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The purpose of this study is to examine how parenting style interacts with other variables related to characteristics of the child (i.e., race/ethnicity, class and gender) in producing delinquency. This research integrates the traditions of criminology and psychology by incorporating the research of two researchers renowned in their respective fields of study, Travis Hirschi from criminology and Diana Baumrind from psychology.

The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1997 (NLSY97) is used in this study to test hypotheses derived from Hirschi’s (1969) social bond theory and Baumrind’s (1966) parenting typology. These hypotheses examine the effects of family process variables and parenting styles on adolescent delinquency moderated by the effect of the child’s race/ethnicity and gender, and class of the family. Based on OLS Regression results of the study revealed there was a negative relationship between most, but not all of the family process variables and delinquency. As hypothesized, as parent-youth relationship, communication, monitoring and limit setting increased, delinquency decreased. In other analyses authoritative parenting compared to authoritarian and neglectful parenting resulted in less delinquency. When
separate equations were estimated this pattern of findings held for Whites and Blacks but not Latinos. White and Black adolescents with a neglectful or authoritarian mom were more likely to be delinquent than White and Black adolescents with an authoritative mom. Dad parenting was only significant for Whites indicating that adolescents with authoritarian dads were more likely to be delinquent than Whites with authoritative dads. There was no effect of parenting on Latino respondents.

Similar results were revealed when separate equations were estimated for males and females. That is, males and females with a neglectful or authoritarian mom were more likely to be delinquent than males and females with an authoritative mom. Dad parenting was only significant for males indicating those with authoritarian dads were more likely to be delinquent than males with authoritative dads. T-statistics indicated there were no significant differences between males and females.

Class of the family did not have an effect and there was no interaction between the parenting styles and class. However, this could be attributed to its poor measurement.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquency is a social problem that has received extensive attention from researchers and practitioners. It has not only been a focus of research for criminologists, but psychologists as well. Many criminological theories that have been attentive to delinquency have focused on various influential factors ranging from peer and parental influences, environmental, and strain. Furthermore, these theories concentrate on how family process variables (e.g., parent-child attachment, communication, parental monitoring) examined independently have an effect on delinquency. On the contrary, psychological theories look at the interaction of family process variables in producing behavioral outcomes. Although both traditions examine the same phenomenon, they take different pathways to its investigation.

The purpose of this study is to examine how parental influences lead to the onset of delinquent behaviors in adolescents. More specifically, this study pays attention to how parenting style (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful) interacts with other variables related to characteristics of the child (i.e., ethnicity, class and gender) in producing delinquency. This research will integrate the traditions of criminology and psychology by incorporating the research of two researchers renowned in their prospective fields of study, Travis Hirschi from criminology and Diana Baumrind from psychology. Hirschi (1969) is a social control theorist who introduced social bond theory. Baumrind (1966) is known for the parenting typology she created that has been influential in not only explaining delinquency but other outcomes as well, such as self-esteem, academic performance and sexual risk-taking.
Research based on Hirschi’s social bond theory (1969) indicates that social process variables such as parental warmth, attachment, and communication, monitoring and discipline do have a negative affect on delinquency (Agnew, 1985; Alarid, Burton & Cullen, 2000; Demuth & Brown, 2004; Huebner & Howell, 2003) however, the literature is inconsistent. Studies that utilized Baumrind’s parenting typology have demonstrated that if you collapse family process variables into two distinct dimensions of parenting they provide an alternative way of explaining delinquency. She developed two concepts to describe the parenting dimensions, responsiveness and demandingness. These two concepts have distinct measures. Responsiveness involves those aspect of the parent-child relationship in which the parent shows support towards the child and recognizes they have basic needs. Parent-youth relationship (i.e., warmth and attachment), parent-child communication and adolescent involvement in family routines are dimensions that measure responsiveness in this study. The second concept, demandingness involves parental controls implemented to not only protect the child, but provide boundaries. Parental monitoring, strictness and limit setting are the three dimensions used to measure demandingness. Further, Baumrind argues that the interaction between responsiveness and demandingness should be used to create categories to describe parenting behavior. This could serve as another approach at looking at the relationship between parenting and delinquency.

In Baumrind’s research responsiveness and demandingness become integrated to describe the four parenting styles (Bednar & Fisher, 2003; Gray & Steinberg, 1999). High demandingness and responsiveness is associated with authoritative parenting and high demandingness, but low responsiveness is associated with authoritarian parenting.
Indulgent parenting has responsive parenting, but is low on demandingness whereas neglectful parenting is low in both responsiveness and demandingness. According to Baumrind (1966), the most effective style of parenting in reducing delinquent behaviors is authoritative parenting.

Although Baumrind's model is effective at explaining how parenting style affects delinquency, many researchers argue that the typology is based on what seems to be more effective parenting for White middle class adolescents than for adolescents of other ethnic groups. African American and Latino adolescents whose parents utilize authoritarian parenting do not necessarily have more behavioral problems. If one considers cultural factors, authoritarian parenting may be optimal (Chao, 2001; Forehand, Miller, Dutra, Chance & Watts, 1997; Lansford, Deater-Deckard, Dodge, Bates & Pettit, 2004). Although Baumrind has conducted research that has addressed issues related to ethnicity, class and gender it has been minimal and is dated. It wasn't until fairly recently that researchers have used limitations of Baumrind's studies as the focus of their research.

The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, 1997 (NLSY97) is used to explore the interaction between ethnicity and gender of the child, class of the family and parenting on adolescent delinquency. The NLSY97 was designed to document education and labor market experiences, as well as a broad range of other topics such as risky behaviors, peer and family relationships and family background. The study also provides measures for crime, delinquency and arrest. The survey was sponsored by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor, and conducted by
Ohio State University. The data for this study is unique because it oversampled Blacks and Latinos; for many studies these groups are underrepresented.

The NLSY97 data is used in this study to test hypotheses relative to Hirschi’s (1969) social bond theory and Baumrind’s (1966) parenting typology. These hypotheses examine the effects of family process variables (e.g., warmth, attachment, communication, supervision and monitoring) on adolescent delinquency moderated by the effect of the child’s ethnicity, gender and class of the family.

The main objective of this study is to find out if the nature of the relationship between parenting and delinquency varies depending on ethnicity and gender of the adolescent or class of the family. This question is answered by examining seven hypotheses. These hypotheses represent ideas related to Hirschi’s social bond theory and Baumrind’s parenting typology.

Hypotheses 1 through 3 involve testing ideas related to the criminological tradition. In hypothesis 1 it is expected that a negative relationship exists between each of the family process variables (i.e., parent-youth relationship, communication, involvement, monitoring, strictness and limit setting) and delinquency. The second hypothesis involves creating factor scores for responsiveness (i.e., parent-youth relationship, communication and involvement) and demandingness (i.e., monitoring, strictness and limit setting). It is hypothesized that the factors for responsiveness and demandingness will be statistically significant. Following the criminological tradition and drawing on Baumrind an interaction term (resp*demand) was created for responsiveness and demandingness to test hypothesis 3. The purpose of this hypothesis is to determine if a bilinear interaction exists between the two variables to see if the effect of
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demandingness depends upon the level of responsiveness. Hypothesis 4 involves examining ideas related to Baumrind's parenting typology. It is hypothesized that authoritative parenting will decrease delinquency, whereas authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful parenting will increase delinquency. Hypotheses 5 through 7 involve examining the effect of the moderator variables (i.e., ethnicity and gender of the child and class of the family) on the relationship between parenting and delinquency. In hypothesis 5 it is hypothesized there is the probability that youth will react similarly to three of the parenting styles; however authoritarian parenting is expected to decrease delinquency for Black and Latino youth, but increase delinquency for White youth. Hypothesis 6 involves class and it is hypothesized that the nature of the relationship between the four parenting styles and delinquency varies depending on class of the family. Hypothesis 7 is focused on gender differences in delinquency and it is hypothesized that there is a probability that males and females react similarly to three of the parenting styles; however for indulgent parenting females react differently in that delinquency decreases for females, but increase for males. Results of regression analysis reveal that some hypotheses were supported while others were not. A more in-depth discussion of the results and my interpretation of the findings are provided in later chapters.

This study is presented in seven chapters. In this first chapter I have provided an introduction to the purpose of the study as well as an introduction to some key concepts. Chapter II presents a discussion of minority parenting (i.e., African American, Latino and Asian American) and the social construction of the concepts such as race, ethnicity, class and gender. Chapter III provides the more comprehensive conceptual framework for the study and includes an elaboration on Hirschi's (1969) social bond theory and Baumrind's
(1969) parenting typology. Chapter IV is devoted to presenting empirical data. Chapter V presents measures for concepts and the procedures for data gathering and analysis and explicitly describes hypothesis to be tested. Chapter VI is devoted to the presentation and analysis of findings and Chapter VII includes a summary of the study, discussion of the findings and possible limitations and strengths of the research, as well as implications for future research.
CHAPTER II
ETHNIC SOCIALIZATION AND KEY CONCEPTS

This study is focused on whether and how ethnicity, class and gender moderate the relationship between parenting and delinquency. In chapter I, an introduction to key concepts relating to parenting was provided. This chapter will focus on the relevance of additional variables and concepts (i.e., race, ethnicity, class, gender and delinquency) to the current study. Next, chapter III will present theories used to analyze data. However, before proceeding it is necessary to discuss why minority parenting (i.e., African Americans, Latinos and Asian American), may differ from White parenting. Also, this discussion about minority parenting or the focus on additional variables and concepts could explain why there is a probability that adolescents from minority groups compared to Whites may react differently to each of the parenting styles.

African American, Latino and Asian American Socialization

Baumrind’s (1969) parenting typology describes three parenting styles that were initially used to study their impact on samples of White, middle-class adolescents; therefore results of these studies cannot be generalized to other ethnic groups. Furthermore, cultural factors that affect socialization practices were not taken into consideration. In this section, socialization among African Americans, Latinos and Asian Americans will be discussed; this will highlight the rationale behind the parenting styles that exist in each group.

After presenting the theories used to analyze the data in chapter III, Chapter IV will highlight that parenting practices of African Americans, Latinos and Asian Americans have only recently become a focus of inquiry. Coll and Pachter (2002) have
argued that historically minority groups were put into a category unto themselves typically labeled "other." Unfortunately, being placed in this "other" category was usually interpreted in terms of their parenting practices being dysfunctional, instead of as "adaptive strategies responsive to unique environmental and historical demands" (Coll & Pachter, 2002, p. 3). Moreover, in many family studies, particularly of African American and Latino families, samples were used that consisted of predominately low-income participants from disadvantaged neighborhoods. The results of these studies were then used to generalize to other individuals within that ethnic group (Coll & Pachter, 2002).

Coll and Pachter (2002) maintain that there are basic universal goals that parents strive for when socializing their children. These goals include (1) protecting the child’s physical safety, (2) providing the child with an environment that leads to smooth transitions in development, and (3) assisting in the learning of normal social values. Although these goals are considered universal, they argue ethnic groups may differ in the process to obtaining these goals.

In the following section the reader will be introduced to concepts that have been used to describe minority families. More specifically, socialization practices specific to African Americans, Latinos and Asian Americans will also be discussed.

**Collectivism/Interdependence in Minority Families**

Markus and Kitayama (1991) highlighted that American culture is individualistic in nature. This primarily means that the individual is an "independent, self-contained, autonomous entity who (a) comprises a unique configuration of internal attributes … and (b) behaves primarily as a consequence of those internal attributes” (p. 224). Harwood, Leyendecker, Carlson, Asencio and Miller (2002) further emphasized that with
individualism all success or failure an individual faces in life is credited to internal attributes. This could be problematic because it does not consider structural factors that may influence an individual’s life.

On the contrary, Harwood et al. (2002), contend that minority groups are considered interdependent or collectivist in their interaction. According to Markus and Kitayama (1991), “experiencing interdependence entails seeing oneself as part of an encompassing social relationship and recognizing that ones behavior is determined, contingent on, and, to a large extent organized by what the actor perceives to be the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others in the relationship” (p. 227).

Chao and Tseng (2002) suggested that the most cited comparisons of interdependence and individualism involves literature on parenting by Asian Americans and Whites. They also argued that the distinct difference between interdependent and individualistic cultures is prioritization. In collectivist cultures in-group goals are important, whereas in individualistic cultures personal goals are considered of high priority. For example, Chao and Tseng (2002) indicated that Chinese mothers emphasize love for the sake of fostering personal relationships, particularly between parent and child; however White mothers emphasize fostering love to help the child develop self-esteem, which will enable the child, later in life, to obtain individual goals.

**Resilience and Adaptiveness in African American Families**

Historically, when the African American family was studied, a deficit or pathological model was used to describe their mode of parenting and socialization. Carter-Black (2001) argued that the appraisal of their “family stability and structure, survival strategies, and success and achievement outcomes was grounded in a comparison
against White middle-class form and function” (p. 76). In addition, most studies had focused on those African American families that were female-headed and living in poverty. Furthermore, Hill (2001) contends that research depicted mothers as “harsh and arbitrary” and fathers as either non-existent or violent (p. 495). The research was then used to make generalizations to all families regardless of within group differences. Allen and James (1998) argued “apparent in the literature are abundant references to ‘family disorganization,’ ‘the underclass,’ ‘culture of poverty,’ and the ‘Black Matriarch.’ Such terms are offered, picked up, and repeated as if they effectively summarize the reality of Black family life in this society” (p. 2). Likewise Sudarkasa (1997) asserted that:

Although families in various ethnic groups and at various income levels are recognized as undergoing change, only the African American family is consistently described as being “in crisis.” Other families are “in transition.” African American families are portrayed as being “on the brink of collapse.” (p. 10)

Coll and Pachter (2002) indicated that recently there has in fact been a “shift away from a social pathological perspective to one of resilience and adaptiveness of families under a variety of social and economic conditions” (p. 4). Sudarkasa (1997) highlighted that:

African American families, like all families, are adaptive institutions. Thus, in analyzing the changing structure of African American families, one must examine the contexts and conditions that influenced those changes. Slavery, segregation, urbanization, changing economic conditions, changing educational opportunities,
changing demographics, housing options, welfare restrictions, and other public policies must be taken into account. (p. 11)

In order to try and understand African American families, Garmezy and Rutter (1983) proposed resilience theory in an effort to illustrate how minority families have to be resilient in order to deal with or protect themselves from adversity. Hughes and Chen (1997) argued that in the context of child socialization families have to recognize their group disadvantage resulting from the existing system of stratification based on race and negative images portrayed in the media.

McCabe, Clark and Barnett (1999) called attention to the fact that African American children, compared to White children are disproportionately exposed to risk factors associated with the environment in which they reside. For example, they pointed out that significantly more African Americans are living in poverty, more likely to be a violent crime victim and will at some point in their life deal with racism. According to McCabe, Clark and Barnett (1999) despite these circumstances, individuals living under these conditions do in fact “develop in a healthy manner and are described as resilient” (p. 137).

According to Rutter (1987), four protective factors are associated with resilience. The first factor deals with the reduction of being exposed to risk, the second factor, which is related to the first, deals with reducing any devastating chain reaction that might occur. The third factor involves the development and maintenance of self-esteem. The fourth factor involves not being limited by what is available. It encourages individuals to be proactive if opportunity does not automatically present itself.
According to Hill and Sprague (1999) ethnic differences in socialization exist because of the perceptions and concerns of the parents. For example, they argued that because inequality exists, Black [and Latino] parents have to concentrate on teaching their children about the barriers to success they will face in life. Therefore, in preparing children for these future challenges they emphasize obedience, conformity and discipline.

White parents on the other hand, not having to deal with issues of racial inequality are afforded an opportunity to be relaxed in their parenting styles and not be burdened with providing their children with skills to survive in a world where discrimination and prejudice is almost guaranteed at some point in their life. Poor Whites also experience discrimination because of economic inequality, which has an effect on parenting behavior; however America’s history of ethnic conflict places minority groups at a higher chance of experiencing discrimination and prejudiced attitudes. As well, Peters (1997) asserted that “many researchers have described the Black parents as using more direct, physical forms of discipline, which differs from the psychologically oriented approach preferred by mainstream families, such as withdrawal of love or making approval of affection contingent on the child’s behavior or accomplishment” (p. 173).

**Respeto and Familismo in Latino Families**

Although Latinos in the United States are a diverse group of people, there are some common themes that emerge to describe the socialization that occurs within these families. Harwood et al. (2002) highlighted that “respeto and familismo” characterize childrearing in Latino families. “Respeto” refers to individuals showing respect to others depending on the context of the situation. The respect granted a person is usually associated with their age, social standing and sex. “Familismo,” another concept
associated with Latino parenting, is “a belief system [which] refers to feelings of loyalty, reciprocity, and solidarity towards members of the family, as well as to the notion of the family as an extension of self” (Cortes, 1995, p. 249).

It has been argued that Latino children are more likely to have more consistent contact with extended family, compared to White children. Also, Latinos are more likely to continue providing financial assistance long after the necessity of such support has passed. Harwood et al. (2002) also indicated that “Latina mothers are more likely than European mothers to structure their child’s behavior directly through positioning, restraining, and signaling and to use more physical control strategies” (p. 30) when they interacted with their children. Likewise, Marsigilia (1990) emphasized that Latino parents are highly overprotective toward their children.

Roopnarine and Ahmeduzzaman (1993) argued that the portrayal of Latino fathers as distant and striving for machismo is a stereotype. They indicated that machismo is a form of masculinity that encourages men to be aggressive, sexually promiscuous, father many children in and out of wedlock, avoid those things thought of as feminine, and have total authority in their household, while at the same time showing total respect towards their own mothers.

Confucianism and Asian American Parenting

Xiao (1999) highlighted that while the American value system is based on Judeo-Christianity, Chinese values are derived from Confucianism. According to Confucianism, “man exists in relationship to others...people are born into a family or a group and can not prosper alone; the success of an individual depends on the harmony and strength of the group” (p. 2). Wink (1997) emphasized that the “Confucian heritage emphasizes the
importance of hierarchy and harmony (interdependent self-construal), belonging to a family and community (collective identity), and the value of tradition, security and conformity (social order)...these values were not as important in Protestant-based White-American culture” (p. 332).

According to Wink (1997), there are several factors that can weaken collectivism in Asian American culture: generation, religion, social status and gender. He argued that collectivism in Asian American culture is not as strong in third generation immigrants. Also, the more an individual frequents worship services, the more he/she is aided in the affirmation of ethnic tradition. Social status is important because Wink (1997) maintained that Asian Americans with lower income are more likely to have “collectivist attitudes” compared to those whom are more educated and therefore in a higher income bracket. Finally, Triandis’ (1995) contribution was related to gender. He highlighted that women are more likely to be collectivist because they tend to deal with the domestic sphere; however men are more individualistic because they have interaction in the public sphere therefore being exposed to the American ideal of individualism.

Cindy-Lin and Fu (1990) pointed out that “definitive views on parental control, obedience, strict discipline, emphasis on education, filial piety, respect for elders, family obligations, reverence for tradition, maintenance of harmony, and negotiation of conflict are attributed to the influence of Confucianism” (p. 429). According to Xiao (1999), this provides an explanation as to why obedience and conformity are valued in Chinese culture.

Ho (1989) argued that although there is diversity within the Chinese [and Latino] population, “there are those that point to the enduring effects of the Chinese [and Latino]
cultural heritage on all ethnic Chinese [and Latino], regardless of where they may find themselves in the world” (p. 150).

The literature on socialization suggests that different issues and experiences are important for minority groups (i.e., African American, Latino and Asian American) and that this may affect the type of parenting style utilized by the parent. In this section, the reader has been introduced to factors that affect parenting among minority groups. African American parents are aware of the structures of inequality that exists in the U.S. and the challenges their child may face (e.g., higher exposure to risk, poverty, and racism), therefore they emphasize obedience, conformity and discipline. Also, in Latino families parents are highly overprotective while Asian Americans value hierarchy and conformity in socialization.

Based upon these various socialization practices by minority families, the probability that authoritarian parenting will produce positive behavior outcomes is increased in minority adolescents. This is a result of exposure to highly demanding behaviors of parents over the course of their childhood. In contrast, when authoritarian parenting is utilized by White families the likelihood of negative behavioral outcomes in adolescents increases. In the next section, key concepts will be highlighted. This will allow the reader to see the complexity of concepts such as race and ethnicity, class, gender and delinquency, with consideration that they have been socially constructed through socialization and in academic literature.
Key Concepts: Race and Ethnicity, Class, Gender and Delinquency

Race and Ethnicity

In this section and in research literature in general, the concepts of "race" and "ethnicity" are used interchangeably. Hirschman, Alba and Farley (2000) made note that although race is used in the U.S. Census and among social scientists, the concept ethnicity may in fact replace race. They also indicated that race was initially used by sociologists to refer to physical characteristics that distinguished racial groups, however today race is viewed as a social category. According to Cashmore (1994), "the changes in the way the word race has been used reflect changes in the popular understanding of the causes of physical and cultural differences" (p. 265). Ethnicity on the other hand refers to an individual's origin or descent. Cashmore (1994) further argued that an ethnic group "is not a mere aggregate of people or a sector of a population, but a self-conscious collection of people united, or closely related, by shared experiences" (p. 102). These experiences are usually related to deprivation or adversity.

When referring to ethnicity researchers are focusing on minority group culture and language differences. Smedley and Smedley (2005) called attention to the fact that the concept of race is a "fairly recent construct, one that emerged well after population groups from different continents came into contact with one another" (p. 16). They highlighted that although the term existed in the 16th and 17th centuries, it was not until the 18th century that the term became more prevalent. It was during the Revolutionary era that its meaning was "solidified as a reference for social categories of Indians, Blacks and Whites...[furthermore], race signified a new ideology about human difference and a new way of structuring society that had not existed before in human history" (p. 19).
The term white was developed during the 1700's to classify those individuals who had ancestors without one drop of Native American or African blood. This included those people who later immigrated to the United States from areas such as Germany, England, Ireland, and Italy. Granted, there was some ethnic discord between these groups upon immigrating to the states, however it was a better political move to unite these various ethnicities under the umbrella of White. This would allow them to more efficiently exert and maintain control over slaves and Native Americans. It was not until the 19th century that these groups (e.g., Germans, British, Irish, and Italians) “were fitted into the racial ranking system” (Smedley & Smedley, 2005, p. 20) upon entering the United States. All groups except Native Americans and African Americans would eventually be categorized as White. Epstein (1997) argued that although “categorization is necessary for analytic thinking…it is rife with pitfalls...because it is based on a difference model and its conceptual ally, essentialism....which justifies unequal treatment ...against groups regarded as other” (p. 260). The end result is that categorization leads to subordination of groups based on race, class and gender distinctions due to perceived inferiority. From this point forward, the concept White may be used interchangeably with European American, or Non-Hispanic White.

Latino and Asian American are “umbrella term[s] ... or label[s] of convenience...used to refer to people who have their origins in Mexico, Central or South America, and the Spanish-speaking Caribbean (Latino)” or are of Asian American or Pacific Island ancestry (Asian) (Harwood et al., 2002, p. 21). Therefore, according to Harwood et al. (2002), it is important to be aware that those groups represented under these labels are “a diverse people” and studies should not be used to reinforce stereotypes based on a false
perception of homogeneity. As with the concept White, Latino may be used interchangeably with Hispanic and African American may be used interchangeably with Black to recognize different ethnic groups in the study.

For the purposes of this study, focus is placed on four ethnic groups: Whites, Blacks, Latinos and Asian Americans. In the survey instrument, variables were created to give an indication of the respondent’s ethnicity or race based on two questions answered by the parent and child. The first question asked if the respondent was of Hispanic origin and the second asked the respondent to mark whether their race was White, Black/African American, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander or something else. In the study a respondent that was Latino could have been of any race. So in order to integrate the questions on Hispanic origin and race, a new variable was created for ethnicity. The new variable gave precedence to respondents who indicated they were of Hispanic origin. Therefore, the new race variable includes White, Black/African American, American Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or something else.

Social Class

Lindsey and Beach (2003) maintain that sociological variables such as gender, age and religion should be easy to study because most individuals are aware of which category they belong. However, class is not as clear cut because many people are not sure of their status. They indicated that a social class is “defined as a category of people who share a common position” (p. 196) based on unequal distribution of economic rewards. They argued that “class location affects almost every aspect of your daily life – not just your school experiences and career opportunities, but also such things as your learning
how to socialize children, which church you attend, [political affiliation, life chances] and the likelihood that you will be victimized by crime” (p. 196).

In order to operationalize class, many researchers use an objective approach whereby they ask respondents about income, occupation and education in order to place them into a social class. Collectively, these indicators are referred to as socioeconomic status (SES). To use any of these indicators independently of each other could misinform the results of your research. For example, just because a person is a high school drop out does not mean he/she will be considered in a lower class than those with a high school diploma. In fact, they may go back to school to obtain their GED and one day own their own business, thereby having the potential to earn a substantially high income. In this instance, to have used income or education independently to measure social class would have been misleading (Lindsey & Beach, 2003).

Dennis Gilbert and Joseph Kahl (1993) (as cited in Gilbert, 1998) simplified the study of class when they developed a classification system that consists of six classes. These classes include the capitalist class, upper middle class, middle class, working class, working poor, and the underclass. Gilbert and Kahl (1993) suggested certain levels of education were common within each of the six classes. Individuals in the capitalist class are likely to have attended a college or university that had a selection criterion based on income. In other words, the students who attended these institutions had parents who were millionaires. The upper-middle class typically consists of individuals who have an undergraduate or graduate degree. Those who are categorized as middle class typically have a high school degree and some college education. The working class usually consists of those with a high school degree. The working class and underclass is typically
composed of those with some high school education. The primary difference between the working poor and underclass is that the underclass is more likely to be dependent on the government for financial assistance. An important note to make in regards to SES is that we are not referring to an individual’s standing, instead this variable is used “to rank households... [because] a family shares many characteristics among its members that greatly affect their relationship with outsiders: the same house, the same income, the same resources and similar values” (Gilbert, 1998, p. 15).

Gilbert (1998) noted that Gilbert and Kahl’s (1993) classification scheme could be collapsed into three “broader” categories, the lower class (working poor and underclass) with incomes of $29,999 and below, the majority class (middle and working) with incomes of $30,000 to $79,999 and the privileged class (capitalist and upper middle) with incomes of over $80,000.

For the purpose of this study the highest grade [education] completed for the respondents residential parent is included in this study as well as the gross household income from the previous year. If the respondent resides with both parents, the highest grade completed for one parent will be used in the analysis. Z-scores will be computed for education and income in order to obtain standard deviation scores. This is a necessary step because education and income as is are measured on two different scales. Computing Z scores will allow me to compare the two variables.

The only variable of the SES set that cannot be measured in this study is occupation. This limitation is based on the absence of the variable from the survey instrument.
Gender

Social scientists and feminists alike contend that gender is created through human interaction and continues to be constructed and re-constructed as society persists in its evolution (Lorber, 1994; Vannoy, 2001). Scott (1988) argued that not only is gender based on differences related to the type of genitalia (biological sex) a child is born with, but gender is also part of a power relationship. In actuality, the construction of gender is initiated with being labeled a male or female at birth, which is usually followed by other labels based on sex (e.g., clothing, colors, hairstyles, etc.).

Being born male or female shapes the type of socialization a person will encounter throughout life. This gendered socialization is facilitated by various institutions in society, such as the family, schools, media, workplace, and among ones peers. Consequently, men are socialized to have masculine traits, whereas females are socialized to have feminine traits and to conform to gendered social behaviors (Vannoy, 2001). Also masculine characteristics are elevated, whereas feminine characteristics are seen as less appealing, especially in men. According to Kaufman (1998) this creates constraints for men and women not only because of perceived expectations, but also because of privileges, or lack there of, afforded to each group. Vannoy (2001) argued that gender socialization inevitably leads to "a self-fulfilling prophecy" (p. 4) that enables gendered stereotypes. Lorber (1994) indicated that doing gender is usually an unconscious behavior that is not recognized in society unless an individual or group of people (e.g., transvestites, transsexuals) fail to conform to gendered behavior and norms.

Living in a gendered society has structural ramifications that results in a form of inequality referred to as patriarchy or male dominance. This involves differential power
relations where men have more privileges and opportunities available to them. Power is established and maintained through social interaction, so those who have power behave in ways to maintain their dominant position. Some individuals who do not have power fall prey to an ideology that contributes to their oppression. Vannoy (2001) argued, “men hold most positions of authority in political, economic, legal, religious, educational, military, and domestic institutions. In such a society, men have a larger share of income and wealth. In positions of authority and power, men can shape culture to serve their interests” (p. 2-3).

In discussing gendered differences in power and authority, Vannoy (2001) also acknowledged that there are ‘multiple masculinities.’ This concept makes note of the fact that although men as a group have more advantages than women, not all men share similar privileges. Sometimes older men, men from various minority groups and homosexual males can also be oppressed and not reap the same benefits as the white, heterosexual male.

In the move from being an industrial to post-industrial society, where knowledge rather than physical ability is seen as more valuable, the gendered role expectations for men and women is not justifiable. Vannoy (2001) argued that this leads individuals to be more aware that power and privilege is not equally distributed among the sexes.

**Juvenile Delinquency**

The concept juvenile delinquency emerged during the early 1800’s under the auspice of informal social control [toward working class adolescents] and referred to characteristics a child possessed. The first characteristic was that the adolescent did not obey his/her parents or showed respect toward adults. The second characteristic involved
the possibility that an adolescent could change his/her ways and could be molded or rehabilitated and become a functional member of society (Shelden & Brown, 2003).

Eventually, the definition of delinquency became more entrenched in law and incorporates two types of behaviors by adolescents, status offenses and violation of criminal law. Status offenses are those behaviors which are considered delinquent because of the age of the offender. In other words, only those individuals under the age of seventeen or eighteen can be penalized. Status offenses include behavior such as running away, truancy, curfew violation and children who need supervision because their parents can no longer control the child’s behavior. Shelden and Brown (2003) highlighted that status offenses were initially applied to “children of immigrant parents...and children of the poor” (p. 329). Later, status offenses would become a way of controlling adolescent females.

In addition to status offenses, adolescents could also be penalized for behaviors that are considered criminal, but because of the age of the offender he/she is labeled a juvenile delinquent and is processed through juvenile court rather than an adult criminal court. These criminal offenses include the eight index crimes (e.g., murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor-vehicle theft and arson) as well as all other offenses, which include crimes such as vandalism, simple assault, sex and drug offenses (Shelden & Brown, 2003).

In studying delinquency researchers have developed various ways to measure the concept. For example, Edwards (1996), in his study of delinquents and non-delinquents, created categories such as minor offenses (e.g., minor property offenses), medium offenses (e.g., marijuana use, drug sales) and serious offenses (e.g., assault, prostitution,
and attempt to use knife or gun in the commission of a crime) to study delinquency. Weis, Crutchfield and Bridges (2001), on the other hand noted that within the Nation Youth Survey (NYS) seven offense categories could be found, which included felony assault, minor assault, robbery, felony theft, minor theft, damaged property and drug use.

In the current study presented here, the delinquency index being utilized includes both minor and serious forms of delinquency as well as one question that asks if the respondent has been arrested by the police. Self-reported criminal behaviors represent a more accurate picture of delinquent activities than official measures. Official measures of delinquent activities are considered less accurate because of bias in the recording and reporting of crime statistics by police agencies, the use of police discretion and the reality that not all crimes are reported to the police (Mosher, Miethe, & Phillips, 2002). This is significant because respondents in this study were asked if they have been “arrested or taken into police custody for illegal or delinquent offenses.” The self-report data in this study will not only allow me the opportunity to obtain information from adolescents who have come in contact with the juvenile justice system, but also from those who have involved themselves in delinquent behaviors, but were not caught or formally sanctioned. Some minority group populations, particularly African Americans and Latinos, and youth from working class families are more likely to be targeted by law enforcement due to ethnic and social class biases in policing. Consequently they are more likely to come in contact with the juvenile justice system and become officially labeled as delinquents. Also, not all adolescents that have participated in delinquent behaviors have come to the attention of the police. Self-report studies provide a more valid picture on the extent of juvenile offending because adolescents are asked to report on their behaviors which may
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reveal that ethnic and class differences in offending may or may not exist. In theory, justice is blind. Unfortunately, the reality of race, class and gender relations in the U.S. makes this assumption questionable.

In this chapter, socialization practices of African American, Latino and Asian American families were discussed. These sections allow the reader to understand how and why parenting practices differ between these minority groups and White Americans. Statistical analysis will reveal whether or not authoritarian parenting represents the best fit for preventing minority adolescents from becoming engaged in delinquent behaviors. In addition, the definitions for ethnicity, class, gender and delinquency that will be used here have been constructed and their relevance to this study was also discussed. The next chapter will provide a theoretical framework for this study.
CHAPTER III
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In studying juvenile delinquency, there is a general consensus that a child’s family is influential in insulating a child from delinquent behavior or increasing the chances for participation in such behaviors. Parent-child relations have been studied as a source in the etiology of delinquent behavior (Kroupa, 1988). Although there has been much debate in criminological literature about who has the most influence over behavior – parents or peers – there is no question that the family is the first agent of socialization with which a child comes in contact. It is true that as a child matures and interacts with individuals outside of home, the number of individuals that influence his or her behavior will increase as well. Colin (1996) suggested that as an adolescent becomes more mature the relationship between adolescent and parent changes substantially.

In this chapter, I will give a brief synopsis of the level of analysis this study involves, discuss Hirschi’s social control theory, as well as give a brief outline of how social control theory has evolved and continues to do so till this day. Additionally, this chapter will go into further detail about the attachment element of the social bond and the significance of discipline and monitoring as it relates to self-control. From there, I will discuss Diana Baumrind’s parenting typology (1966) as well as the dimensions of parenting that are important to this study. Finally, I will examine the ways in which ethnicity, class and gender relate to parenting and delinquency outcomes.

A Micro Level Analysis

For this research I am interested in examining the social process by which parenting practices can insulate a child from delinquent behavior. Therefore, I will utilize
a micro level analysis to investigate the relationship between parenting styles and delinquency, taking into consideration the interaction of variables such as ethnicity, class and gender.

Micro and macro in criminological theory refers to the levels of analysis used to explain criminal behavior. Indication as to which level of analysis an individual’s research will involve can be found in the research question itself. A micro focus is mostly associated with a social process perspective and macro a more social structure perspective. The social process perspective focuses on how an individual learns how to become involved in crime. Micro theories of crime initially came about due to early American sociologists’ attempts to explain the root causes of social problems (Maguire & Radosh, 1999, p. 206). Conversely, the social structure perspective focuses on how structural conditions (e.g., poverty and inequality) may help explain criminal behavior among certain groups of people (e.g., living in poverty) in the United States.

Micro level of analysis of criminal behavior has had an extensive history within the field of criminology. Explaining crime by focusing on the individual began first with the classical school, which viewed humans as rational human beings seeking to maximize pleasure while at the same time trying to minimize pain. According to Maguire and Radosh (1999), micro also looks at the individual and their immediate social environment (e.g., family, church, school). Groups important to the process of socialization include family, peers, work groups, and reference groups with which one identifies.

Micro level analysis takes into consideration the face-to-face interaction of individuals with their environment. This level of analysis also allows us to see the social process by which an adolescent deviates or adheres to norms. According to Barkan

27

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(2001) social process theories help us understand why some individuals are more likely than others to participate in criminal activity even if these individuals live in similar circumstances (e.g., economic disadvantage). This perspective therefore takes into account how people from specific groups learn, are socialized, and interact (i.e., how criminal behavior may be learned), as well as the characteristics (e.g., ethnicity, class, gender) of the groups to which the individual belongs and their experiences.

**Social Control Theory (SCT)**

Albert J. Reiss (1951) was one of the first researchers to introduce the concept of social control. He was interested in whether personal (i.e., the ability to resist the temptation to meet ones needs by breaking the law) or social controls (i.e., primary social groups or institutions in society) could predict recidivism in juvenile delinquents. He found that “adequacy of personal controls of the individual and his/her relation to social controls in terms of acceptance of or submission to social control” (p. 206) was the best predictor of recidivism in juveniles. Furthermore, Reiss (1951) distinguished between two forms of social control, formal and informal. Informal social controls are those controls exercised by parents and other individuals with whom a person may have close personal contact. Formal social controls are those controls exercised by institutions in the community, such as schools and criminal justice agencies.

A few years later, Jackson Toby (1957) introduced the concept of *stakes in conformity* – “how much a person has to lose when he or she breaks the law” (Vold, Bernard & Snipes, 2002, p. 178). Toby (1957) argued that all youth have the potential to break the law, but they “vary in the extent to which they feel a stake in American society” (p. 16). According to Toby (1957), education is essential to “social ascent” (p. 14)
because it provides opportunities for individuals to have more of a possibility for advancement. Therefore, youth whose academic performance is acceptable may risk punishment or jeopardize their careers if they participate in deviant activity; it could result in their not only being suspended or expelled from school, but being labeled as a difficult student. Hence, their stakes in conformity are high. Conversely, youth whose academic performance is below average have lower stakes in conformity. These youth are aware that their current state has placed limitations on future endeavors. Toby (1957) argued that parents are vital to the educational process of youth. If they encourage their child to do well in school, then their attitude toward school would be more positive. This would consequently affect school performance.

The following year, F. Ivan Nye (1958) published a study that directed attention to the family as an important source of informal social control for adolescents. Nye (1958) took Reiss' (1951) theory a step further and introduced three types of informal controls - direct, indirect and internal. Direct control is usually exercised by parents and involves regulation and monitoring of behavior as well as punishment. Indirect controls take into account the affection or attachment an adolescent may have toward a significant other and the adolescent's consideration of how their behavior will impact these individuals. Internal control applies to how the adolescent's guilt prevents him/her from participating in delinquent activities. Nye (1958) also acknowledged there were gender differences in how direct controls were utilized. He argued that more rigid social controls were applied with girls compared to boys.

In 1961, Walter Reckless introduced containment theory, which is composed of two categories: inner and outer containment. Inner containment is a form of self-
regulation based on an individual’s having internalized norms and values of society. Outer containment moves beyond the individual to those primary socializing agents that provide expectations and boundaries for behavior in hopes of preventing deviance. Despite these predecessors, it was Travis Hirschi’s explanation of social control published in *Causes of Delinquency* (1969) that emerged as the prominent statement of control theory.

**Travis Hirschi (1969) — Social Bond Theory (SBT)**

The most influential variation of control theory, which Hirschi called *social bond theory*, focuses on how an individual’s bond to society influences decisions to break the law. There are four elements of a social bond or points of control: attachment, commitment, involvement and belief. According to Hirschi (1969), “control theories have described the elements of the bond to society in many ways, and they have focused on a variety of units as the point of control” (p. 16).

For this study, I am interested in highlighting only the attachment element as it relates to parenting practices and delinquency. This is important to note because Hirschi (1969) himself suggested that each element of the bond can be linked to certain institutions in society; “…control theory has remained decidedly eclectic, partly because each element of the bond directs attention to different institutions. For these reasons, I shall treat specifications of the units of attachment as a problem in the empirical interpretation of control theory, and not attempt at this point to say which should be more or less important” (p. 31). Furthermore, Simons, Simons and Wallace (2004) have since pointed out that a child’s attachment to his or her parent was more influential to the
child's behavior than "all relationships within a child’s social network" that served as a source of social control.

In this section, I have presented information that provides more insight into how attachment is formed and its significance in relation to the parents and child. Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory was weak in fully explaining attachment beyond its social ramifications.

**Element of a Social Bond: Attachment**

According to Buist, Dekovic, Meeus and Aken (2002), the term attachment has evolved over time. It was initially used to describe the bond between infants and mothers. However, over the years, that narrow definition has broadened and now includes later developmental periods and attachment to others besides parents (e.g., siblings, peers). Attachment involves an emotional connection to another person or sensitivity to the opinions of others. According to Kenny and Gallagher (2002), secure parental attachments provide the adolescent with security and support which is very important considering the life changes they are experiencing.

Hirschi (1969) in his book, *Causes of Delinquency*, drew a linear connection between the internalization of norms and an individual’s attachment to others, “if a person...is insensitive to the opinions of others - then he is to that extent not bound by the norms...he is free to deviate” (p. 18). Consequently, attachment relies on whether or not an individual is sensitive to the opinion of others (Hirschi, 1969, p. 16), however this can only apply if the individual feels a closeness to, cares for or identifies with other individuals such as ones parents or peers (Simons, Simons & Wallace, 2004). Hirschi (1969) also suggested that consequences for behavior vary depending on whether
attachment is to conventional or non-conventional parents. Moreover, he made note of the fact that attachment allows an “emotional bond between parent and the child that presumably provides the bridge across which pass parental ideals and expectations” (p. 86). Also, Hirschi (1969) highlighted that children who are attached to their parents are less likely to find themselves in situations where delinquency is possible because it is assumed that the child will be spending more time in the presence of the parent(s). Two issues Hirschi (1969) did not address in much detail were parental discipline and monitoring. This is significant because discipline can increase the probability for delinquency if it is inconsistent, too harsh or permissive. Also, lack of parental monitoring can increase the chances that a youth will come in contact with unconventional individuals (e.g., peers).

Attachment is the most important element [of a social bond] when examining the parent-child relationship. However, as research will indicate, parental responsibility in the context of interacting with the child to establish a quality relationship is essential to a child forming a healthy attachment. Furthermore, this relationship affects how the child forms other relationships (Marty, Readdick & Walters, 2005). Attachment between parent and child decreases chances that the adolescent will deviate and participate in delinquent activities. Bowlby (1973) suggested that parents who recognize and respond to their child’s needs (e.g., comfort, security, independent exploration) enable the child to view others as caring and trustworthy. This sense of trust can only be established through consistent interaction between the parent and child (Readdick & Walters-Chapman, 1994). Marty, Readdick and Walters (2005) provided one of the most sound definitions of parent-child attachment:
A parent capable of providing security-inducing, sensitive, responsive care who understands the child’s individual attributes, accepts the child’s behavioral processing and is thus capable of orchestrating harmonious interactions between self and infant on a relatively consistent basis promotes secure attachment. (p. 275)

**Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) – Self Control**

Travis Hirschi co-authored a book with Michael Gottfredson titled, *A General Theory of Crime* (1990). According to the authors, it was the lack of *self-control* which was the main source of criminal behavior. It was in this book that lack of self-control was attributed to an absence of nurturance, discipline and training by parents. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) argued “the connection between social control and self-control could not be more direct than in the case of parental supervision of the child. Such supervision presumably prevents criminal or analogous acts and at the same time trains the child to avoid them on his own” (p. 99). Furthermore, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) implied that the key to successful child-rearing is “parental concern for the welfare or behavior of the child” (p. 98).

According to Cullen and Agnew (2003) the reason for this change in theorizing was that by 1990 research had revealed that:

Many wayward youth do not suddenly become seriously delinquent in their teen years. Instead, they begin to manifest conduct problems in childhood – problems that evolve into delinquency. This continuity or stability in misconduct suggests that the roots in crime lie not in adolescence but in the first years of life. It would follow that
criminologists should search for causes of crime in childhood and not, as had previously been the case, in experiences of juveniles in the teenage years. (p. 223)

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) suggested that part of encouraging self control in children is effective discipline. They argued that this discipline did not have to be harsh, but could be as simple as letting the child know the parent did not approve of his or her behavior. In reality however, there are various degrees of disciplinary techniques that can be used and this includes those that are too harsh or too lenient.

**Further Developments in Control Theory**

Hagan, Simpson and Gillis' (1987) power-control theory of delinquency focuses on one question “what differences do the relative class positions of husbands and wives in the workplace make for gender variations in parental control and in delinquent behavior of adolescents?” (p. 789). To answer this question, they considered two theories that focused on gender and delinquency - deprivation and liberation theories. Deprivation theory focuses on explaining the relationship between gender and crime by examining female headed households which are usually represented by poor, young, minority women. On the contrary, liberation theory focuses on women who work outside the home and are thriving in the workforce. Female headed households have been used as a comparison group considering power-control theory is based on research conducted with two-parent families where power relations exist (Hagan, Simpson & Gillis, 1987).

Power-control theory considers how mothers in patriarchal families reproduce an inequality of power in the household since they are less likely to work outside the home, but have more contact with the children. Fathers, on the other hand, are likely to have
some form of authority because they work outside the home and contribute financially to the household. According to Hagan, Simpson and Gillis (1987) power and control in the households involves an “instrument-object relationship” (p. 793) because more strict control is exerted over daughters compared to sons. This control usually includes more restrictions placed on the daughter’s behavior and being socialized to be passive rather than possess a preference for risk taking. This results in the likelihood of more delinquency among boys than girls.

On the contrary, in egalitarian families there is more of a balance because both mom and dad work outside the home and have some authority in the workplace that is carried over into the household. In this instance, the same behaviors are expected of daughters and sons. Also, both have a higher risk preference because they are treated equally by mom and dad because they will also one day enter the workforce. Consequently, there is a probability that the gender gap in delinquency will decrease for adolescents from egalitarian homes. Hagan, Simpson and Gillis (1987) argued that “each condition [patriarchal, egalitarian, female-headed household] carries with it a predicted set of consequences in terms of gender variation in parental control, risk taking, and common forms of delinquent behavior” (p. 794). According to Cullen and Agnew (2003):

To Hagan gender is central to understanding delinquency. In traditional families....boys are exposed to fewer controls than girls, and thus they develop stronger risk preferences and have higher involvement in crime. In more egalitarian families......boys and girls are subjected to similar parental controls and thus tend to have similar involvement in delinquency. (p. 225)
Hagan, Simpson and Gillis (1987) contributed further to their power control theory of delinquency by introducing a Dahrendorfian model to explain how class affects family relations. In this model they focused on how authority relations in the workplace affect authority relations in the home. Compared to the power-control theory which concentrated on the authority mother and fathers had in the workplace, the Dahrendorfian model focuses on the position of women in the workplace, particularly working moms, moms of female-headed households and mothers who are employers or managers. In such households, gender difference in deviant behavior is likely to decrease because it is not likely that mothers and fathers will reproduce an inequality of power. Also aside from mothers being in the workforce, fathers are likely to have increased interaction with the children.

Hagan, Simpson and Gillis (1987) power-control theory contributes to this study because it highlights that within a family a unit, there is the possibility of gendered socialization among sons and daughters. This socialization is attributed to whether or not the mother works outside the home and is in a position of authority. In patriarchal families (i.e., mom does not work outside the home) gendered socialization practices exist, whereby social control is more likely to be exerted over the female child. Also, in these types of families, girls are socialized to avoid taking risks and the sanctions that coincide with being caught for participating in risky behaviors. The male child, on the other hand, is socialized to take risks and venture outside the home. On the other hand, in more egalitarian families (i.e., both parents work in the labor force) there is no differentiation between the level of social control and encouragement in risk-taking among male and female children. Essentially, Hagan, Simpson and Gillis (1987) illustrate
that we must consider gendered socialization practices within the family when trying to explain gender differences in adolescent delinquency.

Social control theory has evolved since its inception during the 1950's. Various researchers have developed their version of social control and measurements to test their theories. However, it is evident in current criminological research that Travis Hirschi’s formulation of control theory has been more widely used and tested. It appears researchers have found great use in how an individual’s bond to society can serve as an explanatory factor to help understand criminality among adolescents and adults.

Hirschi’s social bond theory (1969) is prominent in criminological research, whereas Baumrind’s parenting typology is well-known in psychological research. Importantly in the current study, I integrate the two traditions (i.e., criminology and psychology) to examine how parenting style (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful) interacts with other variables related to characteristics of the child and parent (i.e., ethnicity and gender of the child and class of family) in producing delinquency. In criminological theories, the affect of separate parenting dimensions (e.g., attachment, parental-warmth, monitoring, and discipline) on delinquency are emphasized. However, Baumrind was interested in integrating family process variables into two distinct groups (e.g, responsiveness and demandingness) because she believed this approach would be better at predicting adolescent delinquency.

**Dimensions of Parenting**

In this section, I will discuss the two dimensions of parenting based on Baumrind’s research and typology (1966). From there, I draw attention to Maccoby and Martin’s (1983) revision to Baumrind’s typology. This is of significance because
elements of both Baumrind (1966) and Maccoby and Martin’s (1983) research have become integrated in parenting literature.

According to Baumrind (1996) parenting can be grouped under two dimensions, responsiveness and demandingness (control). Responsiveness involves the parent being “attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children’s needs and demands” (p. 410). Demandingness, on the other hand, refers to the nature of direct confrontations, parental monitoring, and discipline. Darling and Steinberg (1993) indicated that demandingness refers to “parent’s willingness to act as a socializing agent, whereas responsiveness refers to the parent’s recognition of the child’s individuality. Thus the two dimensions reflect two types of demands: those made by the society on the child (as conveyed through the parent) and those made by the child on society” (p. 492). According to Baumrind (1996), “demanding parents supervise and monitor their children’s activities by directly confronting rather than subtly manipulating them” (p. 401).

**Responsiveness**

Responsiveness emphasizes measures of parental warmth, communication, and attachment. Warmth involves a “parent’s emotional expression of love” (Baumrind, 1996, p. 410). Warmth is usually revealed in how the parent responds to the child and the child’s needs. Baumrind (1994) argued that if parental warmth exists, it encourages the child to explore his/her environment because the child is secure in knowing their parents are accessible if needed. Parent-child communication according to Baumrind (1996) should not only be clear but person-centered in such that the parent is flexible in dealing with the child and his/her needs. Person centered communication uses persuasion to “legitimize parental authority” (p. 410). Not only is this type of communication more
accepted by the child, but it allows the child to internalize the parent’s values because there is less conflict. The final element, attachment, which is also discussed as an element of Hirschi’s social control theory, involves making the child feel secure, being sensitive and being responsive to the child’s needs. It also involves understanding that the child is an individual whom the parent should try to interact with and understand (Marty, Readdick & Walters, 2005).

**Demandingness**

The second dimension of parenting is demandingness (control). According to Baumrind (1996), demandingness involves direct confrontations that allow the parent to monitor their child and provide consistent, firm (e.g., non-coercive) and contingent discipline. More specifically it refers to “the claims that parents make on children to become integrated into the family and community by their maturity expectations, supervision, disciplinary efforts, and willingness to confront a disputative child” (p. 411). Elements of demandingness include monitoring and discipline.

**Parental Monitoring**

Stattin and Kerr (2000) highlighted that monitoring is a form of social control that refers to parental behavior involving the tracking and surveillance of their child’s behavior. This involves knowing where the child is throughout the day, correspondence with the child’s teacher(s) and knowing who he/she hangs out with as well as who their parents are. Furthermore, Stattin and Kerr (2000) indicate there are three ways in which parents can gain knowledge on their child’s daily activities – (1) child disclosure of information about their lives, (2) parental solicitation in which parents initiate interaction with the child and his or her friends to explore what type of activities the child is
participating in. This second access to knowledge resembles what many would label parent-child communication.

The final way a parent can gain knowledge is through (3) *parental control* in which the establishment and compliance with rules are the focal point. Also, Stattin and Kerr (2000) indicated that although parental monitoring assumes some action on the parent’s part, it actually measures “parents knowledge of the child’s whereabouts, activities and associations” (p. 368). Baumrind (1996) argued that monitoring promotes self-regulation in the child when expectations are consistent, guidelines are clear, and responsibilities are defined in the household. Dorius, Bahr, Hoffmann, & Harmon, (2004) stressed that there should be two distinct forms of monitoring. The first involves parental knowledge of the child’s activities and friends to put the parents in a better position to prevent deviant behavior. The second involves the child’s perception of whether or not he/she thinks his/her parents are likely to catch him/her for misbehavior.

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) argued that if a parent starts out monitoring behaviors then at some point the child would come to avoid misbehaving on his or her own. The child would have been socialized well enough that they would have internalized behavioral norms; therefore he or she would be less likely to participate in misbehavior regardless of whether the parent was knowledgeable of their behavior because they had developed self-control. Baumrind (1996) asserts that consistent monitoring requires an investment of time and energy. Another element of the parent child relationship introduced by Crouter, MacDermid, McHale, and Perry-Jenkins (1990) is that “....parental interest is not enough: A child must be willing to share his or her
experiences and activities with the parent. Seen in this light, parental monitoring is a relationship property” (p. 656).

In parenting and delinquency literature, parental monitoring has had a relatively shared meaning. Then again, methodological questions have not centered on the definition of monitoring, the focus of the research literature has been on the items used to represent monitoring in various studies. Many studies have focused on parental knowledge of their child’s whereabouts and limits placed on how late the child is allowed to stay out at night (e.g., Chao, 2001). Other studies have focused on the presence of the parent in the home when the child is leaving, returning home or goes to bed at night (e.g., Cookstone, 1999). Some researchers who used various instruments (e.g. child reports, mother reports, observer reports) to assess the extent to which parents are knowledgeable about where the child is throughout the day, deviant behavior that occurs in and away from home and the extent to which the parent(s) supervises activities the child takes part in (e.g., Patterson & Dishion, 1985)

Still, other studies utilized scales or indexes to measure parental monitoring. In conducting research, several studies have used a strictness/supervision scale (Forehand, Miller, Dutra, Chance & Watts 1997; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg and Dornbusch, 1991; Pittman & Chase-Landsdale, 2001). This scale seems to focus on parental knowledge of child’s whereabouts, time spent away from home and the child’s friends. In several studies, researchers have used a parental monitoring or parental supervision scale (Huebner & Howell, 2003; McCluskey & Tovar, 2003) to assess parental knowledge about their child’s whereabouts, who he/she hangs out with, if the child is required to check-in with the parent, and whether or not the parent(s) monitor the child’s computer
usage and TV viewing. Gray and Steinberg (1999) used a strictness/supervision scale to investigate not only parental monitoring, but also limit setting.

**Parental Discipline**

Discipline, the second element of demandingness, is intended to control undesirable behavior in the child and promote compliance. Holden (2002) argued that discipline and punishment are distinct concepts. He indicated that discipline provides the child with “instruction and guidance,” whereas punishment was intended to suppress an undesirable behavior. Holden (2002) also maintained that punishment and corporal punishment, although used synonymously are different. In other words, corporal punishment is a type of punishment (i.e., punishment is an umbrella terms for all types of punishment). The difference is that with corporal punishment there is “physical pain” (p.603); however with other types of punishment (e.g. grounding, giving child time-out, extra chores) there is an absence of physical pain.

Oppositional behavior in children is inevitable because children are going to test boundaries and their parent’s authority. However, how the parent responds to this behavior can have effects on the child behavior outcomes. Discipline can take many forms and vary depending on the authority figure, whether it is the mother or father. It ranges from parents grounding the child, taking privileges away, requiring additional chores, spanking and harsher physical punishment. A significant amount of research is interested in the consequences of discipline on subsequent child behavior.

Again, as with parental monitoring, discipline has had a relatively shared meaning in parenting and delinquency literature. However, methodological concerns have focused on the items used to represent discipline in various studies. Patterson and Stouthamer-
Loeber (1984) utilized child reports, mother-child differences in scores, mother reports and interviewer observations to assess parental monitoring in their studies.

Baumrind (1994) indicated that discipline could be categorized according to its coerciveness (e.g., threatening child), consistency and contingency (e.g., immediate vs. delayed use of punishment). According to Baumrind (1996), coercive parents are more likely to issue verbal threats without giving the child reasons as to why they are going to be punished. In this instance, the focus becomes the parent’s status of power “rather than on the harmful consequences of the act that the parent opposes” (p. 364). Baumrind (1996) argued that although inconsistent discipline is commonly used by abusive parents it could also be present in non-abusive homes. Inconsistent discipline is the result of the lack of “consistent expectations” parents have for their child’s behavior. Baumrind (1996) also argued that discipline should be contingent in that “the use of positive or negative reinforcers should immediately follow the desired or prohibited child behavior, respectively” (p. 396). If the child is not punished soon after the misbehavior has occurred, then the parent may likely have pent up aggression that reveals itself through the application of [harsher] punishment on the child. This could lead to the child becoming defiant and provoke the parent to use more coercive controls. Baumrind (1996) indicated that considering these factors, it is “not the specific disciplinary practice [e.g., take away privileges, grounding, physical punishment] [that is of importance] but how it is applied (e.g., consistency, coerciveness) and in what cultural context that determine its efficacy and long term effects” (p. 405). Furthermore, she maintains that when taking into account the influence of physical punishment on the child’s behavior it is important to
consider other parenting factors such as responsiveness, class of the family and minority status.

Coughlin and Vuchinich (1996) used direct observation data to assess the consistency to which parents disciplined their children, and frequency of aversive discipline or physical/psychological abuse. Vuchinich, Bank and Patterson (1992) also used a "comprehensive approach" to measure parenting behavior. The first measure used direct observation data that allowed the researchers to code the degree to which parents "gave rationales for rules, were overly strict, inconsistent, firm, nagging or teased the child" (p. 513). The second measure was based on data that was coded by the researchers who observed the interactions between the parent(s) and children. This data allowed Vuchinich et al. (1992) to characterize the parent’s behavior as aversive or ineffective.

Furthermore, some research used a checklist to assess parental discipline strategies. These checklists usually included measures for whether discipline was consistent, the extent of the use of physical punishment, parent’s demeanor toward the child, and whether or not the parent rewarded good behavior or recognized appropriate child demands based on age (Kilgore, Snyder, & Lentz, 2000).

These dimensions of parenting are related to parenting style because they illustrate through the level of responsiveness and demandingness, as proposed by Baumrind (1996), the distinguishing characteristics between the four styles of parenting. Authoritative parents are both demanding and responsive, whereas authoritarian parents are demanding but not responsive. Permissive parents are responsive, but not demanding and neglectful parents are neither demanding nor responsive (Bednar & Fisher, 1996).
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Diana Baumrind’s Parenting Typology

Baumrind (1966) introduced the possibility that child rearing practices could influence adolescent behavior when she explored the impact of parental disciplinary practices on child conduct problems. From this initial investigation, her research was extended to study adolescent outcomes in the areas of, but not limited to, delinquency, academic achievement, adolescent decision making, health risk behaviors, and as a moderator in peer relationships. This section includes a discussion of the elements of Baumrind’s parenting typology, that is authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting. It will demonstrate that if family process variables are factored into two dimensions - responsiveness (e.g., parental warmth, communication and attachment) and demandingness (e.g., parental monitoring and discipline) - it can serve as another approach to explain delinquency.

Authoritative parenting is used by parents that are highly responsive and demanding in their parenting practices. This combination of responsiveness and demandingness interact to discourage an adolescent from participating in delinquent behaviors. Authoritative parents are more likely to have open communication with their child or the child may feel as though he or she can speak with the parents about various facets of their life. Also, these families have high levels of parental warmth, and parent-child attachment. In addition, monitoring and disciplinary practices serve as a preventive measure against delinquency because expectations for behavior are clear, parents supervise the child’s behavior and discipline is likely to be consistent, firm and contingent. Overall, authoritative parenting is assumed to integrate the needs of the child
with the rest of the family, in other words, it is both parent and child centered (Baumrind, 1966). This style of parenting is considered the most effective in preventing delinquency.

Authoritarian parenting is used by parents that are highly demanding, but not very responsive in their parenting practices. It has even been labeled as militaristic in nature. This combination of responsiveness and demandingness can interact to facilitate rather than discourage an adolescent from participating in delinquent behaviors. Open communication is practically non-existent in these types of families. Furthermore, parental-warmth and parent-child attachment is not very strong. Also, obedience to authority is expected without question, regardless of whether the parent is right or wrong (Baumrind, 1966). Also, like authoritarian parenting expectations for behavior are clear, parents supervise the child’s behavior and discipline is likely to be consistent, firm and contingent. This style of parenting is considered one of the least effective in delinquency prevention.

Thus far, it is evident that in both authoritative and authoritarian parenting demandingness is high. The key distinction between the two types of parenting is the level of responsiveness. In authoritative parenting responsiveness is high, whereas in authoritarian parenting, the opposite holds true.

Permissive parenting is used by parents who are low in responsiveness and demandingness. A major factor associated with this style of parenting is that it “permits a child to be self-regulated” (Baumrind, 1966, p. 889). Permissive parents are not likely to have open communication with their child and weak levels of parental warmth and parent-child attachment are likely to exist. Also, expectations for the child’s behavior will not be clear, parents are less likely to monitor the child’s behavior and discipline is likely
to be inconsistent, coercive and non-contingent, if it exists at all. In other words, there is a possibility for no real restraints on the child’s behavior and the likelihood of low parental control. Consequently, this prevents the child from making any association between his or her behavior and its effect on other people because he or she is not made aware that behavior can have negative consequences. As a result of this lack of balance, children in these types of families are likely to become involved in delinquent behaviors. Like authoritarian parenting, permissive parenting is also considered one of the least effective parenting styles.

Maccoby and Martin’s (1983) Two-Dimensional Framework for Permissive Parenting

From the literature it is evident that by the early 1980’s Baumrind’s tripartite model of parenting had been established; however, Maccoby and Martin (1983) emerged and refined this parenting typology. They called attention to how the permissive style of parenting could be broken down into two distinct dimensions – indulgent and neglectful parenting. The authors defined indulgent parenting as encompassing high responsiveness and low demandingness. However, neglectful parenting would be low in both responsiveness and demandingness. In other words, neglectful parenting represented what Baumrind called permissive parenting, whereas indulgent parenting took into consideration that parents could be responsive to their child’s needs, but not implement measures to monitor or control their behavior. Regardless, both types of parenting are regarded as not very effective in discouraging delinquency.

In this study, I will use Hirschi’s (1969) theoretical approach to test the direct effect of the independent parenting variables on delinquency. After this task is completed, I plan to test Baumrind’s (1996) idea of interaction by creating interaction terms between
variables in order to create measures of demandingness and responsiveness. This will allow me to replicate Baumrind's parenting typology and examine whether the relationship between parenting and delinquency varies, depending on ethnicity and gender of the child and class of the family.

In the next section I will look at the significance of ethnicity, class and gender in social bond theory (SBT) and parenting because these variables can moderate the relationship between parenting and delinquency.

Social Bond Theory, Parenting and Issues of Ethnicity, Class and Gender

Hirschi (1969) has provided scholars with a theory that has been empirically tested with the various agents to which an individual can form a social bond. However, in dealing with the issue of the family and the element of attachment, he only just touched the surface. This is one gap I am trying to fill with this study.

Ethnicity and gender of the child as well as class of the family are variables that can affect family processes. All of these variables could affect which parenting style is more effective at preventing delinquency. For instance, as will be seen in chapter four, research has revealed that authoritative parenting insulates both Caucasian and Black adolescents from delinquent behavior (e.g., Adalbjarnardottir & Hafsteinsson, 2001; Cohen & Rice, 1997; Pittman & Lansdale, 2001). However, at the same time authoritarian parenting renders significantly more negative outcomes for White than for Black adolescents (e.g., Baumrind, 1972; Lansford, Deater-Deckard, Dodge, Bates & Pettit, 2004).

Furthermore, the style of parenting used in a household can be affected by the economic status of the family. Social class is a variable that affects various aspects of
family functioning. If a family is living in an unstable and disorganized neighborhood then parents may have to exercise more punitive discipline and increase monitoring of the child's behavior. In this instance, not only does it insulate the child, but the child may come to see such parenting behaviors as normal.

Also, gender socialization can affect which parenting style is more effective in insulating a child from delinquency. Given that we socialize girls and boys differently, this could affect how they respond to a particular parenting style. Since girls are encouraged not to take risks, demandingness on part of the parents could be less punitive, however a girl would still be less likely to deviate. On the other hand, since boys are encouraged to take risks, any lapse in monitoring or discipline could make delinquency more likely.

This study will highlight four parenting styles – authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful – and their effects on delinquency. More specifically, this study will focus on how ethnicity, class and gender interact with parenting style given that these variables can moderate the relationship between parenting and delinquency. In the next chapter, a review of the literature will be introduced, as well as hypotheses for this study.
CHAPTER IV

LITERATURE REVIEW

Diana Baumrind’s parenting typology has been used to explain the influence of parenting on adolescent behavior since its conception in 1966. However, some scholars have argued that it falls short in fully explaining delinquency when antecedent variables such as ethnicity of the child, class of the family and gender of the child are taken into consideration. Baumrind used European American families as the archetype for explaining parenting styles and behavioral outcomes of children. She did not fully explore the relevance of cultural variations to child rearing and how gender of the child affected how they responded to a specific parenting style. Likewise, she did not completely consider how environmental factors (e.g., lack of quality education, community resources, and informal social control, inadequate housing, numerous single-parent households, elevated crime rate) associated with residing in an area with a high concentration of poverty affected not only styles of parenting, but the child’s response to the parenting style.

In this literature review I provide research utilizing Baumrind’s parenting typology as well as the attachment element of Travis Hirschi’s control theory in explaining adolescent behavior. In addition, literature that provides a link between the variables of ethnicity, class and gender with parenting is incorporated in this chapter. This will provide a larger picture of the relationship between parenting, delinquency and the antecedent variables.
Parenting Styles

In Baumrind's (1966) parenting typology, three distinct styles of parenting emerged: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. Maccoby and Martin (1983) revised the typology and created a two-dimensional framework for permissive parenting: indulgent and neglectful parenting. In considering the following review of literature it is important to note that studies could have used Baumrind's initial typology or the revised typology. Furthermore, literature relevant to Travis Hirschi's social control theory (i.e., attachment) has been integrated with parenting literature. Therefore, in this literature review both a criminological (Hirschi) and psychological (Baumrind) tradition is represented in examining the relationship between parenting and behavioral outcomes for children.

As noted in Chapter 3, there are two concepts -- responsiveness and demandingness -- used to illustrate Baumrind's (1996) parenting typology. Within these concepts are dimensions which assist in fully comprehending the different types of parenting. For example, parents who are authoritative are highly demanding and responsive. Authoritarian parents are highly demanding, but not responsive. Indulgent parents are responsive, but not demanding and neglectful parents are neither demanding nor responsive. The subsequent literature provides research on the various dimensions of responsiveness and demandingness.

Responsiveness

According to Baumrind (1996) responsiveness involves the parent being "attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children’s needs and demands" (p. 410). The following
literature provides research on the following dimensions of responsiveness: parental warmth, attachment, and communication.

**Parental Warmth and Attachment**

Kostelecky (2005) found a significant relationship between attachment and substance use in adolescents. In his study of 133 high school students, age 16 to 19 years of age, from a rural area in the Midwest he found low levels of alcohol and drug use were associated with adolescent’s belief that they had a good quality relationship with their parents.

Dorius, Bahr, Hoffmann, and Harmon (2004) evaluated the extent to which parental support and control moderated the relationship between peers and marijuana among a group of predominately White (88%) adolescents. Their study revealed that closeness to mother and parental support were not significant in that they did not moderate the relationship between peer drug use and adolescent marijuana use.

Data from the 1995 National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health was used by Demuth and Brown (2004) to investigate the effect family structure had on delinquency. In examining 16,304 adolescents from two-parent biological families, single parent families, mother-stepfather families and father-stepmother families they found that after they introduced a model containing family process measures (e.g., parental involvement, supervision, monitoring and closeness), family structure became non-significant. This revealed that both direct (e.g., supervision, involvement and monitoring) and indirect (e.g., parent closeness) parental controls inhibited delinquency. Their research also indicated that parent closeness exhibited the largest effect on delinquency compared to direct controls, males and minorities (e.g., Black and Latino) were more
delinquent than females and parental education, but not family income was significantly related to delinquency.

In a study of Caucasian, African American and Latino first time young adult felons (e.g., violent, property or drug) sentenced to a residential court-ordered boot camp program (coed), Alarid, Burton and Cullen (2000) found there was a significant and inverse correlation between attachment to parents, involvement and beliefs to criminal behavior. Furthermore, their research revealed that attachment to parents served as an insulating factor in decreasing involvement in criminal behavior for females more than for males who had participated in violent crimes.

In a study of Australian teenagers, Peiser and Heaven (1996) found that negative family relations (e.g., extent, severity, or magnitude of perceived problems) and parent-love withdrawal were related to high levels of delinquency.

Using data from the first two waves (1977 & 1978) of the National Youth Survey to conduct a longitudinal test of Hirschi's control theory, Agnew (1991) focused on minor forms of delinquency. Results indicated that parental attachment had an indirect effect via commitment and deviant beliefs on minor delinquency. Overall, delinquency was minimally affected by the social control variables.

Agnew (1985) utilized data from the 1966 and 1968 Youth in Transition Survey which was a national longitudinal survey of a panel of predominately White adolescent boys beginning the 10\textsuperscript{th} grade to test Hirschi's control theory. His research indicated that social control variables of attachment (e.g., parental, school, peer), involvement and commitment were best able to explain minor delinquency compared to more serious forms of delinquency.
In their study of 3,065 adolescents in grades 7 through 12, Krohn and Massey (1980) found that attachment was the weakest predictor for minor delinquency, hard drug use and serious delinquency compared to the other elements in Hirschi’s model. Furthermore, they found that the scale measuring affective ties with the mother was a more powerful predictor of delinquency than the scale for the father. Krohn and Massey (1980) brought up a valid point to rationalize this distinction. They argued that mothers “represented a stronger inhibiting factor to deviance simply because” (p. 538) they were in a better position to supervise their children on a day-to-day basis.

Kerns and Stevens (1996) found that adolescents have had to describe their parents as a unit rather than considering the relationship with each parent when asked questions about attachment. This could be problematic in that each parent may have different parenting styles, therefore this could lead to different behavioral outcomes in children. Teasing out each parent’s influence and evaluating their affect on the child can be valuable in more fully understanding parent-adolescent attachment.

The preceding studies indicate there seems to be a significant relationship between attachment and parental warmth and delinquency. Several of the studies (e.g., Agnew, 1985; Alarid, Burton & Cullen, 2000; Demuth & Brown, 2004; Kostelecky, 2005; Peiser & Heaven, 1996) illustrated that attachment and parental warmth can insulate a child from delinquency.

Communication

Huebner and Howell (2003) examined the relationship between adolescent risk taking and perceptions of parental monitoring, parent-adolescent communication and parenting style in an ethnically diverse sample of 7th – 12 graders. No support was found
for parent-adolescent communication nor parenting style in influencing sexual risk taking behavior. Also, no direct relationship was found between gender, age, and race with sexual risk-taking behaviors.

In a study of 838 predominately White, low to middle income junior and high school students, O’Byrne, Haddock, Poston and the Mid America Heart Institute (2002) explored the relationship between parenting style and adolescent substance abuse. They found that parenting style was a risk factor for smoking initiation but not experimentation (experimentation excluded those who became regular smokers). More specifically, adolescent smokers who were more ready to quit had made a serious attempt to quit smoking and had higher levels of family intimacy and autonomy than those who did not.

In a study of 82,918 seventh through twelfth graders, Kelly, Comello and Hunn (2002) found that parent-child communication about substance use insulated adolescents from becoming involved in using drugs such as alcohol, inhalants, marijuana and cigarettes.

Simons-Morton, Haynie, Crump, Eitel, and Saylor (2001) conducted a study of peer influences on smoking and drinking among adolescents. In their sample of 4,263 sixth to eighth grade students they found that direct and indirect peer pressure was positively associated with drinking and smoking. The study also revealed that adolescents’ whose parents were involved, had high expectations for their behavior and held them in high regard were less likely to initiate substance abuse. Parental monitoring, on the other hand, was not significantly associated with the delinquent behaviors. Simons-Morton et al. (2001) suggested that “parents who are involved, have high
expectations, and grant their teens substantial regard may also effectively influence their
teens' selection and cultivation of friends, compared with other parents” (p. 105).

The studies on parent-child communication highlight that there seems to be a
significant relationship between communication and delinquency. Only one study
(Huebner & Howell, 2003) indicated there was no significant relationship between
parent-child communication and delinquency.

The literature that investigates dimensions of responsiveness has been
inconsistent. Some of the research indicates that dimensions of responsiveness, such as
attachment and communication are not adequate in predicting delinquency. Also,
research revealed that attachment to mothers compared to fathers was better at predicting
delinquency (Krohn and Massey, 1980). However, this study is over 25 years old and
should be replicated for more current findings. Demuth and Brown (2004) found that
family process was more important in predicting delinquency than family structure. This
finding was significant because it adds to the plethora of literature that debates whether
family structure or family process variables are better predictors of delinquency. A
significant amount of the literature has indicated that family process variables are more
effective at insulating an adolescent against participating in delinquent activities. The
next section will discuss the second dimension of parenting, demandingness.

Demandingness pays attention to how parent(s) monitor and discipline their children.

Demandingness

According to Baumrind (1996) demandingness refers to direct confrontations and
involves parental monitoring and consistent discipline. Gerald R. Patterson a researcher
with the Oregon Social Learning Center (OSLC) has studied preadolescent boys who
exhibit antisocial behavior and their families through a therapeutic process called parent training. This process primarily focuses on improving monitoring and disciplinary techniques used by parents (Bank, Patterson & Reid, 1987). According to Kazdin (1987), antisocial behavior in children includes acts which criminologists consider delinquent (e.g., fighting, vandalism, theft, truancy, arson). The primary distinction is that antisocial behavior is diagnosed in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III-R) as a child conduct disorder. The American Psychiatric Association has recognized there is a relationship between “poor parental discipline” and “child adjustment problems” (Capaldi, Chamberlain & Patterson, 1997, p. 343).

Patterson and Stouthamer-Loeber (1984) argued that the root cause of antisocial behavior in children was the result of disruptions to family management skills possessed by the parent(s). So, in order to treat the child, it is necessary to teach parents how to effectively use discipline when the child misbehaves, monitor the child, and utilize good problem solving skills in order to improve the child’s behavior.

There are two major assumptions associated with family management skills. The first is that if the parent is good at monitoring their child’s behavior, then the parent should also be effective in the use of appropriate discipline and problem solving. The second assumption is that family management variables should alter as the child goes through distinguishable developmental stages in life. For example, as the child grows into adolescence, the amount of supervised time the parent has over the child decreases because the child is likely to become more independent and develop peer groups (Patterson and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984). Bank, Patterson and Reid (1987) argued that a parents’ concern for his/her child may change as the development from childhood to
adolescence takes place. However, some parents may be more effective at monitoring a child’s behavior than that of an adolescent. The subsequent literature on parenting provides research on the following dimensions of demandingness: parental monitoring and parental discipline.

**Parental Monitoring**

Richards, Miller, O’Donnell, Wasserman and Colder (2004) conducted a study examining the link between parental monitoring and delinquency outcomes among 205 African American adolescents from working and middle income families. Their study revealed that when sex moderated the relationship between parental monitoring and delinquency boys reported more aggression, delinquency and substance use than girls. This was attributed to the girls reporting they were monitored more by their parents which decreased their opportunity for participating in delinquent behaviors.

Dorius et al. (2004) evaluated the extent to which parental support and control moderated the relationship between peers and marijuana use among adolescents. They provided evidence that adolescent’s perceptions regarding whether they believed their parents would catch them if they skipped school, drank alcohol or carried a gun and closeness to father, rather than mother, moderated the association between peer drug use and the adolescents’ marijuana use. These variables moderated the relationship between peer drug use and adolescent marijuana use. Higher levels of closeness to father and perceptions of being caught by parents weakened the relationship between peer drug use and marijuana use.

In a study of ninety-five predominately White adolescents 10 to 17 years of age from middle and upper class families, Waizenhofer, Buchanan, and Jackson-Newsom
(2004) found that the more mothers knew about their child’s daily activities the less likely the child was to participate in deviant activity.

Huebner and Howell (2003) examined the relationship between adolescent risk taking and perceptions of parental monitoring, parent-adolescent communication and parenting style in an ethnically diverse sample of 7th – 12 graders. They found that adolescents who were monitored by their parents demonstrated low sexual risk taking behavior.

A study conducted by Webb, Bray, Getz, and Adams (2002) revealed gender differences in adolescent adjustment. In their study of an ethnically diverse sample of 1,672 seventh through tenth graders in Houston, TX, both adolescent and teacher reports revealed that males had participated in more delinquent behavior than females. This gendered difference in behavior was attributed to girls’ perceptions that they were monitored more by their mothers.

In a study of 8,700 predominately White adolescent (61.2%) students 14-18 years of age, Gray and Steinberg (1999) found that the stricter the evaluation of perceived behavioral control the less likely a student was to report problem behavior such as alcohol and drug use, deviant behavior in school and even susceptibility to peer pressure.

In a sample of 684 predominately White adolescents (64.2%) from the National Study of Adolescent Health, Cookston (1999) was interested in the effect of parental supervision and family structure on problem behaviors. His study revealed that in looking at single-parent homes there were significantly higher levels of problem behavior observed for single-father homes compared to single-mother homes. Furthermore, they found that adolescents with high supervision had lower levels of problem behaviors.
There were no significant interaction effects found by family structure, sex of the child or parental supervision.

Ary, Duncan, Biglan, Metzler, Noell and Smolkowski (1999) examined the relationship between parental monitoring and delinquency among a sample of 608 adolescents age 14 to 17 in a metropolitan area in the Northwest. Their study revealed that insufficient parental monitoring had a direct effect on problem behavior that developed later in adolescence. Furthermore, results indicated that when parents were not knowledgeable about their child’s behavior it provided the opportunity for the child to associate with delinquent peers (indirect effect).

Forehand et al. (1997) in a study of 907 African American and Latino adolescents from various high schools in the U.S. found that parental monitoring had an effect on deviant behavior. More specifically, the results of their study indicated that monitoring rather than parent-child communication was more of a predictor of deviant behavior in adolescents.

In a study of 136 seventh and tenth grade boys Patterson and Dishion (1985) found that disruption in parental monitoring was associated with an adolescent becoming involved with delinquent peer groups.

All of the studies that examined monitoring indicate that there is a significant negative relationship between parental monitoring and delinquency.

**Parental Discipline**

In a study of an ethnically diverse sample of third grade boys and girls Shumow, Vandell and Posner (1998) observed that families with low incomes, less parental education, maternal unemployment and headed by a single parent reported the use of
harsher\(^1\) parenting strategies. Also, African American parents compared to White parents reported having harsher parenting strategies. On the other hand, firm\(^2\) parenting strategies were associated with less behavior problems in the children.

Peiser and Heaven (1996) investigated the link between delinquency and perceived family relations, parental discipline style, parental-love withdrawal, communication style, and locus of control among Australian teenagers between the ages of 15 and 16 years of age. The study revealed that negative family relations, punitive discipline practices and parent-love withdrawal were significantly related to high levels of delinquency.

In their study of two-parent families with children in the seventh grade, Simons, Johnson and Conger (1994) found that corporal punishment (e.g., spanking using the hand or an object) did not predict adolescent behavior problems.

In a study of 206 low-income, White families with male children, Vuchinich, Bank and Patterson (1992) found there was a reciprocal relationship between ineffective parental discipline and child antisocial behavior. The results indicated that this reciprocity could lead to persistence in antisocial behavior and make the child "resistant to change" (p. 518).

To examine the effect of parental strictness on the sexual behavior and attitudes of adolescents Miller, McCoy, Olson and Wallace (1986) administered a questionnaire to a predominately White group of high school students. Their study indicated that

---

\(^1\) Spanking, doing many chores everyday, not allowing child to question rules that seem unfair.

\(^2\) Make sure child obeys first time he/she is told something; positive reinforcement; reasonable chores; give child chance to explain position before being punished; rules that take into consideration child’s individual needs; try and show understand child’s feelings when punish child; parent explains reasons for rules.
adolescents who perceived their parents as permissive rather than strict were more likely to engage in sexual intercourse.

Patterson and Stouthamer-Loeber (1984), in their study of 206 boys (predominately White) age 9 – 16, found that parents who were unskilled in monitoring their child’s behavior tended to be unskilled in disciplining their child, in problem solving and in reinforcing prosocial behavior in the child. Furthermore, their findings revealed that “both tracking and discipline skills were integrally related to antisocial behavior in children” (p. 1305).

Loeber and Dishion (1983) in their study of White, male adolescents found that parenting variables, particularly those related to harsh and inconsistent discipline and poor supervision, were strong predictors of delinquency in later adolescence.

The studies considered in this section reveal that there is a significant relationship between discipline and delinquency. More specifically, many of the studies indicate that harsh, punitive, and ineffective discipline as well as permissive parenting can increase delinquency in youth. All but one study (e.g., Simons, Johnson & Conger, 1994) highlighted this fact.

The literature relevant to monitoring and discipline has been relatively consistent. Most of the research indicates that behavioral controls do have a significant affect on adolescent behavior. In some research the mere thought that one might get caught (Dorius et al., 2004) is enough of a deterrent to prevent delinquent behavior. In reference to monitoring all of the studies indicated a significantly negative relationship between parental monitoring and delinquency. Furthermore, the literature indicates that if behavioral controls (e.g., punishment) are too harsh, it could in fact lead to an increase in
delinquency. At this point, it seems that demandingness rather than responsiveness is better at predicting delinquent behaviors.

**Literature Specific to Baumrind's (1966) Typology**

There were a few studies in the literature that examined Baumrind's (1966) typology by exploring the interaction between responsiveness and demandingness. Most studies focused on the dimensions of demandingness (e.g., communication, parental warmth, attachment) or responsiveness (e.g., discipline, monitoring). This section will provide a review of the literature that explored the interaction between responsiveness and demandingness and its effect on behavioral outcomes.

Jackson (1998) used a sample of high school students to examine the effect of parenting styles on violent behavior. In her study she observed that the more authoritative the parent, the less likely the adolescent was to participate in violent behavior. Furthermore, gender based differences were found in that parental responsiveness and demandingness were significantly associated with girls violent behavior compared to boys.

Bednar and Fisher (2003), who were interested in how parenting style influenced adolescent decision making, conducted a study of 262 general psychology students age 15 to 22 years of age and found that students with parents who were authoritative rather than permissive, authoritarian or neglectful were more likely to refer to their parent’s rather than peers for moral and informational decisions. However, regardless of parenting style, students were more likely to refer to their peers for social decisions. Furthermore, they also found that responsiveness, rather than demandingness was a significant factor in determining whom the student sought for decision-making assistance. Bednar and Fisher
(2003) proposed that based on these findings adolescents from authoritative families would show more of an orientation towards parents as opposed to peers in decision-making because of high responsiveness.

In examining the relationship between sexual risk taking behaviors among adolescents, Huebner and Howell (2003) conducted a study of an ethnically diverse sample of junior and high school students. They found that parental monitoring, monitoring by communication, and ethnicity by communication were significant in predicting risk taking in adolescents. Adolescents who were monitored closely by their parents were less likely to participate in sexual risk taking. Also, no matter the combination of high or low monitoring or frequency of communication, there was the probability for risk taking. In reference to ethnicity by communication, results indicated that no matter the level of communication (e.g., hi or low) and ethnicity (e.g., White and Black) adolescents were prone to participating in risk taking behaviors.

In a sample of 248 African American and White adolescents from an urban junior high school, Weaver and Prelow (2005) in their study of maternal parenting style found that the interaction between responsiveness and demandingness did little to explain White adolescents likelihood participate in problem behaviors. Responsiveness, but not demandingness was significant in explaining an adolescent’s decision to associate with delinquent peers. Also, the interaction between responsiveness and demandingness did not explain a significant amount of the variance in problem behaviors (e.g., delinquency and aggression). Conversely, neither the main effect of responsiveness or demandingness explained problem behaviors. As for African Americans, regression analysis revealed that neither the main effect of responsiveness and demandingness nor their interaction were
significant in explaining interaction with delinquent peers or participating in problem behaviors.

The literature that investigates the interaction between responsiveness and demandingness has been consistent in concluding that authoritative parenting produces better outcomes in adolescents. Several studies have indicated that authoritative parenting is associated with positive behavioral outcomes (Bednar & Fisher, 2003; Jackson, 1998). The literature has also revealed that not only are mother's perceived as being more authoritative than fathers, but that parents perceive themselves as more authoritative than their children. Furthermore, as the adolescent ages and becomes more autonomous, parents seem to become less authoritative (e.g., Paulson & Sputa, 1996). Furthermore Sabattini and Leaper (2004) observed that there was a representation of each parenting style among moms and dads from egalitarian and traditional households. According to their study moms from traditional households were more likely to be authoritarian, whereas dads were more likely to be disengaged. As for egalitarian households, moms were more likely to be permissive and dads authoritative.

Also, Weaver and Prelow (2005) found racial differences in behavioral outcomes when there was an interaction between responsiveness and demandingness. For example, this interaction was more likely to explain the variance in White adolescent’s participation in problem behavior, but did not serve any explanatory purpose in the participation of African Americans in problem behavior. Likewise, Jackson (1998) found that the interaction of responsiveness and demandingness was more likely to explain violent behavior in females rather than males. Also, some studies have indicated that
responsiveness rather than demandingness was better at explaining behavioral outcomes (Bednar & Fisher, 2003; Weaver & Prelow, 2005).

**Limitations of Baumrind’s Typology: Ethnicity, Class and Gender**

After Baumrind’s theory of parenting styles emerged, it took a few years before researchers realized the model was created as an archetype for studying European American families. However, it was being used to explain behavior across all ethnic and racial groups. This created a dilemma because it implied that if authoritative parenting was not being used by parents, then they were not “good” parents.

As mentioned in the introduction for this study, the primary limitation to Baumrind’s parenting typology is that it does not acknowledge that antecedent variables such as ethnicity and gender of the child as well as class of the family may affect how a child responds to the different styles of parenting. Baumrind gradually recognized that in a stratified, diverse society adolescents from all racial and ethnic groups wouldn’t necessarily respond similarly to her parenting typology. Bluestone and Tamis-LeMonda (1999) argued that it is only recently, in the past decade, that researchers have emphasized the importance of “understanding childrearing in its ethnic and cultural context” (p. 882).

Furthermore, Baumrind’s typology does not consider gender socialization that occurs in the family which affects the child and how they would respond to the different parenting styles. Also, Baumrind does not take into consideration that we also live in a stratified society in which social class affects how a child responds to parenting. This is significant because in communities plagued with crime, demandingness has to be higher in order to protect the child from external forces. All of these variables independently or
simultaneously working together affect how the child responds to his or her parent’s style of parenting.

**Ethnicity and Parenting**

Research that addresses issues of ethnicity, class and gender are introduced in this section. This section is important because it fills the gap on Baumrind’s work and exposes the reader to studies that are usually scattered in both criminological and psychological literature. A review of literature is presented for African American, Latino and Asian American parenting.

**African American and Latino Parenting**

African Americans and Latinos are placed in the same section because the few studies that addressed Latino parenting did so in the company of African American parenting. Also, the literature review for this section has yielded studies that primarily focus on the variables that can be used as measures of demandingness (e.g., monitoring, discipline) rather than responsiveness (e.g., parental warmth, attachment, and communication). Few studies were found that investigated Baumrind’s typology and African American or Latino parenting, however these studies are presented first.

About a decade after Baumrind (1972) developed her parenting typology, she conducted an exploratory study of socialization effects on Black children in order to have a comparison for their White counterparts. In order to acquire the data Baumrind conducted observations in a nursery school for a period of three months. It was this study that suggested a difference in White and Black childrearing patterns. It was assumed prior to this study that the Black family was “disorganized, authoritarian, lacking intellectual values, and therefore changeworthy” (the Moynihan Report, 1965 as cited in Baumrind,
However, this perception was based on a parenting typology developed to study European American families. This study was one of the few studies conducted by Baumrind that considered issues of ethnicity, class or gender.

Baumrind's (1972) study revealed that Black females, compared to their White counterparts, were more independent and self-assertive. Baumrind explained these findings by noting preschool girls had to take care of younger siblings at home. Furthermore, Baumrind (1972) illustrated that they had to "perform both instrumental (e.g., supervision and monitoring) and expressive (e.g., show caring and concern) functions in the home" (p. 265). Furthermore, results of her study indicated that Black males and females were likely to come from homes where parents used authoritarian parenting practices. The limitations of this study were the small number and percentages of Black families in the study and that they were predominately from the lower middle class. The White families, on the other hand, were from "intact relatively advantaged homes" (p. 262).

Hill (1995) conducted a study of 174 African-American high school students from working class neighborhoods to investigate the influence of parenting on family environment. Her findings revealed that adolescents who reported less conflict in their family perceived their parents as more authoritative. Furthermore, adolescents who perceived their parents as more give and take and providing an explanation regarding decisions they made were closer and had more normal family interaction (e.g., cohesion, expressiveness and conflict subscales).

In a study of 111 low to middle income African American families Mandara and Murray (2002) provided an empirical typology of African-American family functioning.
Aware of limitations to Baumrind’s typology in reference to cultural differences in parenting, they identified types of African American families utilizing existing parenting scales. Their typology for African American families included: (1) cohesive authoritative, (2) conflictive-authoritarian, and (3) defensive-neglectful.

According to Mandara and Murray (2002) racial socialization is important to minority groups because it aids in psychological adjustment. The study revealed that the cohesive-authoritative family type exhibited the highest overall level of family functioning and adolescents from these families perceived themselves as obeying their parents more than those adolescents from conflictive-authoritarian families. This type of parenting is similar to Baumrind’s authoritative parenting except that with cohesive-authoritative parenting an emphasis was placed on high proactive racial socialization and low defensive racial socialization. Also, in these families there was a moderate emphasis placed on moral and religious socialization and parents ranked higher in formal education. Conflictive-authoritarian families were more likely to be chaotic and focused on parental control and achievement. Mandara and Murray’s (2002) study is one of the only analysis to contradict the previous studies that indicated that authoritarian parenting was efficient in behavior control in minority youth.

Forehand et al. (1997), in a study of 907 African-American and Hispanic adolescents, found that although African Americans and Hispanics have different historical backgrounds and cultural values that could affect parenting practices there were some ethnic similarities in the study. For example, it was found that for both samples higher levels of parental monitoring in comparison to parent-adolescent communication predicted lower levels of deviance.
In a study of 425 Puerto Rican adolescents, Velez-Pastrana, Gonzalez-Rodriguez and Borges-Hernandez (2005) observed that the lack of parental monitoring, permissive discipline, lack of parental support and living with a single parent were associated with the initiation of early sexual activity.

Lansford et al. (2004) examined ethnic differences in the link between physical discipline and externalizing behavior in later adolescence. In their sample of 453 European and African American families they found that experiences of physical discipline in the first five years of life and during early adolescence were associated with higher levels of problem behaviors for European American adolescents in later adolescence. However, lower levels of behavior problems were exhibited by African American adolescents under the same conditions. Lansford et al. (2004) suggest the reason for these results is that African American children regard spanking as legitimate and in the best interest of the child, whereas European American children may view it as not only scary, but a sign that their parents have lost control. They argue this study makes it clear that we should consider not only the context in which physical punishment is employed but also the meaning for both the parent and child.

Jambunathan, Burts and Pierce (2000) conducted a study that compared the parenting attitudes (e.g., expectations, empathy, corporal punishment and role reversal) of 182 mothers from five ethnic groups: immigrant Asian American, Asian Indian, Hispanic, and U.S. native African American and European American mothers. They found that the five ethnic groups differed in parental attitudes. Belsky (1984) argued that this may be due to cultural variations in child-rearing based on socialization experiences, individual family practices, personalities of child and parent, and cultural background.
The study also revealed that Asian American and African American mothers supported the use of corporal punishment more than the Hispanic and European American mothers. Jambunathan, Burts and Pierce (2000) did however state that one of the limitations to their study was that the instrument used was based on research and theory derived from the values of western culture. It did not take into consideration “developmental expectations for children of different ages vary from one culture to another; what is viewed as an appropriate expectation in one culture might be viewed as delayed or accelerated development in another culture” (402).

Bluestone and Tamis-LeMonda (1999), in their study of parenting and disciplinary practices of 114 working and middle class African-American mothers with children 5-12 years of age found, that mothers who were less educated were also less demanding in their parenting. Their study indicated that these mothers were more likely to let their children’s misbehavior go without any intervention. Furthermore, in regards to disciplinary strategies used by the mothers in the study, physical punishment was the least frequently reported and reasoning was the most frequently reported strategy utilized.

**Asian American Parenting**

A literature review of Asian Americans and parenting has provided studies that used Baumrind’s parenting typology, rather than concepts used to measure responsiveness (e.g., parental warmth, attachment, communication) and demandingness (e.g., monitoring, discipline). Chao (1994, 2001) has contributed a significant amount of literature relevant to Baumrind’s typology and Asian Americans, which is evident in this section. Chao (1994) argued that the authoritarian concept used to describe Chinese
parenting evolved from an “American culture and psychology that is rooted both in evangelical and Puritan religious influences” (p. 1116). She further asserted that historically, European-Americans parenting style was more authoritarian or “harsh”, however after World War II a shift emerged sending acceptable parenting to being more authoritative.

Chao (2001) also demonstrated that authoritative parenting was positively related to closeness (i.e., cohesion and adolescents satisfaction with relationship with parent) for European Americans and first and second generation Chinese adolescents. Authoritarian parenting on the other hand, was negatively associated with closeness only among European American adolescents. Furthermore, she found that first generation Chinese youth from authoritative families did not perform better in school than those Chinese youth from authoritarian families. On the contrary, European American youth from authoritative families did perform better in school.

Chao (1994) also illustrated the need for cultural sensitivity in her study of Chinese parenting. She proposed a strong argument for modifying Baumrind’s initial typology, arguing that it is “ethnocentric and misleading” (p. 1111). She argued, particularly that the concepts “authoritative” and “authoritarian” hold different meaning for different cultures. Furthermore, just because authoritative parenting seems to provide better outcomes for European Americans does not mean that it can or should be generalized to other groups of people or cultures. In other words, these concepts may have different meaning depending upon ethnic group.

Chao (1994) suggested that much literature, particularly in the area of psychology, has depicted Chinese parenting as restrictive and controlling, which is
equated with authoritarian parenting. Chao (1994) provided a good example of how concepts mean different things to different cultures. Strictness, argued Chao (1994) is “equated with parental hostility, aggression, mistrust and dominance” (p. 1112) in European culture. On the contrary, in Chinese culture, this concept may be equated with parental concern, caring and involvement. Chao (1994) offered up the concept “child training” which is derived from an “appreciation of Asian culture” and teaches children to adhere to culturally approved behavior (p. 1112). In her study of Chinese mothers and their children, Chao (1994) revealed that Chinese mothers were higher than European-American mother’s on measures of parental control and authoritarian parenting. However, according to Chao (1994), high parental control and authoritarian parenting are described as child training in Chinese culture. In other words, child training is equivalent to authoritative parenting if you consider the concepts within the culture it was meant to describe.

These studies demonstrate that to generalize that authoritative parenting is best for all children is problematic, in other words what is considered adequate parenting for White children is not necessarily adequate parenting for African American, Latinos and Asian American children.

Class and Parenting

This section presents studies that examine the effect of class on parenting behaviors. It will become evident that there are few studies in this section; hence the contribution I will make to this area of the literature in examining Baumrind’s parenting typology and the interaction of responsiveness and demandingness.
Kaufmann, Gesten, Santa Lucia, Salcedo and Rendina-Gobioff (2000), in their study of 1,230 predominately White mothers, found differences in parenting based on socioeconomic status (SES). More specifically, they found an indirect effect of SES on delinquency. In their study they observed that children from high-income families were exposed to more authoritative parenting and children from low SES were exposed to more authoritarian parenting. Also, authoritative parenting was a better predictor of a child’s adjustment (e.g., health and competence) than authoritarian parenting.

Kilgore, Snyder and Lentz (2000) conducted a study of 123 African-American children whose income level was below the federal poverty line. The families resided in neighborhoods characterized by “deteriorating housing, high unemployment, crime rates in the highest decile in the city, and poor access to services and retail markets” (p. 836). The results of their study also revealed an indirect effect for SES on conduct disorders. Their study indicated that income was not a significant predictor of child conduct problems when monitoring and discipline were controlled. The association of income with child conduct problems was mediated by parenting practices.

Collins, Maccoby, Steinberg, Hetherington and Bornstein (2000) speculated that the effect of neighborhoods on parental practices is evident in studies such as this one in which the parent may have to adjust their management strategies to deal with the external environment in which the child is growing up in. This means that the parent may have to become more controlling or restrictive of the child’s behavior in order to “protect the child’s physical well-being but which also may have the unintended consequence of squelching the child’s sense of autonomy” (p. 228).
The studies by Kaufmann et al. (2000) and Kilgore et al. (2000) highlight the indirect effect of parenting on the relationship between class and adolescent outcome behaviors. These studies illustrate the benefits of the current study in adding to the literature because it is interested in interaction effects.

**Gender and Parenting**

This section provides literature on how the gender of a child may affect the type of parenting exhibited by the mother and/or father in a household. This is of importance because as cited in Chapter 2, there is an abundance of literature in the social sciences that indicate that males and females, from birth, go through gender socialization. Furthermore, being born male or female shapes the type of socialization a person will encounter throughout life. This gendered socialization is facilitated by various institutions in society, such as the family, schools, media, workplace, and among ones peers. Consequently, men are socialized to have masculine traits, whereas females are socialized to have feminine traits and to conform to gendered social behaviors (Vannoy, 2001). Hence, males are encouraged to explore, be aggressive and independent. Females, on the other hand, are encouraged to stay close to home, be dependent and form relationships.

Hill and Lynch (1983) argue that although parents may want to control their children’s behavior, control may in fact be lax for boys because some behaviors (e.g., sexual activity) may be more socially acceptable and developmentally appropriate for boys rather than girls. Furthermore, the authors claim that “given the societal backdrop, perceived authoritative parents of boys might provide an overall environment that is high in provision of behavioral control yet subtly communicate to their sons that ‘boys will be
boys’” (p. 481). Therefore, boys will engage in risk-taking behavior knowing on some level their parents expected to impose some form of disciplinary action (Hill & Lynch, 1983).

Pittman and Chase-Lansdale (2001) examined the relationship between parenting style and adolescent delinquency in a sample of 302 African American adolescent girls from impoverished neighborhoods. They found that adolescent girls with disengaged mothers exhibited more minor delinquency and experienced sexual intercourse at a younger age than adolescents with authoritative, authoritarian and permissive mothers.

Adalbjarnardottir and Hafsteinsson (2001) conducted a study of 347 youth from Reykjavik, Iceland to investigate the relationship between parenting style and adolescent substance use. They found that parenting style was associated with 14 year olds’ experimentation with smoking, alcohol use, and illicit drug use. Among this homogeneous population, adolescents who characterized their parents as authoritative were less likely to have tried smoking, drinking and drugs at age 14 than those adolescents from neglectful and authoritarian families. Adalbjarnardottir and Hafsteinsson (2001) found no gender differences for substance, alcohol and amphetamines use.

Fletcher and Jefferies (1999), in their study of eighth grade students (69% White), observed that adolescent girls who “perceived there to be disciplinary consequences of substance use reported having tried fewer drugs and having gotten higher less frequently” (p. 478). This is of particular interest because in this same study, girls compared to boys perceived their parents as more approving of alcohol and drugs.
In a relatively diverse sample of 386 eighth and ninth grade students and their parents, Cohen and Rice (1997) investigated how children and parents rated their parenting style. They found that children perceived their parents as less authoritative, permissive and authoritarian than parents considered themselves. Furthermore, results of the study revealed that children who smoked and drank perceived their parents as less authoritative and more permissive than children who did not engage in substance use. In reference to gender, Cohen and Rice (1997) found that girls from authoritarian households had a lower authoritarian score than did parents with boys. Their study also revealed that White adolescents perceived their parents as more authoritative than Hispanic and Asian adolescents.

Alarid, Burton and Cullen (2000) used a sample of 1,153 first time young adult felons, ages 17-28 years of age, sentenced to a residential court-ordered boot camp program (coed). Their research indicated that attachment to parents was a significant predictor of female crime participation. On the other hand, it was attachment to peers that affected male’s participation in crime.

The studies that examined gender and parenting are consistent in two areas. First, girls who perceived their mother to be authoritative were less likely to participate in delinquent behaviors, have sexual intercourse or use drugs (e.g., Cohen & Rice, 1997; Fletcher & Jefferies, 1999; Pitman & Chase-Lansdale, 2001). Second, attachment to parents rather than peers was a significant predictor of female crime participation. However, for boys it was attachment to peers that was the predictor of crime participation (e.g., Alarid, Burton & Cullen, 2000). As with class and parenting, since there is a lack of studies that focus on gender and parenting, this study will add to the literature in this area.
This literature reveals that although ethnic minorities benefit from authoritative parenting, authoritarian parenting is not necessarily linked to behavioral problems. Furthermore, in a lot of the studies socioeconomic status was more significant than gender in looking at behavioral outcomes. Also, in a couple of the studies researchers realized the deficiency of Baumrind’s parenting typology and created a modified empirical typology. For example Chao (1994) introduced the concept child-training in respect to Chinese culture and Mandara and Murray (2002) created a typology of African American families to represent what would be equivalent to authoritative parenting for Caucasian parenting. Both studies took into consideration cultural variations in child-rearing.

This literature acknowledges there are cultural factors that need to be considered when investigating the effect of parenting behavior on adolescent adjustment. The literature reviewed also reveals that demandingness (e.g., monitoring and discipline) rather than responsiveness (e.g., communication, warmth and attachment) is better at insulating African American and Asian American adolescents from participating in delinquent behaviors. Furthermore, some studies found that males were more attached to peers which could facilitate delinquency. Girls, on the other hand, were more attached to parents. This indicates that attachment to different people have different effects for boys and girls. For instance, although both boys and girls can be attached to their peers, boys are more likely to become involved in misbehavior because of these attachments. On the other hand, girls are socialized to be more attached to their parents so regardless of whether or not boys and girls are attached to their parents, girls are least likely to participate in behaviors that may jeopardize this relationship. Some could argue these
gender differences are the result of gender socialization or girls being socialized to stay close to home and interact with the family when boys are expected to go out into the world and explore.

**Hypotheses**

Given the preceding literature, now hypotheses relevant to the current study will be discussed. The hypotheses are formulated so that hypothesis relevant to social control theory are examine first, followed by hypotheses that address Baumrind’s (1966) parenting typology. The hypotheses that address Baumrind’s parenting typology incorporate the interaction effects (i.e., ethnicity and gender of child and class of the family).

**Criminological Tradition (Hirschi)**

**Responsiveness**

H-1a. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parent-youth relationship and delinquency.

H-1b. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parent-child communication and delinquency.

H-1c. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between child involvement in family routines and delinquency.

**Demandingness**

H-1d. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parental monitoring and delinquency.

H-1e. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parental strictness and delinquency.
H-1f. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between more parental involvement in limit setting and delinquency.

**Statistical significance of factors for Responsiveness and Demandingness**

H-2. The factors for responsiveness (i.e., relationship, involvement and communication) and demandingness (i.e., monitoring, strictness and limit setting) will be statistically significant.

**Interaction between Responsiveness and Demandingness**

H-3. The effect of demandingness is hypothesized to depend on the level of responsiveness.

**Diana Baumrind’s Parenting Typology**

H-4a. The effect of authoritative parenting is lower delinquency among adolescents.

H-4b. The effect of authoritarian parenting is higher delinquency among adolescents.

H-4c. The effect of indulgent parenting is higher delinquency among adolescents.

H-4d. The effect of neglectful parenting is higher delinquency among adolescents.

**Ethnicity and Delinquency (Group Differences)**

H-5. There is the probability that youth will react similarly to three of the parenting styles; however authoritarian parenting is expected to decrease delinquency for Black and Latino youth, but increase delinquency for White youth.
Class and Delinquency

H-6. The nature of the relationship between the four parenting styles and delinquency varies depending on class of the family.

Gender and Delinquency (Group Differences)

H-7. There is a probability that males and females react similarly to three of the parenting styles; however for indulgent parenting females react differently in that delinquency decreases for females, but increase for males.

Conclusion

This literature review has been valuable in understanding the application of Baumrind’s parenting typology as well as issues related to ethnicity, class and gender. Many studies examined how demographic variables moderated the relationship between parenting and adolescent problem behavior. Furthermore, the research suggests that authoritative parenting is better at decreasing problem behaviors in adolescents.
CHAPTER V
METHODS

This study utilizes data from the 1997 cohort of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY97). The survey was sponsored by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor, and conducted by Ohio State University. The NLSY97 was designed to document education and labor market experiences, as well as a broad range of other topics such as risky behaviors, peer and family relationships and family background. The study also provides measures for crime, delinquency and arrest. For this study, the data will be used to examine the effect of parenting on adolescent delinquency, taking into consideration the interaction between ethnicity of the child, class of the family, gender of the child, and parenting behaviors.

Participants

The NLSY97 cohort includes a cross-sectional sample of 8,984 respondent's 12-18 years of age. The sample is cross-sectional given that during its initial administration it was representative of adolescents living in the U.S. and born between January 1, 1980 and December 31, 1984. Included in the larger sample is a supplemental sample of Latinos and Blacks. Results for the current study are based on 2,389 12 and 13 year old respondents from the NLSY97 sample (see Table 5.1). Twelve and thirteen year old respondents became the focus of this study because all the variables I am interested in are available for these groups. It would have been more beneficial if the data I was interested in was available for respondents ages 14 through 18 as well. For instance, I could have then used age as a control variable. Interview data was collected not only from the youth,
but also from one of the adolescent’s parents or guardians. Family process data were also collected during the interview process.

Table 5.1: Demographic Properties of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 2,389

Instrument

The Center for Human Resource Research at Ohio State University was contracted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) to collect data for this survey. A multidisciplinary committee, composed of social scientists, made recommendations regarding questionnaire design.

Measures

Four types of variables are described and operationalized in this section. These variables include the dependent, independent, moderator and control variables. Some of the variables have multiple indicators. Table 5.2 provides a description of the variables used in this study.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this study is self-reported delinquent behavior. As stated earlier, the delinquency index was prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor by Child Trends, Inc. and the Center for Human Resource Research at the Ohio State
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Variable Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency Score Index</td>
<td>LDELINQUENCY</td>
<td>A continuous logged variable assessing self-reported incidents of delinquency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Youth Relationship</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>A continuous variable (mean for mother and father) assessing closeness and supportiveness in the parent-child relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Family Routines</td>
<td>INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>A continuous variable assessing how often the child interacted with the family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-child Communication</td>
<td>COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>A dichotomous variable assessing who the child turned to when they had an emotional or personal relationship problem; 1 = Biological mother or father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Monitoring</td>
<td>MONITORING</td>
<td>A continuous variable (mean for mother and father) assessing how knowledgeable parents are about child's friends and whereabouts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Strictness</td>
<td>STRICTNESS</td>
<td>A continuous variable (mean for mother and father) assessing if parents are strict or permissive in making sure child does what he/she is suppose to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Variable Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental limit Setting</td>
<td>LIMITSETTING</td>
<td>A continuous variable assessing the parents role in limit-setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>RESPONSIVENESS</td>
<td>Factor score utilizing z scores for RELATIONSHIP, INVOLVEMENT and COMMUNICATION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demandingness</td>
<td>DEMANDINGNESS</td>
<td>Factor score utilizing z scores for MONITORING, STRICTNESS and LIMITSETTING.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness &amp; Demandingness</td>
<td>RESP*DEMAND</td>
<td>Interaction between responsiveness and demandingness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother and Father Parenting Styles</td>
<td>AUTHORITARIAN</td>
<td>Dichotomous Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUTHORITATIVE</td>
<td>1 = Parent strict and very supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDULGENT</td>
<td>1 = Parent permissive and very supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEGLECTFUL</td>
<td>1 = Parent permissive and not very or somewhat supportive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator Variables</td>
<td>ETHNICITY</td>
<td>A categorical variable assessing ethnicity of the child (White, Black, Latino). This variable is dichotomous in Model 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Variable Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of Family</td>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>Factor score for household income and the highest graded completed by one of the child’s parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>A categorical variable assessing whether child was male or female; 1 = female.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Household</td>
<td>BIO PARENTS</td>
<td>A dichotomous variable assessing whether the child lived in a household with both biological parents or another type of household; 1 = Both biological parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Peers</td>
<td>DELPEERS</td>
<td>Mean score for the percent of the child’s peers that participate in delinquent behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to School</td>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>A continuous variable assessing the number of weekdays the child does homework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
university. This index can be found in Appendix 9 of the Codebook Supplement for Round 1 of the NLSY97 study.

The delinquency measures were developed from a modified version of a delinquency index developed by Del Elliot to measure self-reported delinquent and criminal activity in the National Youth Survey (NYS) which was administered between 1983 and 1989 (NLSY97 Appendix 9, 1999). Several indicators are included in this scale and include two response categories, 0 = no and 1 = yes. The respondents were asked if they had ever participated in ten delinquent activities. These activities included such behaviors as running away from home, firearms possession, drug sales, gang membership, and property and violent crimes. The delinquency score for each respondent was calculated by “summing the responses from the number of delinquent/criminal acts the youths identified having ever done, for a possible total of 10” (NLSY97 Appendix 9, 1999, p. 50). According to Child Trends, Inc., no reliability tests were conducted because an index was used, not a scale, and “it is not assumed that the frequency of delinquent acts should be correlated with the frequency of another delinquent act” (p. 150).

**Independent Variables**

Two types of independent variables are discussed in this section. The first type of independent variables involve individual measures of parenting which are representative of the criminological tradition of theorizing. Factor scores were created for the individual measures of parenting in order to create two dimensions of parenting, responsiveness and demandingness. These two dimensions were then used to create an interaction term to test for statistical interaction. The second type of independent variable includes dichotomous variables used to measure Baumrind’s parenting typology. Factor scores were created for
each of the criminological variables in order to create two dimensions of parenting, responsiveness and demandingness. The two dimensions were then used to create a factor to test for a bilinear interaction between responsiveness and demandingness.

According to Baumrind's (1996) parenting typology, an interaction exists between responsiveness (i.e., how supportive the parent is to the child's needs) and demandingness (i.e., parents setting boundaries for behavior). Authoritative parenting is high in both responsiveness and demandingness. Authoritarian parenting is high in demandingness, but low in responsiveness. Indulgent parents are responsive, but not demanding whereas, neglectful parents are neither demanding nor responsive. In order to examine responsiveness and demandingness, each concept has dimensions that are measured to give an overall indication of each parenting style.

The parent-youth relationship scale (i.e., measures parental warmth and attachment), parental monitoring scale, limit setting index, index of family routines (i.e., involvement) and delinquency index were prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor by Child Trends, Inc. and the Center for Human Resource Research at Ohio State University. Details on these scales and indexes are described below and can be found in Appendix 9 of the Codebook Supplement (1999) for Round 1 of the study. The measures for parent-child communication and strictness are single variables selected from the youth questionnaire.

**Responsiveness**

Three variables are used to provide an indication of how responsive the parent is to their child's needs. These indicators measure the parent youth relationship (i.e.,
parental warmth, and attachment), parent-child communication and the adolescents involvement in family routines.

**Parent-Youth Relationship Scale.** This scale includes five items that measure the residential mother and father's warmth and three items that measure attachment. Parental warmth is derived from five items from the NLSY97 youth questionnaire. This dimension involves perceived expressions of affection the adolescent feels the parent is providing. The questions inquire into (1) how often the mother or father praises the adolescent for doing well, (2) how often the adolescent feels he/she is criticized for his/her ideas, (3) how often the parents do things that are important to the adolescent, (4) how often the adolescent feels he/she is blamed for their mother/father's problems, and (5) how often the mother or father makes plans with the adolescent and cancels for no good reason. These questions are measured on a 5-point index with the following responses categories never (0), rarely (1), sometimes (2), usually (3), and always (4). Item 2, how often the adolescent feels he/she is criticized for his/her ideas, item 4, how often the adolescent feels he/she is blamed for their mother/father's problems, and item 5, how often the mother or father makes plans with the adolescent and cancels for no good reason were reverse coded so that high score means greater warmth.

As stated in chapter three, attachment involves emotional commitment and sensitivity towards other. Three items from the NLSY97 youth questionnaire are included to assess the extent to which the adolescent feels close to their parents and how highly they think of them. The questions ask that the adolescent tell the interviewer whether he/she strongly disagrees (0), disagrees (1), feels neutral (2), agrees (3) or strongly agrees (4) with the following statements about their residential mother and father (1) I think
highly of her/him, (2) she/he is a person I want to be like and (3) I really enjoy spending time with her/him.

According to Appendix 9 of the NLSY97 Codebook Supplement, Cronbach’s alpha reliability test was conducted for all eight items. Results indicated that the index scale is reliable for the residential mother (α = .75) and father (α = .82). Responses to the eight questions were summed (range 0 to 32) whereby “higher scores indicate a more positive relationship” (NLSY97 Appendix 9, p. 24). The scale index scores for mother and father indicated only a moderate positive correlation (r = .26, p < .01). In the current analysis, scores for the residential mother and father were averaged together to provide an indication of the overall parent-youth relationship. If the youth only has one residential parent, then the one summed score is used in analysis.

Parent-Child Communication. This dimension is measured by one item on the NLSY97 youth questionnaire. The question inquired into who the respondent would first turn to if he/she had an emotional or relationship problem. There were 13 response categories in which the adolescent could select biological mother, biological father, step or adoptive parent, brother or sister, a relative under the age of 18, a relative over the age of 18, a boyfriend/girlfriend, another friend, a teacher or school counselor, a clergyman, mental health professional, or someone else. As a result, the following response categories apply, biological mother or father (1), some other type of household (0).

The main purpose of this measure is to determine with whom the adolescent felt more comfortable communicating. This measure represents only one facet of parent-child communication. If results indicate the respondent did not go to their parent(s) if they had an emotional or personal problem, this does not mean communication is not open in
reference to seeking out social support for other events in their lives. Nevertheless, I hypothesize that there will be less delinquent activity among those respondents who have open communication with their parents in regards to emotional or personal relationship problems.

**Index of Family Routines.** This index includes four items from the NLSY97 youth questionnaire. Each question asks, in a typical week, how many days from 0 to 7, does the respondent eat dinner with his/her family (1), does housework get done when it is suppose to (2), does the respondent do something fun as a family (3), and does the respondent do something religious as a family (4). These items not only consider the respondents interaction with the family (e.g., Items 1, 3 and 4), but also the respondents contributing to household maintenance (e.g., Item 2). Higher scores on item 2 could indicate that the respondent will do what is necessary to contribute to his/her family unit and higher scores on items 1, 3, and 4 could increase parent-child bonding time. According to Appendix 9 of the NLSY97 Codebook Supplement, a reliability test was not applicable because an index is used, not a scale, and “it is not assumed that the frequency of one family routine should necessarily be correlated with the frequency of another family routine” (NLSY97 Appendix 9, p. 43). Responses to the four items are summed, with scores ranging from 0 to 28 and higher scores indicating more days spent in routine activities with the family.

**Demandingness**

Three indexes are used to provide an indication of how demanding the parent is toward the adolescent. These indexes measure parental monitoring, strictness and limit setting. They highlight the extent to which the parents are aware of who their child
interacts with and what activities they are involved in during their absence, whether the parents are strict or permissive and who is involved in setting limits for the adolescent

**Parental Monitoring Scale.** Parental monitoring is measured using a 4-item scale derived from the NLSY97 youth questionnaire. Parents are not going to be in the presence of their child at all times; therefore, parental monitoring can be effective in reducing behavior that would not otherwise occur in the company of parents. The questions ask the adolescent how much their residential mother and father know about (1) their close friends? (2) their close friends’ parents? and (3) who they are with when not at home? The final item in the scale index is asked only of the mother and asks the adolescent how much their mother knows about who their teachers are and what they are doing in school. Appendix 9 of the NLSY97 Codebook Supplement indicated that the items in the scale index were standard questions used among researchers that conduct family studies.

The response categories for all four questions are: knows nothing (0), knows just a little (1), knows some things (2), knows most things (3), and knows everything (4). According to Appendix 9 of the NLSY97 Codebook Supplement, Cronbach’s alpha reliability test was conducted for the residential mother (α = .71) and father (α = .81). Results indicated that the scale index is reliable. The summed scores to the four items (range 0 to 16) are used as an overall indicator of parental monitoring. The monitoring scores for mother and father indicated a strong positive correlation (r = .65, p < .01). The summed score for the residential mother and father are averaged together to provide an indication of overall parental monitoring. If the youth only has one residential parent, then the one summed score is used in analysis.
Strictness. One item derived from the NLSY97 youth questionnaire and asked of each parent was used to measure how demanding the residential mother and father were in making sure the youth did what was required of them. The item asked, in general, would you say that s/he is permissive or strict about making sure you did what you were suppose to do? The response categories include permissive (1) or strict (2). The strictness items for residential mother and father indicated a moderate positive correlation \( r = .45, p < .01 \). The score for the residential mother and father were averaged together to provide an overall indication of how strict the parents were in making sure the adolescent did what they were suppose to do. If the youth only has one residential parent, then the one score is used in analysis.

Limit-Setting. This index includes 3 items from the NLSY97 youth questionnaires. Appendix 9 of the NLSY97 Codebook indicated that the index is derived from the NLSY79. The index provides an idea of how much autonomy is granted to the child. The respondent indicated who set limits on how late the adolescent stayed out at night, who he/she could hang out with and what kind of TV shows or movies the adolescent could view. The response categories included parents let me decide (0); my parents and I jointly set limits (1); and parent or parents set limits (2). The responses to the three items were summed (range 0 to 6). Higher scores indicate the parents had a greater role in limit setting. According to Appendix 9 of the NLSY97 Codebook Supplement a reliability test was not applicable because an index is used, not a scale, and “it is not assumed that limit setting on one activity should necessarily be correlated with the setting of limits for another activity” (p. 60).
Responsiveness and Demandingness

These concepts are measured by factor scores for the six family process variables listed in the previous text. Since each item had different response categories, z scores were created for all six variables so they could be measured on the same scale. Parent-youth relationship, communication and the involvement variables were loaded together to create a factor for responsiveness. All three variables had high factor loadings (i.e., > .50) and explain 49% of the total variance in the original variables (see Table 5.3). Parental monitoring, strictness and limit setting were loaded together to create a factor for demandingness. All three variables had high factor loadings (i.e., > .50) and explain 43%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>49.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demandingsness</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>42.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strictness</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitsetting</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the variance in the original variables.

Drawing on Baumrind, but using criminological variables, factor scores for responsiveness and demandingness were used to examine if a bilinear interaction existed between responsiveness and demandingness. If a bilinear interaction exists then the effect of demandingness depends on the level of responsiveness. In other words, parental demandingness increases or decreases depending on parental responsiveness. However, if a bilinear interaction does not exist then there may be another type of moderated
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relationship that explains the interaction effect between the variables (Jaccard, Turrisi & Wan, 1990).

**Mother and Father Parenting Styles**

In addition to examining linear effects of responsiveness and demandingness and their possible interactions, I conducted analyses using categorical measures of parenting styles to examine Bamrind's parenting typology. I used indicators of parenting styles developed for the NLSY97 by Child Trends. The survey enabled respondents to provide information that allowed for the categorization of their mother and/or father as authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent or neglectful. Respondents with both a mother and father were included in these analyses.

Child Trends measured responsiveness and demandingness more simply; they used two questions from the youth questionnaire to measure responsiveness and demandingness. Responsiveness was measured by a question that asked how supportive (i.e., supportive, somewhat supportive or very supportive) the respondent thought their mother and father was to them. Demandingness was measured by a question that inquired into whether the respondent thought their mother and father were strict or permissive in making sure they did what they were suppose to do. The two variables were combined so that authoritative parenting was represented by respondents indicating their residential parents were strict and very supportive. A respondent who marked that their residential parents were strict and not very or somewhat supportive was an indication of authoritarian parenting. Respondents who marked that their parents were permissive and very supportive was an indication of indulgent parenting and those respondents who...
indicated their parents were permissive and not very or somewhat supportive were characterized as having neglectful parents.

According to Appendix 9 of the NLSY97 Codebook Supplement a reliability test was not applicable because categorical variables are being used, “not an interval level scale comprised of items presumed to be internally consistent” (p. 90). However, one indication of construct validity was illustrated when respondents who indicated their parent was very supportive also had higher scores on the parent-youth relationship scale compared to those respondents who indicated his/her parent was not very or somewhat supportive (NLSY97 Appendix 9, p. 91). Predictive validity was assessed when family process scores and respondent behavior outcomes were compared for four parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful) for residential mother and father. One-way ANOVA’s with respondent reports of limit setting, reports of family routines and parental monitoring, and respondent reports of behavioral problems serving as dependent variables and the four parenting styles as independent variables were used by Child Trends to determine if main effects for residential parenting existed. Mean scores of family process measures derived from youth reports of residential mother and father parenting styles indicated that main effects for parenting styles for mother and father do exist. Thus, this aims to support the validity of the parenting typology developed by Child Trends.

Thus far, two methods to studying the effect of parenting on delinquency has been highlighted (i.e., bilinear interaction between responsiveness and demandingness and dummy coded parenting styles).
Moderator Variables

Moderator variables in the study include ethnicity of the child, class of the family and gender of the child. These variables are used to determine interaction effects. According to Jaccard, Turrisi and Wan (1990) a moderated causal relationship exists when the assumed direct causal relationship between independent and dependent variable is influenced by a third variable. In this study, I am interested in how the relationship between parenting and delinquency is moderated by ethnicity of the child, class of the family and gender of the child. In other words, the nature of the relationship between parenting and delinquency may vary depending on the moderator variables.

Questions from both the youth and parent questionnaire are used to gather data on the moderator variables. “Data on the respondent’s race and ethnicity were collected in the Screener, Household Roster, and Non-resident Roster Questionnaire and were based on the household informant’s identification. Using the household roster variables, the survey program created KEYIRACE, which describes the respondent’s race and KEY!ETHNICITY, which identifies respondents of Hispanic origin” (NLSY97 User Guide, p. 224).

Key!Race specified if the respondent was White, Black, American Indian, Asian or something else. I recoded Key!Race in order to give preference to respondents who were of Latino origin. In other words, if the respondent was coded as Hispanic in KEY!ETHNICITY he/she was also coded as Latino in the recoded KEY!RACE variable. Therefore, many respondents who identified themselves as White, African American, Native American, or something else will now be considered Latino in this study. Three hundred and forty-four (344) individuals who said they were White, 20 individuals who
said they were Black, nine individuals who said they were American Indian, 360 of those who said they were something else, and 25 of those who had missing data are now coded as Latino.

Class of the family was determined by integrating two variables, income and education. The household roster questionnaire provided information on the highest grade completed (HGC) for both residential mother and father separately. However, a new variable was created [HGC in Household] to represent the HGC by either parent in the household. Highest grade completed by either parent ranged from 0 to 20 years of education.

A variable was provided that represents the household income for each respondent’s family [CV_INCOME_GROSS_YR_1997]. Income for the sample ranged from $0 to $246,474. However, one limitation is that no variable is provided to indicate occupation for the residential parents. The correlation between education and income is moderate and positive (r = .49, p < .01). A factor score was created for HGC by residential parent and household income to represent class of the family. Both income and education had a component loading of .86 and explain 74% of the total variance in the original variables. Gender was measured by the respondent selecting whether or not he/she was male (0) or female (1).

**Control Variables**

In order to control for family, peer and environmental factors that may affect the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, three variables were included as control variables. The first variable is family structure which is a dichotomous variable. This variable was created to indicate respondent’s household type.
Response categories include 1 = both biological parents and 0 = all other types of households (i.e., two-parent, bio mother or father; single parent only; adoptive; foster; grandparents; other relatives; or anything else). This measure of family structure is not robust, however there is likely to be more disruptions and less consistent parenting in all other types of households compared to living with both biological parents.

The second variable is related to the affect of delinquent peer behavior on the adolescent. Five items were taken from the NLSY97 youth questionnaire that asked the respondent about the percent of his/her friends that smoked, drank alcohol, belonged to a gang, used illegal drugs or cut class/school. A bivariate correlation was conducted to see if these variables were correlated. The lowest correlation was between the percent of peers who smoked and drank alcohol (r = .352, p < .01) and the highest between the percent of peers that belonged to a gang and drank alcohol (r = .611, p < .01). The five items were then used to compute a mean score for peer delinquency. Edwin Sutherland’s differential association theory postulates that deviant behavior is learned through ones frequent and extensive interaction with those who are more inclined to participate in deviant activities. If the respondent’s peers are involved in more positive behaviors then this is likely to influence the respondent to participate in similar behaviors. However, if the opposite is true and peers have been participating in deviant behavior this could lead to the respondent having problem behaviors (Sutherland & Cressey, 2003).

The final control variable takes into consideration the respondents commitment to school and asks about the number of weekdays (0 – 5) the respondent did homework. This item is related to the commitment element of Hirschi’s social bond theory. The more committed a respondent is to conventional activities (e.g., school, work, or
organizations), the less likely he/she will participate in deviant behavior for fear of negative consequences (Hirschi, 1969).

**Hypotheses and Analyses**

I conducted traditional univariate analysis to examine the distributions, means and standard deviation of the variables. I also used ordinary least squares (OLS) regression to examine the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variables while holding all of the other variables constant. There are seven models (see Table 5.4) in this study used to test seven hypotheses or sets of hypotheses. Multiple regression is the primary statistical technique used in analyses.

Model 1 tests theoretical variables related to Hirschi’s social bond theory (1969). This model examines the direct effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable holding all other variables. The following set of directional hypotheses is tested using a one-tailed test:

H-1a. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parent-youth relationship and delinquency.

H-1b. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parent-child communication and delinquency.

H-1c. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between child involvement in family routines and delinquency.

H-1d. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parental monitoring and delinquency.

H-1e. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parental strictness and delinquency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1 Direct Model</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderator Variables</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity of child</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X^2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of family</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X^8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Household</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Delinquency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to School</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental warmth</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit Setting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demandingness</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES*DEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother Parenting Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Parenting Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/Father Parenting &amp; Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/Father Parenting*Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/Father Parenting &amp; Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^2 Ethnicity not included in model. Separate equations were estimated for each ethnic group.
^8 Gender not included in model. Separate equations were estimated for males and females.
H-1f. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between more parental involvement in limit setting and delinquency.

Following the criminological tradition and drawing on Baumrind, Model 2 involves looking at the regression factor scores for demandingness and responsiveness on delinquency, while holding all other variables constant, to determine if these variables are statistically significant. If the variables are statistically significant then the next step is to create an interaction term for the two concepts and test for bilinear interaction. The following directional hypothesis is tested using a one-tailed test.

H-2. The factors for responsiveness (i.e., relationship, involvement and communication) and demandingness (i.e., monitoring, strictness and limitsetting) will be statistically significant and negative indicating that high responsiveness and demandingness will result in lower adolescent delinquency.

Model 3 allows for the testing of a bilinear interaction between responsiveness and demandingness (resp*demand). As stated in chapter 1, if a bilinear interaction exists it will contradict Baumrind’s theory for her parenting typology. If a bilinear interaction does not exist, then a different strategy will be used in order to examine the relationship between parenting and delinquency. The following hypothesis is tested using a one-tailed test for parenting, moderator and control variables and a two-tailed test for the interaction term.

H-3. The effect of demandingness is hypothesized to depend on the level of responsiveness.

Model 4 focuses on Baumrind’s parenting typology by examining the effect of each parenting style, measured by the parenting dummy variables, on adolescent
delinquency. Mother and father dummy variables were necessary because they may have different parenting styles, but the expectations for mother's and father's parenting styles are the same. The following set of directional hypotheses is tested using a one-tailed test.

**H-4a.** The effect of authoritative parenting is lower delinquency among adolescents.

**H-4b.** The effect of authoritarian parenting is higher delinquency among adolescents.

**H-4c.** The effect of indulgent parenting is higher delinquency among adolescents.

**H-4d.** The effect of neglectful parenting is higher delinquency among adolescents.

Model 5 examines the interaction between ethnicity and parenting for mother and father. Separate equations were created for each ethnic group (i.e., White, Black and Latino) to examine differential effects for all variables. A t-statistic** is used to determine if there are any significant differences in the regression coefficients of the three ethnic groups. The following directional hypothesis is tested using a one-tailed test:

**H-5.** There is the probability that youth will react similarly to three of the parenting styles; however authoritarian parenting is expected to decrease delinquency for Black and Latino youth, but increase delinquency for White youth.

Since class is a continuous variable, an interaction term was created for each parenting style for mother and father and class (e.g., Mneglect_c, Dneglect_c) as represented in Model 6. The following hypothesis is tested using a one-tailed test for parenting, moderator, and control variables and a two-tailed test for the interaction terms created for the parenting variables and class.

**H-6.** The nature of the relationship between the four parenting styles and delinquency varies depending on class of the family.

\[ t = \frac{b_1 - b_2}{se_{b_1} + se_{b_2}} \]

\[ df = (N_1 + N_2) - 4; t \geq 1.96, p < .05; t \geq 2.58, p < .01. \]
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The seventh model involves creating separate equations for males and females to determine whether there are gender differences in delinquency across the four parenting styles. A t-statistic is used to determine if there are any significant differences in the regression coefficients between males and females. The following directional hypothesis is tested using a one-tailed test.

H-7. There is a probability that males and females react similarly to three of the parenting styles; however for indulgent parenting females react differently in that delinquency decreases for females, but increase for males.

Chapter 6 includes the results of statistical analyses for the preceding models.
CHAPTER VI
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This study examines how the relationship between parenting and delinquency is moderated by ethnicity and gender of the adolescent as well as class of the adolescent’s family. Seven sets of hypotheses, which can be found in Table 6.1, were used to test two theoretical models (social bond theory and Baumrind’s parenting typology) relating to family process variables, parenting styles and adolescent delinquency.

The first set of hypotheses focus on the direct effect of family process variables on delinquency. The second hypothesis focuses on determining whether the factor scores for responsiveness and demandingness are statistically significant. The third hypothesis focuses on the bilinear interaction between the responsiveness and demandingness. The fourth set of hypotheses focuses on the effect of the four parenting styles and delinquency (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful). Hypothesis five focuses on how parenting affects delinquency differently for each ethnic group (i.e., White, Black and Latino). The sixth hypothesis focuses on the interaction between class (e.g., continuous variable) and the four parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful). Hypothesis seven focuses on how parenting affects delinquency differently for boys and girls.

Control variables for this study include: the type of residential household (i.e., either biological parents or another type of household), the child’s association with deviant peers, and the child’s commitment to school. In the following sections, descriptive statistics are presented as well as the results of regression analysis for each hypothesis or set of hypotheses.
Table 6.1

Hypotheses

Criminological Tradition (Hirschi and Gottfredson and Hirschi)

Responsiveness

H-1a. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parent-youth relationship and delinquency.

H-1b. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parent-child communication and delinquency.

H-1c. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between child involvement in family routines and delinquency.

Demandingness

H-1d. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parental monitoring and delinquency.

H-1e. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between parental strictness and delinquency.

H-1f. It is expected that there will be a negative relationship between more parental involvement in limit setting and delinquency.

Statistical significance of factors for Responsiveness and Demandingness

H-2. The factors for responsiveness (i.e., relationship, involvement and communication) and demandingness (i.e., monitoring, strictness and limitsetting) will be statistically significant.
Interaction between Responsiveness and Demandingness

H-3. The effect of demandingness is hypothesized to depend on the level of responsiveness.

Diana Baumrind’s Parenting Typology

H-4a. The effect of authoritative parenting is lower delinquency among adolescents.

H-4b. The effect of authoritarian parenting is higher delinquency among adolescents.

H-4c. The effect of indulgent parenting is higher delinquency among adolescents.

H-4d. The effect of neglectful parenting is higher delinquency among adolescents.

Ethnicity and Delinquency (Group Differences)

H-5. There is the probability that youth will react similarly to three of the parenting styles; however authoritarian parenting is expected to decrease delinquency for Black and Latino youth, but increase delinquency for White youth.

Class and Delinquency (Interaction between Parenting and Class)

H-6. The nature of the relationship between the four parenting styles and delinquency varies depending on class of the family.

Gender and Delinquency (Group Differences)

H-7. There is a probability that males and females react similarly to three of the parenting styles; however for indulgent parenting females react differently in that delinquency decreases for females, but increase for males.
Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for this study are located in Table 6.2. Statistics are provided for all variables in the study, however only continuous variables were used in determining whether Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) assumptions were met. Evaluation of univariate normality revealed the only variable to lack normality was the dependent variable [delinquency]; it was significantly skewed (2.06) and kurtotic (5.01). To correct this, the dependent variable was logged [Ldelinquency], which resulted in an improvement in skewness (.359) and kurtosis (-1.589).

The sample in this study consists of 1,770 Whites, 903 Blacks and 758 Latinos. A little less than half (47.7%, n = 1,139) of the sample consisted of females. Upon further examination of the descriptive statistics, it became apparent that, on average, many of the adolescents had a fairly close and supportive relationship with their mother and father (mean = 25.03, maximum score =32.00). Also, on average adolescents were somewhat involved in routine activities with the family (mean = 15.37, maximum score = 28.00) and likely to turn to their biological mother or father if they had an emotional or personal relationship problem (mean = .59, maximum score = 1.00)

Upon evaluation of family process variables that represented aspects of parental control and knowledge of adolescent behavior, on average (mean = 9.64, maximum score = 16.0) respondents indicated their parents monitored their behavior, were more strict than permissive in making sure they did what was required of them (mean = 1.59, maximum score = 2.0) and were actively involved in setting limits on adolescent behavior (mean = 3.34, maximum score = 6.00). All of the mean scores were at the halfway mark or were just above it, indicating higher levels of parental involvement in
Table 6.2
Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Youth Relationship</td>
<td>25.03</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (1 = Bio mom or dad)</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strictness</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit Setting</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demandingness</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Authoritative</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Authoritarian</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Indulgent</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Neglectful</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Authoritative</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Authoritarian</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Indulgent</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Neglectful</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>-2.73</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1 = female)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio Parents</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelPeers</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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monitoring, limit setting and parents leaning more toward strictness than permissiveness. Of the four parenting styles, many of the respondents in the sample had an authoritative mother (43%, n = 1,521) or authoritative father (31%, n = 1,106) followed by an indulgent mother (30%, n= 1,078) and indulgent father (20%, n = 711). The least recognized parenting styles for mothers were authoritarian (13%, n= 467) and neglectful parenting (10%, n= 361). The similar statistics were revealed for father with the least cited parenting styles including authoritarian parenting (15%, n= 536) and neglectful parenting (8%, n= 291). A little over half of the respondents lived in a home with both biological parents (51%, n = 1,825). Associating with deviant peers (mean = 1.70, maximum score = 5.0) was not common in this sample. On average, adolescents were committed to school which is, highlighted by an average of three days during the week devoted to completing homework (mean = 3.45, maximum = 5.00).

Statistical Analysis

In this section seven models are used to test seven hypotheses. Model 1 focuses on hypotheses H1_a-f and centers on examining the direct effect of family process variables on delinquency. Model 2 is used to test a hypothesis 2. Its purpose is to determine if the factor scores for responsiveness and demandingness are statistically significant in order to create an interaction term for the two concepts. Model 3 focuses on hypothesis three and centers on examining the interaction between the responsiveness and demandingness of parents as reported by the respondents. Model 4 focuses on hypotheses 4_a-d and centers on testing Baumrind’s parenting typology. Model 5 focuses on hypothesis five and centers on examining how ethnicity (i.e., White, Black and Latino) impacts delinquency. Model 6 focuses on hypothesis six and centers on examining the interaction between
class (e.g., continuous variable) and the four parenting styles (e.g., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful). Model 7 focuses on hypothesis seven and centers on examining how gender of the child impacts delinquency.

OLS assumptions relating to normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were tested each time there was a significant change in the independent variables of the various models (1, 2, and 4). As stated earlier, the dependent variable [delinquency] was not normal and thus needed to be logged because it was significantly skewed and kurtotic.

**Models 1, 2 and 3: Family Process Variables**

**Model 1**

Multiple regression was conducted to determine if the family process variables were statistically significant and in the hypothesized direction while controlling for variables relating to type of household, the respondents' association with delinquent peers and his/her commitment to school. This statistical technique was used to evaluate hypotheses one and two (see Table 6.1).

The first set of hypotheses (H1a-f) relate to the criminological tradition of theorizing where the effect of the independent family process variables (e.g., parent-child relationship, communication, involvement in family routines, monitoring, strictness and parental involvement in limit setting) on the dependent variable are evaluated (see Table 6.3, Model 1). The results indicate that two of the six family process variables, involvement (b = -.01, n.s.) and strictness (b = .06, n.s.), were not statistically significant. Therefore, hypotheses 1c and 1e were not supported. OLS regression analysis demonstrate that hypotheses pertaining to the youth's relationship with his/her residential parents (b = -.04, β = -.11, p < .01), parent-child communication (b = -.34, β = -.11, p <
Table 6.3  
Regression Analysis for Models 1 through 3:  
Criminological Tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-child Relationship</td>
<td>-.04**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>-.06**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strictness</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit setting</td>
<td>-.06**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demandingsness</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP*DEMAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of family</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child (1 = female)</td>
<td>-.69**</td>
<td>-.70**</td>
<td>-.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio Parents</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Delinquency</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to School</td>
<td>-.05**</td>
<td>-.05**</td>
<td>-.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Unstandardized coefficients are presented with standard errors in parentheses. N = 2,389. 
* p < .05, ** p < .01, one-tailed test.
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.01), parental monitoring \( (b = -0.06, \beta = -0.13, p < .01) \) and limit setting \( (b = -0.06, \beta = -0.06, p < .01) \) were supported even after control variables (e.g., type of household, deviant peers, and commitment to school) were controlled. Regression coefficients \( (b) \) indicate that as the parent-child relationship, communication, monitoring, and limit setting increase delinquency decreases. Parental monitoring \( (\beta = -0.13) \) had a slightly stronger influence on the logged dependent variable than the other parenting variables \( (\beta \) ranged from -0.06 to -0.11).

Model 1 also illustrates that Blacks \( (b = -0.15, \beta = -0.04, p < .05) \) and Latinos \( (b = -0.18, \beta = -0.05, p < .05) \) were less delinquent than Whites and girls were less delinquent than boys \( (b = -0.69, \beta = -0.23, p < .01) \). Respondents with two biological parents in the household \( (b = -0.24, \beta = -0.08, p < .01) \) and who were committed to school \( (b = -0.05, \beta = -0.056, p < .01) \) were less delinquent than respondents without two biological parents in the residential household and who weren’t committed to school. Respondents reporting a significant number of delinquent peers were also more likely to be delinquent \( (b = 0.39, \beta = 0.20, p < .01) \). According to Model 1, 22% of the variance in delinquency is accounted for by the variables in the model.

Model 2

Factor scores for responsiveness of parents (i.e., parent-child relationship, communication and involvement) and the demandingness of parents (i.e., monitoring, strictness and limit setting) were added as independent variables to test hypothesis 2 (see Table 6.3, Model 2). Both variables were statistically significant \( (p < .01) \) and respondents reporting parents high in responsiveness \( (b = -0.32, \beta = -0.21) \) and demandingness \( (b = -0.15, \beta = -0.10) \) were less likely to be delinquent.
Model 2 also illustrates that Latinos (b = -.16, β = -.04, p < .05) were less delinquent than Whites and girls were less delinquent than boys (b = -.70, β = -.23, p < .01). Respondents with two biological parents in the household (b = -.23, β = -.08, p < .01) and who were more committed to school (b = -.05, β = -.05, p < .01) were less delinquent than respondents without two biological parents in the residential household and who were less committed to school. Respondents reporting a significant number of delinquent peers were also more likely to be delinquent (b = .42, β = .21, p < .01). The only difference between model 1 and 2 is that Blacks are not significantly different from Whites in delinquency (b = -.10, n.s.). According to model 2, 21% of the variance in delinquency is accounted for by the variables in the model.

**Model 3**

This model uses criminological variables to test ideas related to Baumrind's parenting typology but not her typology exactly. Model 3 builds off model 2 given that it focuses on the bilinear interaction between the responsiveness and demandingness of parents as reported by the respondents. In other words, parental demandingness increases or decreases depending on parental responsiveness. The interaction term [resp*demand] is not statistically significant (b = .01, p = .83), which indicates that this hypothesis (H-3) is not supported (see Table 6.3, Model 3). Although a bilinear interaction does not exist, there may be another type of moderated relationship that characterizes the interaction between responsiveness and demandingness (Jaccard, Turrisi & Wan, 1990).

**A Change in Models**

The purpose of this study was to use indicators from the NLSY97 youth questionnaire to acquire family process measures that represented elements of Hirschi’s
social bond theory. These variables were located and tested individually in Model 1. Analysis revealed that of the six variables, two were not statistically significant (i.e., involvement and strictness). The remainder of the four variables (i.e., relationship, communication, monitoring, and limit setting) were statistically significant and their hypotheses were supported. Model 2 indicated that the factor scores for responsiveness and demandingness, which combined the individual variables, were statistically significant. Consequently, in Model 3 an interaction terms was created to test for a bilinear interaction between responsiveness and demandingness; however no interaction existed and the hypothesis for this model was not supported. Thus, the effect of demandingness does not depend on the level of responsiveness.

At this point, I decided to go in a different direction and test ideas related to Baumrind’s parenting typology by using two variables that provided information on parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful) for respondent’s mother and father. Dummy variables, as described in chapter 5, were created for each of the parenting styles for mother and father.

**Model 4: Parenting Typology**

Model 4 represents the introduction of the parenting styles of the residential mother and father to test Baumrind’s parenting typology as illustrated in Table 6.4. Also, beginning with Model 4 the sample size decreased; this is the result of changing from analysis with individual process variables to dummy coded parenting typology. In Models 1 through 3 single parents were included in the sample because when I took the mean of various variables it could have been for one or both parents. However, starting with Model 4, analysis is conducted only with respondents who indicated they resided in
a two parent household in order to capture mother and father parenting styles. Including father parenting was the primary source in this decrease in sample size because more mothers were present in respondent households than fathers. The sample size for each ethnic group was also reduced, so that there are now 1,094 Whites, 328 Blacks and 354 Latinos in the study.

Analyses indicate that having an indulgent mother (b = - .02, n.s.) and father (b = - .04, n.s.) is not statistically significant. Thus, hypothesis 4c is not supported. However, having a neglectful (b = .48, β = .10, p < .01) or authoritarian mother (b = .40, β = .10, p < .01) or neglectful (b = .24, β = .05, p < .05) or authoritarian (b = .38, β = .10, p < .01) father are all statistically significant. The regression coefficients are all positive which indicates that having a mother or father that is neglectful or authoritarian in parenting compared to authoritative results in higher levels of delinquency. Model 4 also indicates that girls are significantly different from boys (b = -.72, β = -.24, p < .01). Respondents with two biological parents in the household (b = -.23, β = -.07, p < .01) and who were more committed to school (b = -.08, β = -.09, p = < .01) were less delinquent than respondents without two biological parents in the residential household and who were less committed to school. Respondents reporting a higher number of delinquent peers were also more likely to be delinquent (b = .42, β = .21, p < .01).

These results support hypothesis 4 a,b and d. In other words, the effect of authoritative parenting compared to authoritarian and neglectful parenting is likely to reduce delinquency among adolescents. In other words, authoritarian and neglectful parenting compared to authoritative parenting is likely to increase delinquency among
Table 6.4  
Regression Analysis for Model 4:
Psychological Tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Neglect</td>
<td>.48** (.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Indulgent</td>
<td>-.02 (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Authoritarian</td>
<td>.40** (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Neglect</td>
<td>.24* (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Indulgent</td>
<td>-.04 (.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Authoritarian</td>
<td>.38** (.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.05 (.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>-.09 (.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of family</td>
<td>.04 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child (1 = female)</td>
<td>-.72** (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio Parents</td>
<td>-.23** (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Delinquency</td>
<td>.42** (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to School</td>
<td>-.08** (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. ( R^2 )</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented with standard errors in parentheses. 
\( N = 1,777 \).
* \( p < .05 \), ** \( p < .01 \), one-tailed.
adolescents. According to model 4, only 17% of the variance in delinquency is accounted for by the variables in the model.

**Model 5: Ethnicity, Parenting and Delinquency**

In order to test for group differences between Whites, Blacks and Latinos (see Table 6.5, Model 5 A, B & C) separate regression models were estimated for each group.

**White Adolescents (Model 5A)**

White adolescents with neglectful mothers \( (b = .39, \beta = .07, p < .05) \) and authoritarian mothers \( (b = .35, \beta = .07, p < .01) \) and authoritarian fathers \( (b = .53, \beta = .14, p < .01) \) are likely to engage in more delinquency than White respondents with authoritative parents. Having an indulgent mother \( (b = -.05, \text{n.s.}) \) or father \( (b = .04, \text{n.s.}) \) or neglectful father \( (b = .24, \text{n.s.}) \) were not statistically significant. White girls are significantly less delinquent than White boys \( (b = -.80, \beta = -.27, p < .01) \). Class of the family was not significant \( (b = .02, \text{n.s.}) \). White respondents who were more committed to school \( (b = -.07, \beta = -.07, p < .05) \) were less delinquent than White respondents who were less committed to school. Whether or not there were two biological parents in the residential household versus other two-parent households was not significant \( (b = -.13, \text{n.s.}) \). White respondents reporting a higher number of delinquent peers were also more likely to be delinquent \( (b = .47, \beta = .22, p = < .01) \). The Beta coefficients (\( \beta \)) indicate that gender of the child had the strongest influence on the dependent variable.

**Black Adolescents (Model 5B)**

Black adolescents with neglectful mothers \( (b = .86, \beta = .16, p < .05) \) and authoritarian mothers \( (b = .52, \beta = .13, p < .05) \) are likely to engage in more delinquency than Black respondents with authoritative mothers. Having an indulgent mother \( (b = -.06, \)
Table 6.5
Regression Analysis for Models 5 A, B & C:
Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Latinos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Neglect</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.17)</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
<td>(.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Indulgent</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.22)</td>
<td>(.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Authoritarian</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
<td>(.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Neglect</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Indulgent</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
<td>(.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Authoritarian</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.13)</td>
<td>(.21)</td>
<td>(.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of family</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.04)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child (1 = female)</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td>-.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio Parents</td>
<td>-.13b</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.57**b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.10)</td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td>(.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Delinquency</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.10)</td>
<td>(.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to School</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj. R²</strong></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented with standard errors in parentheses.
* p < .05, ** p < .01, one-tailed.
a = coefficients significantly different for Blacks and Whites.
b = coefficients significantly different for Latinos and Whites.
n.s.) or father (b = -.24, n.s.), neglectful father (b = .43, n.s.) or authoritarian father (b = .01, n.s.) were not significant. Black girls are significantly different from Black boys (b = -.63, β = -.21, p < .01). Class of the family was statistically significant (b = .20, β = .09, p < .05) indicating that Black youth with more affluent and educated parents are likely to engage in more delinquency. This contradicts most literature that indicates that delinquency is likely to increase among adolescents with less affluent and educated parents. Black respondents reporting a higher number of delinquent peers were also more likely to be delinquent (b = .27, β = .16, p = < .01). Whether or not there were two biological parents in the residential household (b = -.24, n.s.) or the respondent was more or less committed to school (b = -.07, n.s.) were not significant. The Beta coefficients (β) indicate that gender of the child had the strongest influence on delinquency.

**Latino Adolescents (Model 5C)**

Latinos with authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful mothers and fathers were not statistically different from Latino adolescents with authoritative mother and fathers (see Table 6.5). P-values for Latinos ranged from .10 (neglectful mothers) to .72 (neglectful fathers). Latino girls are significantly different from Latino boys (b = -.59, β = -.20, p < .01). Class of the family was not statistically significant (b = .03, n.s.). Latino respondents with two biological parents in the household (b = -.57, β = -.16, p < .01) and who were more committed to school (b = -.13, β = -.15, p < .05) were less delinquent than Latino respondents without two biological parents in the residential household and who were less committed to school. Latino respondents reporting a higher number of delinquent peers were also more likely to be delinquent (b = .46, β = .23, p = < .01). The
Beta coefficients ($\beta$) indicate that reporting a higher number of delinquent peers had the strongest influence on delinquency.

**T-statistic Comparing Regression Coefficients**

Regression coefficients were compared across groups (i.e., Blacks/Latinos; Blacks/Whites; and Latinos/Whites), using a t-statistic to determine if there was a significant difference between the paired groups. In examining coefficients for the three groups, the coefficients for having an authoritarian father among Blacks ($b = .01, \beta = .00$, n.s.) and Whites ($b = .53, \beta = .14, p < .01$) were significantly different ($t = -2.17, df = 1,418, p < .05$). This indicates that among Whites, having an authoritarian compared to authoritative father increase delinquency, but among Blacks there is no difference between having an authoritative or authoritarian father.

Also, the coefficients for delinquent peers among Blacks ($b = .27, \beta = .16, p < .01$) and Whites ($b = .47, \beta = .22, p < .01$) were significantly different ($t = -2.0, df = 1,418$). This indicates that among Blacks and Whites, there is a difference in the coefficients for associating with delinquent peers and delinquency. Although it increases delinquency for both groups, the effect on delinquency is greater for Whites. Finally, the coefficients for living with both biological parents compared to other types of households among Latinos ($b = -.57, \beta = - .16, p < .01$) and Whites ($b = -.13, \beta = -.04, n.s.$) were not significantly different ($t = -2.20, df = 1,444$).

Results indicate that hypothesis five is not supported. My hypothesis states that authoritarian parenting is likely to decrease delinquency for Blacks and Latinos, but increase delinquency for Whites. No effect of parenting styles on Latino delinquency was

---

$^{\dagger \dagger}$ Formula for $t$-statistic. $t = \frac{b_1-b_2}{se_{b_1}^{2}+se_{b_2}^{2}}$; $df = (N_1+N_2)-4$; $t \geq 1.96, p < .05$; $t \geq 2.58, p < .01$. 
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found. The coefficient for Blacks having an authoritarian mother was significant and positive, indicating that having an authoritarian compared to authoritative mother is likely to increase delinquency. Furthermore, for Whites, having an authoritarian mother and/or an authoritarian father was significant and the positive coefficients indicated that these parenting styles are likely to increase delinquency in adolescents compared to having an authoritative mother and/or father. According to model 5, only 19% of the White, 11% of the Black and 17% of the Latino variance in delinquency is accounted for by variables in the models.

**Model 6: Class, Parenting and Delinquency**

Regression analysis revealed that the interaction between class of the respondent’s family and each parenting style was not statistically significant in accounting for the variance in delinquency (see Table 6.6). Therefore, hypothesis six is not supported.

**Model 7: Gender, Parenting and Delinquency**

In order to test hypothesis seven (see Table 6.7), gender differences became the focal point. Multiple regression indicates that males with a neglectful (b = .37, β = .07, p < .05) or authoritarian mother (b = .40, β = .08, p < .05) or authoritarian father (b = .53, β = .13, p < .01) were significantly different from males with authoritative parents. Also, having these types of parents increased the potential for delinquency in boys. Having an indulgent mother (b = -.04, n.s.) or father (b = -.04, n.s.) or neglectful father (b = .32, n.s.) were not statistically significant. Black males (b = -.14, n.s.) and Latino males (b = -.19, n.s.) were not significantly different from White males. Class of the family was also not statistically significant (b = .01, n.s.). Male respondents with two biological parents in
Table 6.6
Regression Analysis for Model 6:
Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Neglect</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Indulgent</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Authoritarian</td>
<td>.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Neglect</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Indulgent</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Authoritarian</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Neglect*Class</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Indulgent*Class</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Authoritarian*Class</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Neglect*Class</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Indulgent*Class</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Authoritarian*Class</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of family</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child (1 = female)</td>
<td>-.72**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.6 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio Parents</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Delinquency</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to School</td>
<td>-.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented with standard errors in parentheses. N = 1,777.
* p < .05, ** p < .01, independent variables, moderator and control variables, one-tailed; interaction terms, two-tailed.
the household (b = -.23, β = -.07, p < .05) and who were more committed to school (b = -.07, β = -.07, p < .05) were less delinquent than male respondents without two biological parents in the residential household and who were less committed to school. Male respondents reporting a higher number of delinquent peers were also more likely to be delinquent (b = .44, β = .20, p < .01). The Beta coefficients (β) indicate that reporting a higher number of delinquent peers had the strongest influence on delinquency.

Girls who had a neglectful (b = .59, β = .13, p < .01) or authoritarian mother (b = .004, β = .11, p < .01) were significantly different from girls with authoritative mothers. Also, having these types of parents increased the potential for delinquency in girls. Having an indulgent mother (b = .00, n.s.) or father (b = -.05, n.s.), neglectful (b = .16, n.s.) or authoritarian father (b = .22, n.s.) was not significant. Black females (b = .07, n.s.) and Latino females (b = .02, n.s.) were not significantly different from White females. Class of the family was also not statistically significant (b = .07, n.s.).

Female respondents with two biological parents in the household (b = -.21, β = -.07, p < .05) and who were more committed to school (b = -.10, β = -.11, p < .01) were less delinquent than female respondents without two biological parents in the residential household and who were less committed to school. Female respondents reporting a higher number of delinquent peers were also more likely to be delinquent (b = .41, β = .24, p < .01). The Beta coefficients (β) indicate that reporting a higher number of delinquent peers had the strongest influence on delinquency.
Table 6.7
Regression Analysis for Model 7: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Neglect</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Indulgent</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mom Authoritarian</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td>(.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Neglect</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>(.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Indulgent</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.13)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad Authoritarian</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>(.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderator Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.13)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of family</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.05)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio Parents</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Delinquency</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to School</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 \]
\[ \text{Adj. } R^2 \] .12   .15   .11  .14

*Note: Unstandardized coefficients are presented with standard errors in parentheses. N = 1, 777. * p < .05, ** p < .01, one-tailed.
According to model 7, 14% of the variance for females and 11% of the variance for males is accounted for by the variables in the models.

**T-statistic Comparing Regression Coefficients**

In order to test for differences in unstandardized coefficients between males and females a t-statistic was computed for each pair of coefficients. Results of these tests indicate there are no significant differences between the two groups. These findings demonstrate that hypothesis seven is also not supported, as indulgent parenting was not significant for boys or girls. Thus, indulgent parenting does not decrease delinquency for girls or increase delinquency for boys.

**Summary of Findings**

Results of the statistical analyses indicate that some of the hypotheses were supported. Hypotheses 1a, b, d and f were supported. In hypothesis 1a there was a negative relationship between parent–youth relationship and delinquency. Hypothesis 1b was also supported because there was also a negative relationship between parent-child communication and delinquency. A negative relationship was found between parental monitoring and delinquency which supports hypotheses 1d. Hypothesis 1f was also supported because a negative relationship was found between parental involvement in limit setting and delinquency. Hypotheses 1c (involvement) and 1e (parental strictness) were not supported. These results suggest that individually family process variables are significant in explaining adolescent delinquency. Hypothesis two was supported because factors representing responsiveness and demandingness were statistically significant. However, there was no bilinear interaction found between responsiveness and demandingness, therefore hypothesis three was not supported.
Three of the four hypotheses relating to Baumrind’s typology were supported because for this sample, adolescents with authoritative parents were less delinquent (H-4a) compared to adolescents with authoritarian and neglectful parents. Hypothesis 4c (indulgent) was not supported; there was no difference in delinquency among adolescents with indulgent versus authoritative parents.

In evaluating the moderator variables, hypothesis five was not supported because no effect of parenting styles on Latino delinquency was found and having an authoritarian mother is likely to increase rather than decrease delinquency in Black adolescents. Having an authoritative mother or father is likely to increase delinquency in White adolescents.

Hypothesis six was not supported because none of the class interactions with the parenting styles were statistically significant. Hypothesis seven was also not supported because indulgent parenting lacked statistical significance in the models for males and females. Also, the t-statistics conducted to determine if group differences existed between males and females was not significant.

Discussion and interpretation of results will follow in chapter 7.
CHAPTER VII
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter provides a discussion of the results for the seven regression models [hypotheses] presented in Chapter VI. First, I assess the results of analyses as it relates to my hypotheses that draw on Hirschi’s social bond theory (SBT) and Baumrind’s parenting typology. Second, the significance of the moderator and control variables are discussed. Third, I discuss strengths and limitations of this study. Fourth, my contributions to the literature are addressed. Finally, I discuss implications for future research.

Assessment of Results

Criminological Tradition: Hirschi’s (1969) SBT

Family Process Variables

One of the objectives of this study was to examine the effect of individual family process variables on delinquency. This objective is based on the criminological tradition of assessing the individual effects of these variables on delinquency. Six family process variables were examined in this study: parent-youth relationship [relationship], parent-child communication [communication], index of family routines [involvement], parental monitoring [monitoring], parental strictness [strictness], and parental involvement in limit setting [limit setting]. Results of regression analysis can be found in Table 6.3, Model 1.

Hypotheses 1 through 3 draw on Hirschi’s SBT (1969). Hirschi emphasized that parenting affects delinquency in adolescents. He focused on how an individual’s bond to society influences decisions to break the law. There are four elements to a social bond:
attachment, commitment, involvement and belief. The attachment element of the bond is highlighted in this study because it relates to parenting practices and delinquency. Attachment involves an emotional connection to another person or sensitivity to the opinion of others. If the child is attached to his/her parents then he/she is less likely to participate in behaviors that would embarrass his/her parents or have his/her parents disappointed in him/her. Having a close and supportive parent-child relationship, open communication and involvement in routine activities with the family can help foster a child’s attachment to his/her parents. This study draws on Gottfredson and Hirschi’s self-control theory because they highlight that parenting affects self control which could affect delinquency. They argued that effective supervision, discipline and training by parents helped foster self-control in adolescents.

Family process variables are important in examining the relationship between parenting and delinquency because it is assumed that if there is a close and supportive parent child relationship, the parent effectively monitors the child’s behavior and is involved in setting limits on the child’s behavior, the likelihood that an adolescent will participate in delinquent behaviors is reduced.

It was hypothesized \([H_{1a-f}]\) that there would be a negative relationship between each of the family process variables [responsiveness, communication, involvement, monitoring, strictness and limit setting] and delinquency. In other words, as the value of these variables increased delinquency would decrease. Results are presented in chapter 6 and show that only the hypotheses for involvement and strictness were not supported because they lacked statistical significance.
There are a few reasons that may explain why involvement and strictness were not significant. First, the index for involvement was created for the NLSY97 to serve as an indicator of family routines (i.e., how often the family participated in activities together, how often the child contribute to household maintenance and how often the child did his/her homework) and was not focused solely on activities that would facilitate parent-child attachment and bonding (e.g., eating dinner together, doing something fun with the family). Second, my premise for this variable was that the more days spent in routine activities with the family would facilitate parent-child bonding. However, the issue may not be the quantity of time spent with parents, but quality of the interaction. Finally, strictness was measured by one question that asked respondents to indicate if their mother and father were permissive or strict. This question was not sufficient in measuring strictness because it only had one question with two answer choices. This poses a question for validity because several indicators would have been more effective in reflecting parental strictness than the one question in the NLSY97. Also, it was left up to respondents with their individual experiences to define what they believed to be strict or permissive parenting.

The remaining four hypotheses \([H_{1a,b,d,f}]\) for relationship, communication, monitoring and limit setting were supported. This is similar to research conducted by Kostelecky (2005) who found that low levels of substance use was associated with adolescent’s belief that they had a good relationship with their parents. Accordingly, research by Alarid, Burton, and Cullen (2000) was supported by this study given that they found attachment to parents insulated adolescents from involvement in criminal behavior. Furthermore, these findings support O’Bryne et al. (2002) who found that adolescents
who had made a serious attempt to quit smoking had higher levels of family intimacy and autonomy. Also, the results support a study conducted by Peiser and Heaven (1996) who found that parent love withdrawal was related to high levels of delinquency. A few studies found that parental knowledge of child’s activities reduced risk taking behavior or decreased opportunities for the association with delinquent peers (Ary et al., 1999; Forehand et al., 1997; Huebner & Howell, 2003; Patterson and Dishion, 1985; Waizenhofer, Buchanan and Jackson-Newsom, 2004).

This study contradicts Dorius et al. (2004) who found that closeness to mother and parental support did not moderate the relationship between peer drug use and adolescent marijuana use. It also contradicts Agnew (1991) who found that delinquency was minimally affected by social control variables. Furthermore, this research contradicts Gray and Steinberg (1999) who found that a stricter evaluation of parental control resulted in less reporting of problem behaviors, such as alcohol and drug use, deviant behavior in school and even susceptibility to peer pressure.

**Responsiveness and Demandingness**

In criminological theory researchers examine the linear relationship between continuous variables because it is expected that variation in one variable affects variation in another variable. In psychology, particularly with Baumrind, mothers and fathers are categorized according to parenting styles (e.g., authoritative, indulgent) and it is the effect of a parent utilizing a certain parenting style that effects delinquency. Thus, unlike criminological theorist she looks at the interaction of parenting variables on delinquency. More specifically, Baumrind focused on how the interaction between responsiveness and demandingness in parenting influenced delinquency. Baumrind associated a responsive
parent as being supportive of the child’s needs and fostering a close relationship while at the same time encouraging autonomy. Demandingness was linked with the parent monitoring the child’s behavior and using effective discipline.

Following the criminological tradition and drawing on Baumrind, factor scores were created by factoring the family process variables to develop a measure of responsiveness (i.e., parent-youth relationship, communication, and involvement) and demandingness (i.e., monitoring, strictness, and limit setting). This was done by creating z scores for the individual family process variables so they could be measured on the same scale. Regression analysis was used to determine if the two variables were statistically significant. After the factors were created an interaction term was produced to determine if there was a bilinear interaction between responsiveness and demandingness.

Responsiveness and demandingness were found to be statistically significant and negative, which supports hypothesis 2. The regression coefficients indicated that responsiveness had a stronger effect on delinquency than demandingness. In other words, having a responsive parent was more effective in preventing delinquency than having a demanding parent. This is similar to Weaver and Prelow (2005) who found that responsiveness was significant in explaining an adolescent’s decision to associate with delinquent peers. The main difference between the two studies is that demandingness was significant, but weaker in my study. In Weaver and Prelow’s study demandingness was not significant. The interaction term [resp*demand] created for these two concepts was not statistically significant, therefore a bilinear interaction does not exist and hypothesis 3 is not supported. Thus, whether parental demandingness is high or low does not depend
on the level of responsiveness. Although a bilinear interaction does not exist, there may be a “wide variety of moderated relationships that can characterize an interaction effect between continuous variables” (Jaccard, Turrisi & Wan, 1990, p. 22). Results of regression analysis with responsiveness and demandingness can be found in Table 6.3, Models 2 and 3.

After hypotheses 3 was not supported I decided to test ideas related to Baumrind’s parenting typology. In the next sections results of analysis that tested hypotheses 4 a-d will be discussed.

**Psychological Tradition: Baumrind’s (1966) Parenting Typology**

The second objective of this study was to examine the effect of parenting on delinquency using a typological approach. This objective is based on the psychological tradition of assessing the effect of types of parenting on delinquency. Baumrind’s typology presents another way of looking at the interaction between responsiveness and demandingness. Two survey questions from the NLSY97 were used to categorize parents into one of four parenting categories (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful parenting). Results of regression analysis with these variables can be found in Table 6.4. Dummy variables were created for each parenting style in order to examine which style of parenting was statistically significant for mother and father for this sample.

It was hypothesized that the effect of authoritative parenting would be lower delinquency among adolescents (H₄a) and that authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful parenting would result in higher delinquency in adolescents (H₄b-d). Results are presented in chapter 6 and show that all but one hypothesis [H₄c] was supported; having an indulgent mother or indulgent father was not significant. There is one primary reason
why hypothesis 4C may not be supported and it is related to the theory behind Baumrind’s parenting typology. It may be that respondents with indulgent mothers and fathers are not significantly different from respondents with authoritative parents. The link between these two parenting styles is that they are high in responsiveness. Therefore, the effect of responsiveness rather than demandingness may be greater at reducing delinquency.

Hypothesis 4 was partially supported because respondents with authoritative parents were less delinquent than respondents with authoritarian and neglectful mothers. However, respondents having an indulgent mother or father was not significant. The remaining two hypotheses [H₄₆&₇] regarding authoritative, authoritarian and neglectful parenting for mother and father were supported. Respondents with mothers and fathers who were authoritarian were more delinquent than respondents with authoritative parents. Similarly, respondents with mothers and fathers who were neglectful were more delinquent than respondents with authoritative parents. These results partially support Baumrind given that she theorized authoritative parenting was more effective at reducing delinquency than authoritarian, indulgent or neglectful parenting. This is consistent with research conducted by Bednar and Fisher (2003) who found that students with parents who were authoritative rather than permissive, authoritarian or neglectful were more likely to refer to their parents rather than peers for moral and informational decisions. It is also consistent with research by Jackson (1998) who found that the more authoritative the parent, the less likely the adolescent was to participate in violent behavior.
Moderating Variables

In this section, the results for hypotheses 5 through 7 will be discussed. These hypotheses involved examining how the nature of the relationship between parenting and delinquency varied when moderator variables (i.e., ethnicity, class and gender) were introduced.

Ethnicity of the Child

The third objective of this study was to test for group differences between Whites, Blacks and Latinos. In order to do this, separate equations were created for each ethnic group (i.e., Whites, Blacks and Latinos) to examine differential effects for all variables. A t-statistic was used to determine if there were any significant differences in the regression coefficients of the three ethnic groups. Results of regression analysis with these variables can be found in Table 6.5. It was hypothesized there was a probability that youth would react similarly to three of the parenting styles; however authoritarian parenting was expected to decrease delinquency for Black and Latino youth, but increase delinquency for White youth. Authoritarian parenting may insulate Blacks and Latinos from delinquency rather than Whites because of cultural differences in child-rearing. Results are presented in chapter 6 and show that hypothesis 5 is not supported for several reasons.

First, there was no effect of parenting on Latino respondents. Also, there were three parenting styles for which there was no effect of parenting on Whites or Blacks; having an indulgent mother or father and having a neglectful father. Father authoritarian was only statistically significant for Whites. White and Black youth did react similarly to two of the parenting styles. White and Black respondents with an authoritarian mother were more delinquent than respondents with authoritative parents. Respondents with a
neglectful mother were more delinquent than respondents with authoritative parents. Although significant, the regression coefficient for Black respondents with an authoritarian mother is positive; therefore it is not in the hypothesized direction for Blacks. In other words, having an authoritarian mother increases delinquency for both White and Black adolescents. The regression coefficients indicated that Blacks with authoritarian mothers had a slightly stronger effect in increasing delinquency.

Hypothesis five may not be supported because having an indulgent mother or father is not significantly different from having an authoritative mother or father. This was consistent for all ethnic groups. Also, fathers characterized as neglectful may not have been prominent in this study, which may explain why having a neglectful father was not significant for either ethnic group. White and Black respondents with a neglectful or authoritarian mother are significantly different from respondents with authoritative mothers. This could be attributed to both parenting types having parents that are low in responsiveness. Having an authoritarian father was only significant for White respondents. This indicates that having an authoritarian father may have a significant impact on delinquency for White adolescents compared to Blacks or Latinos.

Having an authoritarian mother did not decrease delinquency for Black adolescents and was not significant for Latinos. In focusing on ethnicity, there is the possibility that within each ethnic group, there may be class based differences in parenting. These differences may have affected the significance of the parenting variables. For example, middle class Blacks may parent similar to middle class Whites. Therefore, authoritative parenting may have a different effect on Blacks depending on class. These results are similar to research conducted by Hill (1995) who found that in a
sample of 174 African American high school students, respondents who perceived their parents to be more authoritative reported less conflict in their family. It also validates Mandara and Murray (2002) who found that Black adolescents from [cohesive] authoritative family types perceived themselves as obeying their parents more than adolescents from [conflictive] authoritarian families.

Another explanation could be in the sample size. The sample size was reduced when dummy variables were created for mother and father parenting styles because to be included in analysis respondents had to have indicated they lived with two parents. It was important to include respondents with two parents because, unlike hypothesis 1 through 3 which included both two parent and single parent households. I was interested in teasing out the effect of mother and father parenting on adolescent behavior. For example, the sample size for Latinos was reduced from 758 to 354. This smaller sample size could have affected why none of the parenting variables were significant for Latinos. There may have been too few mother and fathers in each of the parenting categories to detect variation in parenting. Many studies in this area have focused solely on mother parenting behavior. In this case, focusing only on mother parenting style would have increased the sample size. However, as stated earlier this was not my focus and data were available for father parenting styles.

**Class of the Family**

The fourth objective of this study was to examine the effect of class on delinquency. An interaction term was created for each of the parenting styles for mother and father and class. Results of regression analysis with these variables can be found in Table 6.6. It was hypothesized that the nature of the relationship between the four
parenting styles and delinquency varies depending on class. Regression analysis revealed that the interaction between class and each of the parenting styles was not statistically significant. Therefore, hypothesis 6 is not supported. Only two questions were used to determine social class, education and income. Having a measure for occupation would have improved the validity of the class variable. However, I was limited to what variables were available in the NLSY97. This analysis was exploratory since there is not a substantial amount of literature available on class and parenting.

**Gender of the Child**

The fifth objective of this study was to examine how parenting may affect delinquency differently for boys and girls. Results of regression analysis with gender can be found in Table 6.7. It was hypothesized there was a probability that males and females would react similarly to three of the parenting styles; however for indulgent parenting females react differently in that delinquency decreases for females, but increase for males. Hypothesis 7 was not supported because no effect of indulgent parenting for mother or father on males or females was found. In other words, the regression coefficients for both groups were not statistically significant. The two variables that are statistically significant for both males and females was having a neglectful mother and having an authoritarian mother. Both had positive regression coefficients indicating that males and females with neglectful or authoritarian mothers were more delinquent than respondents with authoritative mothers. These findings are consistent with research by Adalbjarnardottir and Hafsteinsson (2001) who in their study of parenting style and adolescent substance use found no gender differences for substance, alcohol or
amphetamine use among a sample of 347 youth from Iceland (did they study parenting, not clear).

Hypothesis seven may not have been supported because after conducting analysis I found that it may not be that each parenting style for mother and father decreases or increase delinquency among males and females, but the effect for each parenting style for males and females may be stronger or weaker. For example, the regression coefficient for neglectful mothers was slightly larger for females. The same was observed for authoritarian mothers.

As stated earlier, the reason why having an indulgent mother or father was not significant may be related to both authoritative and indulgent parents being highly responsive to their children. Having a neglectful father was also not significant for males and female which may be related to respondents with a neglectful parent not being prominent in the sample. It seems that having an authoritarian father is significant for males but not for females. Having an authoritarian father increases delinquency for males. The reason for this discrepancy may be associated with the father's role in parenting being focused on more social control towards the male child.

**Control Variables**

In conducting regression analysis to test each hypothesis three variables were controlled because there was the chance that these variables could affect the relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

**Type of Household**

In testing regression Models 1 – 4 there were consistent findings with the control variables. There was a statistically significant negative relationship between living with
two biological parents [bio parents] and delinquency for Models 1 through 3. This was also consistent in Model 4. This indicates that delinquency is decreased for those respondents living in a household with both biological parents compared to other types of households (e.g., two-parent, biological mother or father; foster; adoptive). A statistically significant negative relationship was also found in Model 5 for Latinos living with two biological parents. T-statistic computations were used to determine if there were any significant differences in the regression coefficients of Whites, Blacks and Latinos. Results indicated that the coefficients for Latinos and Whites living with both biological parents were significantly different. Also, this statistically significant negative relationship was found in Model 6 for class and Model 7 for female respondents.

**Delinquent Peers**

There was a statistically significant positive relationship between having delinquent peers [delpeers] and delinquency for all Models (this includes all three ethnic groups, males and females). This indicates that adolescents are more likely to be delinquent if they have a significant amount of friends who are delinquent. T-statistic computations were used to determine if there were any significant differences in the regression coefficients of Whites, Blacks and Latinos. Results indicated that the coefficients for Blacks and Whites having a significant amount of delinquent peers were significantly different. The effect for delinquency was greater for Whites.

**Commitment to School**

There was a statistically significant negative relationship between commitment to school [school] and delinquency for all Models (this includes all three ethnic groups,
males and females). This indicates that adolescents who are more committed to school are less likely to be delinquent.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of this study are primarily associated with secondary data analysis. First, the data for the NLSY97 was collected for a purpose different from the scope of the current study. The NLSY97 was designed to document education and labor market experiences, as well as a broad range of other topics such as risky behaviors, peer and family relationships and family background. The study also provides measures for crime, delinquency and arrest. For this study, the data was used to examine the effect of parenting on adolescent delinquency, taking into consideration the interaction between ethnicity of the child, class of the family, gender of the child, and parenting behaviors.

While I used data collected by the NLSY97 to address hypotheses in my study, the way variables were measured in the survey was not necessarily how I would have measured them. This is another disadvantage of using secondary data. For example, the index of family routines [involvement] contained data on family activities (e.g., doing fun things together) and individual self-motivated activities (e.g., does homework get done when it is suppose to). If I had created the scale specifically for my study, I would have included only those activities relating to the respondents' quality involvement with the family.

A second limitation is in how the parenting style scale was created. I would have preferred to come closer to the ideas of Baumrind's parenting typology and included more specific variables (e.g., discipline) instead of only supportiveness and strictness as indictors of a parenting typology. This could have produced a better classification of
parents according to their parenting styles. Also, these concepts may not have had a consistent meaning for all respondents in the sample. For example, limiting respondents to describing their parents as supportive or strict does not take into account that some respondents may have thought their parent(s) fell in between the two categories. Maxfield and Babbie (2005) argue that “standardized questionnaire items often represent the least common denominator in assessing people’s attitudes, orientations, circumstances, and experiences” (p. 272). However, tests in Appendix 9 revealed that the scores were reliable and measured what they were suppose to measure and were correlated with similar variables expected to measure the same phenomenon therefore face validity exists. Strictness and supportiveness are reasonable measures of parenting behavior. Predictive validity is present because strictness and supportiveness was “significantly associated with other family process variables and/or youth behaviors as expected” (NLSY97 Codebook Supplement, p. 90).

Strengths of the Study

There are various strengths of this study. First, the respondents were selected for the NLSY97 study through stratified multistage probability sampling. This sampling procedure “ensured an accurate representation of different sections of the population defined by ethnicity, income, religion and other factors” (NLSY97 Codebook Supplement, p. 17). There was also the oversampling of Blacks and Latinos, who are often underrepresented in large scale studies. Second, since the NLSY97 consists of a probability sample that is representative of adolescents living in the U.S. and born between January 1, 1980 and December 31, 1984, it can be generalized to larger populations in the United States.
A third strength of this study is a computer-assisted personal interview (CAPI) was used to collect data by the interviewer. They collected data to complete the screener, household roster, and non-resident roster questionnaire. Since this is an electronic questionnaire, it reduces the amount of interviewer error because invalid values and inconsistent data are tagged by the computer system so that the information can be corrected. An audio computer-assisted self-interview (ACASI) was used to obtain information from respondents. This is valuable when collecting sensitive information from respondents (e.g., criminal activity, health-related questions). The respondents had two options when using the ACASI. They could listen to the questions using earphones or read the questions from the screen. A major advantage of using the ACASI is it was in Spanish and English and assisted those who may have had literacy problems. Overall, this could provide more accurate responses to survey questions.

Finally, the NLSY97 allowed the respondents to provide information on their mothers and fathers in reference to parenting variables. This was particularly useful for me considering I used data for both parents in the analysis. The survey also allowed me to examine differences in delinquency based on ethnicity, class, and gender.

**Contributions to the Literature**

My contributions to the literature on parenting and delinquency are threefold. First, I found that factoring family process variables [representative of criminological tradition of theorizing] together that represent elements of Baumrind’s parenting typology (i.e., responsiveness and demandingness) were statistically significant. Furthermore, regression coefficients for both variables were negative, indicating high responsiveness and demandingness decrease delinquency. Thus, both had a linear effect on delinquency.
However, the interaction term [resp*demand] I created for the variables was not statistically significant. This revealed that a bilinear interaction did not exist between the variables. Thus, this one form of interaction was not supported.

Second, my research supports existing literature that theorizes that adolescents with either authoritarian or neglectful mothers and fathers are more delinquent than adolescents with authoritative mothers. Yet, respondents with indulgent mothers or fathers are not different from respondents with authoritative mothers or fathers. This could be attributed to both authoritative and indulgent parenting having high levels of responsiveness. This implies that responsiveness may have more of an effect than demandingness in this sample.

Third, my study found that parenting variables associated with mothers, particularly authoritarian and neglectful, seemed to be more statistically significant in affecting delinquency than father parenting variables when examining ethnicity [Whites and Blacks] and gender. The only parenting variable for father that was statistically significant was having an authoritarian father [Whites and males]. These relationships were positive indicating Whites and males with authoritarian fathers are more likely than adolescents with authoritative fathers to be delinquent.

There was no effect of parenting on Latino respondents. In other words, Latinos with authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful mother and fathers are not different from Latinos with authoritative mother and fathers. This could be attributed to variations in parenting not being detected because there were too few Latino respondents in the study. Also, it could be argued that the survey instrument did not fully capture cultural variations in parenting. Something that should be noted is that Latinos with both
biological parents in the household and who were more committed to school were less delinquent than Latinos without both biological parents in the household and less committed to school. A survey that had indicators that tapped into socialization practices by the dominant ethnic groups in the study may have provided different results.

Fourth, as noted an earlier discussion, having an indulgent mother and father is not statistically significant for the total sample (i.e., Whites, Blacks, Latinos, males or females). This may imply that responsiveness has more of an effect than demandingness. Having a neglectful father for Whites, Blacks, males, and females is also not significant. This could be attributed to not many respondents indicating their parents were neglectful. Thus, an effect would not be detected.

Finally, my study indicates that there is no statistically significant interaction between class (i.e., income and education) and parenting or class as a moderator variable. My factor score for class is continuous whereby high scores indicate families have higher socioeconomic standing. Therefore, delinquency varies as the family’s socioeconomic standing increase or decrease. Unfortunately, I was limited to using income and education as a measure of class. A measure of parental occupation would have added to the validity of the class variable. Although there was no statistical interaction between class and parenting in this study other types of class interactions should not be ruled out. Maybe other studies may have a stronger measure of class.

Future Research

My first suggestion for future research supports claims made by researchers (e.g., Chao, 2001, 1994; Hill & Sprague, 1999; Tamis-LeMonda, 1999) who suggest that a focus should be placed on taking into consideration cultural variations in parenting and
creating culturally sensitive measures for parenting. Since there is a need to include more representative samples in research, instruments used to collect data should also be more inclusive in reference to representing experiences of various ethnic groups. For instance, some ethnic groups go through what is racialized socialization to aid in their entering a society where discrimination and racism still exists.

Second, more research should be conducted to determine if adolescents with indulgent parents are significantly different from adolescents with authoritative parents. This study observed that respondents in this sample with indulgent mother or fathers were not significantly different from respondents with authoritative mother or fathers. More studies should be devoted to examining whether having a parent that is responsive and/or demanding would improve adolescent behavior outcomes relevant to delinquency.

Third, future research should examine if Latino adolescents respond differently to parenting styles [similar to Baumrind’s] than Whites and Blacks considering that in this study, there was no effect of Latinos on parenting. Such a study would validate my findings or support the argument that measurement error may have occurred in this study because the instrument was not culturally sensitive.

**Conclusions**

In exploring the relationship between parenting and delinquency, this study uses ideas from two theorists from different schools of thought to examine the same phenomenon. Hirschi is a criminologist who focused on the linear relationship between individual family process variables and delinquency, whereas Baumrind is a psychologist who focused on categorizing parents according to parenting style in order to examine the relationship between parenting and delinquency. Family process variables were used to
create factors for responsiveness and demandingness. An interaction term was created for responsiveness and demandingness to see if a bilinear interaction existed. Baumrind's parenting typology was used to test for a moderated relationship of ethnicity, class and gender on the relationship between parenting and delinquency. Seven hypotheses were tested.

The moderator variables (i.e., ethnicity of the child, class of the family, and gender of the child) provided consistent results in that respondents with a neglectful or authoritarian mother are more delinquent than respondents with an authoritative mother for Whites, Blacks, males and females. Having an authoritarian father for Whites and males was statistically significant. In other words, White males with an authoritarian father are more likely to be delinquent than White males with authoritative fathers. It was also proposed that respondents with an indulgent mother or father are not significantly different from respondents with authoritative mothers or fathers. This was attributed to both authoritative and indulgent parenting having high responsiveness. I credited this to responsiveness rather than demandingness having more of an effect on delinquency. Having a neglectful father was not significant for any of the ethnic groups, nor was it for males and females. This was attributed to not many of the respondents indicating that they had neglectful father, therefore no effect could be found. Class was not significant in this study.

This study also revealed that a more culturally sensitive survey instrument may need to be used in order to capture more significant effects with Latinos when examining differential effects of parenting by ethnicity. Further results indicate that it is important to
look at family structure for Latinos when examining the relationship between parenting and delinquency.
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