

Copyright

by

Meredith G. F. Worthen

2009

This Dissertation Committee for Meredith Gwynne Fair Worthen certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

**The Color of Friendship:
Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and the Relationships between
Friendship and Delinquency**

Committee:

E. Mark Warr, Supervisor

Sheldon Ekland-Olson

Marc Musick

Mark Regnerus

Michael Lauderdale

**The Color of Friendship:
Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and the Relationships between
Friendship and Delinquency**

By

Meredith Gwynne Fair Worthen, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the faculty of The Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2009

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to those closest to me who have supported me throughout this endeavor. My husband, Brian, who has provided me with tremendous amounts of emotional support; my parents who have consistently responded to my countless inquiries about this process and life in general; and my best friend, Mylinh, who has guided me through sleepless nights of endless anxiety. I would also like to thank my three little bundles of joy who always make me smile when things are rough: Cervo, Muffy, and Annabelle (and in loving memory of my precious Zennia). I thank all of you who have provided me with enough support to complete this process.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the following scholars for their innovative contributions to this research and their support throughout this process: Drs. Marc Musick, Mark Warr, and Sheldon Ekland-Olson.

**The Color of Friendship:
Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and the Relationships between
Friendship and Delinquency**

Meredith Gwynne Fair Worthen, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2009

Supervisor: E. Mark Warr

Studies investigating the etiology of delinquent involvement have pointed to two influential theories: Differential Association Theory and Social Control Theory. Both theories suggest that bonding can impact delinquent behavior. Strong friend relationships influence delinquent involvement while strong parental relationships serve as a positive influence in the curtailment of adolescent delinquency. Indeed, a great deal of research has shown that both friends and families are an integral part of adolescent delinquent involvement. Although these theories provide us with a framework for understanding adolescent delinquency, the contextual nuances of the connections among friend relationships, parental relationships, and delinquency are still unclear. In this project, I investigate the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent as well as the predominant race/ethnicity and gender of the respondents' friendship networks to better understand how both friend and parent-child relationships affect adolescent delinquency. I utilize data from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS). Results suggest that both friend relationships and parental relationships impact respondent delinquency; however, such effects differ by the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent. Furthermore, the predominant race/ethnicity and predominant gender of the respondents' friendship network appear to effect delinquent involvement for some groups and not others. The

exploration of this topic provides a much-needed look into some understudied areas in human behavior. The long-standing tradition of investigating the role of peers in criminal offending has certainly examined the importance of family and the dynamics of friendships. However, few studies have incorporated both gender and race/ethnicity in their investigations into the relationship between friendships and delinquency. In addition, this study is unique in that it examines friendship network characteristics and how they relate to delinquency. Furthermore, this project explores how family and friend influences on delinquent behavior vary across different groups. Neither of these aspects have been adequately explored in past research. It is the purpose of this study to being to fill this gap in the literature and highlight how both gender and race/ethnicity influence involvement in delinquency.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	ix
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Chapter Two: Friend Influences on Adolescent Delinquency.....	3
Chapter Three: Parental Influences on Adolescent Delinquency.....	23
Chapter Four: Methods.....	36
Data.....	36
Descriptive Statistics.....	38
Measurement of Variables.....	39
Analytical Plan.....	46
Chapter Five: Results.....	51
Chapter Six: Discussion.....	74
Tables.....	100
Appendix A.....	125
Appendix B.....	132
References.....	144
Vita.....	158

List of Tables

Table 1. Sample Characteristics of Respondent Friendship Networks by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Table 2a. Descriptive Statistics of Variables used in Analyses by Respondent's Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Table 2b. Means of Variables by Respondent's Race/Ethnicity and Gender and Significant Differences in Means

Table 3. Correlations among Delinquency Variables

Table 4. Factor Loadings of Delinquency Variables for One Factor

Table 5. Correlations among Attachment to Friends Variables

Table 6. Factor Loadings of Attachment to Friends Variables for Two Factors after Oblique Rotation

Table 7. Correlations among Peer Pressure Variables

Table 8. Factor Loadings of Peer Pressure Variables for Two Factors after Oblique Rotation

Table 9. Correlations among Attachment to Parents Variables

Table 10. Factor Loadings of Attachment to Parents Variables for Two Factors after Oblique Rotation

Table 11. Correlations among Parental Involvement in Child's Friendships Variables

Table 12. Factor Loadings of Parental Involvement in Child's Friendships Variables for Two Factors after Oblique Rotation

Table 13. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Entire Sample

Table 14. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Female Subsample

Table 15. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Male Subsample

Table 16. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for White Subsample

Table 17. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for African American Subsample

Table 18. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Hispanic Subsample

Table 13: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Entire Sample

Table 14: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Female Subsample

Table 15: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Male Subsample

Table 16: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for White Subsample

Table 17: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for African American Subsample

Table 18: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Hispanic Subsample

Chapter One: Introduction

The antidote for fifty enemies is one friend. ~Aristotle

Since Sutherland's 1939 proposal of Differential Association Theory, a great deal of research has investigated the relationship between friendships and delinquency. Many researchers have found substantial support for the theory citing that association with delinquent friends is a very strong correlate of delinquent activity (e.g. Haynie and Osgood 2005; McCarthy 1996; Warr 2002). On the other hand, Social Control Theory (Hirschi 1969) suggests that parental relationships serve as a positive influence in the curtailment of adolescent delinquent involvement. Indeed, a great deal of research has shown that families are an integral part of the development of adolescent delinquency (see Giordano, Cernkovich, and DeMaris 1993; Gove and Crutchfield 1982). Although such theories provide a framework for understanding adolescent delinquent involvement, the contextual nuances of the relationships between friendships and delinquency are still unclear. In order to better understand the relationship between adolescent friendships and delinquency, I investigate the gender and race/ethnicity of respondents as well as the predominant race/ethnicity and gender of friendship networks. I utilize data from wave one of the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS) (Giordano, Longmore, and Manning 2001). Specifically, this dissertation is divided into two sections. First, I investigate how adolescent friendship networks affect delinquent involvement in the context of Differential Association Theory. Next, I utilize Social Control Theory to

understand how parent-child relationships affect adolescent delinquency. Both discussions incorporate race/ethnicity and gender to best understand the relationships.

The specific aims of this dissertation are to:

- Understand how friendship network characteristics in terms of gender and race/ethnicity influence delinquency
- Explore variation in the effects of parents and friends across different groups by gender and race/ethnicity

The exploration of this topic provides a much-needed look into some understudied areas in human behavior. Although the long-standing tradition of investigating the role of peers in criminal offending has examined the dynamics of friendships and the importance of family (e.g. Haynie 2002; Warr 2002), few investigations have incorporated both gender and race/ethnicity in their study of the relationship between friendships and delinquency. Moreover, in addition to including gender and race/ethnicity in the study of adolescent friendship and delinquency, the current project also explores how family and friend influences on delinquent behavior vary across different groups. Furthermore, this study makes a unique contribution to the literature through examining friendship network characteristics and how they relate to delinquency. These aspects have not been adequately explored in past research. It is the purpose of this study to begin to fill gaps in the literature by highlighting how both gender and race/ethnicity influence involvement in delinquency.

Chapter Two: Friend Influences on Adolescent Delinquency

Adolescence is a life-stage where friendship is essential to the development of identity. Groupings of friends (such as dyads or triads) begin to develop during early childhood (Erikson 1968). During adolescence, close friendship networks generally develop into groups of five or fewer individuals. Such adolescent friendship networks are typically groups of individuals that have a reciprocal relationship with one another and who serve as sources of support among each other. Although the composition of this network may change frequently throughout adolescence, friends can have a large impact on life outcomes. Indeed, research shows that establishing close and intimate friendships is increasingly important during early adolescence since such friendships contribute toward healthy adolescent development (e.g. Buhrmester 1990; Hartup and Stevens 1999; Youniss and Smollar 1985). In addition, close friendships among adolescents have also been shown to be a key source in the development of empathy which contributes to a significant decrease in aggressive behaviors among adolescents (Cohen and Strayer 1996; Miller and Eisenberg 1988; Ohbuchi 1988; Schonert-Reichl 1993; Worthen 2000). Friendships are also an influential source in the development of happiness and intimacy among adolescents while simultaneously serving as both emotional and social support for adolescents (Cauce 1986; Ellison 1990; Rawlins 1992). With the importance of friendship well established in the human development literature, it makes sense that criminologists have looked to friendships to understand the development of adolescent involvement in delinquent behavior.

Friendship Bonds and Differential Association Theory

Delinquency and delinquent friends seem to go hand-in-hand the literature suggests (e.g. Haynie and Payne 2006; Regnerus 2002). In fact, one of the most documented findings in criminology indicates that where there is adolescent delinquent behavior, there are usually delinquent friends (e.g. Aseltine 1995; Haynie 2002; Haynie and Osgood 2005; Warr 1993; Warr 2002). Moreover, the sheer number of delinquent friends an individual has significantly influences involvement in delinquency (Warr and Stafford 1991). Embeddedness in delinquent social structures also increases the likelihood that social networks will influence adolescent delinquent behaviors (Granovetter 1985; Haynie 2002; McCarthy and Hagan 1995). Other research also indicates that delinquent friendships are very common among adolescents (Haynie 2002). Haynie (2002) found that the majority of adolescents belong to mixed delinquent and non-delinquent networks. However, the second most popular friendship network is entirely composed of delinquent friends. Only a small minority of adolescents (less than twenty percent) belong to non-delinquent networks (Haynie 2002). Thus not only do delinquency and delinquent friendships hang together, friendships with a great deal of delinquent involvement are also very common among adolescents.

The consistently reported finding that delinquent friends influence the delinquent behavioral patterns of adolescents stems from Differential Association Theory put forth by Sutherland in 1939. The Theory suggests that through interaction with others, individuals learn the values, attitudes, techniques, and motives necessary for criminal behavior (Sutherland 1939). Sutherland claims that criminal behavior is learned within

intimate personal groups. Sutherland's theory can be applied to all intimate groups including both family and friend relationships. From his theory, it can be suggested that criminal behavior is cultivated through group communication and interaction within intimate networks. Among adolescents, friendship networks can serve as an important intimate network. Thus, the friendship network is a key source of learning attitudes and behaviors that are conducive to delinquency during adolescence. Together, the elements of Differential Association Theory imply that youth engage in delinquency because they learn the behaviors and attitudes conducive to delinquency from their friends (Giordano et al. 1986; Haynie and Osgood 2005; Sutherland 1939). It is important to note that although Sutherland (1939) does not specifically identify friendship networks as an outlet for learning delinquent behavior, he does indicate that "the principal part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs within intimate personal groups" (Sutherland 1955:78).

Furthermore, Sutherland suggests that the association within intimate networks may vary in intensity, frequency, duration, and priority. Sutherland (1939) identifies intensity as the quality and *emotional investment* individuals have with others. Frequency and duration refer to the quantity of *time spent* with others. Priority is defined as the ability of delinquent relationships that are formed in early childhood to influence adult criminal behavior. Sutherland suggests that when the elements of intensity, frequency, duration, and priority are heightened, the influences of others on the development of delinquent behavior will also increase.

In addition to the impact of the above elements, Sutherland also highlights the importance of learning values and attitudes from others. The extent to which these values

and attitudes *influence* delinquent behavior is another element that contributes toward delinquency (Agnew 1991; Sutherland 1939). In this way, it could be suggested that friends have the capacity to both reinforce delinquent attitudes and *influence* delinquent behavior. A synthesis of Sutherland's contention and Agnew's (1991) work indicates that the elements of the friendship bond that are most likely to contribute to delinquency can be described as (1) *emotional attachment* to friends (what Sutherland calls "intensity"), (2) frequency of *time spent* with friends (identified by Sutherland as "frequency"), and (3) *influential capacity* of friends (Sutherland's description of the influence of friends' values and attitudes).

Elements of the Friendship Bond

As youth enter into adolescence, their friendship bonds become more intense and are often strengthened in terms of *emotional attachment*, frequency of *time spent* with friends, and *influential capacity* (Rawlins 1992). While friendships during childhood are often based on common activities and propinquity (Bigelow and La Gaipa 1995), adolescent friendships are characterized by close emotional intensity (Rawlins 1992). In addition, both the time spent with friends and the influences of friends peak during adolescence (Hirschi and Gottfredson 1983; Steffensmeir, Allan, Harer, and Streifel 1989; Warr 1993). Thus, the elements of the friendship bond appear to be most influential during adolescence.

Emotional Attachment to Friends. The first element of the friendship bond, emotional attachment, includes both the positive and negative expressive aspects of a

friendship. Positive emotional friend attachment involves caring and reflexivity between friends as well as a reassurance of self identity (Erikson 1968). Such positive emotional attachments also allow for opportunities for friends to help one another while simultaneously strengthening the friendship bond. In contrast, negative emotional attachments to friends involve disappointment, dissatisfaction, and discouragement between friends. Negative emotional friend attachment is also characterized by a difficulty expressing feelings with other friends and an overall feeling of uneasiness around friends. When the friendship bond is weakened, there is negative emotional attachment between friends. Sutherland offers that those who are emotionally bonded to their intimate group members will be influenced by their behaviors (see also Agnew 1991). This suggests the following: (1) those with high levels of positive emotional attachment to friends will likely be influenced by friends' behavior and (2) those with high levels of negative emotional attachment to friends will not likely be influenced by friends' behavior.

Frequency of Time Spent with Friends. The second element of the friendship bond indicates that those who spend more time with their friends are more likely to have a strengthened friendship bond. Spending time “hanging out,” talking on the phone or through email, and spending time at friends' houses are all ways that the bond of friendship can be reinforced. More frequent interactions of this type will increase the bond of friendship. Further, spending time with friends causes a direct increase in the influence of friends' behavior. Much research indicates that those who spend time with their friends are more influenced by their friends' behaviors than those who spend less

time with their friends (Agnew 1991; Warr 2002). Thus, those adolescents with high levels of interaction with friends will be more closely bonded to their friends and more influenced by their friends' behaviors than those who do not spend a significant amount of time with their friends.

Influential Capacity of Friends. The final element of the friendship bond is the influential capacity of friends to control or affect attitudes and behaviors. Sometimes called "peer pressure," the influential capacity of friends is the ability of friends to encourage, or urge others to engage in activities. Direct peer pressure is the straightforward urging or encouragement from friends to control or change friends' behaviors. Indirect peer pressure is a more subtle form of convincing others to engage in certain behaviors (Simons-Morton, Haynie, Crump, Eitel, and Saylor 2001). The majority of research suggests that peer pressure is a common experience during adolescence and can strongly influence the use of drugs/alcohol and other forms of delinquent behavior (Brown 1982; Clasen and Brown 1985; Simons-Morton et al. 2001). The influential capacity of others is highlighted in Sutherland's Theory (1939) that suggests individuals learn attitudes and behaviors that are conducive to crime from their intimate group members. The extent to which individuals are persuaded by friends' attitudes and behaviors reflects higher levels of the influential capacity of friends. Those who report higher levels of peer pressure (both direct and indirect) are more likely to be influenced by their friends' behaviors when compared to those who report low levels of peer pressure.

Together, the elements of the friendship bond (in terms of emotional attachment to friends, frequency of time spent with friends, and influential capacity of friends) can contribute to the well-documented finding that friend delinquency influences individual delinquency levels. Specifically, these ideas are reflected in my first hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: The effects of friend delinquency on respondent delinquency depend on the elements of the friendship bond.

Gender and Friendship Bond Influences on Delinquency

The elements of the friendship bond (as noted above) are certainly important when explaining delinquency; however, gender is yet another characteristic that might also contribute to our understandings of adolescent delinquent involvement. Indeed, studies have shown that the gender of the respondent can impact delinquency. For example, young men are much more likely to be involved in delinquency and have delinquent friends than are young women (Heimer and Decoster 1999). In addition, young men are both less bound to conventional values and also more likely to associate with delinquent peers (Heimer and Decoster 1999; Hagan et al. 1987; Liu and Kaplan 1999). Such findings suggest that the gender of the respondent can affect delinquent involvement.

Further studies also show that the predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network can contribute to different levels of delinquent involvement. Research indicates that friendship networks comprised of predominantly young women offer fewer

opportunities for delinquency and less motivation for offending than do friendship networks of young men. Indeed, studies show that female friendships provide much more social control than male friendships (e.g. Giordano, Cernkovich, and Pugh 1986; Rountree and Warner 1999). Such studies suggest that the gendered characteristics of the respondent's friendship network might reveal insight into their delinquent behaviors. This brings me to my second hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: The effects of friend delinquency on respondent delinquency depend on the predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network.

While it is important to examine the predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network, it may also be helpful to study the gender of the individual who is a part of these gendered friendship networks. For example, the preventative impact of female friendships has been found to be true only among young women involved in predominantly female friendship networks (see McCarthy, Felmlee and Hagan 2004). McCarthy et al. (2004) found a marked reduction in the level of property crime among females involved in female-dominated networks of close friends. Such findings suggest that young women involved in friendships with other young women have a reduced involvement in delinquency; however, this relationship was much weaker for young men and non-existent for men from vulnerable populations. Kruttschnitt, Gartner, and Ferraro (2002) also found that young men's involvement in delinquency was not influenced by friendships dominated by young women. The results of these studies imply that it is not

only being female that reduces delinquency but also being a part of a female-dominated friendship network that both reduce the likelihood of delinquent behavior.

On the other hand, some studies suggest that male dominated friendships contribute to increases in delinquent behavior for both young men and young women. Indeed, researchers (Fleisher and Krienert 2004; Giordano 1978; Miller and Brunson 2000) have found that young women who are involved in social networks that are dominated by males are more likely to participate in delinquency than those in mostly female networks. Moreover, research on gender and gang violence suggests that young women in mostly female gangs are involved in the least levels of violence when compared to mostly male, all-male, and mixed-gender gangs. Interestingly, young women in mostly male gangs report higher levels of delinquency than young men in all-male gangs (Peterson, Miller, and Esbensen 2001). These studies point to an important aspect of this research: *examining gendered friendship network characteristics can explain more than just the inspection of the gender of the respondent.*

Taken together, these studies suggest that the gendered characteristics of the friendship network reveal insight into the relationships between friendship and delinquency that might otherwise be masked. When only examining the respondent's characteristics, we are taking away the group that the respondent is a part of. Interestingly, the majority of those who examine the relationship between friendships and delinquency neglect to examine basic elements of the friendship group (such as the predominant gender and race/ethnicity of the friendship network). While it is true that we already know a great deal about how the number of delinquent friends and the levels of

friend delinquency relate to respondent delinquent involvement, we know little about other characteristics of friends, including how the gendered characteristics of the friendship network might influence delinquency. Together, the results from previous studies suggest the need to investigate my next hypothesis:

Gender Hypothesis 1: The effects of the predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network on respondent delinquency depend on the characteristics of the respondent.

The gendered patterns of delinquent behavior are clearly documented in past studies. However, previous research has neglected to highlight gender differences in the relationship between delinquency and elements of the friendship bond. Although past research indicates that female friendship networks provide more social control, it could be the case that certain elements of the friendship bond such as *emotional attachment*, *time spent with friends*, and *influential capacity* vary by the respondent's gender. Below I will investigate how elements of the friendship bond differ by the respondent's gender.

Gender and Elements of the Friendship Bond

Emotional Attachment to Friends. One of the most obvious gender differences in friendship bonds relates to intimacy levels. Research shows that as young women enter adolescence, their friendships become closer and more intimate than friendships among young men (Collins, Hartup, and Laursen 1999). In addition, adolescent women value

close friendship and intimacy much more than adolescent men (Giordano et al. 1986; Steffensmeier and Allan 1996). Sutherland's contention that those who are more bonded to each other will be more influenced by friends' behaviors would imply that those in female friendships will be more influenced by their friends' behaviors. However, a great deal of research has found that female friendship networks are not conducive to delinquency (e.g. Giordano, Cernkovich, and Pugh 1986; McCarthy et al. 2004; Rountree and Warner 1999). It is likely that female friendships are characterized by higher levels of non-delinquent friend behavioral influences while male friendships are much more often characterized by delinquent friend influences. Whatever the case, the aforementioned gender differences in emotional friend attachment suggest that the relationship between emotional attachment to friends and delinquent behavior will be affected by the gender of the respondent.

Frequency of Time Spent with Friends. The majority of adolescents spend a great deal of time with their friends. Most evidence suggests that there are no significant gender differences in the frequency of time spent with friends (e.g. Barth and Kinder 1988). Nevertheless, there is evidence that young women spend more time with their parents than young men (Warr 2002). It could be the case that although young men and women spend equivalent amounts of time with their friends, the friendship bond is enhanced for those who spend time with *only* their friends, rather than those who spend time with both their friends and family. In addition, females are less likely to be involved in unstructured socializing in unsupervised groups when compared to males (Osgood and Anderson 2004). Thus, although young women are spending as much time with their

friends as young men, their time is more likely to be supervised by a parental figure. However, neither one of these relationships has been adequately explored. It may be that males are more likely to spend time with *only* their friends and without parental supervision than females. Thus, it is important to consider how the frequency of time spent with friends might differentially affect delinquency based on the gender of the respondent.

Influential Capacity of Friends. While we know that friends certainly influence behavior, studies also show that this relationship differs by gender (Giordano et al. 1986; Heimer 1996). Much research on young girls' friendships has shown that, compared to boys, girls have a greater sensitivity to the opinions of others (Gilligan 1982; Maccoby 1990). Indeed, Brown (1982) found that young women report higher levels of peer pressure and more intense peer pressure than young men report. Conversely, other studies indicate that young men are more susceptible to peer influence (Giordano et al. 1986). Still more research shows that the influence of peers is similar for both men and women (Bjerregaard and Smith 1993; Smith and Paternoster 1987). Although there is mixed evidence reported in past research, the possible gender differences in the influential capacity of friends suggest that the relationship between the friendship bond and delinquency will differ by the gender of the respondent.

In sum, the aforementioned studies suggest that each of the elements of the friendship bond may differ by gender to some degree. Such gendered differences in friendship patterns also suggest that the relationship between the elements of the

friendship bond and delinquency might also differ by gender. This leads me to my next hypothesis:

Gender Hypothesis 2: The effects of the elements of the friendship bond on respondent delinquency depend on the gender of the respondent.

Race/Ethnicity and Friendship Bond Influences on Delinquency

Friendship networks not only differ by gender composition, race/ethnicity has also been found to be a very significant source of homophily (Shrum et al. 1988). Indeed, race/ethnicity is such an important part of friendship that many have determined that it is one of the most salient characteristics that influence friendship formation (Graham and Cohen 1997; Hallinan and Teixeira 1987). Such patterns are set in place by early ages since most young persons interact with individuals of similar races/ethnicities (Shrum et al. 1988). However, it is the case that whites are more likely to be in racially homogenous friendship networks when compared to African Americans and Hispanics (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001).

While it is clear that race/ethnicity plays a role in friendship formation, race/ethnicity might also be important when considering involvement in delinquency (LaFree 1995). Studies examining self-report data show that African American youth report higher levels of involvement in serious crimes when compared to other groups (Elliott and Ageton 1980). Indeed, Elliott (1994) also found that African American male youth report more violent offenses than white males report. Official reports of arrest for

crime are no better. African American youth continue to be overrepresented in arrests for all crimes and especially overrepresented in violent crimes including robbery, murder, and non-negligent homicide (Federal Bureau of Investigations 1999). The homicide arrest rate among Hispanic youth has also been reported to be markedly higher than the rate for whites (Valdez, Nourjah, and Nourjah 1988). While it is likely that socioeconomic status and community-level factors contribute to such differences in offending, such clear racial/ethnic differences in offending still exist among juveniles today (LaFree 1995). Thus, it is important to consider the race/ethnicity of the respondent when examining respondent delinquency.

The predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network might also play a role in delinquent involvement. Haynie and Payne (2006) found that the racial/ethnic composition of friendship networks contributes to variations in delinquency. Their study showed that predominantly African American friendship networks were qualitatively different from predominantly White and Hispanic friendship networks in terms of delinquency (Haynie and Payne 2006). This is an important aspect of this study: *examining racial/ethnic friendship network characteristics can explain more than just the inspection of the race/ethnicity of the respondent*. This leads me to my next hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: The effects of friend delinquency on respondent delinquency depend on the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network.

Furthermore, it is likely that the racial/ethnic characteristics of the friendship network as well as the respondent's race/ethnicity are important when understanding delinquent involvement. Indeed, Kanter's (1977) work shows that the relative numbers of socially and culturally different people in a group are critical in shaping interaction dynamics. Kanter (1977) further suggests that "visibility" within particular groups generates performance pressures. For example, in a friendship network comprised of several white individuals and few non-white individuals, "visibility" may contribute to different behaviors among non-white members of friendship networks. This minority "token" status has been found to be related to differences in group dynamics and behaviors (Hoffman 1985). Such research suggests that it may be important to consider how an individual's race/ethnicity and the racial/ethnic composition of the friendship network which he/she belongs to both play a role in understanding delinquent behavior. As mentioned above, if we only examine the respondent's characteristics, we miss the important elements of the group that the respondent is a part of. Together, the results from previous suggest the need to investigate my next hypothesis:

Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 1: The effects of the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network on respondent delinquency depend on the characteristics of the respondent.

While previous research has found that race/ethnicity affects friendship formation, there may also be certain characteristics of the friendship bond that differ by

race/ethnicity. Such differences in friendship bonding may also contribute to differential effects of the friendship bond on delinquency. However, previous research has neglected to examine elements of the friendship bond such as *emotional attachment*, *time spent with friends*, and *influential capacity* and the potentially differential effects such elements may have depending on the predominant race/ethnicity of friendship networks. Below I will attempt to fill this gap in the literature.

Race/Ethnicity and Elements of the Friendship Bond

Emotional Attachment to Friends. Racial/ethnic differences in friendship intimacy and emotional attachment have been documented in past research. Some studies suggest that friendships among racial/ethnic minorities are characterized by high levels of bonding since racial/ethnic minorities face similar barriers in achieving success (Anderson 1999; Savin-Williams and Berndt 1990). African Americans may also be more likely to look to friends (compared to family members) for both emotional and financial support (McAdoo 1983). Indeed, African Americans are much more likely than whites and Hispanics to view their delinquent friends as a “surrogate family.” Research has shown that African American friends can act as “fictive kin” (McAdoo 1983; Stack 1974). Stack (1974) defines “fictive kin” as individuals who take on familial responsibilities and provide a source of support when family members are unable to do so. Past studies have shown that “fictive kin” can become the most important source of emotional and social support among African Americans (Chatters, Taylor, and Jayakody

1994; Liebow 1967; Anderson 1978). African Americans might view their friends as “fictive kin” much more so than whites or Hispanics.

In stark contrast to the findings of the above studies, other research shows that African American youth are less likely to have intense relationships with friends and are more likely to view their families as a “safe haven” or anchor to the discriminating culture surrounding minority youth (Giordano, Cernkovich, and DeMaris 1993; Willie 1988). Similarly, while Hispanic youth view both family and friends as central to their lives, they more often report parents, siblings, and cousins as primary sources of social support compared to friend relationships (Azmitia, Ittel, and Brenk 2006). Whatever the case, it is likely that race/ethnicity might contribute to differences in emotional attachment. Sutherland (1939) suggests that those who are bonded to their friends will be more influenced by their behaviors. Potential variations in emotional attachment among different racial/ethnic groups may impact the relationship between the friendship bond and delinquency.

Frequency of Time Spent with Friends. As mentioned above, most adolescents spend quite a bit of time with friends. However, there has been some research indicating that Hispanics spend less time with their friends than other racial/ethnic groups (Coombs, Paulson, and Richardson 1991). In addition, Hispanic parents often insist on high levels of familial involvement and restrict children’s time with friends much more so than white and African American parents (Moore 1991). On the other hand, African Americans are much more likely to come from single-parent households which have been shown to be related to high levels of peer interaction and low levels of parental interaction (Steinberg

1987). Thus, studies show that Hispanics are likely to spend less time with their friends while African Americans are likely to spend more time with their friends. Such differences in the frequency of time spent with friends suggest that there may be significant differences the effect of the friendship bond on delinquency by the race/ethnicity of the respondent.

Influential Capacity of Friends. Peer pressure has also been found to vary by race/ethnicity. Some researchers have found that whites respond to peer pressure much more so than African Americans and Hispanics (Billy and Udry 1985; Coombs et al. 1991; Giordano et al. 1993; Iscoe, Williams, Harvey 1964; Matsueda and Heimer 1987). In addition, whites describe friendships as more intimate, report a higher need for approval from peers, and rank “having a group of friends to hang around with” as very important (Giordano et al. 1993). Hispanic youth report that peer acceptance is significantly less important to them and that peer influences are less influential to their behaviors than do white youth (Coombs et al. 1991). Thus, those in white friendship networks are more likely to look to their friends for acceptance and are more likely to be influenced by their behaviors while this is much less likely to be the case for those in African American and Hispanic friendship networks. On the other hand, some research indicates that adolescents in single-parent homes (which are more common among African American and Hispanic families) are more susceptible to peer pressure to engage in delinquency (Steinberg 1987). Recall that Sutherland (1939) claims delinquent behavior is more common when friends influence attitudes and behaviors that are conducive to delinquency. This suggests that significant racial/ethnic variations in the

influential capacity of friends might affect respondent delinquency differentially depending on the race/ethnicity of the respondent.

Taken together, the preceding discussion suggests that the elements of the friendship bond may differ by the race/ethnicity of the respondent. It is also likely that such differences in the friendship bond might contribute to differences in the effects of the friendship bond on respondent delinquency. This brings me to my next hypothesis:

Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 2: The effects of the elements of the friendship bond on respondent delinquency depend on the race/ethnicity of the respondent.

Before proceeding forward, it is important to note that much research on friendship formation shows that individuals choose friends who are like themselves. Indeed, researchers find support for the common anecdote “birds of a feather flock together” (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001; Worthen 2000). It would appear that in the majority of circumstances, the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent are strongly correlated with the gender and race/ethnicity of his/her friends (e.g. Shrum et al. 1988). This is an important finding that provides us with a great deal of information regarding friendship formation. At times, however, this strongly limits our ability to understand possible differences between the respondent’s gender and race/ethnicity and the gender and race/ethnicity of his/her friendship network. So while this dissertation focuses on hypothesized relationships regarding friendship network characteristics in terms of both gender and race/ethnicity, it is difficult at times to disentangle the

respondent's gender and race/ethnicity from the gender and race/ethnicity of his/her friendship network due to their strong correlation with one another. That being said, previous research has neglected to explore exactly how closely the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent and the gender and race/ethnicity of his/her friends are correlated with one another. So while we know there is enormous overlap between respondent characteristics and friendship network characteristics, we do not know exactly how much these things overlap. The correlation between these two characteristics is certainly evident, however, this homogeneity problem may not be a problem at all. This research will provide further evidence to understand exactly how homogeneous adolescent friendship networks are in terms of gender and race/ethnicity while also providing a discussion of how such patterns of friendship formation affect delinquent involvement.

Chapter Three: Parental Influences on Adolescent Delinquency

Although friends are an important part of the lives of adolescents, parent-child relationships are also influential. Those who have healthy relationships with their parents are less likely to be involved in delinquency. Studies show that parental bonding strongly decreases adolescent involvement in delinquency (e.g. Cernkovich and Giordano 1987; Hirschi 1969; Warr 1993). Indeed, warm, loving, and responsive parenting contributes to a strengthened parent-child bond and reduces the likelihood of delinquency (Smith and Krohn 1995). As friendships become more salient during adolescence, parents may choose to make shifts in levels of monitoring of their children or they may give their child more freedom to interact with his or her friends. In addition, parent-child relations in adolescence become more essential to identity development (Erikson 1968). Children look to their parents as protective providers while adolescents look to their parents as role models (Rawlins 1992).

Nevertheless, the strength of the parental bond can be offset by the strength of the friendship bond. During adolescence, friendships become increasingly important. Indeed studies show that while parents are most influential during early adolescence, middle and late adolescence are characterized by a much greater influence of friends (Kandel 1996; Warr 1993). However, parents have been found to influence the type of friends an adolescent chooses to associate with (Kandel 1996; Smith, Flay, Bell, and Weissberg 2001). As a result, both the elements of the parental bond and the elements of the friendship bond are important to consider when understanding adolescent delinquency.

Parental Bonding and Social Control Theory

In addition to the clearly influential role that friendships play in the context of delinquency involvement pointed to in Differential Association Theory, another large body of research that seeks to explain delinquent involvement stems from Social Control Theory. Hirschi's Social Control Theory (1969) asserts that all people have the propensity to commit crimes, but those who are socially bonded to others (in this case, parents) are less likely to conduct delinquent acts. He further outlines four components of social bonding: (1) the person must be emotionally *attached* to others, (2) the individual must be *committed* to society, (3) the individual must be *involved* in conventional activities to keep them busy and productive, leaving little time for delinquent behavior, and (4) the person must have a strong *belief* that they should follow society's rules. Hirschi's tests of Social Control Theory show that emotional attachment to others is the strongest predictor of Social Control Theory. Attachment involves a sensitivity to the needs of others, affectional identification, love and respect between the parent and child (Hirschi 1969:91). The stronger this attachment bond, "the more likely the person is to take it into account when [s/]he contemplates a criminal act" (Hirschi 1969:83). Hirschi (1969) suggests that low levels of emotional attachment to parents predict involvement in delinquency regardless of race/ethnicity, class, or peer delinquency. If the bond to the parent is weakened, the probability of delinquent behavior increases. If this emotional bond is strengthened, the probability of delinquent behavior decreases (Hirschi 1969). Strong support for the other components of Social Control Theory (i.e. commitment, involvement, and belief) is rather limited (see Kempf 1993).

Hirschi (1969) further contends that the *emotional attachment* bond to parents as indicated by Social Control Theory influences children's behavior through the following dimensions. First, the parent-child bond is strengthened when children *spend more time with their parents*. As in Sutherland's Differential Association Theory, both theories contend that spending time with individuals (whether they be parents or friends) can increase their influential capacity on behaviors and attitudes. Second, the parent-child bond will reduce delinquency when the parent is "psychologically present when temptation to crime appears" and children are more inclined to ask themselves "What will my parents think?" (Hirschi 1969:88). Hirschi operationalizes this through asking respondents "Does your mother (father) know where you are when you are away from home?" and "Does your mother (father) know whom you are with when you are way from home?" (1969:88-89). This type of parental monitoring both increases the strength of the parental bond while simultaneously decreasing the likelihood of delinquent behavior. Therefore, the elements of the parental bond can be understood in terms of (1) *emotional attachment* to parents (as outlined by Hirschi), (2) frequency of *time spent with parents* (seen in Hirschi's Social Control Theory and similar to Sutherland's frequency element of friendship bonding), and (3) the *influential capacity* of parents (Hirschi's contention that parents can influence children's attitudes and behaviors through monitoring their children's behaviors).

Elements of the Parental Bond

Emotional Attachment to Parents. The relationship between both positive and negative emotional attachment to parents and involvement in delinquency is strongly supported in contemporary research. Sampson and Laub (1993) explored Hirschi's Social Control Theory (1969) focusing primarily on the importance of positive pro-social bonds to society (i.e. attachment) and their preventative effects on delinquency. The authors theorized that a lack of positive emotional attachment with family members influences involvement in delinquency (Sampson and Laub 1993). According to Sampson and Laub (1993), positive emotional attachment between parents and friends will decrease delinquency while negative emotional attachment with parents will increase delinquency. In 2002, Rebellon used the framework of emotional attachment under Hirschi's Social Control Theory in his exploration of the relationship between broken homes and delinquency. Rebellon (2002) found that individuals engage in delinquency when they have non-affective (i.e. negative emotional) attachment to parents. Finally, Warr (2007) determined that weak attachment to parents is higher among delinquent youth than among non-delinquent youth. It is therefore highly likely that the strength of the emotional attachment element of the parental bond will affect involvement in delinquency just as Hirschi (1969) purported.

Frequency of Time Spent with Parents. Research also finds that children are less likely to be involved in delinquency when they spend time with their parents. This finding can be traced back to the Glueck and Glueck (1950) study that determined that delinquents are less likely to spend time with their parents than non-delinquents. Further,

Warr (1993) found that the amount of time a child spends with his/her parents can greatly reduce the influence of delinquent peers. Still more research indicates that those who spend time at home with their parents are less likely to be involved in delinquent activities (Riley 1987; Warr 1993; Warr 2005). Although some studies show that time spent with parents is unrelated to reduced involvement in delinquency (e.g. Agnew and Petersen 1989), the majority of past research (as noted above) shows that parental relationships do play a role in delinquency. In addition, previous studies find that frequent interaction with parents reduces delinquent involvement. Those parents that spend time talking with their children, helping them with homework, and engaging in leisure activities with their children are likely to have a strengthened parent-child bond (e.g. Riley 1987; Warr 1993; Warr 2005). As Hirschi's (1969) research reports, such frequent interaction with parents will result in parental behaviors becoming more influential to children's behaviors. Put another way, children who interact more with their parents will be more influenced by their parents' behaviors.

Influential Capacity of Parents. In addition to the effects of emotional attachment to parents and spending time with parents, parents have the capacity to influence their children's behaviors through parental monitoring. Parental monitoring of the child's friendships and of the child's time spent with friends are both ways in which parents can strongly influence their child's behavior. Parents can not only monitor who their child's friends are, they can also monitor who their child's friends' parents are and what activities their child engages in with their friends. Such parental monitoring affects delinquent involvement since delinquent friendships are more likely to flourish when

parents are unaware of their children's delinquent friends (Warr, unpublished manuscript). Less parental monitoring results in a reduced influential capacity of parents on their child's behaviors and an increased likelihood of association with delinquent peers (Ary, Duncan, Duncan, and Hops 1999). It is not surprising that research shows parental knowledge/monitoring of both children's friends and of the time children spend with their friends are significant predictors of involvement in delinquency among adolescents (Smith and Krohn 1995). Further research indicates that a high level of parental monitoring of children's activities with their friends is significantly related to decreased involvement in delinquent behaviors (Parker and Benson 2004), while a low level of parental knowledge/monitoring about their children's behaviors is related to increased delinquent behavior (Laird, Pettit, Bates, and Dodge 2003) and association with delinquent friends (Ary et al. 1999). These past studies indicate that the influential capacity of parents to shape attitudes and behaviors of their children will affect delinquent behavior.

In sum, past studies show that the parent-child relationship can be a strong element in curtailing delinquent involvement. Hirschi's Social Control Theory provides a framework for understanding the influences parental relationships on adolescent delinquent involvement in terms of parental *emotional attachment*, frequency of *time spent with parents*, and *the influential capacity* of parents. Together, this suggests the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: The effects of friend delinquency on respondent delinquency depend on the elements of the parental bond.

Gender and Parental Bond Influences on Delinquency

The elements of the parental bond (as noted above) are certainly important when considering delinquency; however, gender is another element that might also contribute to our understandings of adolescent delinquency. Because most research suggests that sons and daughters have different relationships with their parents (i.e. Armsden and Greenberg 1987), it is likely that the elements of the parental bond (i.e. emotional attachment, frequency of time spent with parents, and influential capacity) differ by gender. In addition, such variations by gender may contribute to significant differences in the effects of the parental bond on delinquency.

Gender and Elements of the Parental Bond

Emotional Attachment to Parents. Although emotional attachment to parents is often cited as an important element of delinquency prevention (see Gove and Crutchfield 1982), significant gender differences in parental attachment have also been consistently reported. For example, one study found that young women are much more likely than young men to report high levels of emotional attachment to their parents (Armsden and Greenberg 1987). In addition, further research shows that young women are much more negatively affected by low levels of parental attachment when compared to young men (Rosenbaum 1987; Austin 1978). Further findings also suggest that young women engage in fewer acts of delinquency than young men because young women are more influenced by bonds to the family than are young men (Heimer and DeCoster 1999). In contrast, others have found that poor parental attachment and support are better indicators of

delinquency among adolescent males than among adolescent females (Johnson, Su, Gerstein, Shin, and Hoffman 1995; Krohn and Massey 1980). The mixed results from past research suggest that it is likely that emotional attachment to parents does vary by gender. While Hirschi's Social Control Theory (1969) posits that those who are more bonded to their parents will be less likely to be involved in delinquency, past research suggests that such parent-child bonds may differ by gender. Thus it is important to consider the respondent's gender to understand how parental bonding might affect delinquency.

Frequency of Time Spent with Parents. While most children have some level of interaction with their parents, this element of the parental bond also likely differs by gender. Warr's (1993) study revealed that young women spend more time with their parents than young men. In addition, Warr (1993) also found that those youth who spend time with their parents are less likely to be involved in delinquency. It would appear that young women not only have a reduced likelihood of delinquent involvement, but also, this could be due to their increased likelihood of spending more time with their parents than young men. Further research indicates that young women are more likely to be supervised when interacting with friends (than are young men) thus increasing the likelihood that young women will interact with their parents (Osgood and Anderson 2004). Because of the clear relationship between frequency of time spent with parents and a reduction in delinquent behavior as highlighted in Hirschi's Social Control Theory (1969), it is important to consider how the frequency of time spent with parents might affect delinquency among young men and young women.

Influential Capacity of Parents. While it is true that parents influence children's behaviors, some evidence suggests that the parental capacity to reinforce certain behaviors through the monitoring of the child's friendships and the child's time spent with friends might differ by gender. An investigation into family influences on delinquency found several significant gender differences in terms of parental monitoring. Gove and Crutchfield (1982) determined that when parents know their child's friends, there is a significant reduction in delinquency; however, this relationship differs by gender. In their research, parental monitoring of children's friendships contributed to a significant reduction in delinquency likelihood among adolescent women but this relationship was not significant for adolescent men. This relationship held true for adolescents from both intact and single-parent families. Moreover, parental influence over children's behaviors was the strongest when monitoring of child's friends was heightened. However, parental knowledge of the child's friends decreased the likelihood of delinquency only among adolescent women. Thus, a further investigation of the respondent's gender and the influential capacity of parents might contribute to our overall understanding of adolescent delinquency.

The above research suggests that the three elements of the parental bond that decrease delinquent behavior (i.e. high levels of *emotional attachment* to parents, high frequency of *time spent with parents*, and *influential capacity* of parents) are all more likely among daughters than among sons. In addition, young women might be more closely bonded to their parents than young men. Thus, the importance of parental

bonding on delinquency likely varies by the predominant gender of the respondent as suggested in my next hypothesis:

Gender Hypothesis 3: The effects of the elements of the parental bond on respondent delinquency depend on the gender of the respondent.

Race/Ethnicity and Parental Bond Influences on Delinquency

The elements of the parental bond also potentially differ by race/ethnicity. Compared to whites and Hispanics, African American children are most likely to come from single-mother/non-resident father households, they are more likely to live in chronic poverty, and they are more likely to become teen mothers/fathers (Taylor, Tucker, Chatters, and Jayakody 1997). For example, fully 76% of white children live in two-parent households while fewer Hispanic children live in similar households (about 68%); however, only 38% of African-American children come from households with two parents (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2004). In contrast, whites are least likely to be comprised single-parent households most likely to be well-above the poverty line compared to African Americans and Hispanics (Taylor, Tucker, Chatters, and Jayakody 1997). Such disparate family situations almost certainly impact parent-child bonding. Indeed, Smith and Krohn suggest that “the overall impact of family life on behavior at midadolescence may differ across ethnic contexts” (1995:85). For example, studies have shown that the absence of positive family relations has a stronger impact on depression levels among Hispanic and Black youth compared to white adolescents (Azmitia, Ittel,

and Brenk 2006). It is likely that those parents who have the luxury to enhance their *emotional attachment*, *spend time* with their children, and *influence* their child's behaviors are most likely to contribute to reducing delinquency among their children.

Race/Ethnicity and Elements of the Parental Bond

Emotional Attachment to Parents. Emotional attachment to parents appears to vary by race/ethnicity. For example, studies show that attachment to parents contributes to a reduction in delinquency among Hispanics, however, the relationship between emotional attachment to parents and delinquency is much weaker for whites and is almost non-existent among African Americans (Cernkovich and Giordano 1987; Coombs et al. 1991). In addition, research on Hispanic families shows that they are often characterized by a strong presence of family members outside of the nuclear family such as grandparents, cousins, aunts, and uncles and are also reflective of close-knit enclaves with strong kinship ties (Halgunseth 2004; Taylor, Tucker, Chatters, and Jayakody 1997; Moore 1994). Hispanic families are also often characterized by family interdependence and an emphasis on the importance of family goals (Azmitia, Ittel, and Brenck 2006). In contrast, studies show that whites are most likely to be living in two-parent households (Taylor, Tucker, Chatters, and Jayakody 1997) which have been shown to contribute to a greater likelihood of emotional attachment between parent and child (Matsueda and Heimer 1987). Moreover, African American adolescents are much more likely to be from single-parent households that often contribute to lower levels of emotional attachment. In

sum, emotional attachments to parents have been found to vary by race/ethnicity and this may contribute to differential effects on delinquency.

Frequency of Time Spent with Parents. A second element of the parental bond that appears to vary by race/ethnicity is the amount of time spent with parents. Hispanic families promote active parent-child interactions through encouraging help with household chores, babysitting, taking on the role of “translator” for members of their family, and even working with their parents at their places of employment (Díaz-Stevens 1994; Halgunseth 2004; Moore 1991). In some cases, Hispanic parents insist on high levels of familial involvement and restrict children’s time with friends much more so than white parents (Azmitia, Ittel, and Brenck 2006; Moore 1991). Studies show that Hispanic youth who spent more time with family members on the weekends and evenings were less likely to be involved in delinquent behavior than white or African American youth (Pabon 1998; Smith and Krohn 1995). In addition, Hispanic youth are found to spend much less time with their friends and consequently much more time with their parents than both whites and African Americans (Coombs et al. 1991). Moreover, one study shows that time spent with parents is not a significant predictor in reducing delinquency among either African American or white youth (Smith and Krohn 1995). In sum, such reported racial/ethnic differences in frequency of parental interaction might contribute to differential affects on delinquency by race/ethnicity.

Influential Capacity of Parents. The final element of the parental bond that appears to vary by race/ethnicity is the influence of parents. Recall that those parents that monitor their child’s activities have more influence over their behaviors (Gove and

Crutchfield 1982). Since family life is integral to Hispanic adolescents, parents are more of an influential source in their lives (Smith and Krohn 1995). Hispanics youth report that parents have more influence on their delinquent behavior than their friends have (Coombs et al. 1991). On the other hand, children from single-parent households are less likely to be monitored as closely as those from two-parent households. Indeed, one study shows that African American youth from single-parent homes are more likely to engage in delinquency than non-African Americans from single-parent homes (Matsueda and Heimer 1987). In contrast, parental monitoring of child's friends has been found to be a significant predictor of delinquent involvement for whites and not for other racial/ethnic groups (Smith and Krohn 1995). Overall, studies show that the effects of parental monitoring may vary by race/ethnicity and this element of the parental bond might contribute to differences in delinquency depending on the respondent's race/ethnicity.

In sum, the previous studies suggest that parental bonding differs by race/ethnicity. Adolescents may have very different parent-child relationships in terms of *emotional attachment, time spent with parents, and the influential capacity* of their parents depending on their racial/ethnic background. Such differences in parent-child relationships might also contribute to differences in delinquency. Taking these findings into consideration leads me to my final hypothesis:

Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 3: The effects of the elements of the parental bond on respondent delinquency depend on the race/ethnicity of the respondent.

Chapter Four: Methods

Data

This project used secondary data from wave one (collected in 2001) of the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS) (Giordano, Longmore, and Manning 2001). This study was derived from public and private school enrollment records in Lucas County, Ohio. The majority of children in the county (and those in the sample) were enrolled in public schools. According to the United States Census Bureau, the population of Lucas County at the time of sample selection (2000) was just under half a million persons with approximately 30% of the population under the age of 18. There were nearly 200,000 households out of which around 30% had children under the age of 18 living with them. The average household size was 2.44 and the average family size was 3.06.

Overall, Lucas County is a predominantly urban county and includes the Toledo metropolitan area (population: 313,619 in 2000). The median household income in the county was \$38,004 and the median income for a family was \$48,190 in 2000. Just over 11% of families lived below the poverty line (including nearly 20% of those under age 18) at the time of sample selection (for more about Lucas County, see Appendix B).

Specifically, a stratified, random sample (N = 1,321) was drawn from all 7th, 9th, and 11th grade youth enrolled in public and private schools residing in Lucas County in the fall of 2000. Both adolescent quantitative interviews and parent/guardian interviews were collected. For the adolescent interviews, laptop computers pre-loaded with the questionnaire were given to adolescents for structured in-home interviews. While the

adolescent was given control of the computer to complete the sensitive questions for the bulk of the interview, an interviewer administered both the beginning and end of the questionnaire. This was done to assure the adolescent respondents a certain level of privacy and confidentiality. A parent or guardian was also given a self-administered questionnaire, usually in a different area of the home to secure the adolescent respondent's confidentiality from both the researcher and parent/guardian. Through the parent/guardian questionnaire, a household roster was established and any major disruptions or changes in the household were also documented. Questions about past and present behaviors, educational level, work experience, and parenting methods were also asked of parents/guardians.

There are two important biases to point out related to the sampling process for the TARS. First, since school records were used to identify the sampling frame, only those adolescents enrolled in school were included in the TARS data. Second, since parent/guardian questionnaires were required, only those adolescents with available parents/guardians were included in the TARS data. These sampling frame restrictions yield important biases to remember when considering the findings of this project.

The data were obtained from the Data Sharing for Demographic Research a project of the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research under the supervision of Dr. Russel Hathaway. A detailed contract was executed to adhere to the guidelines of the Data Sharing for Demographic Research. IRB approval was also received for this project.

Descriptive Statistics of the Sample

First, I obtained descriptive statistics of my sample by race/ethnicity and gender. The total sample I utilized for this project (less missing and non-response data, N = 1,171) consisted of 65% White, 26% African American, 9% Hispanic. For the purposes of this project, other races/ethnicities were excluded from analyses. In terms of gender, the sample was 48% male and 52% female and the average age of all respondents was 15.26. These sample characteristics closely approximate those of Lucas County in 2000 which consisted of 48% male and 52% female. Furthermore, the racial/ethnic composition of Lucas County in 2000 included 77.5% White, 17% African American, and 5.5% other races while 4.5% of the population were Hispanic or Latino of any race. Overall, the sample is similar to the population of Lucas County, although certainly not exact since it includes more racial/ethnic minorities than the population of Lucas County.

Next, I obtained descriptive statistics about the friendships of the respondent. First, respondents were asked “Which of the following best describes the number of friendships you have with other kids?” Respondents indicating they had no friendship were excluded from the sample. The rest of the respondents indicated that they had a few friends (9%, N = 109), about 5 friends (11%, N = 124), or more than 5 friends (80%, N = 938).

In addition, each respondent was asked to identify characteristics of five friends. This line of questioning created a total of 5,295 friends (1,171 respondents provided characteristics of 1 friend; information about 2 friends was indicated by 1,159 respondents; 1,066 respondents indicated characteristics about 3 friends; 981 respondents

described 4 friends; there were 918 respondents who provided information about 5 friends). The friends' characteristics were very similar to the respondents' characteristics. In terms of gender, 50% were male (N = 2,666) and 50% female (N = 2,629). Most attended the same school as the respondent or did so in the past (83%, N = 4,410). The friends sample consisted of 63% White (N = 3,358), 27% African American (N = 1,428), 6% Hispanic (N = 332). For the purposes of this project, other races/ethnicities of friends will be excluded from analyses. The average age of the friends of the respondents was 15.4.

In sum, all missing/non-response items were removed from the final analyses resulting in a final sample population of 1,171 respondents. Both the respondent sample and the friend sample generated by the respondents have similar gender, age, and racial/ethnic backgrounds.

Measurement of Variables¹²

Friendship Networks

Friendship networks can be defined as a closely bound group of five or less in which there is an agreed upon (whether unspoken or spoken) reciprocal support system. Respondents indicating their top five friends provided a list of their current friendship network. To best understand the gender composition of friendship networks, categories were created regarding the percentage of each gender within the friendship networks as

¹ Please note that Appendix B includes the exact wording and summary statistics for all items used in analyses.

² Tables 2a and 2b include descriptive statistics of all variables used in analyses by race/ethnicity and gender.

indicated by the respondent. Those friendship networks that consisted of more than 50% male friends were coded as *Male Friendship Network* while those friendship networks of more than 50% female friends were coded as *Female Friendship Network*. For the purposes of this research, those in mixed gender friendship networks (i.e. respondents reporting equal numbers of male and female friends) were excluded from analyses due to the low number of individuals in this group and the lack of theoretical grounding to investigate this group.

A similar process was followed to determine the racial/ethnic composition of friendship networks. From the information provided by respondents about their friends, categories were constructed that indicated percentages of racial/ethnic groups within friendship networks. Those friendship networks that consisted of more than 50% white friends were coded as *White Friendship Network* while those with more than 50% African American friends were coded as *African American Friendship Network* and networks with more than 50% Hispanic friends were coded as *Hispanic Friendship Network*. Those indicating they had equal numbers of any of the racial/ethnic categories of friends were excluded from analyses. Table 1 provides detailed information about the gender and racial/ethnic composition of friendship networks.

It should be noted that the choice to define networks in terms of more than 50% of the group of interest is exploratory since there is very little research this area. As mentioned above, McCarthy et al. (2004) were some of the first researchers to examine the gender composition of friendship networks and how such gender characteristics affect delinquent involvement. In their study, the researchers identified “female-dominated

friendship networks” as 2 or 3 female friends in a 4 person friendship network (McCarthy et al. 2004). I utilized an identical method (more than 50% of group of interest) in this project since McCarthy et al.’s (2004) study yielded significant results. Another option for defining friendship network construction is the use of a heterogeneity index. Haynie and Payne (2006) utilized a racial heterogeneity index in their work. This index allows for the comparison of the respondent’s race to the number of individuals in his/her friendship network with an identical race. The resulting index provides a number that can be interpreted as the level of racial heterogeneity in the respondent’s friendship network. While I did not utilize this method in the current project, I plan to explore heterogeneity indexes in future research.

It is also important to point out (again) that individual and group characteristics are often highly correlated with one another. In the majority of circumstances, the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent are identical to the gender and race/ethnicity of his/her friends (e.g. Shrum et al. 1988). This means that although I am making efforts to measure the predominant gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent’s friendship network, in most cases such measures are identical to the respondent’s characteristics. I do acknowledge that this is a large limitation to this project, however, the contributions of this project lie in its ability to provide the larger criminology community with a resource that shows us that individual and group characteristics are correlated with one another and this has an impact on the way we examine delinquent friendship networks.

Dependent Variable

Respondent Delinquency is a dichotomous variable created from measurements of how often the respondent reported his/her involvement in nine specific delinquent activities. The response options were: (1) Never, (2) Once or twice a year, (3) Once every 2-3 months, (4) Once a month, (5) Once every 2-3 weeks, (6) Once a week, (7) 2-3 times a week, (8) Once a day, (9) More than once a day. Those who reported “never” on all nine measure of delinquency are coded as (0) for *Respondent Delinquency*. Those who report involvement in one or more delinquent behaviors are coded as (1) for *Respondent Delinquency*. The individual items consisted of behaviors such as stealing, damaging property, carrying weapons, attack with intent to harm, selling drugs, public intoxication, breaking and entering, and drug abuse. Appendix B lists each individual item and relevant statistics. There were strong correlations between these variables (see Table 3) and exploratory principle components factor analysis revealed one common factor among these variables (see Table 4), demonstrating the support for creating a combined measure of these behaviors.

The decision to construct the delinquency measures in this project into a 0/1 variable most certainly biases the estimates. Essentially, this collapses all individuals into delinquent and non-delinquent groups. Because this project is focused on the gender and racial/ethnic composition of friendship networks and not delinquency *per se*, I decided to simplify the delinquency measures and focus on the network variables. While this truncation does provide biased estimates, it also allows for a simplistic interpretation of delinquency among the groups of interest. I recognize that this is only one way to

conceive of delinquency and there are certainly many other ways to explore delinquent behavior. In future projects I hope to explore different types of delinquency (i.e. property offenses, violent offenses, etc.) to further elucidate the results of this dissertation.

Independent Variables

Friend Delinquency is a dichotomous variable comprised of the respondent's report of his/her friends' involvement in delinquent activities. The behaviors used to create this variable are identical to those used to create *Respondent Delinquency*.

It is important to note that some researchers indicate that friend delinquency (as reported by respondents) is actually a proxy for respondent delinquency: "self-reported peer delinquency is just another measure of self-reported delinquency" (Gottfredson and Hirschi 597:1987). In other words, it could be the case that some individuals actually measure their own delinquency through reporting their friend delinquency. This could possibly mask the respondent's delinquency through his/her inflation of friend delinquency measures. While this is certainly a possibility, further research suggests that while self-reported peer delinquency and self-reported delinquency are certainly correlated, they are certainly not identical measures but rather their correlations are the result of the fact that delinquency is almost always group behavior (Elliott and Menard 1996; Warr 2002).

I. Friendship Bond Elements

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted in order to create an accurate measurement of respondents' attachment to their friends. First, correlations between relevant variables were sought (see Table 5). After isolating relevant correlated variables,

principle components factor analysis was conducted. Findings indicated an oblique rotation was necessary. Results isolated two factors (as seen in Table 6). Due to the results of this factor analysis, both *Negativity toward Friends* (alpha = .72) and *Positivity toward Friends* (alpha = .68) were employed as independent variables in analysis.

I utilized an identical method to investigate the underlying constructs of peer pressure. Table 7 indicates correlations between relevant variables while Table 8 displays the results of the factor analysis. Like the previous construct, two measures were created as a result of these analyses: (1) *Direct Peer Pressure* (alpha = .67) and (2) *Indirect Peer Pressure* (alpha = .69).

Time Spent with Friends was measured through the summation of four questions: (1) During the past week how many times did you just hang out with your friends? (2) During the past week, how many times did you go to the home of one of your friends? (3) How many times did you talk with your friends on the phone or on email? The response options for these three questions were: (1) not at all, (2) one to two time, (3) three to four times, (4) five or more times. The fourth question was: (4) Tell me how often you spend time with your friends on weekends. (For this statement, the response options were: (1) Never, (2) Hardly Ever, (3) Sometimes, (4) Often, and (5) Very often).

II. Parent Bond Elements

To investigate respondents' attachment to parents, I examined correlations between relevant variables (see Table 9) and determined that exploratory principle components factor analysis using oblique rotation was necessary to estimate the underlying contributing factors estimating attachment to parents. Factor analytic results

regarding respondents' attachment to parents isolated two relevant factors: (1) *Negativity toward Parents* (alpha = .70) and (2) *Positivity toward Parents* (alpha = .75) (as seen in Table 10).

It was also important to construct a measure that investigated parental involvement in children's friendships. Using methods highlighted above, correlations of relevant variables can be seen in Table 11 while the results of the principle components factor analysis using oblique rotation are available in Table 12. The findings of the factor analysis indicate that there are two underlying constructs: (1) *Parental Monitoring of Child's Friends* (alpha = .76) and (2) *Parental Monitoring of Child's Time with Friends* (alpha = .57); both of which will be used in the following analyses.

Parents were asked to indicate how often they spend time with their child. The results were summed to create *Time Spent with Parents*. The questions were: (1) In the average month, how often do you: spend time working on a project together with your child? (2) In the average month, how often do you: spend time in leisure activities with your child away from home? (3) During the past school year, in a typical school week how often did you help your child did homework or other school assignments? (4) In an average month, how often do you have private talks with your child? The response options were: (1) Never, (2) Hardly Ever, (3) Sometimes, (4) Often, and (5) Very often.

III. Background Variables

To determine the household parental constructs, respondents were asked: "During the past 12 months, who were you living with most of the time?" Those respondents

answering “mother only and no other adults” were coded as *Single Mother Household* (N = 270; 21%).

Socioeconomic status was measured through a series of questions asked of parents of the respondents regarding schooling, employment status, income, and government or public assistance. To determine educational attainment, parents were asked “How far did you go in school?” Those who indicated responses “less than 12 years” or “1st-8th grade” were coded as (1) in *Less than High School or GED*, all others were coded as (0). Those who reported that they are currently unemployed were coded as (1) in *Unemployed*, those employed were coded as (0). Household income was determined through the following question: “Which of the following categories does your income from all wages and salaries last year fall into?” Those earning less than \$30,000 were coded as (1) in *Less Than \$30,000 Income* and others were coded as (0). Finally, respondents were asked to indicate if they have ever received any kind of government or public assistance. Respondents indicating “yes” were coded as (1) for *Received Government Assistance*, those responding “no” were coded as (0).

Respondent Age was constructed through a variable that asked respondents for their date of birth.

Analytical Plan

Logistic regression was chosen as the modeling technique for this project due to the dichotomous nature of the dependent variable, *Respondent Delinquency*. Logistic regression allows for the conversion of the predicted coefficients into odds ratios that can

indicate change in the likelihood of the occurrence of the dependent variable (i.e. the likelihood of delinquent involvement) given a one unit change in an independent variable holding the other independent variables constant. Below I describe my models.

*Description of Models*³

I ran a series of logistic regressions with *Respondent Delinquency* as the dependent variable. I divided the entire sample into the following groups: female, male, white, African American, and Hispanic. I ran all models for the entire sample and each group separately. All models estimate the effects of predictor variables on *Respondent Delinquency*. For each model, I reported the logistic regression coefficient (β) and corresponding standardized error as well as the odds ratio. All models include socio-demographic controls. For all models, white male friendship network serves as the reference category.

I decided to combine the investigation of both the friendship bond and the parental bond into each table to best compare their effects on delinquent involvement. As Warr (1993) suggests, it is important to consider the impact of both parents and peers on delinquency since both are large parts of the lives of adolescents. To do so, I first addressed the effects of the elements of the friendship bond on respondent delinquency (see Hypothesis 1). For all groups/tables, Model 1 includes the following attachment to friends measures: *Positivity toward Friends*, *Negativity toward Friends*, *Time Spent with Friends*, *Direct Peer Pressure*, and *Indirect Peer Pressure*. Next, I investigated the

³ Note that for comparison purposes, baseline models that include the baseline effects of friend and parental bonds can be found in Appendix A.

effects of the elements of the parental bond on respondent delinquency. For all groups/tables, Model 2 includes the following attachment to parents measures: *Positivity toward Parents*, *Negativity toward Parents*, *Time Spent with Parents*, *Parental Monitoring of Child's Friendships*, and *Parental Monitoring of Child's Time with Friends*. For all groups/tables, Model 3 includes the combined the effects of both the friendship bond and the parental bond.

The next part of this project explored the predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network. I addressed Hypothesis 2 (The effects of friend delinquency on respondent delinquency depend on the predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network) and Gender Hypothesis 1 (The effects of the predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network on respondent delinquency depend on the characteristics of the respondent) through including *Female Friendship Network* membership for all groups in Tables 13-18.

In addition to the exploration of the predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network, I also investigated how the gender of the respondent affects the impact of the friendship bond on respondent delinquency (see Gender Hypothesis 2: The effects of the elements of the friendship bond on respondent delinquency depend on the gender of the respondent) and the impact of the parental bond on respondent delinquency (see Gender Hypothesis 3: The effects of the elements of the parental bond on respondent delinquency depend on the gender of the respondent) through creating subsamples of the entire sample population. As noted above, I conducted separate analyses for each

subsample. This allowed me to examine how the effects for both the friendship bond and the parental bond varied for the female and male subsamples.

In the next part of this project, I investigated the racial/ethnic composition of the respondent's friendship network. I explored Hypothesis 3 (The effects of friend delinquency on respondent delinquency depend on the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network) and Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 1 (The effects of the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network on respondent delinquency depend on the characteristics of the respondent) by incorporating *Black Friendship Network* and *Hispanic Friendship Network* into all models.

The final part of this project explored how the race/ethnicity of the respondent contributed to differential effects of the friendship and parental bonds. To address this, I examined Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 2 (The effects of the elements of the friendship bond on respondent delinquency depend on the race/ethnicity of the respondent) and Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 3 (The effects of the elements of the parental bond on respondent delinquency depend on the race/ethnicity of the respondent) through creating racial/ethnic subsamples of the entire sample population. As noted above, this allowed me to examine how the effects for both the friendship bond and the parental bond vary for the white, African American, and Hispanic subsamples.

It is important to note here that many other models were explored in this project. Interaction effects were included in all models and did not produce any significant results that would add to the results presented here. In addition, more sophisticated modeling techniques including Tobit analysis were also conducted and did not produce any results

that differ from those presented here. The decision to include simplistic nested models using logistic regression stems from these past explorations.

Chapter Five: Results

Tables 13-18 report estimates from logistic regression equations for all groups. As noted above, all models include the logistic regression coefficient (β) and corresponding standardized error as well as the odds ratio. Below I discuss my results tracing the importance of both the friendship bond and the parental bond on respondent delinquency for each subsample. I then discuss how friendship network characteristics contribute toward the likelihood of delinquent involvement for each subsample. Although this next chapter is perhaps more lengthy than the reader would like, it allows for great detail in understanding the dynamics of these complex relationships.

Entire Sample

Table 13 reports logistic regression results for the entire sample. The first thing to note here is that delinquent friendships have a significant impact on delinquent involvement. In fact, Model 1 shows that *Friend Delinquency* significantly increases the odds of respondent delinquent involvement by nearly 10.5 times among those respondents who have delinquent friends. Subsequent models also show that *Friend Delinquency* continues to significantly increase the odds of delinquent involvement for those with delinquent friends. It is obvious that this research supports previous findings indicating that having delinquent friends has a large impact on delinquent involvement.

Moving our attention to the friendship network characteristics, we can see that compared to the reference category (white male friendship network), being involved in a female friendship network does not produce significant results. In addition, African

American friendship membership does not reveal significant findings. Conversely, Hispanic friendship network has a positive effect on respondent delinquency. This means that within the entire sample, Hispanic friendship network membership increases the odds of delinquent involvement compared to those in white friendship networks. In Model 1, being a part of a Hispanic friendship network increases the odds of delinquent involvement by nearly 2.7 times. Subsequent models show similar results with Hispanic friendship network membership increasing the odds of delinquent involvement. From this table, we can see that Hispanic friendship network membership has a significant impact on delinquent involvement compared to white friendship network membership while being part of a female friendship network does not impact delinquency for the entire sample.

Next, I would like to turn your attention to the friendship bond elements. Here we see that both spending time with friends and direct peer pressure increase the likelihood of delinquent involvement. In both Model 1 and Model 3, spending time with friends increases the odds of delinquent involvement by a little over 1.1 times per unit of *Time Spent with Friends*. Model 1 shows that *Direct Peer Pressure* also increases the likelihood of delinquent involvement; however, this effect is not persistent and does not remain in the full model (Model 3). Overall, it would appear that spending time with friends has a significant impact on respondent delinquent involvement while *Direct Peer Pressure* contributes slightly less to the story when considering the entire sample population.

Next I would like to discuss the effects of the parental bond elements on respondent delinquency for the entire sample population. Here we see that of all the parental bond elements measured, only *Positivity toward Parents* is significant. Having a positive relationship with parents significantly reduces the likelihood of respondent delinquent involvement by nearly .9 times per unit of *Positivity toward Parents* in Models 2 and 3. However, compared to the effects of *Friend Delinquency*, having a positive relationship with parents only modestly contributes toward a reduction in respondent delinquency.

Overall for the entire sample population in Table 13, we can see four important findings related to the friendship and parental bonds: (1) having delinquent friends dramatically increases the likelihood of respondent involvement in delinquent behavior, (2) Hispanic friendship network membership increases respondent delinquent involvement, (3) spending time with friends also contributes toward an increase respondent delinquency, and (4) having a positive relationship with parents contributes to a moderate negative impact on delinquent involvement. Such findings at least partially support Hypotheses 1 and 4 since some elements of the friendship and parental bonds contribute toward respondent delinquency. Hypothesis 2 does not receive support since female friendship network membership was not found to be significant. Conversely, there is partial support for Hypothesis 3 since Hispanic friendship network membership was found to increase the delinquent involvement. These results provide important information about the effects of the friendship and parental bonds for the entire sample population, however, I would like next to turn to the female subsample.

Female Subsample

Table 14 reports the logistic regression results for the female subsample. This subsample includes all females who are a part of the entire sample population. A quick glance at Table 14 shows similar results to Table 13. First and foremost we see that having delinquent friends significantly increases the likelihood of respondent involvement in delinquency. All three models show large increases in the odds ratios. In Models 1 and 3, having delinquent friends increases the odds of delinquent involvement by just over 11 times for those reporting delinquent friends. In Model 2, *Friend Delinquency* results in a 12 times increase in respondent delinquent involvement for those with delinquent friends. It would appear from this table (as well as others) that respondent delinquency is strongly related to *Friend Delinquency*.

Moving to the friendship network characteristics of the female subsample, we find that females in Hispanic friendship networks are *more* likely to be involved in delinquent behavior. Indeed, Model 1 shows that Hispanic friendship network membership increases the odds of delinquency by over 4 times for females. Models 2 and 3 show similar results with Hispanic friendship network membership contributing towards large increases in the odds of delinquency among females. Unfortunately, none of the other friendship network characteristics are significant in this table. Results from this table suggest that Hispanic friendship network membership has a significant impact on delinquent involvement among the female subsample while female friendship network membership does not produce significant results.

Turning our attention to the friendship bond elements, we see that, just like in Table 13 which examined the entire sample population, both spending time with friends and *Direct Peer Pressure* significantly increase the odds of delinquent involvement. Spending time with friends increases the odds of respondent delinquency by 1.11 times per unit of *Time Spent with Friends* while *Direct Peer Pressure* increases the odds of delinquent involvement by 1.14 times per unit of *Direct Peer Pressure* in Model 1. However, unlike in Table 13, neither of these elements of the friendship bond remain significant in the full model (Model 3). This is significant since the full model examines the impact of both the friendship and parental bonds together in the same model. Since the impact of the friendship bond elements fail to remain significant in the full model, it would appear that for the female subsample, parental bond elements may be more important in curtailing delinquent involvement.

This brings me to my discussion of the impact of parental bond elements on respondent delinquent involvement. In Models 2 and 3, we see that having a positive relationship with parents reduces delinquent involvement by nearly .9 times per unit of *Positivity toward Parents* for the female subsample. In addition, a closer inspection of Model 3 shows that of all the elements measured in both the friendship and parental bonds, having a positive relationship with parents is the only one to remain significant for the female subsample. This tells me that parental bonds are especially meaningful in curtailing delinquent involvement among females, much more so than friendship bond elements.

Table 14 reveals similar to findings of those in Table 13, however, we can also see that when comparing the effects of the friendship bond elements and the parental bond elements in the full model, parental relationships appear to be most effective in curtailing female delinquency while friendship bond elements are no longer significant. This finding reveals an important difference between the examination of the entire sample and the exploration of the female subsample. From this table, we can see that parental relationships (in terms of *Positivity toward Parents*) are especially helpful in reducing the likelihood of female involvement in delinquency.

Overall, results from this table partially support Gender Hypotheses 2 and 3 since compared to the entire sample, the gender of the respondent does change the impacts of the friendship and parental bonds slightly. However, Gender Hypothesis 1 is not supported since female friendship network membership did not produce any significant results. Nevertheless, there is partial support for Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 1 since Hispanic friendship network membership significantly increased delinquent involvement among the female sample. Next, I will turn my attention to the male subsample which consists of all males in the entire sample.

Male Subsample

Table 15 reports logistic regression results for the male subsample. A brief examination of this table shows that it is very similar to previous tables. In all Models, *Friend Delinquency* continues to have a very large impact on respondent delinquency. Among those reporting delinquent friends, the odds of respondent delinquent

involvement are increased by up to 12.32 times in Model 2. Subsequent models show similar trends increasing the odds of respondent delinquency. Overall, having delinquent friends strongly impacts delinquent involvement (and this is also the case for the male subsample).

Moving our attention to the friendship network characteristics, we see one persistent and very significant finding: males in African American friendship networks are *less* likely to be involved in delinquent behavior. Indeed, membership in an African American friendship network contributes to just over a .4 *decrease* in the odds of delinquent involvement across all three models. Such results are quite surprising. Contrary to previous findings indicating that African American friendship networks are fraught with delinquency, it appears African American friendship networks are *less* likely to be conducive to delinquent behavior for males. Although this result is modest in comparison to those findings reported in previous tables related to *Friend Delinquency*, it is important to note that this finding is somewhat groundbreaking. Previous studies continue to paint African American youth (and especially African American male youth) as especially delinquent. However, the results from this study indicate quite the contrary: *African American friendship networks are less conducive to delinquency than white friendship networks for males*. In addition, it is important to note that unlike in Tables 13-14, Hispanic friendship network membership is not significant in contributing toward delinquent involvement for the male subsample. Thus, it would appear that being male and involved in a Hispanic friendship network does not impact delinquency while being female and part of a Hispanic friendship network does. In addition, being a part of an

African American friendship network reduces the odds of delinquent involvement among males but not among females.

Moving our attention to the friendship bond elements, only *Time Spent with Friends* is a significant predictor of respondent delinquency among the male subsample. Spending time with friends increases the odds of respondent delinquent involvement by just over 1.1 times per unit of *Time Spent with Friends* in Models 1 and 3. Unlike in the previous tables, *Direct Peer Pressure* is not significant in Model 1 for the male subsample. It would appear that *Direct Peer Pressure* does not impact delinquent involvement among the male subsample while it is significant in increasing female delinquent involvement. Furthermore, the impact of spending time with friends *does* remain in the full model, providing support for the fact that both the friendship and parental bond elements impact male involvement in delinquency.

Of the parental bond elements examined, only *Positivity toward Parents* is significantly related to curtailing delinquent involvement for the male subsample. This is similar to the findings using the entire sample and the female subsample. Having a positive relationship with parents significantly reduces the odds of male respondent delinquent involvement by nearly .9 times per unit of *Positivity toward Parents* in both Models 2 and 3.

In the full model, Model 3, the effects of the friendship bond elements and the parental bond elements are examined together. For the male subsample, the positive effect of spending time with friends and the negative effect of a positive relationship with parents continue to be significantly related to respondent delinquency. These results are

similar to those found in Table 13 which examined the entire sample population. It would appear that both the friendship bond and the parental bond impact male involvement in delinquent behavior. Overall, results from this table partially support Gender Hypotheses 2 and 3 since compared to the entire sample, the gender of the respondent does change the impacts of the friendship and parental bonds. However, similar to the results for the female subsample, Gender Hypothesis 1 is not supported for the male subsample. In contrast, Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 1 did receive partial support for the male sample since there was a significant reduction in the odds of respondent delinquency for males in African American friendship networks.

Thus far we have seen the following patterns: (1) friend delinquency contributes to a significant increase in respondent delinquency for all groups thus far, (2) spending time with friends also significantly increases the odds of respondent delinquency for all groups thus far, and (3) positive relationships with parents reduce the odds of delinquency among all groups examined to this point. However, there are some unique findings when examining particular subsamples. First, *Direct Peer Pressure* has a positive increase on the odds of delinquent involvement for females, however, this variable is not significant when tested using the male subsample. Thus, *Direct Peer Pressure* impacts female delinquency but does not impact male delinquency. Second, when examining the effects of the friendship and parental bonds together in the full model, parental bond results remain significant while friendship bond results do not for the female subsample. This shows that the parental bond is more significant when compared to the friendship bond among those in the female subsample. This is not the

case for the male subsample. In the male subsample, both the friendship and parental bonds together remain significant in the full model. The predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network was not significant for any group examined thus far. Such findings show that it is important to consider respondent characteristics when examining the likelihood of respondent delinquency and partially support Gender Hypotheses 2 and 3 but do not support Gender Hypothesis 1.

Furthermore, we have learned that the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network contributes toward delinquent involvement; however, this varies by gender. While the results for the entire sample show that it is Hispanic friendship network membership that contributes toward delinquent involvement, we do find different results for male and female subsamples. Among females, involvement in a Hispanic friendship network contributes to an *increase* in the odds of delinquency. Among males, involvement in an African American friendship network *reduces* the odds of delinquency. Such different findings highlight the importance of examining the effects of friendship network characteristics by subsamples. However, since no significant findings were related to the predominant gender of the friendship network, Gender Hypothesis 1 (The effects of the predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network on respondent delinquency depend on the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent) is not supported. Nevertheless, Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 1 is supported since the effects of the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network differed for females and males. Now I will turn to my investigation of the remaining three subsamples: white, African American, and Hispanic.

White Subsample

The next subsample to be explored is the white subsample which includes all white respondents from the entire sample population. Table 16 looks suspiciously like results for Table 13, which includes the entire sample population. This is not surprising since the majority of the sample is white, it makes sense that an examination of the entire sample and an examination of the white members of the sample would look similar. As repetitious as this might sound, Table 16 shows that having delinquent friends dramatically increases the odds of delinquent involvement. Model 1 indicates that *Friend Delinquency* contributes to a nearly 14 times increase in the odds of respondent delinquent involvement for whites with delinquent friends. Even larger impacts on the odds of respondent delinquent involvement can be seen in Models 2 and 3. Having delinquent friends increases the odds of delinquency by over 16 times in Model 2 and nearly 15 times in Model 3. As with previous results, having delinquent friends dramatically increases the likelihood of delinquent involvement and this holds true for the white subsample.

Next, I would like to move to the friendship network characteristics for the white subsample. It is important to note that due to the low number of whites involved in Hispanic friendship networks (N = 2), Hispanic friendship network was removed from the friendship network characteristics for tests using the white subsample. The one persistent finding related to friendship network characteristics found in this table shows that female friendship network membership contributes to a decrease in the odds of delinquency among whites. Although not significant in Model 1, female friendship

network membership contributes to a decrease in the odds of delinquent involvement of nearly .7 times for Models 2 and 3. Compared to being involved in a male friendship network, female friendship network membership contributes to a reduction in the likelihood of delinquency among the white subsample. This result supports Gender Hypothesis 1 since the predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network contributed to significant results among white involvement in delinquency. This is an important finding since we did not see any significant results related to female friendship network membership in previous tables. In contrast, Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 1 is not supported since African American friendship network membership did not produce significant results among the white subsample. It would appear that we must examine different subsamples in order to best understand the impact of friendship network characteristics on delinquent involvement.

The friendship bond elements results among the white subsample are also similar to results using entire sample population. Here we see that spending time with friends significantly increases the odds of delinquent involvement by just over 1.1 times per unit of *Time Spent with Friends* for both Models 1 and 3. These results are nearly identical to those found in the male subsample and are very similar to those found in the entire sample population. *Direct Peer Pressure*, however, does not appear to impact white involvement in delinquency as it does for the entire sample population and for the female subsample.

The story is the same for the parental bond elements. As with all previous results, only *Positivity toward Parents* impacts respondent delinquency. Having a positive

relationship with parents significantly reduces the odds of delinquent involvement by nearly .9 times per unit of *Positivity toward Parents* for the white subsample. In the full model, even when combined together, time spent with friends is a moderate predictor of increasing the odds of delinquent involvement while having a positive relationship with parents contributes to a decrease in the odds of delinquent involvement. Unlike the results for the female subsample, the results for the white subsample show that both friendship bond elements and parental bond elements contribute toward respondent involvement in delinquency.

Overall, results from this table reveal some differences by the race/ethnicity of the respondent. Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 1 is not supported among whites since membership in an African American friendship network was not significantly different from membership in a white friendship network. Furthermore, *Direct Peer Pressure* is significant for the entire sample but is not for the white sample. Thus, the effects of the friendship bond do differ when the race/ethnicity of the respondent is considered, partially supporting Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 2. However, the effects of the parental bond are the same for the entire sample and the white sample, so Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 3 is not supported. While it is not surprising that we would see similar results in the entire sample population and the white subsample, it is important to now turn to the African American subsample to examine the effects of the friendship and parental bonds on respondent involvement in delinquency.

African American Subsample

Table 17 reports the logistic regression estimates for the African American subsample which includes all African American respondents from the entire sample population. Even a quick glance at Table 17 shows that these findings differ from those discussed previously. The first thing to note is the impact of *Friend Delinquency*. Obviously, having delinquent friends is still a strong positive predictor of delinquent involvement for the African American subsample. *Friend Delinquency* increases the odds of delinquent involvement by about 6 times for those with delinquent friends in all three models. While this is certainly a largely significant finding, it is nearly half the size of the results from previous tables. Still, it would appear that *Friend Delinquency* continues to contribute to increases in the likelihood of respondent delinquent involvement for the African American subsample.

The friendship network characteristics for the African American subsample are next in this discussion. First it is important to note that due to the low number of African Americans involved in Hispanic friendship networks (N = 3), Hispanic friendship network was removed from analyses in this table. An examination of the friendship network characteristics shows that among African Americans, neither membership in a female friendship network nor membership in an African American friendship network impacts respondent delinquency. It would appear that the friendship network characteristics examined here are not influential toward explaining respondent delinquency among African Americans. This finding does not support Gender Hypothesis 1 and Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 1 since neither the predominant gender nor

the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network had an effect on the delinquency of African Americans. However, results from previous tables have provided significant findings among other racial/ethnic groups. Thus, race/ethnicity is important to consider when examining delinquent involvement.

Next, I would like to turn your attention to the friendship bond elements examined in both Model 1 and Model 3. Here we see that none of the friendship bond elements are significant for those in the African American subsample. This is quite surprising since most previous models have shown that time spent with friends is a significant and positive predictor of respondent delinquency. We are not seeing that here for the African American subsample. It would appear that relationships with friends are not significant contributors to delinquent involvement among African Americans. This is a very astounding finding and strongly supports Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 2. Previous research shows that spending time with friends is a very strong predictor of delinquent involvement, however, the results from this table show that this previous established finding may not be applicable to African American samples.

Finally, an examination of the parental bond elements proves to be similar to all previous tables. Having a positive relationship with parents significantly reduces the odds of delinquent involvement by just over .8 times per unit of *Positivity toward Parents* in Models 2 and 3. It would appear that parental relationships are significant in curtailing delinquent involvement among African American samples while friend relationships do not appear to affect respondent delinquency.

Thus far we have learned that it is important to examine respondent characteristics when exploring respondent delinquency. Two findings have remained persistent across all subsamples: (1) having delinquent friends has a strong positive impact on respondent delinquency and (2) having a positive relationship with parents contributes to reduced odds of involvement in delinquency. While spending time with friends contributes to a significant increase in odds of delinquent involvement for most groups, it fails to predict delinquent behavior among African Americans. Thus, it would appear that friendship bond elements operate differently for different groups while parental bond elements appear to behave in similar ways across all subsamples examined thus far. These results support Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 2 but do not support Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 3.

Hispanic Subsample

The final subsample to explore is the Hispanic subsample which includes all Hispanic members of the entire sample population. The first thing to notice in Table 18 is that *Friend Delinquency* has similar results to those seen in the African American subsample. Having delinquent friends has a strong positive impact on delinquent involvement increasing the odds of respondent delinquency around 6 times in all models for those in Hispanic subsample. Although not as large as previous findings, it is clear that having delinquent friends strongly impacts delinquent involvement for the Hispanic subsample as well as all other subsamples examined.

An investigation into the friendship network characteristics of the Hispanic subsample reveals that the only persistent finding related to friendship network

characteristics found in this table is that female friendship network membership contributes to a decrease in the odds of delinquency among Hispanics, supporting Gender Hypothesis 1 but not Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 1. These results are similar to those seen in Table 16 (white subsample). We see here that female friendship network membership contributes to a .34 decrease in the odds of delinquent involvement in Model 2 and a .22 decrease in the odds of delinquency in Model 3. Compared to being involved in a male friendship network, female friendship network membership contributes to a reduction in the likelihood of delinquency for Hispanics. While female friendship network membership did not result in significant findings among those in the African American subsample, female friendship network membership is significant in both the white and Hispanic subsamples.

The next significant finding can be seen in the friendship bond elements. Here we see that *Direct Peer Pressure* increases the odds of delinquency by 1.39 times per unit of *Direct Peer Pressure* for the Hispanic subsample. This is quite different from most previous findings. Recall that *Direct Peer Pressure* significantly contributed toward respondent delinquency in Tables 13 (entire sample) and 14 (female subsample). It would appear that this form of peer pressure impacts some groups more than others, namely Hispanics and females. However, in the full models (Model 3), *Direct Peer Pressure* fails to remain significant when considering the parental bond elements. Thus, while *Direct Peer Pressure* does appear to impact respondent delinquent involvement for some subsamples, it does not remain significant in the full models in any of the tables.

Another important thing to note in Table 18 is the lack of significant findings. Unlike most previous findings with other subsamples (with the exception of the African American subsample), *Time Spent with Friends* is not significant in contributing toward respondent delinquent involvement. Neither Model 1 nor Model 3 reports significant findings related to spending time with friends. Again, I have to point to the significance of this finding. While previous studies show that spending time with friends contributes to delinquent involvement, this does not appear to be the case for Hispanic and African American subsamples, supporting the contention that the effects of the friendship bond vary by the respondent's race/ethnicity (i.e. Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 2). To my knowledge, this is the first finding of its kind and can have large impacts for the way that future studies examine friendship bond elements and their relationship to respondent delinquency.

Turning our attention to the parental bond results, we can see that none of the parental bond elements are significant for the Hispanic subsample. This is quite different compared to all other tables in this project. *Positivity toward Parents* has been the only persistent finding related to the parental bond elements throughout all tables. It would appear from Table 18 that neither the friendship bond nor the parental bond have a strong impact on respondent delinquency for the Hispanic subsample. This finding supports Race/Ethnicity Hypotheses 2 and 3. In addition, only female friendship network membership contributes to a decrease in the odds of delinquency among Hispanics, supporting Gender Hypothesis 1 but not Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 1. It is quite possible that something unique is happening among Hispanics that is not adequately explored in

these models. Furthermore, it could be the case that the lack of significant findings among Hispanics may be due to the relatively low number of Hispanics interviewed for this study. Future investigations are certainly needed.

In sum, the only persistent finding across all subsamples is the strong positive impact of *Friend Delinquency* on respondent delinquency. This finding can be seen in all logistic regression results in Tables 13-18. This is consistent with past research highlighting the significant impact of having delinquent friends on respondent involvement in delinquency (e.g. Warr 2002). A second finding found among almost all subsamples (with the exception of the Hispanic subsample) is the effect of positive relationships with parents reducing the odds of delinquency. This shows that parental relationships are important contributors in curtailing delinquent involvement for most adolescents. A third persistent finding found among almost all subsamples (except the Hispanic and African American subsamples) is the impact of spending time with friends on increasing the odds of delinquent involvement. This is also consistent with previous literature exploring the impact of delinquent friendship bonding.

In addition to the persistent findings, I also found some unique findings when exploring individual subsamples. First, I found out that *Positivity toward Parents* is a stronger element in understanding female delinquent involvement when compared to the impact of time spent with friends and direct peer pressure. In the full model for the female subsample, none of the friendship bond elements remained significant while positive relationships with parents continued to reduce the odds of delinquent

involvement. This shows me that parental bonding is much more significant in curtailing delinquent involvement when compared to friendship bonding among females.

Second, *Direct Peer Pressure* appears to be a significant predictor of respondent delinquency for some groups and not others. This type of peer pressure significantly increases the odds of delinquency for the entire sample, for the female subsample, and for the Hispanic subsample. It would appear that peer pressure may only be meaningful to some groups. However, in all cases, the effect of *Direct Peer Pressure* does not remain significant in the full models.

Third, having a positive relationship with parents does not significantly decrease Hispanic delinquent involvement. This is surprising since *Positivity toward Parents* significantly reduced the odds of delinquent involvement for all other groups examined. It is likely that there are more elements of the parental bond that should be explored in order to best understand Hispanic parent-child relationships and their effects on delinquent involvement.

Fourth, spending time with friends does not contribute toward delinquency among African American and Hispanic subsamples. This is quite surprising since I could not locate any previous studies reporting a differential impact of spending time with friends by the race/ethnicity of the respondent. What this tells me is that time spent with friends is a significant predictor of white delinquency, but not other groups. As mentioned above, this finding may have some very real impacts on the way time spent with friends and other friendship bond elements are explored in the future.

Overall it would seem that both Hypothesis 1 (The effects of friend delinquency on respondent delinquency depend on the elements of the friendship bond) and Hypothesis 4 (The effects of friend delinquency on respondent delinquency depend on the elements of the parental bond) are at least partially supported. While not all measures of either bond were significant, some elements of both bonds did prove to be significantly related to respondent involvement in delinquency including *Time Spent with Friends*, *Direct Peer Pressure*, and *Positivity toward Parents*.

Furthermore, friendship network characteristics do seem to impact delinquent involvement for some subsamples supporting Hypotheses 2 and 3. Significant results related to the predominant gender of friendship networks for some subsamples were found in some models providing partial support for Gender Hypothesis 1 (The effects of the predominant gender of the respondent's friendship network on respondent delinquency depend on the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent). In addition, the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network also produced different results among some subsamples, partially supporting Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 1 (The effects of the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network on respondent delinquency depend on the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent).

When examining the entire sample, it would appear that involvement in Hispanic friendship networks has a large impact on respondent delinquency. However, when we explore this finding further using different subsamples, we find that this is only the case among the female subsample. In addition, while the results for the entire sample indicate that neither female friendship network membership nor African American network

membership are significant in contributing toward respondent delinquent involvement, subsequent results reveal that both female friendship network membership and African American network membership affect delinquent involvement for specific groups. African American friendship network membership contributes to a *decrease* in delinquent involvement among males while female friendship network membership contributes to a *decrease* in delinquent involvement among Whites and Hispanics. Such findings reveal the importance of examining both friendship network characteristics and respondent characteristics when exploring respondent involvement in delinquency.

In addition, Gender Hypothesis 2 (The effects of the elements of the friendship bond on respondent delinquency depend on the gender of the respondent) is also partially supported. Both the female and male subsamples differed slightly from the entire sample in terms of the impact of the friendship bond on respondent delinquency since *Direct Peer Pressure* was significant among females but not among males. Furthermore, Gender Hypothesis 3 (The effects of the elements of the parental bond on respondent delinquency depend on the gender of the respondent) receives some partial support since the impact of *Time Spent with Friends* was not as strong for females as it was for males.

Finally, both Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 receive some support. While the white sample did not differ much from the entire sample in neither the effects of the friendship nor parental bonds, other subsamples did. For example, none of the elements of the friendship bond were significant for the African American subsample but were significant among whites and the entire sample. Such different findings among subsamples support Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 2 (The effects of the elements of the

friendship bond on respondent delinquency depend on the race/ethnicity of the respondent). In addition, *Positivity toward Parents* was a strong negative predictor of delinquency among most samples; however, it was not significant among the Hispanic subsample. This finding supports Race/Ethnicity Hypothesis 3: The effects of the elements of the parental bond on respondent delinquency depend on the race/ethnicity of the respondent.

Overall, findings partially support all of my hypotheses. The elements of the friendship and parental bonds appear to affect respondent delinquency in different ways depending on the respondent's gender and race/ethnicity. In addition, the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent as well as the predominant gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network play a role in understanding delinquent involvement. Such new and exciting findings may provide some meaningful contributions to the literature.

Chapter Six: Discussion

Much of the literature investigating friend and parental influences on adolescent delinquency neglects to examine how such influences differ by gender and race/ethnicity as well as how characteristics of friendship networks affect such influences. This research has taken that necessary next step and investigated how both the respondent's gender and race/ethnicity and the predominant race/ethnicity and gender of the respondent's friendship network affect respondent delinquency. In addition, this project has explored differential effects of friendship and parental bonds by creating population subsamples to best understand the processes at work.

The Friendship and Parental Bonds

Friendship Bond

Of the elements of the friendship bond measured in this study *Time Spent with Friends* appears to be a somewhat strong predictor of delinquency for most subsamples and *Direct Peer Pressure* seems to be a moderate predictor of delinquency for some subsamples. As Sutherland's Differential Association Theory suggests, friend relationships are most likely to impact behaviors when they involve positive emotional attachment, high frequency of time spent with friends, and high levels of persuasion among friends (i.e. peer pressure). It would appear that spending time with friends and *Direct Peer Pressure* are positive predictors of respondent delinquency for some subsamples; however, findings related to emotional attachment to friends were not

significant in any models. From the initial findings related to the friendship bond, Sutherland's Differential Association Theory is partially supported here.

However, when subsamples are examined, a different story emerges. Let's first consider the effect of spending time with friends. *Time Spent with Friends* is a significant predictor of delinquency for most subsamples; however, spending time with friends does not predict delinquency for African American subsamples. This is quite curious since most previous studies indicate that spending time with friends influences delinquent behavior. For example, Warr's 2002 book shows that spending time with friends has a positive impact on delinquent involvement. In addition, Haynie and Osgood's (2005) work further indicates that adolescents are more likely to be involved in delinquent behavior if they spend a great deal of time socializing with their friends. However, it would appear that this is *not* the case for African Americans and Hispanics. This is quite a surprising finding; no previous studies could be located that discuss the impact of spending time with friends on delinquent involvement as it varies by race/ethnicity.

So spending time with friends *does not* impact African American and Hispanic youth involvement in delinquency. This exciting finding could be attributed to the fact that, in this study, African American and Hispanic youth spend significantly less time with their friends when compared to white youth (see Table 2b for significant differences between subsamples). It could be the case that there is a threshold effect such that spending time with friends only impacts delinquent behavior if it is above a certain threshold of time. In this study, it could be the case that white youth are above this threshold since they report a 13.09 on the *Time Spent with Friends* composite measure

while African American youth report a 11.89 and Hispanic youth report 12.11 on this measure. However, no studies could be located regarding threshold effects of spending time with friends so more research is certainly needed to understand why spending time with friends impacts white involvement in delinquency and not African American and Hispanic youth.

Another reason why we might see racial/ethnic differences in the effects of spending time with friends could be that white friendships are qualitatively different from other friendships. In Table 2b, we see that the white subsample reports significantly higher levels of *Positivity toward Friends*, *Time Spent with Friends*, and *Indirect Peer Pressure* when compared to African American and Hispanic subsamples. This tells me that the friendships of white adolescents are much more involved in terms of the friendship bond elements considered here. It could be the case that when individuals are more closely bonded within friendships, spending time with friends has more of an impact on delinquent behavior. Thus, among whites who report more closely bonded friendships, spending time with friends impacts delinquent behavior. Since African Americans and Hispanics do not report such closely bonded friendships, spending time with friends for these groups does not impact delinquent behavior. Past research does indicate that whites are more likely to look to their friends for acceptance and be influenced by their friends' behaviors (Coombs et al. 1991; Giordano et al. 1993). However, we have learned from the present study that this may be due to the fact that whites report higher levels of friendship bonding when compared to other groups. This closer friendship bonding among whites may help to explain why spending time with

friends impacts white involvement in delinquency and not African American and Hispanic youth.

Another friendship bond finding that differs when comparing subsamples is related to *Direct Peer Pressure*. Results indicate that this type of peer pressure is a significant predictor of delinquency for the entire sample. However, when we explore particular subsamples, we find that *Direct Peer Pressure* is related to delinquency for the female and Hispanic subsamples, but not for the other groups examined. This is an important finding because it shows me that effects found for the entire sample are not generalizable to all subsamples. In addition, this finding also shows me that peer pressure operates differently depending on the group of interest.

For the female subsample, *Direct Peer Pressure* is significantly related to an increase in the odds of delinquent behavior. Past research does indicate that the influence of friends may differ by gender. Studies show that compared to boys, girls have a greater sensitivity to the opinions of others, they report higher levels of peer pressure, and girls more intense peer pressure compared to young men (Brown 1982; Gilligan 1982; Maccoby 1990). While other research indicates that young men are more susceptible to peer influence (Giordano et al. 1986) and that the influence of peers is similar for both men and women (Bjerregaard and Smith 1993; Smith and Paternoster 1987), findings from this project indicate that peer pressure impacts the delinquent involvement of young women, however, it does not significantly effect male delinquency. Previous studies have provided evidence that peer pressure might be more evident among young women. The

results from this study support such findings while also drawing the important link between *Direct Peer Pressure* and delinquency among females.

Furthermore, *Direct Peer Pressure* is also significantly related to an increase in the odds of delinquent behavior for the Hispanic subsample. This is surprising since most studies show that it is whites who respond to peer pressure much more so than African Americans and Hispanics (Billy and Udry 1985; Coombs et al. 1991; Giordano et al. 1993; Iscoe, Williams, Harvey 1964; Matsueda and Heimer 1987). However, none of the peer pressure variables were significant for the white subsample, but rather it was the Hispanic subsample which provided significant results related to *Direct Peer Pressure*. It could be the case that peer pressure is more influential toward delinquent involvement among Hispanics compared to other groups. There is some evidence to support this contention in the literature. One study found that peer pressure influences smoking among Hispanics more so than among African Americans (Griesler and Kandel 1998); however, this study did not explore other forms of delinquent involvement. Another study found that when presented with scenarios involving delinquent misconduct (e.g. shoplifting, drinking beer, graffiti on a building, etc.) those respondents from predominantly Hispanic schools were more likely to view refusing to participate in such activities when influenced by a peer as very negative when compared to those from predominantly white and predominantly African American schools (Pearl, Bryan, and Herzog 1990). Although this study did examine how peer pressure may vary by groups, the researchers explored the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's school and not respondent characteristics. The present project shows that *Direct Peer Pressure*

influences delinquent involvement among Hispanic youth but not among white and African American youth.

In sum, friendships are an important part of adolescence (e.g. Burhmester 1990; Youniess and Smollar 1985). Indeed, friendship bonding can be influential toward securing happiness and maintaining high levels of social support among adolescents (Cauce 1986; Rawlins 1992). However, Differential Association Theory (Sutherland 1939) suggests that certain elements of friendship bonds can impact delinquent behavior among adolescents. Overall, results show that two friendship bond elements are significant contributors toward respondent delinquency: *Time Spent with Friends* and *Direct Peer Pressure*. However, the effects of these variables are not universal. Spending time with friends is significantly related to respondent delinquency for most groups, however, time spent with friends does not significantly contribute to respondent delinquency among African Americans and Hispanics. In addition, *Direct Peer Pressure* is significantly related to delinquency for: (1) the entire sample, (2) females, and (3) Hispanics; however, results for this form of peer pressure are not significant for other groups. Together these findings provide important contributions to the literature through explaining the influence of friendship bonds on delinquent involvement as well as how such findings compare across different subsamples. Overall, this study provides a great deal of support for the investigation of friendship bond elements in the exploration of adolescent delinquent involvement.

The Parental Bond

The second component of this study looked to the parental bond to understand adolescent delinquent involvement. Overall, this study showed that emotional attachment to parents (in terms of positivity toward parents) was the only element of the parental bond contributing to the curtailment of delinquent involvement. This is in stark contrast to the friendship bond elements since emotional attachment to friends was not a significant predictor of respondent delinquency in any models. The preventative effect of a positive emotional relationship with parents holds true for almost all groups. This is powerful and suggests that positive emotional bonds are enough to curtail delinquency among most adolescents. Previous studies have indicated that positive emotional attachment to parents does have a preventative impact on delinquency (Hirschi 1969; Sampson and Laub 1993). Such results are supported here. In addition, Warr's (1993) study found that parental relationships could, in fact, reduce and sometimes even eliminate the negative effects of delinquent friends. It would appear that the positive parental bond is quite effective at controlling delinquent behavior.

Although having a positive emotional relationship with parents does contribute to a reduction in the likelihood of delinquency for most groups, this is not the case among Hispanics. This is quite a surprising finding for several reasons. First, because it is the only anomalous finding related to *Positivity toward Parents* found throughout all subgroup explorations. Second, this finding is contrary to most past research. Previous studies have found that attachment to parents contributes to a reduction in delinquency among Hispanics (Cernkovich and Giordano 1987; Coombs et al. 1991). Another study

also shows that Hispanic youth are often part of families that are characterized by family interdependence and an emphasis on the importance of family goals (Azmitia, Ittel, and Brenck 2006). In addition, much research suggests that Hispanic youth are closely bonded to their parents (e.g. Halgunseth 2004; Moore 1994; Taylor et al. 1997). Such studies would lead me to believe that positive relationships with parents would decrease the likelihood of delinquent involvement among Hispanic youth, however, that is not what the results suggest. On the contrary, the lack of significant findings related to *Positivity toward Parents* among Hispanic youth suggests a different story. It could be the case that Hispanic parent-child relationships are much more complex than the parental bond measures employed here. While this project included measures of emotional attachment to parents, time spent with parents and parental monitoring, other constructs might be more influential toward explaining curtailment in Hispanic delinquent involvement. For example, it may be that we are not adequately measuring the Hispanic parent-child bond. One study found that there are several constructs not measured in the present study that might also be important components of the parental bond. Van Wel, Linssen, and Abma (2000) determined that the degree to which adolescents identify with their parents, view their parents as good examples, accept their parents as educators, and value their communication with their parents are all positively related to the general well-being of adolescents. It is likely that further exploration of additional elements of the parental bond are needed to best understand how the parental bond affects delinquent involvement among Hispanic youth.

Furthermore, no other dimensions of the parent-child bond that Social Control Theory highlights receive support. While many studies suggests that spending time with parents reduces the likelihood of delinquent activities (e.g. Glueck and Glueck 1950; Riley 1987; Warr 1993; Warr 2005), these findings are not supported in this research. Similarly, parental monitoring of children's behaviors with friends does not appear to affect delinquency in predicted ways. This is in stark contrast to the bulk of the literature that suggests low levels of parental monitoring of children's behaviors is related to increased delinquent behavior and association with delinquent friends (e.g. Ary et al. 1999; Laird et al. 2003; Parker and Benson 2004; Warr, unpublished manuscript). It could be the case that measures corresponding to spending time with parents and parental monitoring are not good predictors of delinquent behavior while emotional bonding between parents and children might be a better estimator of delinquent involvement.

In sum, the parental relationships are clearly an important part of adolescents' lives and can contribute to reductions in delinquent involvement (Kandel 1996; Smith and Krohn 1995; Smith et al. 2001). Indeed, parental bonding can be influential toward maintaining high levels of social support among adolescents (e.g. Sampson and Laub 1993). Social Control Theory (Hirschi 1969) suggests that certain elements of parental bonds can impact delinquent behavior among adolescents. The findings from this study show that *Positivity toward Parents* is a relatively strong predictor of delinquency while other elements of the parental bond do not impact delinquent behavior. Overall, this study provides a great deal of support for the investigation of parental bond elements in the exploration of adolescent delinquent involvement.

The Importance of Both Friendship and Parental Bonds

Overall, it is clear that both friendship and parental relationships are important to understanding delinquent involvement. Indeed, theorists suggest that rather than viewing family and friends as competing with one another, it may be best to focus on how adolescents are influenced by both of these important relationship networks (Youniss and Smollar 1985). Indeed, Warr's (1993) study found that it is important to consider both family and peer influences. His study showed that spending time with family can reduce and in some cases eliminate the influence of delinquent peers (Warr 1993). However, in contrast to the findings of this study, Warr's (1993) work, this study showed that spending time with parents did not influence delinquent involvement. It is likely that many elements of both the friendship bond and the parental bond contribute to changes in adolescent behaviors.

In sum, would appear that both parents and friends impact adolescent delinquent behavior. Youth must learn to navigate between both family and peer cultures (Phelan et al. 1993). Some youth are able to form pro-social bonds with conventional groups while others become bonded to deviant groups. It is likely that all youth interact with both conventional and deviant groups and thus experience pressures from both family and friends. Thus, it is certainly important to examine both family and friend relationships in the study of adolescent delinquent behaviors.

Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Friendship Network

In addition to the clear impact of both the friendship and parental bonds, I also examined friendship network characteristics in terms of the predominant gender and the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network. Unlike findings discussed above related to the friendship and parental bonds, there were no consistent findings relating the predominant gender or the predominant race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network to respondent involvement in delinquency. However, I did find a great deal of differences when comparing the effects of friendship network characteristics on delinquency among subsamples. Below I will discuss how each type of friendship network does (or does not) contribute toward respondent delinquent involvement for each subsample.

Female friendship network membership reduces the likelihood of delinquent involvement among white and Hispanic subsamples. Although other studies have found that membership in a predominantly female friendship network is related to lower levels of delinquency (e.g. McCarthy et al. 2004), the findings from this study provide an additional layer to this story: female friendship network membership is related to a reduction in delinquent involvement *only* among whites and Hispanics. Among African Americans, female friendship network does not contribute to a reduction in delinquency. In addition, results for female friendship network membership are not significant for male and female subsamples. It would appear that this friendship network is "protective" against delinquent involvement only for whites and Hispanics. Adolescent female friendship networks are often characterized by a great deal of intimacy and closeness

(Giordano et al. 1986; Steffensmeier and Allan 1996). The suggestion that female friendships provide more social control than male friendships (e.g. Giordano, Cernkovich, and Pugh 1986; Rountree and Warner 1999) is bolstered by these findings.

However, it is curious that female friendship network membership was not significant in reducing delinquent involvement among all subsamples. Past research has shown that predominant female friendship networks are characterized by lower levels of delinquent involvement for those females involved in female friendship network but not among males involved in female friendship networks (McCarthy et al. 2004). The results of the present project only partially support such findings. Although I did find that female friendship network membership was not significantly related to delinquency among males, it was also unrelated to delinquency among females (contrary to the findings of McCarthy et al. 2004). It could be the case that female friendship network membership is not a strong enough negative predictor of delinquency for some groups. For example, although the coefficients are all in the expected direction (negative) for female friendship network membership among the female and male subsamples, the results only approach significance. It could be the case that the other predictors (i.e. elements of the friendship and parental bonds) outweigh those related to female friendship network membership for the male and female subsamples. This is meaningful since it shows that preventative effect of female friendship network found in previous research may depend on respondent characteristics.

Furthermore, it is unclear why results would be significant among whites and Hispanics, while not among African Americans. McCarthy et al's (2004) study cannot

account for this curious finding since their results did not examine race/ethnicity. My results indicate that not only are the results not significant for the African American sample, but in addition, the coefficients are all positive (meaning they are not in the predicted direction either). This means that among African Americans, female friendship network membership is not preventative toward delinquent involvement. It could be that the preventative effects of female friendship network membership really do vary depending on respondent characteristics. Perhaps among African Americans, the gendered characteristics of their friendship network do not influence delinquent behavior in any way. This finding is quite important since it demonstrates that the preventative effect of female friendship network found in previous research is not universal since it does not apply to African Americans.

African American friendship network membership is negatively related to delinquent involvement but *only* among those in the male sample. African American adolescent friendships have been discussed in two very different camps. Firstly, African American adolescent friendships have been characterized as strong close-knit networks that can act as a “surrogate family” and be strongly influential in delinquent involvement (e.g. Anderson 1999; McAdoo 1983; Savin-Williams and Berndt 1990). In this frame of thought, friends are viewed as “fictive kin” and are one of the most (if not the most) influential element of the African American adolescent’s life (Stack 1974). Conversely, African American adolescent friendships have been characterized as less intense and less important to African Americans when compared to white friendships. In addition, researchers in this paradigm believe that African American adolescents are more likely to

view their families as a “safe haven” or anchor to the discriminating culture surrounding minority youth (Giordano, et al. 1993; Willie 1988). It appears that the latter paradigm is most supported in this research.

While previous findings have shown us that African American networks can operate in certain ways, this study showed that African American friendship networks contribute to a significant decrease in the likelihood of delinquent involvement among the *male* sample. It could be the case that males involved in African American friendship networks are not closely bonded to their friends as other groups. For example, males report significantly lower levels of emotional attachment to friends compared to females (see Table 2b) and those in African American friendship networks report significantly lower levels of emotional attachment compared to whites (see also Table 2b). Since delinquent youth are more involved with and committed to their friends than are non-delinquent youth (Elliott, Huizinga, and Ageton 1985), a weaker friendship bond is likely an element contributing to the negative relationship between African American friendship network membership and delinquency among males.

In contrast to the results regarding African American friendship networks, membership in a Hispanic friendship network is positively related delinquency for the entire sample and the female subsample. This is an interesting finding. We would expect to see a negative relationship to delinquency since the friendship bond is weaker among Hispanics compared to whites. It could be the case that the elements of the friendship bond measured in this study do not reflect actual Hispanic friendship characteristics. Research indicates that although Hispanic youth view both family and friends as central

to their lives, they often report parents, siblings, and cousins as primary sources of social support (Azmitia, Ittel, and Brenk 2006). Indeed, relationships with siblings and cousins may often serve as close “friendship” networks among Hispanic youth. For some Hispanic youth, especially young women whose access to friends is sometimes highly restricted, siblings and cousins can become best friends obscuring the definitions between family and peer cultures. Some research even indicates that siblings can actually serve as bridges between and within both family and peer cultures (Azmitia, Ittel, and Brenk 2006; Cooper 1999; Phelan, Davidson, and Yu 1993). Thus, although this research indicated that Hispanic friendship networks are conducive to criminality, my measures may not be adequately assessing the actual friend relationships that Hispanic youth experience. Indeed, it could be the case that those youth who are close “friends” with siblings and cousins are less likely to be involved in delinquency while those youth who are friends with other (non-familial) Hispanic youth are more likely to be involved in delinquency because they are less tied to the family. However, due to the structure of the data collection instrument, only friend relationships were picked up and no sibling or cousin information was provided in the questionnaire.

In sum, friendship network characteristics do appear to explain respondent involvement in delinquency to some degree. Female friendship network membership and African American friendship network membership *decrease* the likelihood of involvement in delinquency; however, results are only significant for some groups. In contrast, Hispanic friendship network membership *increases* the likelihood of delinquent

involvement for some groups. Overall, however, results suggest that both the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent as well as the predominant gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent's friendship network contribute to explanations of respondent delinquency.

Summary of All Findings

In sum, this study provided two important findings that may contribute to the future study of friendships and delinquency: (1) friend and parental influences vary by gender and race/ethnicity and (2) the predominant gender and race/ethnicity of friendship networks contributes to differential effects on delinquent involvement.

More specifically, this study providing the following findings related to the friendship and parental bond elements: (1) *Friend Delinquency* is strongly related to respondent delinquency across all groups examined, (2) spending time with friends is significantly related to respondent delinquency for all groups EXCEPT African Americans and Hispanics, (3) *Direct Peer Pressure* is significantly related to delinquency for the entire sample, females, and Hispanics, (4) the only significant element of the parental bond is *Positivity toward Parents* and this effect is true for all groups EXCEPT Hispanics. Overall, such findings show that certain elements of the friendship and parental bonds affect delinquent involvement; however, such results do vary across groups.

In addition, this study also provided important findings related to the predominant gender and race/ethnicity of friendship networks: (1) Hispanic friendship network

membership *increases* delinquent involvement for the entire sample and among females, (2) African American friendship network membership *decreases* delinquent involvement for male subsample, (3) Female friendship network *decreases* delinquent involvement for the white and Hispanic subsamples. In addition, none of the friendship network characteristics were significant for the African American sample.

The results of this dissertation contribute to a better understanding of how race/ethnicity and gender affect the relationship between friendships and delinquency. Overall, all hypotheses are at least partially supported. However, it is important to note that there are some limitations to this study as noted below.

Limitations

Many of the limitations of this study are reflected in the data collection process. First, the sampling frame for the data collection process utilized public and private school records. This automatically biases the results to include only those adolescents enrolled in school at the time of data collection. Similarly, only those adolescents who had a parent or guardian who could be contacted to participate in the study were included in the data. Both of these qualifications of the data collection process automatically bias the results.

Another limitation deals specifically with the survey instrument. Respondents provided detailed information about their top five friends. This information was used to understand friendship networks. However, we know from past research that during adolescence, friendship networks change frequently. This presents a problem when attempting to understand the relationship between friendship networks and delinquency.

In addition, friend delinquency involvement reported by the respondent was not specific to the top five friends the respondent nominated in the previous section of the survey. Third, delinquency was measured as “over the past 12 months” while friendship networks were measured at the time the data were collected. Thus, the friendship network data is more of a “snapshot” of the adolescents’ friends at that point in time while the measures of delinquency are self reports of behaviors over the past year. Fourth, neither mixed racial/ethnic friendship networks nor mixed gender friendship networks were considered in this research. Similarly, only white, African American, and Hispanic individuals were included in the analyses. It is likely that an even more nuanced understanding of the relationships between friendship and delinquency could be better understood when taking these groups into consideration. For example, research by Haynie and Payne (2006) suggests that the use of a heterogeneity index might be another way of examining the predominant characteristics of friendship networks. Furthermore, it is essential that further studies examine not only race/ethnicity, but also the socioeconomic and community-level contexts of youth to best understand their experiences. Fifth, the low numbers of Hispanic individuals in this data set make the generation of conclusions about Hispanics and Hispanic friendship networks somewhat problematic. Sixth, the decision to explore the predominant gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent’s friendship network could be called into question. As noted previously, the majority of friendships are characterized by a great deal of homophily (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001). Since the gender and race/ethnicity of the respondent is strongly correlated with the gender and race/ethnicity of his/her friends in majority of circumstances (e.g. Shrum et al.

1988) our ability to understand possible differences between the respondent's gender and race/ethnicity and the gender and race/ethnicity of his/her friendship network are limited. So while this dissertation focused on hypothesized relationships regarding friendship network characteristics in terms of both gender and race/ethnicity, at times, it is difficult to disentangle the respondent's gender and race/ethnicity from the gender and race/ethnicity of his/her friendship network.

Additional limitations related to friendship network formation are also important to point out. First, this study did not make any attempt to understand how these friendship networks were formed. This is a question of "selectivity." For example, are the youth in this project "choosing" their friends or are their friends just a "default" grouping of peers from school? While almost all of the adolescents in this study were friends with others who were similar to themselves, this could be an artifact of living near peers who are like themselves. Thus, the findings of this project are limited since an understanding of the context in which these friendships were formed is not addressed. Secondly, it is important to note that these friendship networks do not exist in a vacuum. Friendships form for a multitude of reasons, but they almost always serve as a source of socialization. So whether or not adolescents are "choosing" their friends, such friends are most likely a key source in the socialization process. This socialization process can certainly include delinquent behavior. However, in most friendship networks, delinquency is the norm and non-delinquent behavior is actually the deviant behavior that these adolescents are engaging in. Haynie (2002) found that only a small minority of adolescents belong to non-delinquent networks, so we know that delinquency is the "norm" for most friendship

networks. Thus, when these youth conform to the behavior of their peers, they are actually delinquent. But what happens when youth don't conform to their deviant peers? This is only one question that this project did not explore. It is clearly important that future projects consider how friendship networks form and how such patterns may (or may not) serve as a source for involvement in delinquency.

Another important consideration is related to the delinquency measure used in this project. I decided to include all forms of delinquency into one dichotomized (0/1) measure. This most certainly limits our ability to understand how certain types of delinquency are influenced by the variables of interest. It would be beneficial to understand how different types of delinquency (i.e. property crimes, violent behaviors, etc.) are influenced by friendship network characteristics.

It is also important to note that this project did not include coefficient differences tests that would allow for statistically different comparisons between groups. So while in the results section I report comparisons of findings between males and females and whites and Hispanics, such results might not be statistically different from one another. Coefficient differences tests would be helpful in reporting future results of this project.

One final limitation of this project deals with the lack of longitudinal data for this project. This study utilized Wave 1 of the TARS (other waves have not yet released at this time). As with all cross-sectional studies, it is unclear how these relationships might change over time.

Future Research

Future research might utilize a larger data set that includes more Hispanic individuals as well as other race/ethnicities and biracial individuals. If we are to begin to understand the complexities of racial/ethnic friendship networks, we would be remiss to explore only white, African American, and Hispanic friendship networks. Similarly, further investigation into the composition of friendship networks might also be beneficial. While this study examined the predominant race/ethnicity and gender of the friendship network, another study (Haynie and Payne 2006) explored the level of racial/ethnic heterogeneity in respondents' friendship networks. This might be another important outlet to investigate when examining the effects of friendship networks on delinquency. In addition, a further study utilizing Waves 2-4 (as they become available) of the TARS data would also likely yield important results that could contribute to this study. Future studies might also incorporate race/ethnicity, gender, and sexuality to explore romantic relationships and their influence on delinquent involvement as many have already begun to investigate (see Giordano 2003; Haynie, Giordano, Manning, and Longmore 2005). Future investigations would also benefit from qualitative studies in this area.

It is also important that future research examine different causal models related to delinquent behaviors as they relate to friendship and parental bonds. While the current project suggested that friend and parent influences both contribute to delinquency during adolescence, other causal models would be an important contribution to the literature. For example, it could be the case that parental bonds influence friendship formation and this later influences delinquent behavior. Furthermore, it could be the case that friend and

parental bonding covary with one another in such a way that was not examined in this project. These distinct conceptualizations of the delinquent behaviors as they relate to friendship and parental bonds would certainly be important to examine in future research.

Finally, future studies would benefit from different conceptualizations of delinquency. While the delinquency measure in this project collapsed all individuals into delinquent and non-delinquent groups, future projects would benefit from exploring different types of delinquency (i.e. property offenses, violent offenses, etc.) to further elucidate the results of this dissertation.

Delinquency Prevention

Before proceeding to the conclusions of this project, it is important to take a moment to discuss how the results of this dissertation might contribute toward delinquency prevention. The prevention and control of adolescent delinquent behavior is something of interest to many groups including (but not limited to) city officials, police, juvenile authorities, and school personnel. This dissertation suggests that delinquency can be understood (and perhaps prevented) if we begin to understand the correlates of delinquency and how they differ in terms of gender and race/ethnicity.

Specifically, the results of this project indicate several important findings that might be helpful in delinquency prevention programs. First, reducing the amount of time that adolescents spend with others involved in delinquency will clearly reduce the opportunities and motivation for delinquent behavior. Such findings support the work of the Mobilization for Youth Program of the 1960s in which opportunities for delinquency

were minimized through setting up education programs for youth (and thus reducing their time for delinquency). While we have come a long way since then, researchers continue to find that when youth are separated from their delinquent counterparts, there is a marked reduction in delinquency. However, this dissertation uncovered an important new finding: spending time with friends is significantly related to respondent delinquency among whites, but not among African Americans and Hispanics. Thus, programs working toward reducing delinquency among these groups would perhaps need to focus on other correlates of delinquency. For example in this project, peer pressure was significantly related to delinquency among Hispanics. Education programs focused on reducing and understanding the dynamics of peer pressure might contribute to reductions in delinquency among Hispanic youth.

While peer pressure was found to contribute to delinquency among Hispanic youth, this was not the case for African American youth. In fact, African American friendship network membership was actually found to *decrease* delinquent involvement among males. This has important implications for delinquency prevention programs. Most research seems to show that African American youth are very likely to be involved in delinquency; however, this project suggests that African American youth are less likely to be involved in group delinquent behavior because they are less closely bonded to their friends compared to other groups. Delinquency prevention programs might benefit from understanding how friend bonding (and also a lack of close friend bonding) can impact delinquent behavior.

Finally, delinquency prevention programs might explore the parent-child relationship as a possible area for delinquency prevention. In this dissertation, a positive emotional relationship was negatively related to delinquency among almost all groups considered. Education focused on building and maintaining positive parent-child emotional relationships might benefit adolescents and could even work to prevent delinquent behavior.

Conclusions

This dissertation has been an effort to examine the importance of gender and race/ethnicity in the discussion of delinquent behavior. As Warr (2002) points out, there are two indisputable facts related to delinquent behavior (1) delinquency is a largely group behavior and (2) having delinquent friends is associated with delinquent behavior. What I have suggested through this dissertation is that there might be a possible third element that is indisputable when discussing delinquent behavior. The results from this dissertation show that (3) delinquency must be understood within the context of gender and race/ethnicity.

As with previous studies, the *only* “universal” finding from this project was the persistent effect of friend delinquency on respondent delinquency across all groups examined. All other relationships explored in this project varied by group. This alone shows that (most) conclusions related to delinquency should be considered in the context of gender and race/ethnicity. Furthermore, the importance of both friend relationships and parent-child relationships also varied by group. It appears from this project that

adolescents cannot be clumped together; but rather it is essential to consider how one's lived experiences can affect his/her behaviors. Friend relationships mean something different to whites than they do to African Americans and Hispanics. Parent-child relationships mean something different to Hispanics than other groups. To adequately examine the etiology of adolescent delinquency, it is imperative that we consider adolescent identities.

Furthermore, it is helpful to elaborate on the ground-breaking findings of my predecessors. Warr (2002) clearly shows that delinquency is almost always group offending. What I have suggested with this project is that the *characteristics of this group* might also contribute to our understandings of delinquency. For example, members of African American friendship networks differ from members of white friendship networks in their delinquent behaviors and female friendship networks differ from male friendship networks. Such findings add to our discussions of adolescent delinquency while also contributing to larger feminist discussions of the importance of incorporating gender and race/ethnicity into analyses human behavior.

Overall, this dissertation has provided evidence to support the following paradigms in criminological research: (1) the influences of friends and parents on adolescent delinquent behavior vary by gender and race/ethnicity and (2) the predominant gender and race/ethnicity of friendship networks contributes to differential effects on delinquent involvement.

Final Thoughts

There is a great lack of research that incorporates both gender and race/ethnicity in the examination of delinquency and friendships. In addition, theorists often place gender and race/ethnicity as controls in their models, severely disguising the effects of an individual's identity. Without taking into consideration one's actual lived experiences, theory testing is meaningless. Furthermore, this study took on two new perspectives that have not been seen in previous research. First, this dissertation explored friend and parental influences vary by gender and race/ethnicity. Second, I examined the predominant gender and race/ethnicity of friendship networks contributes to differential effects on delinquent involvement. The ideas put forth in this dissertation do not refute the argument that delinquent friendships are highly associated with delinquent involvement. But rather, my hypotheses suggest that this relationship differs by both the race/ethnicity and gender of the respondent and of the respondent's friendship network. Together, these unique explorations yield important contributions to the literature.

Table 1. Sample Characteristics of Respondent Friendship Networks by Respondent's Race/Ethnicity and Gender

	Total Sample	White	African American	Hispanic	Male	Female
(N) in Sample	1,171	747	299	108	565	606
% in Gender Friendship Network						
<i>Male Friendship Network</i>	48%	48%	51%	46%	99%	1%
<i>Female Friendship Network</i>	52%	52%	49%	54%	1%	99%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% in Racial/Ethnic Friendship Network						
<i>White Friendship Network</i>	69%	97%	5%	---	69%	69%
<i>African American Friendship Network</i>	27%	2%	95%	---	27%	27%
<i>Hispanic Friendship Network</i>	4%	---	---	100%	4%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 2a. Descriptive Statistics of Variables used in Analyses by Respondent's Race/Ethnicity and Gender

	Range	Alpha	Total Sample		White		African American		Hispanic		Male		Female	
			Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)
Respondent Delinquency	0-1	---	.34	(.47)	.34	(.47)	.27	(.45)	.51	(.50)	.38	(.49)	.30	(.46)
Friend Delinquency	0-1	---	.64	(.48)	.62	(.49)	.65	(.48)	.81	(.40)	.70	(.46)	.59	(.49)
<i>I. Friendship Bond Elements</i>														
Positivity toward Friends	5-20	.68	16.79	(2.32)	17.13	(2.11)	16.14	(2.63)	16.28	(2.31)	16.10	(2.27)	17.44	(2.17)
Negativity toward Friends	5-25	.72	19.34	(3.42)	19.54	(3.29)	18.74	(3.69)	19.64	(3.35)	18.74	(3.38)	19.91	(3.37)
Time Spent with Friends	4-17	---	12.70	(3.02)	13.09	(2.88)	11.89	(3.14)	12.11	(3.13)	12.76	(3.04)	12.64	(3.00)
Indirect Peer Pressure	3-15	.69	7.49	(2.52)	7.75	(2.51)	6.94	(2.43)	7.20	(2.65)	8.02	(2.47)	7.00	(2.47)
Direct Peer Pressure	3-15	.67	5.89	(2.21)	5.83	(2.15)	6.06	(2.34)	5.81	(2.14)	6.29	(2.18)	5.52	(2.18)
<i>II. Parental Bond Elements</i>														
Positivity toward Parents	5-25	.75	19.85	(3.23)	19.78	(3.05)	19.89	(3.67)	20.10	(3.00)	19.85	(3.07)	19.84	(3.37)
Negativity toward Parents	4-20	.70	14.84	(3.29)	15.10	(3.17)	14.17	(3.61)	14.98	(2.87)	14.71	(3.15)	14.97	(3.41)
Time Spent with Parents	4-20	---	13.52	(2.87)	13.30	(2.71)	14.34	(3.09)	12.77	(2.86)	13.29	(3.02)	13.73	(2.70)
Parental Monitoring of Child's Friends	4-17	.76	12.74	(2.24)	13.01	(2.02)	12.28	(2.58)	12.17	(2.35)	12.56	(2.28)	12.91	(2.18)
Parental Monitoring of Child's Time With Friends	4-16	.57	14.25	(1.68)	14.18	(1.50)	14.34	(2.08)	14.41	(1.62)	14.09	(1.79)	14.39	(1.57)
<i>Background Variables</i>														
Single Mother Household	0-1	---	.21	(.41)	.14	(.34)	.39	(.49)	.20	(.40)	.19	(.40)	.22	(.42)
Less than High School	0-1	---	.12	(.32)	.07	(.26)	.18	(.38)	.29	(.45)	.12	(.33)	.11	(.31)
Unemployed	0-1	---	.23	(.42)	.20	(.40)	.30	(.46)	.25	(.43)	.21	(.40)	.26	(.44)
Less than \$30,000 Income	0-1	---	.63	(.48)	.58	(.49)	.74	(.44)	.74	(.44)	.63	(.48)	.64	(.48)
Received Govt. Assistance	0-1	---	.50	(.50)	.36	(.48)	.80	(.40)	.69	(.47)	.48	(.50)	.52	(.50)
Respondent Age	12-19	---	15.26	(1.72)	15.25	(1.75)	15.29	(1.68)	15.38	(1.66)	15.25	(1.12)	15.27	(1.72)

Table 2b. Means of Variables by Respondent's Race/Ethnicity and Gender and Significant Differences in Means

	Means			Means	
	A White	B African American	C Hispanic	D Male	E Female
Respondent Delinquency	.34 ^{bc}	.27 ^{ac}	.51 ^{ab}	.38 ^e	.30 ^d
Friend Delinquency	.62 ^c	.65 ^c	.81 ^{ab}	.70 ^e	.59 ^d
<i>I. Friendship Bond Elements</i>					
Positivity toward Friends	17.13 ^{bc}	16.14 ^a	16.28 ^a	16.10 ^e	17.44 ^d
Negativity toward Friends	19.54 ^b	18.74 ^{ac}	19.64 ^b	18.74 ^e	19.91 ^d
Time Spent with Friends	13.09 ^{bc}	11.89 ^a	12.11 ^a	12.76	12.64
Indirect Peer Pressure	7.75 ^{bc}	6.94 ^a	7.20 ^a	8.02 ^e	7.00 ^d
Direct Peer Pressure	5.83	6.06	5.81	6.29 ^e	5.52 ^d
<i>II. Parental Bond Elements</i>					
Positivity toward Parents	19.78	19.89	20.10	19.85	19.84
Negativity toward Parents	15.10 ^b	14.17 ^{ac}	14.98 ^b	14.71	14.97
Time Spent with Parents	13.30 ^b	14.34 ^{ac}	12.77 ^b	13.29 ^e	13.73 ^d
Parental Monitoring of Child's Friends	13.01 ^{bc}	12.28 ^a	12.17 ^a	12.56 ^e	12.91 ^d
Parental Monitoring of Child's Time w/Friends	14.18	14.34	14.41	14.09 ^e	14.39 ^d

T-Test Results:

^a Different from Whites at the $p < .05$ level

^b Different from Blacks at the $p < .05$ level

^c Different from Hispanics at the $p < .05$ level

^d Different from Males at the $p < .05$ level

^e Different from Females at the $p < .05$ level

Table 3. Correlations Among Delinquency Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Stolen or tried to steal something worth \$5 or less.	---								
2. Damaged or destroyed property on purpose.	.28***	---							
3. Carried a hidden weapon other than a plain pocket knife.	.49***	.41***	---						
4. Stolen or tried to steal something worth more than \$50.	.60***	.39***	.63***	---					
5. Attached someone with the idea of seriously harming him/her.	.38***	.43***	.55***	.55***	---				
6. Sold drugs.	.30***	.49***	.45***	.51***	.55***	---			
7. Been drunk in a public place.	.32***	.39***	.42***	.41***	.37***	.50***	---		
8. Broken into a building or vehicle or tried to break in to steal something or just to look around.	.47***	.50***	.57***	.59***	.53***	.55***	.43***	---	
9. Used drugs to get high (not because you were sick).	.36***	.22***	.30***	.36***	.30***	.45***	.54***	.33***	---

* p < .05 p < .01** p < .001***

Table 4. Factor Loadings of Delinquency Variables for One Factor

Delinquency Variables	Factor 1	Uniqueness
Stolen or tried to steal something worth \$5 or less.	.65	.57
Damaged or destroyed property on purpose.	.64	.60
Carried a hidden weapon other than a plain pocket knife.	.77	.41
Stolen or tried to steal something worth more than \$50.	.80	.37
Attached someone with the idea of seriously harming him/her.	.74	.45
Sold drugs.	.75	.43
Been drunk in a public place.	.67	.54
Broken into a building or vehicle or tried to break in to steal something or just to look around.	.78	.37
Used drugs to get high (not because you were sick).	.58	.66

Note: Results revealed one common factor among the delinquency variables.

Table 5. Correlations Among Attachment to Friends Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. How important are your friends to you?	---								
2. They (my friends) care about me.	.52***	---							
3. My friends are often disappointed in me.	.19***	.24***	---						
4. My friends seem to wish I were a different type of person.	.26***	.32***	.44***	---					
5. My friends make me feel good about myself.	.36***	.47***	.22***	.30***	---				
6. Sometimes I feel I need to watch what I say to my friends.	.14***	.18***	.27***	.31***	.16***	---			
7. Sometimes I don't know quite what to say to my friends.	.14***	.18***	.24***	.32***	.17***	.50***	---		
8. Sometimes I find it hard to talk about my feelings with my friends.	.24***	.30***	.28***	.34***	.25***	.32***	.45***	---	
9. I feel comfortable talking with my friends when I have a problem.	.28***	.31***	.12***	.16***	.31***	.08**	.12***	.30***	---

* $p < .05$

$p < .01^{**}$

$p < .001^{***}$

Table 6. Factor Loadings of Attachment to Friends for Two Factors after Oblique Rotation

Attachment to Friends Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2	Uniqueness
<i>Positivity toward Friends (Factor 1)</i>			
How important are your friends to you?	.77	-.07	.44
They (my friends) care about me.	.80	.00	.36
My friends make me feel good about myself.	.73	-.01	.48
I feel comfortable talking with my friends when I have a problem.	.64	-.08	.62
<i>Negativity toward Friends (Factor 2)</i>			
My friends are often disappointed in me.	.15	.52	.64
My friends seem to wish I were a different type of person.	.25	.55	.53
Sometimes I feel I need to watch what I say to my friends.	-.14	.80	.43
Sometimes I don't know quite what to say to my friends.	-.13	.83	.37
Sometimes I find it hard to talk about my feelings with my friends.	.21	.58	.52

Note: Factor 1 (eigenvalue 3.21, explaining 36% of variance) is measuring *Positivity toward Friends* while Factor 2 (eigenvalue 1.40; 16% variance explained) is measuring *Negativity toward Friends*. The correlation between *Positivity toward Friends* and *Negativity toward Friends* was .39.

Table 7. Correlations Among Peer Pressure Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. I sometimes do things because my friends are doing them.	---					
2. I sometimes do things because I don't want to lose the respect of my friends.	.48***	---				
3. My friends often get me into trouble.	.26***	.24***	---			
4. My friends often influence what I do.	.42***	.37***	.24***	---		
5. My friends sometimes try to control what I do.	.22***	.24***	.30***	.23***	---	
6. My friends sometimes try to change me.	.20***	.24***	.31***	.19***	.62***	---

* p < .05 p < .01** p < .001***

Table 8. Factor Loadings of Peer Pressure Variables for Two Factors after Oblique Rotation

Peer Pressure Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2	Uniqueness
<i>Indirect Pressure (Factor 1)</i>			
I sometimes do things because my friends are doing them.	.84	-.06	.33
I sometimes do things because I don't want to lose the respect of my friends.	.77	.01	.40
My friends often influence what I do.	.75	-.03	.45
<i>Direct Pressure (Factor 2)</i>			
My friends often get me into trouble.	.26	.46	.64
My friends sometimes try to control what I do.	-.03	.88	.24
My friends sometimes try to change me.	-.07	.91	.22

Note: Factor 1 (eigenvalue 2.52, explaining 42% of the variance) is measuring *Indirect Pressure* and Factor 2 (eigenvalue 1.19; 20% of variance explained) is measuring *Direct Pressure*. The correlation between *Indirect Pressure* and *Direct Pressure* was .38.

Table 9. Correlations of Attachment to Parents Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. My parents often ask about what I am doing in school.	---								
2. My parents give me the right amount of affection.	.51***	---							
3. My parents trust me.	.27***	.49***	---						
4. I'm closer to my parents than a lot of kids my age.	.20***	.34***	.34***	---					
5. My parents sometimes put me down in front of other people.	.14***	.27***	.31***	.19***	---				
6. My parents seem to wish I were a different type of person.	.19***	.36***	.43***	.23*** ⁺	.37***	---			
7. My parents are clueless about a lot of things I do.	.21***	.27***	.36***	.25***	.27***	.37***	---		
8. Sometimes I want to leave home when I have a problem.	.17***	.30***	.40***	.24***	.34***	.43***	.41***	---	
9. I feel close to my parents.	.33***	.50***	.49***	.55***	.25***	.39***	.34***	.35***	---

* p < .05

p < .01**

p < .001***

Table 10. Factor Loadings of Attachment to Parents Variables for Two Factors after Oblique Rotation

Attachment to Parents Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2	Uniqueness
<i>Positivity toward Parents (Factor 1)</i>			
My parents often ask about what I am doing in school.	.81	-.22	.46
My parents give me the right amount of affection.	.77	.05	.35
My parents trust me.	.44	.41	.47
I'm closer to my parents than a lot of kids my age.	.63	.04	.58
I feel close to my parents.	.70	.18	.37
<i>Negativity toward Parents (Factor 2)</i>			
My parents sometimes put me down in front of other people.	-.12	.76	.50
My parents seem to wish I were a different type of person.	.04	.76	.40
My parents are clueless about a lot of things I do.	.11	.60	.57
Sometimes I want to leave home when I have a problem.	.01	.74	.44

Note: Factor 1 (eigenvalue 3.70, explaining 41% of variance) is measuring *Positivity toward Parents* and Factor 2 (eigenvalue 1.15, explaining 13% of the variance) is measuring *Negativity toward Parents*. The correlation between *Positivity toward Parents* and *Negativity toward Parents* was .46.

Table 11. Correlation Among Parental Involvement in Child's Friendships Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. How involved are you in making decisions regarding these areas of your child's life? Friendships.	---							
2. How much do you know about your child's friends?	.14***	---						
3. When my child is away from home, he/she is supposed to let me know where she/he is.	.17***	.20***	---					
4. I ask who my child is going out with.	.18***	.20***	.41***	---				
5. I ask where my child is going.	.14***	.17***	.41***	.63***	---			
6. Have you met your child's friends?	.10***	.51***	.17***	.12***	.09**	---		
7. Have you met the parents of your child's friends?	.12***	.54***	.18***	.19***	.12***	.50***	---	
8. Some parents don't know much about their child's social life, while others may feel they know most everything. How much would you say you know?	.19***	.45***	.21***	.20***	.10***	.37***	.32***	---

* p < .05 p < .01** p < .001***

Table 12. Factor Loadings of Parental Involvement in Child's Friendships Variables for Two Factors after Oblique Rotation

Parental Involvement in Child's Friendships Variables	Factor 1	Factor 2	Uniqueness
<i>Parental Monitoring of Child's Friends (Factor 1)</i>			
How much do you know about your child's friends?	.82	.01	.33
Have you met your child's friends?	.82	-.12	.38
Have you met the parents of your child's friends?	.78	-.02	.40
Some parents don't know much about their child's social life, while others may feel they know most everything. How much would you say you know?	.64	.07	.56
<i>Parental Monitoring of Child's Time With Friends (Factor 2)</i>			
How involved are you in making decisions regarding these areas of your child's life? Friendships.	.15	.30	.86
When my child is away from home, he/she is supposed to let me know where she/he is.	.07	.68	.51
I ask who my child is going out with.	-.01	.85	.29
I ask where my child is going.	-.10	.87	.28

Note: Factor 1 (eigenvalue 2.82, 35% of variance explained) is measuring *Parental Monitoring of Child's Friends* and Factor 2 (eigenvalue 1.58, 20% of variance explained) is measuring *Parental Monitoring of Child's Time With Friends*. The correlation between *Parental Monitoring of Child's Friends* and *Parental Monitoring of Child's Time With Friends* was .30.

Table 13. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Entire Sample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friend Delinquency	2.35	(.22)	10.46 ***	2.46	(.23)	11.67 ***	2.37	(.23)	10.67 ***
Friendship Network Characteristics									
Female Network	-.17	(.16)	.84	-.28	(.15)	.75	-.30	(.17)	.74
Black Network	-.25	(.19)	.78	-.24	(.21)	.78	-.10	(.21)	.91
Hispanic Network	.99	(.36)	2.68 **	.81	(.40)	2.24 *	1.03	(.41)	2.80 *
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	.01	(.04)	1.01				.06	(.04)	1.06
Negativity to Friends	.00	(.03)	1.00				-.01	(.03)	.99
Time Spent Friends	.11	(.03)	1.12 ***				.10	(.03)	1.11 ***
Indirect Peer Pressure	.02	(.03)	1.02				.02	(.03)	1.03
Direct Peer Pressure	.09	(.04)	1.09 *				.06	(.04)	1.06
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.14	(.03)	.87 ***	-.16	(.03)	.85 ***
Negativity to Parents				-.02	(.03)	.98	.00	(.03)	1.00
Time Spent w/Parents				-.03	(.03)	.97	-.02	(.03)	.98
Parental Monitoring of Friends				.01	(.04)	1.01	-.01	(.04)	.99
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				-.04	(.05)	.96	-.03	(.05)	.97
<i>Background Variables</i>									

Single Mother	.08	(.19)	1.09							
Less than HS/GED	-.32	(.24)	.73							
Unemployed	.04	(.19)	1.05							
> \$30,000 Income	-.01	(.16)	.99							
Govt. Assistance	-.01	(.17)	.99							
Respondent Age ²	.00	(.00)	1.00	**						
Log-Likelihood	-556.47				-510.79				-499.49	
	* p < .05	** p < .01	*** p < .001							

Note that reference category is White Male Friendship Network

Table 14. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Female Subsample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friend Delinquency	2.42	(.30)	11.19 ***	2.48	(.32)	12.00 ***	2.40	(.32)	11.02 ***
Friendship Network Characteristics									
Female Network	.52	(.90)	1.68	-.11	(.89)	.90	-.09	(.90)	.91
Black Network	.28	(.28)	1.33	.32	(.29)	1.38	.47	(.31)	1.61
Hispanic Network	1.42	(.50)	4.14 **	1.15	(.56)	3.15 *	1.30	(.57)	3.68 *
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	-.01	(.06)	.99				.02	(.06)	1.02
Negativity to Friends	.01	(.04)	1.01				.03	(.05)	1.03
Time Spent Friends	.10	(.04)	1.11 *				.08	(.04)	1.09
Indirect Peer Pressure	.02	(.05)	1.02				.03	(.05)	1.03
Direct Peer Pressure	.13	(.06)	1.14 *				.11	(.07)	1.11
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.14	(.04)	.87 **	-.15	(.04)	.86 ***
Negativity to Parents				-.04	(.04)	.96	.00	(.05)	1.00
Time Spent w/Parents				-.07	(.05)	.94	-.05	(.05)	.95
Parental Monitoring of Friends				-.01	(.06)	.99	-.03	(.06)	.97
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				-.02	(.08)	.98	-.01	(.08)	.99

Background Variables

Single Mother	-.29	(.27)	.75	-.24	(.28)	.78	-.24	(.29)	.79	
Less than HS/GED	-.65	(.36)	.52	-.45	(.38)	.64	-.42	(.39)	.65	
Unemployed	-.05	(.27)	.95	-.01	(.28)	.99	-.03	(.29)	.97	
> \$30,000 Income	-.03	(.23)	.97	-.19	(.25)	.83	-.17	(.25)	.85	
Govt. Assistance	.11	(.25)	1.12	-.11	(.26)	.89	-.06	(.27)	.94	
Respondent Age ²	.01	(.00)	1.01	**	.00	(.00)	1.00	.00	(.00)	1.00

Log-Likelihood	-265.24			-240.38				-235.99	
----------------	---------	--	--	---------	--	--	--	---------	--

* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

Note that reference category is White Male Friendship Network

Table 15. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Male Subsample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friend Delinquency	2.36	(.32)	10.58 ***	2.51	(.33)	12.32 ***	2.42	(.34)	11.22 ***
Friendship Network Characteristics									
Female Network	-1.86	(1.13)	.16	-1.67	(1.13)	.19	-1.78	(1.18)	.17
Black Network	-.84	(.28)	.43 **	-.86	(.30)	.42 **	-.72	(.31)	.49 *
Hispanic Network	.42	(.55)	1.52	.37	(.59)	1.45	.69	(.61)	2.00
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	.03	(.05)	1.04				.10	(.06)	1.11
Negativity to Friends	.00	(.04)	1.00				-.02	(.04)	.98
Time Spent Friends	.13	(.04)	1.13 ***				.13	(.04)	1.14 **
Indirect Peer Pressure	.02	(.05)	1.02				.02	(.05)	1.02
Direct Peer Pressure	.04	(.06)	1.04				.02	(.06)	1.03
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.12	(.04)	.89 **	-.16	(.04)	.86 ***
Negativity to Parents				-.01	(.04)	.99	.00	(.04)	1.00
Time Spent w/Parents				.00	(.04)	1.00	.01	(.04)	1.01
Parental Monitoring of Friends				.03	(.06)	1.03	.01	(.06)	1.01
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				-.07	(.07)	.93	-.06	(.07)	.94

Background Variables

Single Mother	.57	(.28)	1.77 *	.28	(.30)	1.32	.40	(.31)	1.49
Less than HS/GED	.12	(.34)	1.13	.22	(.36)	1.25	.30	(.38)	1.34
Unemployed	.11	(.28)	1.12	.17	(.29)	1.19	-.01	(.30)	.99
> \$30,000 Income	-.01	(.22)	.99	-.07	(.23)	.93	-.01	(.24)	.99
Govt. Assistance	-.12	(.24)	.89	-.09	(.25)	.91	-.03	(.25)	.97
Respondent Age ²	.00	(.00)	1.00	.00	(.00)	1.00	.00	(.00)	1.00

Log-Likelihood	-280.05			-262.20					-253.99
----------------	---------	--	--	---------	--	--	--	--	---------

* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

Note that reference category is White Male Friendship Network

Table 16. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for White Subsample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friend Delinquency	2.62	(.28)	13.77 ***	2.78	(.30)	16.10 ***	2.70	(.31)	14.83 ***
Friendship Network Characteristics									
Female Network	-.33	(.21)	.72	-.41	(.20)	.67 *	-.44	(.22)	.65 *
Black Network	-1.27	(.71)	.28	-1.29	(.82)	.28	-1.30	(.85)	.27
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	-.02	(.05)	.98				.03	(.06)	1.04
Negativity to Friends	-.01	(.04)	.99				-.01	(.04)	.99
Time Spent Friends	.13	(.04)	1.14 ***				.12	(.04)	1.13 **
Indirect Peer Pressure	.02	(.04)	1.02				.02	(.05)	1.02
Direct Peer Pressure	.03	(.05)	1.03				.00	(.06)	1.00
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.10	(.04)	.90 **	-.12	(.04)	.88 **
Negativity to Parents				-.07	(.04)	.93	-.05	(.04)	.95
Time Spent w/Parents				-.07	(.04)	.93	-.05	(.04)	.95
Parental Monitoring of Friends				.08	(.06)	1.08	.06	(.06)	1.06
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				-.06	(.07)	.94	-.06	(.07)	.94

Table 17. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for African American Subsample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friend Delinquency	1.75	(.40)	5.74 ***	1.90	(.43)	6.66 ***	1.81	(.44)	6.13 ***
Friendship Network Characteristics									
Female Network	.29	(.32)	1.33	.20	(.33)	1.22	.17	(.35)	1.18
Black Network	1.40	(1.12)	4.05	1.13	(1.13)	3.09	1.28	(1.15)	3.61
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	.08	(.07)	1.09				.14	(.07)	1.15
Negativity to Friends	.02	(.06)	1.02				.00	(.06)	1.00
Time Spent Friends	.06	(.05)	1.06				.07	(.06)	1.07
Indirect Peer Pressure	.04	(.07)	1.04				.03	(.08)	1.03
Direct Peer Pressure	.13	(.09)	1.14				.13	(.09)	1.13
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.16	(.05)	.85 **	-.18	(.05)	.83 ***
Negativity to Parents				.05	(.05)	1.05	.07	(.06)	1.07
Time Spent w/Parents				.04	(.06)	1.04	.05	(.06)	1.05
Parental Monitoring of Friends				-.07	(.07)	.93	-.10	(.08)	.91
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				.00	(.10)	1.00	-.02	(.10)	.98
<i>Background Variables</i>									

Single Mother	.05	(.31)	1.05	.05	(.31)	1.05	.01	(.34)	1.01
Less than HS/GED	-.35	(.43)	.70	-.35	(.43)	.70	-.24	(.46)	.79
Unemployed	.50	(.36)	1.65	.50	(.36)	1.65	.47	(.39)	1.60
> \$30,000 Income	.28	(.39)	1.32	.28	(.39)	1.32	.14	(.43)	1.16
Govt. Assistance	-.14	(.41)	.87	-.14	(.41)	.87	.00	(.45)	1.00
Respondent Age ²	.00	(.00)	1.00	.00	(.00)	1.00	.00	(.00)	1.00
Log-Likelihood	-134.49			-120.84			-116.66		
	* p < .05	** p < .01	*** p < .001						

Note that reference category is White Male Friendship Network

Note also that due to the low Ns for African Americans (N =3) involved in Hispanic friendship networks, Hispanic friendship network was removed from analyses presented in this table

Table 18. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond and the Predominant Gender and Race/Ethnicity of the Respondent's Friendship Network Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Hispanic Subsample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friend Delinquency	1.81	(.74)	6.13 *	1.90	(.80)	6.71 *	1.71	(.87)	5.53 *
Friendship Network Characteristics									
Female Network	-.72	(.57)	.49	-1.07	(.54)	.34 *	-1.52	(.70)	.22 *
Black Network	-.04	(.95)	.96	-.32	(.94)	.73	-.05	(1.03)	.95
Hispanic Network	.87	(.55)	2.39	.99	(.57)	2.69	1.06	(.64)	2.89
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	.00	(.13)	1.00				.02	(.17)	1.02
Negativity to Friends	.07	(.09)	1.07				.24	(.13)	1.27
Time Spent Friends	.15	(.09)	1.17				.19	(.12)	1.21
Indirect Peer Pressure	-.08	(.10)	.92				-.05	(.13)	.95
Direct Peer Pressure	.33	(.16)	1.39 *				.26	(.19)	1.29
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.18	(.13)	.83	-.23	(.17)	.79
Negativity to Parents				-.05	(.13)	.95	-.10	(.15)	.90
Time Spent w/Parents				.02	(.10)	1.02	.09	(.11)	1.10
Parental Monitoring of Friends				-.08	(.12)	.93	-.22	(.14)	.80
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				-.19	(.19)	.82	-.15	(.19)	.86

Background Variables

Single Mother	.05	(.64)	1.05	.54	(.75)	1.72	.69	(.80)	1.99
Less than HS/GED	.14	(.58)	1.15	.35	(.68)	1.41	.68	(.72)	1.97
Unemployed	-.69	(.58)	.50	-.60	(.66)	.55	-.87	(.74)	.42
> \$30,000 Income	-.12	(.57)	.89	-.50	(.60)	.60	.23	(.72)	1.26
Govt. Assistance	-.14	(.58)	.87	-.01	(.63)	.99	.47	(.70)	1.60
Respondent Age ²	.00	(.00)	1.00	.00	(.01)	1.00	-.01	(.01)	.99

Log-Likelihood	-556.47	-510.79	-499.49
----------------	---------	---------	---------

* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

Note that reference category is White Male Friendship Network

APPENDIX A

Appendix A includes corresponding baseline models for all logistic regression results. Baseline models include all friend and parental bond measures as well as background variables but do not include Friend Delinquency or Friendship Network Characteristics. These tables were included so that the reader could compare the baseline models to the models presented in the dissertation results section if desired. They provide a baseline for understanding how friend and parental bonds influence respondent delinquency without the consideration of friend delinquency (which is a very strong predictor of delinquency) and friendship network characteristics (which are the main variables of interest).

Table 13: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Entire Sample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	-.03	(.03)	.97				.01	(.03)	1.01
Negativity to Friends	.03	(.02)	1.03				.03	(.03)	1.03
Time Spent Friends	.12	(.02)	1.12 ***				.11	(.03)	1.12 ***
Indirect Peer Pressure	.05	(.03)	1.06				.05	(.03)	1.05
Direct Peer Pressure	.15	(.04)	1.17 ***				.12	(.04)	1.13 ***
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.10	(.02)	.91 ***	-.11	(.02)	.89 ***
Negativity to Parents				-.08	(.02)	.93 ***	-.05	(.02)	.95
Time Spent w/Parents				-.06	(.03)	.94 *	-.04	(.03)	.96
Parental Monitoring of Friends				.03	(.03)	.98	-.06	(.04)	.94
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				-.02	(.04)	1.02	-.03	(.05)	1.03
<i>Background Variables</i>									
Single Mother	.06	(.16)	1.06	-.02	(.16)	.98	.03	(.17)	1.03
Less than HS/GED	-.14	(.21)	.87	-.19	(.22)	.83	-.14	(.23)	.86
Unemployed	.03	(.16)	1.03	.06	(.17)	1.06	.01	(.17)	1.01
> \$30,000 Income	-.07	(.14)	.93	-.14	(.14)	.87	-.16	(.15)	.85
Govt. Assistance	-.17	(.14)	1.18	.06	(.14)	1.06	.15	(.15)	1.16
Respondent Age ²	.01	(.00)	1.00 **	.00	(.00)	1.00 ***	.01	(.00)	1.00 ***
Log-Likelihood	-733.18			-680.87			-658.00		

*p < .05 ** p < .01

*** p < .001

Table 14: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Female Subsample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	-.02	(.05)	.98				.01	(.06)	1.01
Negativity to Friends	.03	(.04)	1.03				.05	(.04)	1.05
Time Spent Friends	.09	(.03)	1.10 **				.08	(.04)	1.08
Indirect Peer Pressure	.02	(.04)	1.02				.01	(.05)	1.01
Direct Peer Pressure	.20	(.05)	1.22 ***				.17	(.06)	1.18 **
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.08	(.04)	.92 *	-.09	(.04)	.91 *
Negativity to Parents				-.09	(.04)	.91 **	-.06	(.04)	.94
Time Spent w/Parents				-.08	(.05)	.92 *	-.07	(.04)	.94
Parental Monitoring of Friends				-.08	(.06)	.93	-.10	(.05)	.91
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				.07	(.08)	1.07	.09	(.07)	1.09
<i>Background Variables</i>									
Single Mother	-.28	(.22)	.97	-.02	(.23)	1.01	.03	(.24)	1.03
Less than HS/GED	-.37	(.30)	.69	-.61	(.33)	.54	-.54	(.34)	.58
Unemployed	.08	(.22)	1.08	.04	(.23)	1.04	.05	(.24)	1.05
> \$30,000 Income	-.12	(.20)	.89	-.26	(.21)	.77	-.26	(.21)	.77
Govt. Assistance	.45	(.20)	1.56 *	.34	(.21)	1.41	.40	(.21)	1.49
Respondent Age ²	.01	(.00)	1.01 **	.01	(.00)	1.00 **	.01	(.00)	1.00 **
Log-Likelihood	-364.42			-327.12			-318.73		

*p < .05 ** p < .01

*** p < .001

Table 15: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Male Subsample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	-.00	(.04)	1.00				.10	(.06)	1.07
Negativity to Friends	.02	(.03)	1.02				-.02	(.04)	1.00
Time Spent Friends	.15	(.03)	1.16 ***				.13	(.04)	1.16 ***
Indirect Peer Pressure	.08	(.04)	1.08				.02	(.05)	1.07
Direct Peer Pressure	.10	(.05)	1.11 *				.02	(.06)	1.08
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.12	(.03)	.89 **	-.16	(.04)	.86 ***
Negativity to Parents				-.06	(.03)	.94	.00	(.04)	.96
Time Spent w/Parents				-.05	(.04)	.95	.01	(.04)	.98
Parental Monitoring of Friends				.03	(.05)	1.03	.01	(.06)	.99
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				-.00	(.06)	1.00	-.06	(.07)	1.00
<i>Background Variables</i>									
Single Mother	.27	(.24)	1.31	.03	(.24)	1.03	.40	(.31)	1.17
Less than HS/GED	.09	(.30)	1.10	.18	(.31)	1.19	.30	(.38)	1.24
Unemployed	-.05	(.24)	.95	.07	(.25)	1.08	-.01	(.30)	.89
> \$30,000 Income	-.01	(.20)	.99	-.05	(.20)	.95	-.01	(.24)	.97
Govt. Assistance	-.14	(.19)	.87	-.15	(.20)	.86	-.03	(.25)	.95
Respondent Age ²	.01	(.00)	1.01	.00	(.00)	1.00 *	.00	(.00)	1.00 *
Log-Likelihood	-361.83			-344.99			-328.55		

Table 16: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for White Subsample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	-.08	(.04)	.93				-.03	(.06)	.97
Negativity to Friends	.02	(.03)	1.02				.02	(.04)	1.02
Time Spent Friends	.15	(.03)	1.16 ***				.14	(.04)	1.15 ***
Indirect Peer Pressure	.04	(.04)	1.04				.03	(.05)	1.03
Direct Peer Pressure	.14	(.04)	1.15 **				.11	(.06)	1.11 *
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.08	(.03)	.93 **	-.09	(.04)	.92 *
Negativity to Parents				-.11	(.03)	.90 ***	-.07	(.03)	.93 *
Time Spent w/Parents				-.09	(.04)	.92 *	-.07	(.04)	.93
Parental Monitoring of Friends				.00	(.05)	1.00	-.03	(.05)	.97
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				.02	(.06)	1.02	.02	(.06)	1.02
<i>Background Variables</i>									
Single Mother	.26	(.23)	1.29	.08	(.24)	1.08	.14	(.25)	1.15
Less than HS/GED	-.53	(.36)	.59	-.56	(.39)	.57	-.54	(.40)	.58
Unemployed	-.02	(.21)	.98	.07	(.22)	1.07	-.00	(.23)	1.00
> \$30,000 Income	-.12	(.17)	.89	-.19	(.17)	.83	-.22	(.18)	.80
Govt. Assistance	.14	(.17)	1.15	.07	(.18)	1.07	.08	(.19)	1.09
Respondent Age ²	.01	(.00)	1.01 ***	.01	(.00)	1.00 *	.01	(.00)	1.01 ***
Log-Likelihood	-452.01			-427.10			-412.16		

Table 17: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for African American Subsample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	.11	(.06)	1.11				.17	(.07)	1.18 *
Negativity to Friends	-.01	(.05)	.99				-.01	(.05)	.99
Time Spent Friends	.06	(.05)	1.06				.07	(.05)	1.07
Indirect Peer Pressure	.09	(.07)	1.09				.08	(.07)	1.09
Direct Peer Pressure	.11	(.08)	1.12				.10	(.08)	1.11
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.12	(.04)	.89 **	-.15	(.05)	.86 ***
Negativity to Parents				-.01	(.04)	.99	.01	(.05)	1.01
Time Spent w/Parents				.00	(.05)	1.00	.01	(.05)	1.01
Parental Monitoring of Friends				-.07	(.06)	.93	-.08	(.07)	.92
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				.03	(.09)	1.03	.02	(.09)	1.02
<i>Background Variables</i>									
Single Mother	.13	(.29)	1.14	.12	(.30)	1.13	.09	(.31)	1.09
Less than HS/GED	-.50	(.39)	.61	-.33	(.41)	.72	-.53	(.43)	.59
Unemployed	.50	(.32)	1.65	.40	(.32)	1.49	.48	(.34)	1.61
> \$30,000 Income	.22	(.35)	1.25	.22	(.37)	1.25	.22	(.38)	1.25
Govt. Assistance	-.02	(.37)	.98	-.02	(.38)	.98	.07	(.39)	1.07
Respondent Age ²	.00	(.00)	1.00	.00	(.00)	1.00	.00	(.00)	1.00
Log-Likelihood	-160.88			-147.76			-140.69		

Table 18: Baseline. Logistic Regression Results of the Effects of the Friendship and Parental Bond Predicting Respondent Involvement in Delinquency for Hispanic Subsample

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio	β	(SE)	Odds Ratio
Friendship Bond Elements									
Positivity to Friends	-.09	(.09)	.91				-.15	(.11)	.86
Negativity to Friends	.10	(.07)	1.11				.22	(.10)	1.24 *
Time Spent Friends	.09	(.07)	1.10				.11	(.08)	1.12
Indirect Peer Pressure	-.01	(.08)	.99				.05	(.09)	1.05
Direct Peer Pressure	.26	(.11)	1.30 *				.20	(.13)	1.21
Parental Bond Elements									
Positivity to Parents				-.12	(.08)	.89	-.14	(.09)	.87
Negativity to Parents				-.11	(.07)	.90	-.14	(.09)	.87
Time Spent w/Parents				.02	(.07)	1.02	.08	(.08)	1.08
Parental Monitoring of Friends				-.04	(.09)	.97	-.09	(.10)	.91
Parental Monitoring of Child Time Friends				-.05	(.14)	.95	-.04	(.15)	.96
<i>Background Variables</i>									
Single Mother	.31	(.52)	1.37	.31	(.56)	1.36	.62	(.61)	1.86
Less than HS/GED	-.07	(.42)	.93	-.29	(.48)	.75	-.17	(.49)	.85
Unemployed	-.52	(.48)	.59	-.60	(.52)	.55	-.88	(.56)	.41
> \$30,000 Income	-.27	(.44)	.76	-.27	(.45)	.77	-.16	(.50)	.85
Govt. Assistance	.24	(.42)	1.27	.19	(.46)	1.21	.50	(.50)	1.65
Respondent Age ²	.01	(.00)	1.00	.00	(.00)	1.00	.00	(.00)	1.00
Log-Likelihood	-86.11			-78.24			-71.83		

APPENDIX B

Respondent Delinquency

Response options were: (1) Never, (2) Once or twice a year, (3) Once every 2-3 months, (4) Once a month, (5) Once every 2-3 weeks, (6) Once a week, (7) 2-3 times a week, (8) Once a day, (9) More than once a day.

In the last 12 MONTHS, how often have you:

VAR NAME	Item	Range	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
HR41	Stolen or tried to steal things worth \$5 or less?	1-9	1.20	1	.83
HR42	Damaged or destroyed property on purpose?	1-9	1.18	1	.71
HR43	Carried a hidden weapon other than a plain pocket knife?	1-9	1.15	1	.85
HR44	Stolen or tried to steal things worth more than \$50?	1-9	1.11	1	.65
HR45	Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting him/her?	1-9	1.22	1	.82
HR46	Sold drugs?	1-9	1.15	1	.82
HR47	Been drunk in a public place?	1-9	1.29	1	1.01
HR48	Broken into a building or vehicle or tried to break in to steal something or to just look around?	1-9	1.10	1	.63
HR49	Used drugs to get high (not because you were sick)?	1-9	1.51	1	1.46

Those reporting “never” for all acts of delinquency were coded as (0); all others were coded as (1) for *Respondent Delinquency*.

Friend Delinquency

The response options were: (1) Never, (2) Once or twice a year, (3) Once every 2-3 months, (4) Once a month, (5) Once every 2-3 weeks, (6) Once a week, (7) 2-3 times a week, (8) Once a day, (9) More than once a day.

In the last 12 MONTHS, how often have your friends:

VAR NAME	Item	Range	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
F43	Stolen or tried to steal things worth \$5 or less?	1-9	1.41	1	1.08
F45	Damaged or destroyed property on purpose?	1-9	1.49	1	1.15
F44	Carried a hidden weapon other than a plain pocket knife?	1-9	1.28	1	1.15
F46	Stolen or tried to steal things worth more than \$50?	1-9	1.22	1	.90
F47	Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting him/her?	1-9	1.62	1	1.37
F48	Sold drugs?	1-9	1.51	1	1.59
F49	Been drunk in a public place?	1-9	1.78	1	1.59
F50	Broken into a building or vehicle or tried to break in to steal something or to just look around?	1-9	1.15	1	.67
F51	Used drugs to get high (not because you were sick)?	1-9	2.20	1	2.13

Respondent reports of “never” for all acts of delinquency were coded as (0); all others were coded as (1) for *Friend Delinquency*.

Emotional Attachment to Friends

The first question, “How important are your friends to you?” included the following response options: (1) Not at all important, (2) Not too important, (3) Somewhat important, (4) Pretty important, and (5) Very important.

The rest of the items were preceded by the following statement; “How much do agree or disagree with the following things about your friends?” and the response options were: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither agree nor disagree, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree.

VAR NAME	Item	Range	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
Positivity toward Friends					
F7	How important are your friends to you?	1-5	4.05	4	.73
F10	They (my friends) care about me.	1-5	4.29	4	.68
F14	My friends make me feel good about myself.	1-5	4.20	4	.70
F25	I feel comfortable talking with my friends when I have a problem.	1-5	3.91	4	1.01
Negativity toward Friends					
fdiss (F12)	My friends are often disappointed in me.	1-5	4.19	4	.80
fwish (F13)	My friends seem to wish I were a different type of person.	1-5	4.36	4	.76
fwatch (F22)	Sometimes I feel I need to watch what I say to my friends.	1-5	3.56	4	1.17
fsay (F23)	Sometimes I don't know quite what to say to my friends.	1-5	3.53	4	1.08
ftalk (F24)	Sometimes I find it hard to talk about my feelings with my friends.	1-5	3.63	4	1.12

Influential Capacity of Friends/Peer Pressure

The response options were: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither agree nor disagree, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree.

“How much do agree or disagree with the following things about your friends?”

VAR NAME	Item	Range	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
Indirect Peer Pressure					
F15	I sometimes do things because my friends are doing them.	1-5	2.49	2	1.08
F16	I sometimes do things because I don't want to lose the respect of my friends.	1-5	2.33	2	1.05
F18	My friends often influence what I do.	1-5	2.68	3	1.09
Direct Peer Pressure					
F17	My friends often get me into trouble.	1-5	2.08	2	1.04
F20	My friends sometimes try to control what I do.	1-5	1.99	2	.96
F21	My friends sometimes try to change me.	1-5	1.87	2	.90

Frequency of Time Spent with Friends

Response options: (1) not at all, (2) one to two time, (3) three to four times, (4) five or more times.

VAR NAME	Item	Range	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
F26	During the past week how many times did you just hang out with your friends?	1-4	3.11	3	.94
F27	During the past week, how many times did you go to the home of one of your friends?	1-4	2.46	2	1.03
F28	How many times did you talk with your friends on the phone or on email?	1-4	3.25	4	.98
<i>For the below statement, the response options were: (1) Never, (2) Hardly Ever, (3) Sometimes, (4) Often, (5) Very often</i>					
F29	Tell me how often you spend time with your friends on weekends.	1-5	3.86	4	1.11

Emotional Attachment to Parents

The response options were: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neither agree nor disagree, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree.

VAR NAME	Item	Range	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
Positivity toward Parents					
PA4	My parents often ask about what I am doing in school.	1-5	4.14	4	.80
PA5	My parents give me the right amount of affection.	1-5	4.13	4	.78
PA6	My parents trust me.	1-5	3.94	4	.93
PA9	I'm closer to my parents than a lot of kids my age.	1-5	3.45	4	1.14
PA15	I feel close to my parents.	1-5	4.12	4	.85
Negativity toward Parents					
putdown (PA10)	My parents sometimes put me down in front of other people.	1-5	3.91	4	1.04
wishdif (PA11)	My parents seem to wish I were a different type of person.	1-5	4.10	4	1.03
clueless (PA12)	My parents are clueless about a lot of things I do.	1-5	3.40	4	1.20
leavehom (PA13)	Sometimes I want to leave home.	1-5	3.40	4	1.27

Influential Capacity of Parents/Parental Monitoring of Child's Friendships

VAR NAME	Item	Range	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
---------------------	-------------	--------------	-------------	---------------	----------------------

Parental Monitoring of Child's Friends

Response options were: (1) No, (2) Some of them, (3) Most of them, (4) All of them.

PQ93	Have you met your child's friends?	1-4	3.12	3	.65
PQ95	Have you met the parents of your child's friends?	1-4	2.45	2	.74
PQ97	Some parents don't know much about their child's social life, while others may feel they know most everything. Would you say you: 1) Do not know much about your child's social life 2) Know a little 3) Know some things 4) Miss a few things, but know a lot 5) Know most everything	1-5	3.88	4	.80

Response options were: (1) Not at all, (2) A little, (3) Some, (4) A great deal.

PQ94	How much do you know about your child's friends?	1-4	3.25	3	.74
------	--	-----	------	---	-----

Parental Monitoring of Child's Time With Friends

Response options were: (1) Not at all, (2) A little, (3) Some, (4) A great deal.

PQ19	How involved are you in making decisions regarding these areas of your child's life? Friendships.	1-4	2.92	3	.91
------	---	-----	------	---	-----

Response options were: (1) None of the time, (2) Some of the time, (3) Most of the time, (4) All of the time.

PQ47	When my child is away from home, he/she is supposed to let me know where she/he is.	1-4	3.73	4	.59
PQ50	I ask who my child is going out with.	1-4	3.75	4	.56
PQ53	I ask where my child is going.	1-4	3.87	4	.43

Frequency of Time Spent with Parents

The response options were: (1) Never, (2) Hardly Ever, (3) Sometimes, (4) Often, (5)

Very often.

VAR NAME	Item	Range	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
PQ3	In the average month, how often do you: spend time working on a project together with your child?	1-5	3.16	3	.94
PQ27	In the average month, how often do you: spend time in leisure activities with your child away from home?	1-5	3.44	3	.98
PQ28	During the past school year, in a typical school week often did you help your child did homework or other school assignments?	1-5	3.09	3	1.05
PQ29	In an average month, how often do you have private talks with your child?	1-5	3.82	4	.92

Single Mother Household (N = 270; 21%)

VAR NAME	Item	Range	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
singlemo (PA1)	During the past 12 months, who were you living with most of the time? Those respondents answering "mother only and no other adults"	0-1	.21	0	.41

Socioeconomic Status

VAR NAME	Item	Range	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.
lesshs (PQ280)	"How far did you go in school?" Those who indicated responses "less than 12 years" or "1 st -8 th grade" were coded as (1) in <i>Less than High School or GED</i> , all others were coded as (0).	0-1	.13	0	.33
unemploy (PQ281)	Are you employed now? (N/Y)	0-1	.23	0	.42
ltthirty (PQ289)	"Which of the following categories does your income from all wages and salaries last year fall into?" Those earning less than \$30,000 were coded as (1) in <i>Less Than \$30,000 Income</i> and others were coded as (0).	0-1	.64	1	.48
govasst (PQ291)	As an "adult," have you ever received any kind of government or public assistance? (N/Y)	0-1	.52	1	.49

Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000

Data Set: Census 2000 Summary File 1 (SF 1) 100-Percent Data
 Geographic Area: **Lucas County, Ohio**

Subject	Number	Percent
Total population	455,054	100.0
SEX AND AGE		
Male	218,764	48.1
Female	236,290	51.9
Under 5 years	31,180	6.9
5 to 9 years	34,317	7.5
10 to 14 years	34,302	7.5
15 to 19 years	32,771	7.2
20 to 24 years	31,695	7.0
25 to 34 years	63,057	13.9
35 to 44 years	69,454	15.3
45 to 54 years	61,406	13.5
55 to 59 years	20,692	4.5
60 to 64 years	16,739	3.7
65 to 74 years	30,381	6.7
75 to 84 years	21,753	4.8
85 years and over	7,307	1.6
Median age (years)	35.0	(X)
18 years and over	335,573	73.7
Male	157,670	34.6
Female	177,903	39.1
21 years and over	315,838	69.4
62 years and over	69,221	15.2
65 years and over	59,441	13.1
Male	23,295	5.1
Female	36,146	7.9
RACE		
One race	445,212	97.8
White	352,678	77.5
Black or African American	77,268	17.0
American Indian and Alaska Native	1,179	0.3
Asian	5,527	1.2
Asian Indian	1,646	0.4
Chinese	1,526	0.3
Filipino	525	0.1
Japanese	231	0.1
Korean	486	0.1
Vietnamese	381	0.1
Other Asian ¹	732	0.2
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	92	0.0
Native Hawaiian	25	0.0
Guamanian or Chamorro	14	0.0
Samoan	27	0.0
Other Pacific Islander ²	26	0.0
Some other race	8,468	1.9
Two or more races	9,842	2.2

Subject	Number	Percent
<i>Race alone or in combination with one or more other races</i>³		
White	361,106	79.4
Black or African American	81,665	17.9
American Indian and Alaska Native	3,635	0.8
Asian	6,924	1.5
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	245	0.1
Some other race	11,999	2.6
HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE		
Total population	455,054	100.0
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	20,670	4.5
Mexican	15,913	3.5
Puerto Rican	917	0.2
Cuban	235	0.1
Other Hispanic or Latino	3,605	0.8
Not Hispanic or Latino	434,384	95.5
White alone	343,146	75.4
RELATIONSHIP		
Total population	455,054	100.0
In households	446,158	98.0
Householder	182,847	40.2
Spouse	81,807	18.0
Child	138,043	30.3
Own child under 18 years	107,661	23.7
Other relatives	19,334	4.2
Under 18 years	9,058	2.0
Nonrelatives	24,127	5.3
Unmarried partner	11,100	2.4
In group quarters	8,896	2.0
Institutionalized population	4,268	0.9
Noninstitutionalized population	4,628	1.0
HOUSEHOLDS BY TYPE		
Total households	182,847	100.0
Family households (families)	116,330	63.6
With own children under 18 years	56,921	31.1
Married-couple family	81,807	44.7
With own children under 18 years	35,798	19.6
Female householder, no husband present	26,838	14.7
With own children under 18 years	17,002	9.3
Nonfamily households	66,517	36.4
Householder living alone	55,074	30.1
Householder 65 years and over	19,212	10.5
Households with individuals under 18 years	62,383	34.1
Households with individuals 65 years and over	42,309	23.1
Average household size	2.44	(X)
Average family size	3.06	(X)

(X) Not applicable

¹ Other Asian alone, or two or more Asian categories.

² Other Pacific Islander alone, or two or more Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander categories.

³ In combination with one or more other races listed. The six numbers may add to more than the total population and the six percentages may add to more than 100 percent because individuals may report more than one race.

References

- Agnew, Robert. 1991. "The Interactive Effects of Peer Variables on Delinquency." *Criminology* 29(1):47-71.
- Agnew, Robert and David M. Petersen. 1989. "Leisure and Delinquency." *Social Problems* 36(4):332-350.
- Anderson, Elijah. 1978. *A Place on the Corner*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1999. *The Code of the Street*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Armsden, Gay and Mark Greenberg. 1987. "The Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment: Individual Differences and their Relationship to Psychological Well-Being in Adolescence." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 16(5): 427-454.
- Ary, Dennis, Terry Duncan, Susan Duncan, and Hyman Hops. 1999. "Adolescent Problem Behavior: The Influence of Parents and Peers." *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 37:217-230.
- Aseltine, Robert. 1995. "A Reconsideration of Parental and Peer Influences on Adolescent Deviance." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 36(2):103-121.
- Austin, Roy. 1978. "Race, Father-Absence, and Female Delinquency." *Criminology* 15:4879-504.
- Azmitia, Margarita, Angela Ittel, and Charlotte Brenk. 2006. "Latino-Heritage Adolescents' Friendships." Pp. 426-451 in *Peer Relationships in a Cultural Context*, Chen, French, and Schneider (eds.). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Barth, Robert and Bill Kinder. 1988. "A Theoretical Analysis of Sex Differences in Same-Sex Friendships." *Sex Roles* 19(5/6):349-363.
- Bigelow, Brian and John La Gaipa 1995. "The Development of Friendship Values and Choice." Pp. 15-44 in *Friendship and Social Relations in Children*, edited by Foot, Chapman, and Smith. Transaction Publishers: New Brunswick.
- Billy, John and J. Richard Udry. 1985. "Patterns of Adolescent Friendship and Effects on Sexual Behavior." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 48(1):27-41
- Bjerregaard, Beth and Carolyn Smith. 1993. "Gender Differences in Gang Participation, Delinquency, and Substance Abuse." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 9(4):329-355.
- Brown, B. Bradford. 1982. "The Extent and Effects of Peer Pressure Among High School Students: A Retrospective Analysis." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 11(2):121-133.
- Buhrmester, Duane. 1990. "Intimacy of Friendship, Interpersonal Competence, and Adjustment during Preadolescence and Adolescence." *Child Development* 61(4):1101-1111.
- Cauce, Ana Mari. 1986. "Social Networks and Social Competence: Exploring the Effects of Early Adolescent Friendships." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 14(6):607-628.
- Cernkovich, Stephen and Peggy Giordano. 1987. "Family Relationships and Delinquency." *Criminology* 25(2):295-319.

- Chatters, Linda, Robert Taylor, and Rukmalie Jayakody. 1994. "Fictive Kinship Relations in Black Extended Families." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 25:294-312.
- Clasen, Donna Rae and B. Bradford Brown. 1985. "The Multidimensionality of Peer Pressure in Adolescence." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 14(6):451-468.
- Cohen, Douglas and Janet Strayer. 1996. "Empathy in Conduct-Disordered and Comparison Youth." *Developmental Psychology* 32:988-998.
- Collins, W. Andrew, Willard Hartup and Brett Laursen. 1999. *Relationships as Developmental Contexts*. New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Coombs, Robert, Morris Paulson, and Mark Richardson. 1991. "Peer vs. Parental Influence in Substance Use among Hispanic and Anglo Children and Adolescents." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 20(1):73-88.
- Cooper, C. 1999. "Multiple Selves, Multiple Worlds: Cultural Perspectives on Individuality and Connectedness in Adolescent Development." Pp. 25-57 in *Cultural Processes in Child Development. The Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology*, Volume 29. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Díaz-Stevens, Ana María. 1994. "Latino Youth and the Church." Pp. 278-307 in *Hispanic Catholic Culture in the U.S.: Issues and Concerns*, edited by Dolan and Deck. London: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Ellison, Christopher. 1990. "Family Ties, Friendships, and Subjective Well-being among African American Americans." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52:298-310.
- Elliott, Delbert S. 1994. "Serious Violent Offenders: Onset, Developmental Course, and

- Termination—The American Society of Criminology 1993 Presidential Address.”
Criminology 32(1):1–21.
- Elliott, Delbert S., and Suzanne Ageton. 1980. “Reconciling Race and Class Differences in Self-Reported and Official Estimates of Delinquency.” *American Sociological Review* 45(1):95–110.
- Elliott, Delbert, David Huizinga, and Suzanne Ageton. 1985. *Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Elliott, Delbert and Scott Menard. 1996. “Delinquent Friends and Delinquent Behavior.” Pp. 28-67 in *Delinquency and Crime: Current Theories*, edited by Hawkins. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erikson, E. 1968. *Identity, Youth and Crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. 1999. *Crime in the United States 1998*. Uniform Crime Reports. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- Fleisher, Mark and Jessie Krienert. 2004. “Life-Course Events, Social Networks, and the Emergence of Violence among Female Gang Members.” *Journal of Community Psychology* 32:607-622.
- Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development*. Harvard University Press.
- Giordano, Peggy. 1978. “Girls, Guys, and Gangs: The Changing Social Context of Female Delinquency.” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 69:26-132.
- . 2003. “Relationships in Adolescence.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:257-81.

- Giordano, Peggy, Stephen A. Cernkovich, and Alfred DeMaris. 1993. "The Family and Peer Relations of African American Adolescents." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55:277-287.
- Giordano, Peggy, Stephen A. Cernkovich, M. D. Pugh. 1986. "Friendships and Delinquency." *The American Journal of Sociology* 91(5):1170-1202.
- Giordano, Peggy, Monica Longmore, and Wendy Manning. 2001. Toledo Adolescent Relationship Study (TARS): WAVE 1, 2001 [Computer file]. ICPSR04679-v1. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University, Center for Family and Demographic Research [producer], 2006. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2008-01-09.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. 1950. *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: Commonwealth Fund.
- Gottfredson, Michael and Travis Hirschi. 1987. "The Methodological Adequacy of Longitudinal Research in Crime and Delinquency." *Criminology* 25:581-614.
- Gove, Walter and Robert Crutchfield. 1982. "The Family and Juvenile Delinquency." *The Sociological Quarterly* 23:301-319.
- Graham, James and Robert Cohen 1997. "Race and Sex as Factors in Children's Sociometric Ratings of Friendship Choices." *Social Development* 6(3):355-372.
- Granovetter, M. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91:481-510.
- Griesler, Pamela and Denise Kandel. 1998. "Ethnic Differences in Correlates of Adolescent Cigarette Smoking." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 23:167-180.

- Hagan, John, John Simpson, and A. R. Gillis. 1987. "Class in the Household: A Power-Control Theory of Gender and Delinquency." *The American Journal of Sociology* 92(4):788-816.
- Halgunseth, Linda. 2004. "Continuing Research on Latino Families: El Pasado y el Futuro." Pp. 333-351 in *Handbook of Contemporary Families*, edited by Coleman and Ganong. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Hallinan, Maureen and Ruy Teixeira 1987. "Opportunities and Constraints: African American-White Differences in the Formation of Interracial Friendships." *Child Development*, Special Issue on Schools and Development 58(5):1358-1371.
- Hartup, Willard and Nan Stevens. 1999. "Friendships and Adaptation Across the Lifespan." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 8:76-79.
- Haynie, Dana. 2002. "Friendship Networks and Delinquency: The Relative Nature of Peer Delinquency." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 18(2):99-134.
- Haynie, Dana, Peggy Giordano, Monica Longmore, and Wendy Manning. 2005. "Adolescent Romantic Relationships and Delinquency Involvement." *Criminology* 43(1):177-210.
- Haynie, Dana, and D. Osgood. 2005. "Reconsidering Peers and Delinquency: How Do Peers Matter?" *Social Forces* 84(2):1109-1130.
- Haynie, Dana and Danielle Payne. 2006. "Race, Friendship Networks, and Violent Delinquency." *Criminology* 44(4):775-805.
- Heimer, Karen. 1996. "Gender, Interaction, and Delinquency: Testing a Theory of Differential Social Control." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59(1):39-61.

- Heimer, Karen and Stacy Decoster. 1999. "The Gendering of Violent Delinquency." *Criminology* 37(2):277-318.
- Hirschi, Travis. 1969. *The Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hirschi, Travis and Michael Gottfredson. 1983. "Age and the Explanation of Crime." *American Journal of Sociology* 89(3):552-583.
- Hoffman, Eric. 1985. "The Effect of Race-Ratio Composition on the Frequency of Organizational Communication." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 48(2):17-26.
- Johnson, Robert, S. Susan Su, Dean Gerstein, Hee-Choon Shin, and John Hoffman. 1995. "Parental Influences on Deviant Behavior in Early Adolescence: Response Analysis of Age and Gender-Differentiated Effects." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 11(2):167-192.
- Kandel, Denise. 1996. "The Parental and Peer Contexts of Adolescent Deviance: An Algebra of Interpersonal Influences." *Journal of Drug Issues* 26(2):289-316.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." *The American Journal of Sociology* 82(5):965-990.
- Kempf, Kimberly. 1993. "The Empirical Status of Hirschi's Control Theory." Pp. 143-186 in *New Directions in Criminological Theory*, edited by Freda Adler and William S. Laufer. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

- Kruttschnitt, Candace, Rosemary Gartner, and Kathleen Ferraro. 2002. "Women's Involvement in Serious Interpersonal Violence." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 7(6):529-565.
- LaFree, Gary. 1995. "Race and Crime Trends in the United States, 1946–1990." PP 169-193 in *Ethnicity, Race, and Crime: Perspectives Across Time and Place*, ed. Hawkins. Albany, NY: State University of New York
- La Greca, Annette and Nadja Lopez. 1998. "Social Anxiety Among Adolescents: Linkages with Peer Relations and Friendships." *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 26(2): 83-94.
- Laird, Gregory S. Pettit, John E. Bates, Kenneth A. Dodge. 2003. "Parents' Monitoring-Relevant Knowledge and Adolescents' Delinquent Behavior: Evidence of Correlated Developmental Changes and Reciprocal Influences." *Child Development* 74(3):752–768.
- Liebow, E. 1967. *Tally's Corner*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Liu, Xiaoru and Howard Kaplan. 1999. "Explaining the Gender Difference in Adolescent Delinquent Behavior: A Longitudinal Test of Mediating Mechanisms." *Criminology* 37(1):195-215.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E. 1990. "Gender and Relationships: A Developmental Account." *American Psychologist* 45(4):513-520.
- Matsueda, Ross and Karen Heimer. 1987. "Race, Family Structure, and Delinquency: A Test of Differential Association and Social Control Theories." *American Sociological Review* 2:826-840.

- McAdoo, Harriette Pipes. 1983. "Stress and Support Networks of Working Black Single Mothers." in *Black Women Debunking the Myths: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, Center for the Study, Education, and Advancement of Women. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- McCarthy, Bill. 1996. "The Attitudes and Actions of Others: Tutelage and Sutherland's Theory of Differential Association." *British Journal of Criminology* 36(1):135-147.
- McCarthy, Bill and John Hagan. 1995. "Getting into Street Crime: The Structure and Process of Criminal Embeddedness." *Social Science Research* 24(1):63-95.
- McCarthy, Bill, Diane Felmlee and John Hagan. 2004. "Girl Friends are Better: Gender, Friends, and Crime among Street Youth." *Criminology* 42(4):805-836.
- McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James Cook. 2001. "Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 415-444.
- Miller, Jody and Rod Brunson. 2000. "Gender Dynamics in Youth Gangs: A Comparison of Male and Female Accounts." *Justice Quarterly* 17(3):801-830.
- Miller, Paul, and Nancy Eisenberg. 1988. "The Relation of Empathy to Aggressive and Externalizing/Antisocial Behavior." *Psychological Bulletin*, 103:324-344.
- Moore, Joan. 1991. *Going Down to the Barrio*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- , 1994. "The Social Fabric of the Hispanic Community since 1965." Pp. 6-49 in *Hispanic Catholic Culture in the U.S.: Issues and Concerns*, edited by Dolan and Deck. London: University of Notre Dame Press.

- Ohbuchi, Ken-Ichi. 1988. "Arousal of Empathy and Aggression." *Psychologia--An International Journal of Psychology* 31:177-186.
- Osgood, D. Wayne and Amy Anderson. 2004. "Unstructured Socializing and Rates of Delinquency." *Criminology* 42(3):519-549.
- Pabon, Edward. 1998. "Hispanic Adolescent Delinquency and the Family: A Discussion of Sociocultural Influences." *Adolescence* 33(132):941-956.
- Parker, Jennifer and Mark Benson. 2004. "Parent-Adolescent Relations and Adolescent Functioning: Self-Esteem, Substance Abuse, and Delinquency." *Adolescence* 39(155):519-30.
- Pearl, Ruth, Tanis Bryan, and Allen Herzog. 1990. "Resisting or Acquiescing to Peer Pressure to Engage in Misconduct: Adolescents' Expectations of Probable Consequences." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 19(1):43-55.
- Peterson, Dana, Jody Miller, and Finn-Aage Esbensen. 2001. "The Impact of Sex Composition on Gangs and Gang Member Delinquency." *Criminology* 39(2):411-439.
- Petersen, Anne C., Pamela A. Sarigiani, and Robert E. Kennedy. 1991. "Adolescent Depression: Why More Girls?" *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 20(2):247-271.
- Phelan, Patricia, Anne Locke Davidson, and Hanh Cao Yu. 1993. "Students' Multiple Worlds: Navigating the Borders of Family, Peer, and School Cultures." Pp. 52-88 in *Renegotiating Cultural Diversity in American Schools*, edited by Patricia Phelan and Ann Locke Davidson. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Rawlins, William. 1992. *Friendship Matters: Communication, Dialectics, and the Life Course*. New York: Aldine Du Gruyter.
- Rebblon, Cesar. 2002. "Reconsidering the Broken Homes/Delinquency Relationship and Exploring its Mediating Mechanisms." *Criminology* 40(1):103-136.
- Regnerus, Mark. 2002. "Friends' Influence on Adolescent Theft and Minor Delinquency: A Developmental Test of Peer-Reported Effects." *Social Science Research* 31:681-705.
- Riley, David. 1987. "The Link between Teenager Lifestyle and Delinquency." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 3(4):339-354.
- Rosenbaum, Jill Leslie. 1987. "Social Control, Gender and Delinquency: An Analysis of Drug, Property, and Violent Offenders." *Justice Quarterly* 4(1):117-132.
- Rountree, Pamela Wilcox and Barbara Warner. 1999. "Social Ties and Crime: Is the Relationship Gendered?" *Criminology* 37(4):789-813.
- Sampson, Robert and John Laub. 1993. *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Savin-Williams, Ritch and Thomas Berndt. 1990. "Friendship and Peer Relations." Pp. 277-307 in *At the Threshold: The Developing Adolescent*, edited by S. Shirley Feldman and Glen Elliot. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Schonert-Reichl, Kimberly A. 1993. "Empathy and Social Relationships in Adolescents with Behavioral Disorders." *Behavioral Disorders* 18:189-204.
- Shrum, Wesley, Neil H. Cheek, Jr., Sandra MacD. Hunter. 1988. "Friendship in School: Gender and Racial Homophily." *Sociology of Education* 61(4):227-239.

- Simons-Morton, Bruce, Denise Haynie, Aria Crump, Patricia Eitel, and Keith Saylor. 2001. "Peer and Parent Influences on Smoking and Drinking among Early Adolescents." *Health Education & Behavior* 28(1):95-107.
- Smith, Carolyn and Marvin Krohn. 1995. "Delinquency and Family Life Among Male Adolescents: The Role of Ethnicity." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 24(1):69-93.
- Smith, Douglas and Raymond Paternoster 1987. "The Gender Gap in Theories of Deviance: Issues and Evidence." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 24(2):140-172.
- Smith, Paula, Brian Flay, Carl Bell, and Roger Weissberg. 2001. "The Protective Influence of Parents and Peers in Violence Avoidance among African American Youth." *Maternal and Child Health Journal* 5(4):245-252.
- Stack, Carol. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in an African American Community*. New York: Harper Row.
- Steffensmeier, Darrell and Emilie Allan 1996. "Gender and Crime: Toward a Gendered Theory of Violent Offending." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22:459-487.
- Steffensmeier, Darrell, Emilie Allan, Miles Harer, and Cathy Streifel 1989. "Age and the Distribution of Crime." *American Journal of Sociology* 94(4):803-840.
- Steinberg, Laurence. 1987. "Single Parents, Stepparents, and the Susceptibility of Adolescents to Antisocial Peer Pressure." *Child Development* 58:269-275.
- Sutherland, Edwin. 1939. *Principles of Criminology*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.
- . 1955. *Principles of Criminology, 5th Edition*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.

- Taylor, Robert, M. Belinda Tucker, Linda Chatters, and Rukmalie Jayakody. 1997. "Recent Demographic Trends in African American Family Structure." Pp. 14-62 in *Family Life in African American America*, edited by Taylor, Jackson, and Chatters. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2001. *Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000 in Lucas County, Ohio*. Retrieved June 8, 2009 from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTable?_bm=n&_lang=en&qr_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U_DP1&ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&geo_id=05000US39095
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2004. *Table 1. Detailed Living Arrangements of Children by Race, Hispanic Origin and Age: 2004*. Retrieved July 13, 2008, from www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/children.html.
- Valdez, R., B. Nourjah and P. Nourjah. 1988. "Homicide in Southern California, 1966–1985: An Examination Based on Vital Statistics Data." Pp. 85-100 in *Proceedings of Research Conference on Violence and Homicide in Hispanic Communities*, edited by Kraus, Sorenson, and Juarez. Los Angeles, CA: University of California.
- Van Wel, Frits, Hub Linssen, and Ruud Abma. 2000. "The Parental Bond and the Well-Being of Adolescents and Young Adults." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 29(3):307-318.
- Warr, Mark. "Secret Friends: Delinquent Affiliations and Parental Awareness." *Unpublished Manuscript*.
- . 1993. "Parents, Peers and Delinquency." *Social Forces* 72(1):247-264.

- , 2002. *Companions in Crime*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 2005. "Making Delinquent Friends: Adult Supervision and Children's Affiliations."
Criminology 43(1):77-106.
- , 2007. "The Tangled Web: Delinquency, Deception, and Parental Attachment."
Journal of Youth and Adolescence 36:607-622.
- Warr, Mark and Mark Stafford 1991. "The Influence of Delinquent Peers: What they
Think or What they Do?" *Criminology* 29(4):851-866.
- Willie, Charles Vert. 1988. *A New Look at Black Families*. New York: General Hall.
- Worthen, MaryLou Fair. 2000. "The Role of Empathy in Adolescent Friendship."
Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering
61(2-B):1116-1366.
- Youniss, James and Jacqueline Smollar. 1985. *Adolescent Relations with Mothers,
Fathers, and Friends*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

VITA

Meredith Gwynne Fair Worthen was born and raised in Texas. After finishing her work at Berkner High School in Richardson, Texas in May of 2001, she began her collegiate career at The University of Texas at Austin in August of 2001. She received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology from The University of Texas at Austin in May of 2004. She began her graduate career through entering The Graduate School in The Department of Sociology at The University of Texas at Austin in August of 2004. She received her Master's degree in Sociology in May, 2006. She continued through the doctoral program defending her dissertation proposal in August 2008 and finally defending her dissertation in June of 2009.

Permanent Address: mgfworthen@yahoo.com

This dissertation was typed by the author, Meredith Gwynne Fair Worthen.