. Data was collected in over 300 classes at 42 different public schools within these sites. Two basic criterion were used to select sites for the evaluation. First, prospective sites had to have officers qualified to teach the G.R.E.A.T. program. Since the cross-sectional evaluation surveyed eighth grade students in 1995, this meant officers must have completed their G.R.E.A.T. training program before January 1994, in order to teach the program to the seventh graders in time for the survey. A second criterion was used in order to create a nationally representative sample. Since the G.R.E.A.T. program originated in Phoenix, Arizona, an overrepresentation of Arizona and surrounding states occurred. This meant not all prospective sites in Arizona or New Mexico were considered for the evaluation. The final cross-sectional sites are: Las Cruces NM, Omaha NE, Phoenix AZ, Philadelphia PA, Kansas City MO, Milwaukee WI, Orlando FL, Will County IL, Providence RI, Pocatello ID, and Torrance CA.

FIGURE 1. ABOUT HERE

DATA COLLECTION

Group administered questionnaires were provided to all eighth grade students in school on the day of the survey. Passive parental consent procedures were used at 10 of the sites. One site required active parental consent. Students were not required to participate, but were assured that their answers would be anonymous and strictly confidential. A data collection group made up of two to three researchers surveyed individual classrooms within the schools. One researcher read through the survey out loud, this took approximately 40 minutes, while other assistants walked around the classrooms answering individual questions. This was done to make sure students did their own work, thus ensuring confidentiality.

MEASURES

This study comprises an analysis of the information which was collected on a number of demographic, family, and delinquency variables. Demographic variables include: sex, age, race, mother and father's educational level, and family structure. Family variables include both mother and father attachment scales, parental monitoring questions, and other measures of the child's feelings towards his/her family in general. Delinquency variables include status offenses, crimes against persons and gang membership.

Race. Students were classified into six possible race categories:

1. White/Anglo, not Hispanic
2. Black/African-American
3. Hispanic/Latino
4. Asian/Pacific Islander, Oriental
5. American Indian/Native American
6. Other

Due to small sample size, in this study, Native Americans were included in the category of Other.

Family Structure. This category specifically compared intact and single-parent families. Students were asked if they lived with their mother only, their father only, or both mother and father. For the purpose of this study, step-families were considered intact families and therefore coded as living with both mother and father. Students were also allowed to specify alternative living arrangements in a separate category labeled "Other".

Parental Education. Students were given seven education categories for the highest level of schooling completed by each parent. The categories ranged from "Grade School or Less", to "More Than College", with a "Don't Know" response making up the seventh category.

Parental Attachment. Attachment to parents was measured by two separate semantic differentials; one for the mother or mother figure, and one for

the father or father figure. Both scales demonstrated high reliability, with alpha scores of .84 for mother attachment and .88 for father attachment (See Appendix A for scale characteristics). While answering these questions, students were told to think of their mother or father, or who they considered their mother or father figure to be. This was done in order to measure attachment toward surrogate mothers or fathers, such as step-parents. If the child didn't have a mother/father or mother/father figure, they were instructed to leave the questions blank. The semantic differential items used a seven point response scale. The items were:

Can talk about anything	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Can't talk about anything
Always trusts me	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Never trusts me
Knows all my friends	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Does not know any of my friends
Always understands me	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Never understands me
Always ask her/his advice	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Never ask her/his advice
Always praises me when I do well	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Never praises me when I do well

Parental Monitoring. Monitoring was measured with a set of four Likert-type questions. The scale produced an alpha of .73, with a mean scale score of 14.90 and a standard deviation of 3.26 (See Appendix A. for additional scale information). Student responses ranged from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) on the following questions:

1. When I go someplace, I leave a note for my parents or call them to tell them where I am.
2. My parents know where I am when I am not at home or school.
3. I know how to get in touch with my parents if they are not at home.
4. My parents know who I am with if I am not at home.

Self-reported delinquency. The total delinquency index was made up of 17 delinquency questions. The two main concentrations of delinquency examined in this study are status offenses and personal offenses.

1. Status Offenses
    a. Skipped classes without an excuse
    b. Lied about your age to get into some place or to buy something
2. Personal Offenses
    a. Hit someone with the idea of hurting them
    b. Attacked someone with a weapon
    c. Used a weapon or force to get money or things from people
    d. Shot at someone because you were told to by someone else

Other areas used to measure total delinquency include: two questions addressing minor offenses, four questions measuring property offenses, and two items addressing drug sales

SELF-REPORT MEASURES

Both advantages and disadvantages exist with the use of self-report data. Limitations revolve around the reliability and validity of self-reported measures. The first question centers on the memory of the respondent. In order to accurately assess self-report data, it is assumed that the respondent not only understands and correctly interprets the question, but that he/she then accurately remember the needed information (McCord, 1991). Another problem with self-reports, especially in the area of delinquency, is the worry that respondents may give socially desirable responses, not admitting to delinquent behavior. False responses of illegal activities may also occur out of fear of being reprimanded by parents, teachers or officials. Over-reporting could also occur in self-reports. Respondents, especially juveniles, may report or over-report behaviors that they know peers have engaged in, in order to better fit in with their peer group (McCord, 1991). Additional questions concerning self-reports exist in findings that lower validity occurs for African Americans and delinquents (Hindelang et al., 1981). In conclusion, problems do exist with self-reports, however, many benefits also occur.

For example, self-reports can give access to delinquent behavior that is not illegal or has not been identified by officials. In addition, discrimination and bias on the part of the Criminal Justice system does not occur in self-reported

behavior, thereby making self-reports a better measure of actual delinquent behavior than official records.

Finally, numerous studies have concluded that although self-reports are not a perfect measure, they do have reasonable levels of reliability and validity, and in fact, are appropriate for behavioral and social science standards (Hindelang et al., 1981; Huizinga and Elliott, 1987). Therefore, most social scientists agree with Wells and Rankin (1991) that self-reports are a:

> Widely preferred, arguably superior method of measuring juvenile delinquency in research on family dynamics.

HYPOTHESES

Based on a review of existing literature, four hypotheses concerning family and delinquency have been formulated. The first hypothesis examines the relationship between family structure and delinquency. The second and third describe parental attachment and parental monitoring and their effects on self-reported delinquency. The final hypothesis develops a delinquency prediction model using the three elements of family discussed.

Hypothesis 1: Children from single-parent homes will have higher levels of self-reported delinquency than children from two-parent homes.

Hypothesis 2: Both strength of parental attachment and number of parental attachments have effects on self-reported delinquency.

Hypothesis 3: Higher levels of parental monitoring are associated with lower levels of self-reported delinquency.

Hypothesis 4: Parental attachment and parental monitoring will mediate any effect of broken home status on self-reported delinquency.

DATA

The total sample included in the present study is 5,935. Due to missing data, a slightly smaller sample (5,884) was used for analysis. The sample contained a number of students from several racial/ethnic backgrounds; 2,355 (40.4%) are white, 1,544 (26.5%) are black, 1,098 (18.8%) are Hispanic, 346 (9.9%) are Asian, and 489 (8.4%) fall into the category of Other. Although the distribution is not representative of the United States as a whole, it may be an accurate representation of public school enrollments. Males and females were fairly evenly distributed, with a total of 2,830 (48.1%) males and 3,054 (51.9%) females included in the sample. As stated earlier, the sample consisted of eighth-grade students. As would be expected, the mean age was 14 (60%) with those aged from 12-16 accounting for 99.8% of all cases. Most students came from intact homes, while 1,833 (31.2%) were from single-parent households. Of those from single-parent households the majority, 88.4 percent, are from mother only families. In the area of education, levels between mothers and fathers were fairly similar. The category with the highest percentage of responses for mother or father schooling was college or more for each parent. However, it is important to note that students did not know their fathers' education 26.7 percent of the time. This figure compares to 16.5 percent of students not knowing their mothers' education.

TABLE I. ABOUT HERE

ANALYSIS

The analysis for the present research began with bivariate comparisons among family structure, attachment and parental monitoring. The relationship between the three main areas and sex, race, and parental education levels were the main focus of bivariate analysis. The purpose is to demonstrate the degree to which a certain gender, or race, or family status, may be disporportiotly represented among those with higher or lower levels of parental attachment or monitoring. Bivariate comparisons also assess significant relationships between any independent or dependent variables. Next, multivariate analysis were used to examine any additive effects that could occur.

RESULTS

FAMILY STRUCTURE

The majority of students in the sample came from intact families. Males and females were fairly equally distributed between single and intact families (See Table II). However, there were slightly more females (63.9%) from intact families than males (59.8%). The racial/ethnic breakdown, however, was not as evenly distributed. African Americans had a significantly higher percentage responding they were from single-parent families than did any of the other racial/ethnic categories. In contrast, Asians had the lowest percentage coming from single parent families, with only 11 percent.

TABLE III. ABOUT HERE

Parental education also showed significant differences when examining family status. A loose trend could be detected; the more parental education increased, the less likely the student came from a single-parent family. This occurred for both mother's education, and father's education, with slightly higher percentages found in relation to father's education and family. For those who did not know their parent's education, higher percentages were found in the child residing in a two-parent family. However, this relationship was much greater for mothers education than fathers.

TABLE IV. ABOUT HERE

For descriptive purposes, the attachment scales were each broken into three categories. The lowest third of the scale was labeled 'weak attachment', the middle third was labeled 'moderate attachment', and the upper third became 'strong attachment'. When examining parental attachment, paternal attachment was found to be the strong area. Significantly weaker paternal attachments were found in single-parent families. Interestingly, no significant differences were found when looking at maternal attachment (See Table XII). Although slightly weaker attachment can be seen in single-parent families, it is not a significant difference. In an additionally interesting result, no significant differences in parental monitoring were found.

TABLE VII. ABOUT HERE

PARENTAL ATTACHMENT

When examining attachment to parent by gender, both sexes have similar responses for maternal attachment. The majority of both males and females report having a high maternal attachment (See Table IX). This holds true regardless of family status. In contrast, significant differences come forth when examining paternal attachment. Males show a significantly stronger attachment to fathers than do females. In addition, those from single-parent families also report weaker paternal attachment.

TABLE XII. ABOUT HERE

More significant differences are found when race/ethnicity is added to the picture. In general, all races follow the trend reported earlier, with weaker paternal attachments. When examining differences among the individual races, those from the category of Other report the weakest attachments to either parent when compared to all other categories. When examining strong attachments, African Americans report the highest percentage of maternal attachment (60.3%), while whites report the highest level of attachment to the father.

TABLE X. ABOUT HERE

Education level also had a significant relationship with parental attachments. As education level increased, students were more likely to report having stronger attachments. This occurred for both maternal and paternal attachment.

TABLE XI. ABOUT HERE

PARENTAL MONITORING

For descriptive purposes, the parental monitoring scale was divided into two categories. The first, high monitoring, consisted of the top half of responses. The lower half of responses was then labeled 'low parental monitoring'. As had been found in previous studies (Hagan et al., 1988; Nye, 1958:199), significant gender differences occurred between high and low parental monitoring. Females perceived a higher level of monitoring, with only 6.6 percent reporting

they received low parental monitoring (See Table V). In addition, this strong difference did not significantly change when accounting for single or intact family status. Although slightly more students from single parent families reported lower levels of monitoring, it was not significant.

TABLE XIII. ABOUT HERE

Race/ethnicity also exhibited significant monitoring differences. Whites and Asians both reported higher levels of monitoring when compared to other racial categories, while Hispanics, Others, and African Americans were found at the lower end of the monitoring scale (See Table VI). The same trend occurs for both males and females.

TABLE XIV. ABOUT HERE

Level of parental education was another area significantly related to level of parental monitoring. The higher the level of education, the higher the level of monitoring. This significant trend can be seen for both mother and father education. For those who did not know their parents' education, the responses compare most closely with the category of some high school (See Table VIII).

Parental attachment reveals a close relationship to monitoring. Those with weak attachments, are much more likely to have low monitoring than those with strong attachments. This can be seen in both maternal and paternal attachments (See Table XII).

ZERO-ORDER CORRELATIONS

Zero-order correlations were used to examine bivariate relationships between any two variables included in the model. This is done to better examine the differences between the different family variables and delinquency. Bivariate analyses indicate that family structure, attachment, parental monitoring, and parent education, are significantly related to self-reported delinquency. Zero-order correlations examining the relationships are presented in Appendix B.

Family Structure. To assess family structure, a dummy variable (SINGLE) was created. This variable measures single-parent families, including both mother only and father only responses. For all subsequent analysis, this variable was used.

Several measures were significantly correlated to single-parent status. The matrix showed that age was significantly correlated to family structure with older children more likely to live in a single-parent families and younger children more likely to reside in intact households. Race/Ethnicity differences were also found in regard to family structure, with whites and Asians both less likely to come from single-parent homes, while being African American was more highly correlated with single-parent homes.

In the area of education, those from single-parent households reported fathers with lower educational levels. Those from single-parent families were

also more likely not to know their fathers' education. No significant results, however, were found in relation to mothers' educational level.

Parental attachment was weaker in single-parent families for both mother and father attachment. However, only paternal attachment had a significant correlation. Parental monitoring also revealed the same relationship. Monitoring was shown to be significantly lower in single-parent families.

When delinquency was examined, several significant results arose. Higher levels of total delinquency, committing status offenses, and committing personal offenses all occurred in the single-parent family.

Maternal Attachment. No gender effects were found in relation to maternal attachment. When examining race/ethnicity effects. African Americans were the only race/ethnic group to display a stronger attachment, while the Other category was the only race/ethnicity to show a significantly weak attachment. Age was also significantly associated with attachment. Younger children had higher maternal attachments. In terms of family status, those from intact families had a stronger maternal attachment.

Education was positively related to maternal attachment, with high levels of parental education associated with high levels of attachment. In addition, those not knowing their parents' education exhibited weak levels of maternal attachment. The highest correlation with Maternal Attachment, was Paternal Attachment (.47), followed closely by Parental Monitoring (.45)

Delinquency was also highly negatively correlated with maternal attachment. Strong attachment was associated with a lesser likelihood of overall delinquency, reporting status offenses and reporting personal offenses.

Paternal Attachment. Males were significantly more likely than females to have a strong paternal attachment. In terms of Race/Ethnicity, whites had the only significant correlation to having a strong attachment. Family status was also significant; children in single-parent families displayed weaker attachment than others. Furthermore, parental education was also positively correlated with parental attachment. Other education findings indicate that those with a strong paternal attachment were significantly less likely not to know their fathers' education.

Parental monitoring, following the same trend as maternal attachment, showed a positive relationship to paternal attachment, with a correlation coefficient of .31. Delinquency, on the other hand, was inversely correlated with paternal attachment. Those with strong paternal attachment were less highly correlated to total delinquency, status, or personal offenses.

Parental Monitoring. Females were significantly more likely than males to report high parental monitoring. Race/Ethnicity differences show that whites perceive greater levels of parental monitoring, while those of Hispanic origin report lower levels of parental monitoring. In addition, younger children have

higher levels of monitoring, as do children from intact families. In contrast, those from single-parent families display lower parental monitoring.

Parents' education is another area that is closely correlated to parental monitoring. High levels of education in both mother and father categories reveal a significant association with high parental monitoring. Furthermore, those with high levels of monitoring are less likely not to know their parents' education.

As stated earlier, strong attachment to both mother (.45) and father (.31) indicate higher levels of parental monitoring. In contrast, delinquency is inversely correlated with parental monitoring. Those with low levels of parental monitoring have high levels of delinquency. This is true for total delinquency, status, and personal offenses.

Education. To measure education, the two parental education variables were recoded into six levels of education, leaving out the category for not knowing parental education. The Don't Know category, was then measured through the creation of two separate dummy variables; one for mother, and a separate category for father.

Gender differences occurred with respect to education. For instance, males were less likely than females to have a mother with high education. Similarly, males were more likely than females not to know their mothers' education. Gender was not significantly correlated with either category of

father's education. Significant age differences occurred, linking older students to parents with lower education.

Race/Ethnicity differences were also observed. Whites and Asians had parents with higher education. This trend occurred for both mother and father education. For Hispanics, on the other hand, the analysis revealed a -.27 correlation with mother's education, and an equally strong trend for lower education when examining father education. African Americans were also more likely to have mothers with less education. Although father education level was not significant for African Americans, it did follow the same trend. Additionally, whites and Hispanics were less likely not to know either parent's education. In contrast, Asians were more likely not to know either parent's education, while African Americans revealed a greater likelihood of not knowing their fathers' education.

In terms of family status, single-parent families were highly correlated both with low father education and not knowing their fathers' education. Single-parent families had no correlation to mothers' education level, although intact families were more likely to have mothers with higher education.

Delinquency items correlated to parent education include a significant association between total delinquency and low parent education. This relationship also holds true for status offenses. In the area of personal offenses, father's education, not mother's, plays the significant role. It is also interesting to

note that delinquency is not significantly correlated with not knowing parents' education.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Multivariate techniques were utilized to estimate the effect of one independent variable on the different family factors, while simultaneously controlling for the effects of all other variables included in the model. Three separate measures were used to capture different aspects of self-reported delinquency. The measures were transformed to correct for the skewness of the responses. To correct for this problem, all responses were truncated at 12. The scales were then computed, and the natural logarithmic transformations were created for analysis purposes. Total delinquency, status offense, and personal offense scales were all used as independent variables in this analysis.

Dummy variables were created to represent both parental education levels and racial categories. Graduation from high school was used as a reference category for education, while whites were used as a reference group for race.

Two models were run for each of the independent variables used in this study. The first, or base, model contains only demographic variables: sex, race, parental education, and family status. The second regression adds maternal

and paternal attachment, along with parental monitoring. All regression results are presented in Appendix C.

The effect of family structure. The first hypothesis being tested suggests that family structure will have an impact on self-reported delinquency. Specifically those from single-parent families will have higher levels of delinquency than those from intact families.

Overall results show that family structure did have the predicted effect on delinquency. Strong support for the first hypothesis was found in all three delinquency categories.

When examining total delinquency, gender had the greatest predictive power, followed by the race category Other. Family status, specifically, coming from a single-parent family, was the third largest predictor of total delinquency in the base model. When attachment and monitoring were added to the model, the predictive power of single-parent families did not change; however, parental monitoring was found to be a better predictor than family status.

When total delinquency is broken down into categories, family status again reveals a significant relationship to delinquency. When examining status offenses, family status holds onto its third place position, behind the Black and Other race categories. When the full model is examined, family status stays significant, even when controlling for attachment and monitoring.

In the area of personal offenses, family status drops significantly in its predictive power, and in fact, when attachment and monitoring are controlled for, becomes insignificant at the .001 level. However, it is important to note that the beta value stays the same size.

The effect of parental attachment. The second hypothesis predicts that strong attachment to parents and number of parental attachments will reduce delinquency. Support for this hypothesis was found in all three delinquency categories.

Both maternal and paternal attachments revealed a significant negative relationship to total delinquency. Attachment to mother proved to be a better predictor, with a larger Beta value.

The same findings arose in conjunction with status and personal offenses. Although both maternal and paternal attachment were significant, attachment to mother proved to have more predictive power. Since attachment to mother and father were both significant in all three delinquency categories, this lends additional support to the idea that number of attachments is negatively related to delinquency. In this study, having both mother and father attachments was significantly valuable in predicting delinquency.

The effect of parental monitoring. A third hypothesis describes a negative relationship occurring between parental monitoring and delinquency.

Specifically, when levels of parental monitoring increase, delinquency decreases. Analysis revealed that in this study, this was in fact the case.

When examining total delinquency, the addition of parental monitoring significantly improved the predictive power of the model. What is of additional interest, is the decrease that occurs in the predictive power of gender, when controlling for parental monitoring.

Monitoring has the highest level of prediction in the area of status offenses. Not only does parental monitoring have the largest Beta value, but the Beta value for the measure of gender is nearly cut in half when parental monitoring is added to the model.

When personal offenses are examined, parental monitoring still shows a significant negative relationship. However, the dramatic decrease in significance for gender is not seen in this area.

The effect of family factors. The final hypothesis suggested that a model including both parental attachment and monitoring would be a better predictor of delinquency and in turn mediate the effects of family status on delinquency. Limited support was found for this hypothesis.

When attachment and monitoring were added to the base total delinquency model, the R^2 increased dramatically from a .09 to .24. In addition, monitoring and attachment were all significant at the .001 level. In this respect, support is gained for Hypothesis 4. However, the addition of monitoring and

attachment, did not significantly reduce the influence of single-parent status on delinquency. In fact, all factors that were significant in the base model sustained significance in the second regression. The same findings also occurred for both status and personal offenses.

DISCUSSION

The objective of the present study was to test four hypotheses focusing on family factors relating to delinquency. The first hypothesis predicted that children from single-parent homes would have higher levels of self-reported delinquency than those in two-parent homes. The second and third dealt with high levels of attachment and monitoring leading to lower levels of delinquency. The final hypothesis focused on a total model of delinquency prediction using several family factors.

FINDINGS

The effect of family structure. Although family structure was not the strongest predictor of delinquency, it had significance in five of the six models. This would be expected, since children who go through the juvenile justice system are disproportionately likely to come from single-parent homes (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; Smith and Walters, 1978). What is interesting, however, was the higher correlation of status offenses as compared to personal offenses with

family status. In addition, family structure again had a greater impact on status offenses than personal offenses in both the base and second regressions.

Past explanations for similar findings have involved the bias of the justice system. Systematic discrimination against single-parent families have been found in other research in the area of status offenses (McCord, 1991). However, since the present study uses self-report data, this is a less likely explanatory factor.

One possible explanation for the higher level of delinquency found in single-parent homes could be the negative relationship between parental education and family status. Past research has found that those coming from a lower socio-economic status have higher rates of delinquent behaviors (Powell and Steelman, 1990). When treating parental education as a possible indicator of socio-economic status, the same results were found in bivariate analysis. Although parental education was not significant in present regression models, the inclusion of additional, perhaps more accurate, measures of socio-economic status would be helpful in future research.

The effect of parental attachment. Those with strong attachments reported lower levels of delinquency. This finding stayed relatively constant regardless of the type of delinquency being examined. This finding is consistent with past findings outlined in earlier sections. One difference not consistent with

previous studies is the fairly even amount of maternal attachment reported by both males and females. In past studies, females were found to report significantly higher levels of attachment to both parents (Rankin and Kern, 1994). In this study, the opposite trend occurred, with males, not females reporting higher levels of attachment to fathers.

Another interesting finding involves racial differences and attachment. African Americans reported the strongest levels of maternal attachment, and fairly strong levels of paternal attachment. In addition, being African American is a stronger predictor of delinquency than attachment in all six regression models.

Education level, used as a measure of socio-economic status also provided a significant negative relationship with attachment, as was expected. Reasons for lower education levels found with lower attachment levels could include working status. If both parents work long hours, less time is available to nurture the attachment relationship.

The effect of parental monitoring. Parental monitoring was the strongest predictor of delinquency. Gender and age differences discussed in previous studies were also noted in the present study (Chesney-Lind and Shelden, 1992; Hagan et al., 1990). Females reported significantly higher levels of monitoring than did males. In addition, younger children also reported higher monitoring. Race differences also occurred in this area, whites and Asians were found to have higher levels of monitoring. Parental education also revealed

significant differences in parental monitoring. A significantly positive relationship occurred; those with high parental education provided higher parental monitoring.

The effect of family factors. Several interrelated effects had an impact on delinquency. For instance, parental attachment and parental monitoring were significantly correlated to one another, as were maternal and paternal attachment. Moreover, although a relationship was detected between attachment and family status, no significant relationship was found between monitoring and family status. Monitoring, however, was the strongest predictor of delinquency.

LIMITATIONS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Before making concrete conclusions addressing the influence of family factors on juvenile delinquency, the limitations of the present study must be addressed. A main limitation involves the use of secondary data. Since the primary goal of the existing data-set was not to explore family and delinquency, not all desired measurements are available. However, several good measures of family and delinquency were found in this data. A second limitation involves the measurement of the dependent delinquency variable. Although studies have shown self-reported delinquency to be a valid measure of delinquent behavior, all children have differing definitions of certain behaviors. In a 1986 assessment

of the validity of self-report delinquency, Huizinga and Elliott conclude that self-report data cannot be used without question. In fact, self-report measures have been found in the past to have a lower validity for African Americans and delinquents, than for whites and nondelinquents (Hindelang et al., 1981). Therefore, checking self-reported measures with official measures could help broaden the results of the present study.

A third limitation found in the present study involves the operationalization of the family structure variable. In the present research, intact families include stepfamilies, and those living with a fiancé/ fiancée. It is not clear if restructured families should be weighted the same as natural intact families. In addition, there were no measures of marital discord or conflict, which have both been found to be significant predictors of delinquency in previous studies (Van Voorhis, *et al.,* 1988:240). Similarly, the present study does not allow for the measurement of dysfunctional or unhappy homes. A final limitation in conjunction with family structure, involves the lack of measurement for both emotional and economic resources in the single-family home. In order to truly conclude family status has a strong impact on delinquency, measures such as these must be added.

A fourth main weakness of the present study is the failure to measure positive or negative parental attachments. It is possible students have strong attachments to bad role models. If a child has a strong attachment to a parent

who promotes illegal activity, this could significantly change the results. Although this may occur only in a small portion of responses, it is still an important factor to consider.

An additional limitation in the area of attachment occurs with the use of one-sided perceptions. Parents and children may interpret behaviors and actions in different manners. Therefore, the addition of measures of parents' perception of attachment could add more to the present research.

A final limitation is the lack of an adequate measure of socio-economic status. Although parental education was used in an attempt to draw out social class, the fact that over 25 percent of the sample did not know their fathers' education, leads one to believe it may not have been a complete measure. In addition, although education is highly correlated with socio-economic status, it is not a perfect correlation. Not every person with low education resides in the lower-strata of the population.

IMPLICATIONS/FUTURE RESEARCH

Significant findings in the family-delinquency relationship implicate the family as an important factor in juvenile delinquency. Since both structural and functional aspects were found to impact delinquency, neither should be eliminated from the family-delinquency arena. Future research efforts should continue to look at the combined impact of several family factors, instead of

single factors in the area of delinquency. The inclusion of both parent and child perceptions in all areas would provide a better idea of their true effects. In addition, the use of official delinquency data in conjunction with a better indicator of true family status would increase the predictive power. Moreover, a measure of positive versus negative parental attachments and family life in general, would be assets to any family and delinquency study. Finally, the use of primary data would allow for more accurate measures of the family-delinquency relationship.

CONCLUSION

The present study reveals that several family factors have an impact on delinquency. In fact, even when controlling for demographic characteristics, such as race, sex, and age, the family still holds significance in the area of delinquency.

Living in a single-parent family increases the likelihood that delinquency will occur. This result is found regardless of race or gender. Parental attachment also has an impact on delinquency. Specifically, strong parental attachments lessen the likelihood that the child will report delinquency. Additionally, parental monitoring appears to have the strongest impact on delinquency; those with higher monitoring report less self-reported delinquency. In conclusion, a model incorporating several family factors, such as maternal and

paternal attachments, in addition to parental monitoring has greater predictive power than does any one family factor.

TABLES

TABLE I. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS.

Characteristic	Number	Percent
Gender		
Male	2,830	48.1
Female	3,054	51.9
Total	5,884	
Race/Ethnicity		
White/Anglo, not Hispanic	2,355	40.4
Black/African-American	1,544	26.5
Hispanic/Latino	1,098	18.8
Asian/Pacific Islander/Oriental	346	5.9
Other	489	8.4
Total	5,832	
Age		
13 and Under	1,699	29.1
14	3,530	60.4
15 and Over	612	10.5
Total	5,841	
Mean Age	13.82	
Live With		
Single Parent	1,833	31.2
Mother Only	1,620	27.6
Father Only	213	3.6
Intact Family	3,628	61.7
Other	417	7.1
Total	5,878	
Mother Schooling		
Grade School or Less	148	2.5
Some High School	548	9.4
Completed High School	1,468	25.2
Some College	1,011	17.3
College or More	1,699	29.1
Don't Know	960	16.5
Father Schooling		
Grade School or Less	181	3.1
Some High School	496	8.5
Completed High School	1,208	20.8
Some College	748	12.9
College or More	1,625	28.0
Don't Know	1,548	26.7

Table II. Family Structure by Gender.

Family Status	Females		Males	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Single Family	850	30.3	975	31.6
Mother Only	732	26.1	880	28.9
Father Only	118	4.2	95	3.1
Intact Family	1,793	63.9	1,819	59.8
Other	165	5.9	249	8.2

*Chi Square Value = 16.38
**p<.001.

Table III. Family Structure by Race.

Race/Ethnicity	Single Family		Mother Only		Father Only		Intact Family		Other	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
White	489	20.8	388	16.5	101	4.3	1,788	76.1	72	3.1
African American	789	51.3	732	47.6	57	3.7	549	35.7	199	12.6
Hispanic	344	31.6	313	28.7	31	2.8	682	62.6	63	5.9
Asian	38	11.0	33	9.6	5	1.5	291	84.6	15	4.4
Other	157	32.5	139	28.8	18	3.7	267	55.3	62	12.8

*Chi Square Value = 761.95
**p< .001.

Table IV. Family Structure by Parental Education.

Highest Level of Education	Mother's Level of School				Father's Level of School			
	Single		Intact		Single		Intact	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Grade School or Less	43	34.4	82	65.6	44	26.7	121	73.3
Some High School	217	45.8	257	54.2	184	40.7	268	59.3
Completed High School	445	32.9	906	67.1	380	33.8	744	66.2
Some College	334	34.8	625	65.2	183	25.9	524	74.1
Completed College	313	28.7	776	71.3	245	23.1	814	76.9
More than College	173	32.6	358	67.4	97	19.7	396	80.3
Don't Know	274	31.6	592	68.4	645	47.0	726	53.0

*Chi Squared Values:
Mother Education=45.74
Father Education=239.79
**Both p< .001.

Table V. Parental Monitoring by Gender.

	High Monitoring		Low Monitoring	
Gender	No.	%	No.	%
Male	2430	86.5	379	13.5
Female	2829	93.4	201	6.6

*Chi Square Value = 76.64
**Significant at the .001 level.

Table VI. Parental Monitoring by Race/Ethnicity.

	High Monitoring		Low Monitoring	
Race/Ethnicity	No.	%	No.	%
White	2158	92.0	188	8.0
African American	1348	88.5	176	11.5
Hispanic	956	87.8	133	12..2
Asian	320	92.8	25	7.2
Other	427	88.0	58	12.0

*Chi Square Value = 25.2
**p< .001.

Table VII. Parental Monitoring by Family Structure.

	High Monitoring		Low Monitoring	
Family Status	No.	%	No.	%
Single-Parent	1619	89.0	201	11.0
Intact	3291	91.3	314	8.7

*Chi Square Value = 7.67
**p>.001.

Table VIII. Parental Monitoring by Parent Education.

	Father's Education				Mother's Education			
Highest Level of	High		Low		High		Low	
Education	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Grade School or Less	141	79.2	37	20.8	113	76.9	34	23.1
Some High School	437	88.5	57	11.5	473	87.4	68	12.6
Completed High School	1085	90.4	115	9.6	1338	91.5	124	8.5
Some College	672	90.2	73	9.8	912	90.7	94	9.3
Completed College	1016	92.0	88	8.0	1037	91.5	96	8.5
More Than College	476	92.6	38	7.4	511	91.6	47	8.4
Don't Know	1368	89.3	164	10.7	833	88.0	114	12.0

*Chi Square Values:
Father's Education = 34.56; Mother's Education = 45.35
**Both p< .001.

Table IX. Attachment by Gender.

	Males		Females	
Maternal Attachment	No.	%	No.	%
Weak	138	5.0	174	5.8
Moderate	1042	37.7	1083	36.0
Strong	1581	57.3	1750	58.2
Paternal Attachment				
Weak	275	10.7	413	15.1
Moderate	913	35.6	1174	43.0
Strong	1379	53.7	1141	41.8

*Chi Square Values:
Maternal = 3.03
Paternal = 77.98
**Paternal Attachment p< .001; Maternal Attachment p> .001.

Table X. Attachment by Race.

	Maternal Attachment					
	Weak		Moderate		Strong	
Race/Ethnicity	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
White	118	5.1	836	35.9	1375	59.0
African American	70	4.6	528	35.1	908	60.3
Hispanic	60	5.6	410	38.5	596	55.9
Asian	18	5.4	148	44.0	170	50.6
Other	46	9.6	191	39.9	242	50.5

*Chi Square Value = 36.40
**p< .001.

	Paternal Attachment					
	Weak		Moderate		Strong	
Race/Ethnicity	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
White	231	10.3	893	39.8	1121	49.9
African American	196	15.3	495	38.7	588	46.0
Hispanic	155	16.1	360	37.5	445	46.4
Asian	31	9.6	151	46.7	141	43.7
Other	72	16.5	171	39.1	194	44.4

*Chi Square Value = 43.20
**p< .001.

Table XI. Attachment by Parental Education Level.

Highest Level of Education	Paternal Attachment					
	Weak		Moderate		Strong	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Grade School or Less	32	20.9	67	43.8	54	35.3
Some High School	74	16.2	208	45.4	176	38.4
Completed High School	138	12.2	452	40.1	538	47.7
Some College	79	11.0	278	38.8	360	50.2
Completed College	89	8.4	381	35.5	594	55.8
More Than College	28	5.6	172	34.3	302	60.2
Don't Know	247	20.1	508	41.3	475	38.6

*Chi Square Value = 178.99
**p< .001.

Highest Level of Education	Maternal Attachment					
	Weak		Moderate		Strong	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Grade School or Less	21	15.2	55	39.9	62	44.9
Some High School	41	7.7	212	40.0	277	52.3
Completed High School	68	4.7	544	37.4	842	57.9
Some College	41	4.1	362	36.2	597	59.7
Completed College	45	4.0	378	33.6	703	62.4
More Than College	19	3.4	182	32.7	355	63.8
Don't Know	76	8.3	378	41.1	466	50.7

*Chi Square Value = 91.85
**p< .001.

Table XII. Parental Attachment by Family Structure and Level of Parental Monitoring.

	Single				Intact			
	Low Monitoring		High Monitoring		Low Monitoring		High Monitoring	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Maternal Attachment								
Weak	37	19.2	64	4.1	55	18.0	108	3.3
Moderate	105	54.4	565	35.9	178	58.2	1114	34.1
Strong	51	26.4	944	60.0	73	23.9	2046	62.6
Paternal Attachment								
Weak	42	28.8	195	15.9	93	30.0	298	9.2
Moderate	71	48.6	474	38.5	137	44.2	1260	38.7
Strong	33	22.6	561	45.6	80	25.8	1698	52.1

Table XIII. Parental Monitoring by Gender by Race/Ethnicity by Family Structure.

	Parental Monitoring							
	High				Low			
Family Status and Race	Male		Female		Male		Female	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Single								
White	196	86.3	242	93.1	31	13.7	18	6.9
Black	315	85.5	377	91.1	52	14.2	37	8.9
Hispanic	144	85.2	157	91.8	25	14.8	14	8.2
Asian	14	77.8	19	95.0	4	22.2	1	5.0
Other	47	81.0	88	94.6	11	19.0	5	5.4
Intact								
White	796	89.3	855	96.4	95	10.7	32	3.6
Black	245	86.0	236	94.0	40	14.0	15	6.0
Hispanic	281	84.1	311	91.2	53	15.9	30	8.8
Asian	119	93.7	153	94.4	8	6.3	9	5.6
Other	104	86.0	131	91.6	17	14.0	12	8.4

Table XIV. Parental Monitoring by Education Level and Gender.

	Parental Monitoring							
	High				Low			
	Males		Females		Males		Females	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Mothers Highest Education Level								
Grade School or less	13	81.3	23	85.2	3	18.8	4	14.8
Some High School	72	83.7	86	89.6	14	16.3	10	10.4
High School Graduate	153	84.5	181	91.9	28	15.5	16	8.1
Some College	72	82.8	90	95.7	15	17.2	4	4.3
Completed College	114	88.4	110	94.8	15	11.6	6	5.2
More than College	38	90.5	50	94.3	4	9.5	3	5.7
Don't Know	239	85.4	328	92.1	41	14.6	28	7.9
Fathers Highest Education Level								
Grade School or less	11	68.8	23	88.5	5	31.3	3	11.5
Some High School	70	80.5	118	92.2	17	19.5	10	7.8
High School Graduate	174	87.0	233	95.5	26	13.0	11	4.5
Some College	131	86.8	163	90.6	20	13.2	17	9.4
Completed College	125	84.5	152	93.8	23	15.5	10	6.2
More than College	78	89.7	79	92.9	9	10.3	6	7.1
Don't Know	119	83.8	109	87.2	23	16.2	16	12.8

FIGURES

Figure 1. Cross-Sectional G.R.E.A.T. Sites

APPENDIX A: Scale Characteristics

Reliability Analysis for Mother Attachment

Individual Variables			
Variable	Description	Mean	Std Dev
v20	Talk About Anything	5.0272	1.7039
v21	Trusts Me	5.0654	1.7315
v22	Knows My Friends	4.5651	1.7972
v23	Understands Me	4.6265	1.7776
v24	Ask Advice	4.2069	1.9760
v25	Praises Me When I Do Well	5.6029	1.7240

Scale Mean: 29.09 N of Cases: 5765
Standard Deviation: 8.03 Alpha = .84

Reliability Analysis for Father Attachment

Individual Variables			
Variable	Description	Mean	Std Dev
v26	Talk About Anything	4.2980	2.0191
v27	Trusts Me	5.0684	1.8490
v28	Knows My Friends	3.6194	1.9548
v29	Understands Me	4.4549	1.9514
v30	Ask Advice	3.9407	2.0928
v31	Praises Me When I Do Well	5.3338	1.9508

Scale Mean: 26.72 N of Cases: 5278
Standard Deviation: 9.40 Alpha: .88

Reliability Analysis for Parental Monitoring

Individual Variables			
Variable	Description	Mean	Std Dev
v32	Leave Note or Call	3.8518	1.0923
v33	Parents Know Where I Am	3.6606	1.1259
v34	Get in Touch With Parents	3.8983	1.0105
v35	Know Who With	3.4850	1.1405

Scale Mean: 14.90 N of Cases: 5843
Standard Deviation: 3.26 Alpha: .73

APPENDIX B: Correlation Matrix

CORRELATION MATRIX

	Male	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other	Age
Male	1.00*						
White	.02	1.00					
Black	-.00	-.49*	1.00				
Hispanic	.01	-.40*	-.29	1.00			
Asian	-.02	-.21*	-.15*	-.12*	1.00		
Other	-.03	-.25*	-.18*	-.15*	-.08	1.00	
Age	.10*	-.07*	.10*	.03	-.07*	-.01	1.00
Single	-.02	-.19*	.26*	.00	-.11*	.01	.07
Father Education	.02	.20*	-.06*	-.27*	.14*	-.01	-.12
Don't Know Father Educ.	-.03	-.17*	.10*	.05*	.05*	.03	.01
Mother's Education	.05*	.15*	-.00	-.24*	.08*	-.00	-.07*
Don't Know Mother Educ.	.04*	-.10*	-.02	.07*	.13*	.01	-.00
Maternal Attachment	-.01	.02	.04*	-.01	-.03	-.06*	-.06*
Paternal Attachment	.13*	.06*	-.02	-.03	-.01	-.03	-.03
Parental Monitoring	-.17*	.11*	-.07*	-.06*	.02	-.03	-.12*
Total Delinquency	.20*	-.11*	.08*	.04	-.08*	.07*	.15*
Status Offenses	.06*	-.11*	.08*	.05*	-.07*	.06*	.13*
Personal Offenses	.15*	-.08*	.11*	-.03	-.07*	.05*	.12*
Gang Membership	.09*	-.11*	.03	.06*	-.02	.07*	.12*

*p < or = .001.
"." Coefficient cannot be computed.

CORRELATION MATRIX (continued).

	Single	Father Educ.	Don't Know Father Educ.	Mother Educ.	Don't Know Mother Educ.	Maternal Attach.	Paternal Attach.
Male							
White							
Black							
Hispanic							
Asian							
Other							
Age							
Single	1.00						
Father Education	-.11*	1.00					
Don't Know Father Educ.	.15*	.	1.00				
Mother Education	-.04	.57*	-.06*	1.00			
Don't Know Mother Educ.	-.02	-.02	.52*	.	1.00		
Maternal Attachment	-.03	.12*	-.07*	.11	-.07*	1.00	
Paternal Attachment	-.08*	.16*	-.13*	.14	-.02	.47*	1.00
Parental Monitoring	-.06*	.14*	-.08*	.12*	-.08*	.45*	.30*
Total Delinquency	.11*	-.12*	-.02	-.07*	-.03	-.31*	-.22*
Status Offenses	.11*	-.10*	-.02	-.07*	-.03	-.25*	-.20*
Personal Offenses	.08*	-.07*	-.02	-.03	-.04	-.24*	-.18*
Gang Membership	.07*	-.12*	.01	-.07*	-.00	-.15*	-.13*

*p< or = .001.
"." Coefficient cannot be computed.

CORRELATION MATRIX (continued).

	Parental Monitoring	Total Delinquency	Status Offenses	Personal Offenses	Gang Membership
Male					
White					
Black					
Hispanic					
Asian					
Other					
Age					
Single					
Father Education					
Don't Know Father Educ.					
Mother Education					
Don't Know Mother Educ.					
Maternal Attachment					
Paternal Attachment					
Parental Monitoring	1.00				
Total Delinquency	-.39*	1.00			
Status Offenses	-.32*	.78*	1.00		
Personal Offenses	-.29*	.77*	.48*	1.00	
Gang Membership	-.23*	.48*	.33*	.35*	1.00

*p< or = .001.
"." Coefficient cannot be computed.

APPENDIX C: Regressions

Predicting Total Delinquency: Regression Analysis--beta values.

PREDICTOR VARIABLES	MODEL 1	MODEL 2
Demographics		
Race/Ethnicity		
Asian	-.02	-.02
African American	.07*	.07*
Hispanic	.06*	.05*
Other	.10*	.07*
Gender	.19*	.16*
Age	.11*	.08*
Mother's Education		
Less than H.S.	.03	.02
Some College	.02	.03
College or More	-.02	.01
Don't Know	-.01	-.03
Father's Education		
Less than H.S.	.05	.01
Some College	-.00	-.01
College or More	-.03	-.02
Don't Know	-.03	-.05
Single-Parent	.09*	.09*
Maternal Attachment		-.16*
Paternal Attachment		-.08*
Parental Monitoring		-.25*
R^2	.09	.24

*p< or = .001

Predicting Status Offenses: Regression Analysis--beta values.

PREDICTOR VARIABLES	MODEL 1	MODEL 2
Demographics		
Race/Ethnicity		
Asian	-.01	-.01
African American	.09*	.07*
Hispanic	.07*	.07*
Other	.08*	.07*
Gender	.06*	.03
Age	.10*	.06*
Mother's Education		
Less than H.S.	.03	.02
Some College	.02	.04
College or More	-.02	.00
Don't Know	-.00	-.02
Father's Education		
Less than H.S.	.04	.01
Some College	-.01	-.01
College or More	-.01	.00
Don't Know	-.04	-.04
Single-Parent	.08*	.09*
Maternal Attachment		-.12*
Paternal Attachment		-.06*
Parental Monitoring		-.22*
R^2	.05	.15

*p< or = .001.

Predicting Personal Offenses: Regression Analysis--beta values.

PREDICTOR VARIABLES	MODEL 1	MODEL 2
Demographics		
Race/Ethnicity		
Asian	-.03	-.03
African American	.10*	.11*
Hispanic	.00	.00
Other	.07*	.04
Gender	.15*	.13*
Age	.09*	.06*
Mother's Education		
Less than H.S.	.02	.01
Some College	.03	.04
College or More	-.01	.01
Don't Know	-.02	-.04
Father's Education		
Less than H.S.	.03	-.01
Some College	.01	.00
College or More	-.02	-.01
Don't Know	-.01	-.03
Single-Parent	.05*	.04
Maternal Attachment		-.14*
Paternal Attachment		-.07*
Parental Monitoring		-.17*
R^2	.06	.15

*p< or = .001.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bahr, Steven
1979 Family determinants and effects of deviance. In Contemporary Theories about the Family, vol. 1, ed. Wesley Burr, Rubin Hill, F. Ivan Nye, and Ira Reiss, 615-643. New York: Free Press.

Bernard, Thomas J.
1992 The Cycle of Juvenile Justice. New York: Oxford University Press.

Becker, Howard S.
1963 Outsiders. New York: The Free Press.

Bowlby, J.
1952 Maternal Care and Mental Health. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Brownfield, David and Ann Marie Sorenson
1994 Sibship size and sibling delinquency. Deviant Behavior 15: 45-61.

Bureau of the Census
1988 Statistical Abstracts of the United States. Washington D.C.: US Government Recording Office.

Burgess, Robert L.
1980 Family violence: Implications from evolutionary biology. In Travis Hirschi and Michael Gottfredson (eds.), Understanding Crime. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Canter, Rachelle J.
1982 Family correlates of male and female delinquency. Criminology 20: 149-168.

Cernkovich, S.A. and P.C. Giordano
1987 Family relationships and delinquency. Criminology 25(2): 295-319.

Chesney-Lind, M. And R.G. Shelden
1992 Girls, Delinquency, and Juvenile Justice. Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole.

Elliott, D.S. and S.S. Ageton
1980 Reconciling race and class differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency. American Sociological Review 45: 95-110.

Geiger, Brenda and Michael Fischer
1995 Family, Justice, and Delinquency. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Geismar, Ludwig L., and Katherine Wood
1986 Family and Delinquency: Resocializing the Young Offender. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Glueck, S., and Glueck, E.
1950 Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

1957 Working mothers and delinquency. Mental Hygiene 41: 327-352.

Gove, Walter R. And Robert D. Crutchfield
1982 The family and juvenile delinquency. Sociological Quarterly 23: 301-319.

Hagan, John, Gillis, A.R., and J. Simpson
1990 Clarifying and extending power-control theory. American Journal of Sociology 95: 1024-1037.

Hirschi, Travis
1971 Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley, CA: University of California -Press.

Hirschi, Travis and Michael Gottfredson
1983 Age and the explanation of crime. American Journal of Sociology 89: 552-584.

Hindelang, M.J., Hirschi, T., and J.G. Weis.
1981 Measuring Delinquency, Sage, Beverly Hills.

Huizinga, David and Delbert S. Elliott.
1986 Reassessing the reliability and validity of self-report delinquency measures. Journal of Quantitative Criminology 2: 293-327.

1987 Juvenile offenders: prevalence, offender incidence, and arrest rates by race. Crime and Delinquency 33(2): 206-223.

Jang, Sung Joon, and Marvin D. Krohn
1995 Developmental patterns of sex differences in delinquency among African American adolescents: A test of the sex-invariance hypothesis. Journal of Quantitative Criminology 11(2): 195-222.

Johnson, Richard E.
1987 Mother's versus Father's role in causing delinquency. Adolescence 22: 305-315.

1986 General patterns and gender differences. Criminology 24: 65-80.

1979 Juvenile Delinquency and its Origins. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, R.A.; Su, S.S.; Gerstein, D.R.; Shin H.C., and Hoffman, J.P.
1995 Parental influences on deviant behavior in early adolescence: A logistic response analysis of age and gender differentiated effects. Journal of Quantitative Criminology 11(2): 167-193.

Kanmeyer, K.
1967 Birth order as a research variable. Social Forces 46: 71-80.

Krohn, Marvin D., and James L. Massey
1980 Social Control and delinquent behavior: an examination of the elements of the social bond. Sociological Quarterly 21(4): 529-543.

Loeber, R. and M. Stouthamer-Loeber
1986 Family factors as correlates and predictors of juvenile conduct problems and delinquency. In M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.), Crime and Justice. Vol. 7. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McCord, Joan
1991 Family relationships, juvenile delinquency, and adult criminality. Criminology 29(3): 397-417.

McCord, W., and McCord, J.
1959 Origins of Crime. New York: Columbia University Press.

Morash, Merry and Lila Rucker
1989 An exploratory study of the connection of mother's age at childbearing to her children's delinquency in four data sets. Crime and Delinquency 35(1): 45-93.

Nye, F. I.
1973 Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. Westport CT: Greenwood Press.

Patterson, G.
1982 Coercive family process. Eugene OR: Castalia.

1986 Performance models for anti-social boys. American Psychologist 41: 432-444.

Platt, A.M.
1977 The Child Savers. Chicago: University Press.

Powell, Brian and Lala Carr Steelman
1990 Beyond Sibship size; sibling density, sex composition, and educational outcomes. Social Forces 69: 181-206.

Rahav, Giora
1981 Family size and delinquency. Sociology and Social Research 66: 42-51.

Rankin, Joseph H., and Roger Kern
1994 Parental attachments and delinquency. Criminology 32: 495-515.

Rankin, Joseph H., and L. Edward Wells
1990 The effect of parental attachments and direct controls on delinquency. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 27: 140-165.

Rosen, Lawrence
1985 Family delinquency: Structure or function? Criminology 23: 553-573.

Rosenbaum, J.L.
1987 Social control, gender, and delinquency: An analysis of drug, property, and violent offenders. Justice Quarterly 4: 117-132.

Seydlitz, Ruth
1993 Complexity in the relationships among direct and indirect parental controls and delinquency. Youth & Socity 24: 243-275.

1991 The effects of age and gender on parental control and delinquency. Youth and Society: 23: 175-201.

Smith, Carolyn, Anne Wylie Weiher, and Welmoet B. Van Kammen
1991 Family attachment and delinquency. In Urban Delinquency and Substance Abuse: Technical Report, vol 1. eds: David Huizinga, Rolf Loeber, and Terence Thornberry: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Smith, Richard M., and James Walters
1978 Delinquent and non-delinquent males' perceptions of their fathers. Adolescence 13: 21-28.

Stein, Samuel M, De Miranda, Sylvain, and Abigail Stein
1988 Birth Order, Substance Abuse, and Criminality. Individual Psychology 44: 500-506.

Stockard, J. And M. Johnson
1992 Sex and Gender in Society. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Van Voorhis, Patricia, Francis T. Cullen, Richard A. Mathers, and Connie Chenoweth Garner
1988 The impact of family structure and quality on delinquency: a comparative assessment of structural and functional factors. Criminology 26: 235-261.

Wells, L. Edward, and Joseph H. Rankin
1988 Direct parental controls and delinquency. Criminology 26: 263-285.

1985 Broken homes and juvenile delinquency: an empirical reiew. Criminal justice Abstracts 17(2): 249-272.

White, H.R., Pandina, R.J., and R.L. La Grange.
1987 Longitudinal predictors of serious substance use and delinquency. Criminology 25: 715-740.

Wilkinson, Karen, Stitt B. Grant, and Maynard L. Erickson
1982 Siblings and delinquent behavior: an exploratory study of a neglected family variable. Criminology 20: 223-239.

Wilson, James Q., and Richard J. Herrnstein
1985 Crime and Human Nature. New York: Simon & Schuster.