

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Student Theses

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Spring 6-2020

An Analysis of the Parental Structure and Involvement on Subsequent Delinquency

Bosco Villavicencio Jr

CUNY John Jay College, boscovillavicencio@outlook.com

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/jj_etds/142

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).

Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Student Theses

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Spring 6-2020

An Analysis of the Parental Structure and Involvement on Subsequent Delinquency

Bosco Villavicencio Jr

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at:

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

**An Analysis of the Parental Structure and Involvement on
Subsequent Delinquency**

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Master of Arts in Criminal Justice

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

City University of New York

Bosco Villavicencio

May 7, 2020

Abstract

This thesis examines how parental involvement and family structure relate to the prevalence of juvenile delinquency. To answer the research question, the current study used a large sample of 12th grade youth (n=1,272) from the Monitoring the Future project which includes measures on parental involvement, household structure, academic abilities, and risky behavior and delinquent behavior. The results of this secondary analysis showed a significant association between parental-child involvement measures and the delinquent outcomes examined; drinking, suspension, and skipping school. This study emphasizes the need to consider that the impact of household structure as well as that of a supportive environment provided by parental involvement on youth behavior and delinquency.

Keywords: parental involvement, juvenile delinquency, drinking, secondary data, two-parent household

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my thesis supervisor, Professor Kevin Wolff, who expertly guided me through my graduate thesis education and who continuously shared a spirit of adventure in regard to research. Without his support and persistent help this thesis research project would not have been possible. I would also like to thank Professor Jeff Mellow, director of the Masters of Arts Program, whose excitement for teaching introduced me to the thesis-track that transcended my academic progress.

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Bosco and Lorena Villavicencio, who provided love, support, and motivation despite the sacrifices made to earn and complete the master's program.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| <i>Abstract</i> | 2 |
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | 3 |
| <i>List of Tables</i> | 6 |
| <i>Section #1: Introduction of Research</i> | 7 |
| I. Existing Research on Parental Involvement & Juvenile Delinquency | 8 |
| II. Limitations of the Existing Research | 8 |
| III. Purpose of the Research Study & Research Questions | 9 |
| IV. Research Plan of Analysis | 10 |
| <i>Section #2: Literature Review of the Research</i> | 12 |
| I. Definitional Processes of Juvenile Delinquency..... | 12 |
| II. Theoretical Framework | 13 |
| III. Parental Involvement Structure Measures..... | 16 |
| IV. Parental Involvement Dynamic Measures | 21 |
| <i>Section #3: Methodology</i> | 26 |
| I. Secondary Data Collection Procedure | 26 |
| II. Research Project Variables & Statistical Analysis..... | 27 |
| III. Analysis..... | 30 |
| <i>Section #4: Results</i> | 32 |
| I. Descriptive Statistics | 32 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| II. Chi-Square Results | 35 |
| III. Logistic Regression Results | 38 |
| <i>Section #5: Discussion & Conclusion</i> | <i>42</i> |
| I. Interpretation of Results | 42 |
| II. Current Implications | 44 |
| III. Limitations | 46 |
| IV. Direction of Future Research | 48 |
| <i>Bibliography</i> | <i>51</i> |

List of Tables

| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---------|--------------------------------|------|
| Table 1 | Descriptive Statistics | 32 |
| Table 2 | Chi-Square Statistics | 35 |
| Table 3 | Logistic Regression Statistics | 39 |

Section #1: Introduction of Research

Studies consistently find that parents, guardians, and/or other individuals who youths associate with shape their behavior and social interactions; this finding suggests that parents play an important role in the child's maturation process into adulthood (Fosco, Stormshak, Dishion, & Winter, 2012; Koolae, Lor, Soleimani, & Rahmatizadeh, 2014). Therefore, it comes as no shock that interrelationship between parental involvement and delinquency have been examined in criminological research as a means of preventing delinquency. For instance, according to recent estimates in the United States, 40% of serious violent crime reported to law enforcement was committed by youth under the age of 18 (United States Department of Justice, 2018). However, according to recent estimates, juvenile crime, especially that which is violent in nature, has been occurring at historically low levels, declining by nearly 60% since 2008 (Puzzanchera, 2019). In other words, although there is evidence that juvenile crime rates are declining for violent crimes, such as murder and rape, and misdemeanor crimes, such as substance use, it remains a pervasive problem.

Despite the gradual decrease, juvenile delinquency remains a pervasive issue because there are youths who are drawn to delinquency for a lot of reasons, including the lack of ineffective parental involvement dynamic and structure. Without parental involvement, this significant contribution to juvenile rates would lead to youth recidivism. For instance, Indiana recorded 33.4% of juvenile recidivism rates between 2013 and 2016 which shows a near spike onto the 40% of serious crimes in the U.S for 2016 (Indiana Department of Correction, 2016). Since Indiana is one state alone with significant juvenile recidivism rates, it can be determined that parents in the United States matter in situations where youths who reenter society are likely to engage in delinquent activity again.

I. Existing Research on Parental Involvement & Juvenile Delinquency

Evidence derived from a variety of data sources shows that parents who effectively communicate with their child, supervise their interactions, discipline inappropriate behavior, and place minimal family conflict promotes lower levels of delinquency and higher positive psychological well-being (Davidson & Cardemil, 2009; Rankin & Wells, 1990). Parents who are particularly attached and involved with their child positively impacts the child's academic performance and conscious reflection on who they associate with (e.g. friends) (Omoruyi, 2014). Taken together the literature suggests that parents are an important part in an individual's childhood to control for other measures of subsequent delinquency, such as academic performance, household dynamic and structure, peer associations, and substance use (Omoruyi, 2014; Singh & Kiran, 2014).

II. Limitations of the Existing Research

Extant research showed that effective parental involvement and structure draws youth away from antisocial or delinquent behavior due to a positive social environment and the parent's ability to monitor the whereabouts of their child (Fosco, Stormshak, Dishion, & Winter, 2012; Laird, Criss, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates, 2008). Researchers have collectively used cross-sectional and/or longitudinal data to measures participant responses in one of the following areas of parental involvement and structure studies: broken homes, communication, attachment, and or substance abuse. Furthermore, researchers recommended that secondary data juvenile studies should explore self-report surveys to distinguish the relationship between youth and parent participant responses. (Chung & Steinberg, 2006; Vitulano, Fite, & Rathert, 2010). In other words, by measuring a wide variety of parental involvement measures in a collective analysis we can contribute to the literature devoted to primary risks of delinquency.

Despite methodological recommendations, researchers have yet to broaden the conceptualization and extend investigation into a collective analysis of parental involvement measures. Therefore, this current study differs from other delinquency studies through a close analysis of parental involvement structure and dynamic measures altogether that are likely to predict youths drawn to criminal behavior. An interconnected analysis of broken homes, parental attachment and involvement will capture the significance of parent-child bonds whereby studies often only capture youth or parent responses individually; or studies that only measure one parental involvement variable (Vitulano, Fite, & Rathert, 2010).

III. Purpose of the Research Study & Research Questions

The purpose of this current research study is to closely examine certain parental involvement measures that are risks for youths drawn to delinquent behavior. This quantitative-based study will examine a cross-sectional or longitudinal data set available from the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) database. With a workable and accessible ICPSR dataset, this study will further juvenile research with a close analysis on collected parental involvement measures that may predict delinquency than a single variable measure. Moreover, a multiple interconnected parental involvement variables analysis can determine the risks of academic failure, peer associations, and substance use. The following research questions are posited to meet the objective of the study:

RQ1: What does the broken homes measure imply about the relative impact of parental involvement on subsequent delinquency?

RQ2: What extent does parental involvement measures trigger delinquency outcomes, such as drinking, suspension, and skipping school?

RQ3: In what context does school challenges and risky behavior play a role in identifying parental involvement association with juvenile delinquency?

The current study builds upon existing parental involvement, attachment, and broken homes research through an investigation regarding the association between parental involvement and delinquency. This analysis uses a rich source of data that includes youths who reported delinquent or non-delinquent behavior, the importance of parent involvement measures, substance use, and mental health. First, we examine participant responses to understand the significant impacts of parental involvement measures onto subsequent delinquency. Second, I will examine whether delinquency is an actual result of involvement, communication, attachment, and broken homes individually or altogether. Lastly, this study will control for other variables in the analysis may be related to juvenile delinquency, such as academic failure and peer association.

IV. Research Plan of Analysis

The goal of this study is to advance juvenile research through an analysis of parental involvement measures, such as attachment and communication, and broken homes that draw youths into subsequent delinquent behavior, delinquent associations, or academic failure. Therefore, the current study draws on two criminological theories as a model for explaining the significance of parents and their involvement during youth adolescent period: social bond theory and social learning theory. Social bond and social learning theory are important to assert whether parents provide effective support, supervision, discipline, and environment onto their child's psychological well-being. Following a theoretical framework on the topic, a literature review will be provided to demonstrate the level of knowledge capable for conducting the research study. The literature review will also be accompanied with a methodological section that outlines

the designs, measurements, techniques, and variables to conduct the analysis and reach the objective of the study. To this end, a thorough discussion of the results will be provided to spoon-feed the findings of the project and offer any future recommendations for research on parental involvement and juvenile delinquency.

Section #2: Literature Review of the Research

I. Definitional Processes of Juvenile Delinquency

According to Baba, Ahmad, & Jaafar (2008, p. 2)), “delinquency from a legal perspective refers to any behavior that violates the criminal law, committed by a young person below the age of eighteen”. In other words, juvenile delinquency is an ascribed social and legal status placed onto youths younger than eighteen who committed a crime, offense, or violation of the rule of law and socially approved standards for youths (Alboukordi, Nazari, Nouri, & Sangdeh, 2012; Baba, Ahmad, & Jaafar, 2008). For example, youths are convicted of delinquency for minor crimes such as substance use, like drugs and alcohol, theft, and negligent misdemeanor violations, like truancy (Baba, Ahmad, & Jaafar, 2008). Although, youth crimes may be as serious as adult crimes, yet for this reason juvenile delinquency is a pervasive phenomenon because parents continuously fail to respond at areas where youths are likely drawn to antisocial or delinquent behavior.

The following literature review is presented to focus primarily on the structure and dynamic of parental involvement. First, this literature review will present a theoretical framework that addresses the usefulness of social control theory and social learning theory as a means of understanding the significance of parental involvement on youth delinquency. Second, literature on the structure of parental involvement will consider household and parental conditions that may distant and draw the youths out to engage in delinquency and its associations, such as deviant peers. Lastly, literature on the dynamic of parental involvement will review the important styles of parenting, such as attachment and communication, that could drive parent-child social bond onto a level where youths will develop prosocial behavior.

II. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical background of this literature review focuses on social control theory (Hirschi, 1969), which is referred to the social ties and beliefs as predictors of delinquency, and social learning theory (Bandura & Walters, 1977), which is referred to the intimate social interactions as predictors of delinquency. Decades of social science research have used social control theory and social learning theory to explain the causal relationships between parent-youth involvement on antisocial or delinquent behavior. A lack of parent-child social bonds, for instance, may draw youths onto peer associations and the possibility of conforming into norm-breaking or deviant behavior (Dillon, Pantin, Robbins, & Szapocznik, 2008; Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia, 2010).

i. Social Control Theory

Hirschi's (1969) social control theory is a theoretical foundation of delinquency, whereby researchers speculate that social control theory examines social ties, involvement, commitment, and beliefs as predictors of antisocial or delinquent behavior (Ozbay & Ozcan, 2006; Booth, Farrell, & Varano, 2008). For instance, *attachment* involves parent-child connectivity, such as spending time and doing activities, which can promote positive academic performance and minimize peer associations. Second, *involvement* refers to youth ability to bond with institutions that promote prosocial norms and lowers involvement in delinquent activities and affiliations (Booth, Farrell, & Varano, 2008; Church II, Wharton, & Taylor, 2009). Third, *commitment* indicates whether youths can conform to the prosocial norms that rationalizes their interactions and ability to engage in delinquent behavior (Booth, Farrell, & Varano, 2008). Lastly, *beliefs* depend on youths who can strongly value the institutions that strictly reinforce inappropriate behavior as a means of lowering delinquent (Booth, Farrell, & Varano, 2008; Hill & Pollock,

2015). Therefore, the prongs of social control theory are useful to indicate the extent to which parents can effectively bond, control, and enforce appropriate and conventional norms for youths to avoid delinquency.

In fact, Booth, Farrell, & Varano (2008) examined survey data on high school adolescents (n=1,400) and found parents who are involved in their child's everyday interactions is associated with lower levels of delinquency (Booth, Farrell, & Varano, 2008). Similarly, Church, Wharton, & Taylor (2009) examined a longitudinal survey and found that family stressors (e.g. separated and divorced parents) is a predictor of youths drawn to delinquency due to a lack of parent-child connectedness (Church II, Wharton, & Taylor, 2009; Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia, 2010). Overall, Booth, Farrell, & Varano (2008) and Church, Wharton, & Taylor (2009) contended family cohesion and structure is an important aspect in delinquency because strong parent-child bond can provide positive youth self-image and household structure which may reduce the likelihood of interactions with others than their parents (Booth, Farrell, & Varano, 2008; Church II, Wharton, & Taylor, 2009). However, researchers have speculated that too much parenting involvement can cause the child to further themselves away from their parents (Church II, Wharton, & Taylor, 2009; Ford, 2005).

Institutional religion is another factor researchers have found to which Hill & Pollock (2015) examined a longitudinal survey on reported youths (n=1,725), between the ages of 11 and 17, and found that youths who attended more religious services are likely to avoid substance use. Using Hirschi's (1969) social control theory on attachment beliefs, the authors found that youths who are strong attached to their religious beliefs and institutions may reduce substance use delinquency. Despite the authors focus on religion and substance use, their findings demonstrate the importance of youth conventional attachment to groups and institutions that are likely to

prevent youth antisocial or delinquent behavior. More importantly, their reports contended a significant correlation between youth substance use and deviant peer associations because youths are likely to learn and engage in substance use with their peers (Hill & Pollock, 2015; Winfree II, Mays, & Vigil-Backstrom, 1994). Therefore, substance use is a good measure of delinquency to operationalize the structure and dynamic of parental involvement, and account for a theoretical background on social learning theory whereby youths are likely to learn criminal behavior through social interaction.

ii. Social Learning Theory

Albert Bandura's (1977) social learning theory dictates that antisocial or delinquent behavior is a product of socialization or the interactions and experiences of youths in their social world (Bandura & Walters, 1977). Like Sutherland's differential association theory (Akers & Jensen, 2007), which asserts that criminal behavior is primarily learned through intimate personal groups and association with criminal patterns, Bandura's social learning theory is a process of learning and reinforcing criminal behavior through social interaction (Akers & Jensen, 2007; Bandura & Walters, 1977). Therefore, in the context of the current study, social learning theory focuses on the motivation and drives of the child to engage in in delinquent behavior unfavorable to society (Akers & Jensen, 2007; Bandura & Walters, 1977; Pratt, et al., 2010). This claim is supported by Pratt et al. (2019), through their meta-analysis study, who contended that social learning theory offers different perspectives on delinquency, such as strain theory, rational choice theory, and social bond theory (Pratt, et al., 2010). Therefore, empirical investigators can understand that the social learning of peer associations is a result of disrupted and ineffective parental involvement.

On the other hand, Winfree Jr., Mays, & Vigil-Backstrom (1994) qualitative study on incarcerated youths (n=200), between the ages of 12 and 19, found that youths are likely to differentiate their interactions between parents and peer gangs. For instance, children are likely to respond differently to their parents who reject inappropriate behavior than peer gangs who offer the ability for social support and statuses (Winfree II, Mays, & Vigil-Backstrom, 1994; Laird, Criss, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates, 2008). In addition, Winfree Jr. and colleagues note that youths are concerned with social statuses embedded by their peer gangs to differentiate between actual friends and antisocial gangs who emit deviant behavior (Winfree II, Mays, & Vigil-Backstrom, 1994). The point of their study was to operationalize parental involvement through strictness, supervision or awareness of youth social interactions and the possibility of deviant behavior (Winfree II, Mays, & Vigil-Backstrom, 1994). Overall, both Hirschi and Bandura's theories of social interaction/ties and criminal behavior is useful for a thorough examination of the family structure behind subsequent delinquency in the forthcoming paragraphs.

III. Parental Involvement Structure Measures

Empirical evidence defines family structure as the household conditions that affect youth behavioral and cognitive development, such as the marital status of the parents, income/wealth status, and the relationship that determines how connected parents and their children are. For example, children who live with a single parent may be exposed to the absence of their biological parents due to income struggles. Therefore, family structure is an important area of the current study because children in conflicting households, or broken homes, may feel insecure which may predict the likelihood of delinquent behavior (Hoeve, et al., 2007; Theobald, Farrington, & Piquero, 2013).

i. Broken Homes

Hoeve and colleagues assert that broken homes, measured through single-parent, cohabiting, and other broken households, can demonstrate a lack of parental involvement than two-biological parent households (Hoeve, et al., 2007). Using a European longitudinal study of family characteristics and delinquency with a sample of 856 youths at Pittsburgh, Hoeve et al. (2007) reported that broken homes results in weak parenting bonds and skills that increases delinquency in the long-run because youths will be drawn to peer associations and engage in socially disapproved norms. Although this is an international study, their findings support the idea of households with minimal family conflict and more positive environment promotes a latter for prosocial behavior (Hoeve, et al., 2007; Rebellon, 2002; Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia, 2010).

Existing theoretical and empirical research implies that parent involvement measures and delinquency is influenced by broken homes defined as non-intact, single-parent, or cohabiting households caused by divorce, separation, death, or domestic violence (Magpantay, Malabrigo, Malijan, & Manarin, 2014). For instance, a collection of broken homes research posit cohabitation as children living in households with a biological mother and stepfather, biological father and stepmother, or stepparents (Apel & Kaukinen, 2008; Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia, 2010). Schroeder, Osgood and Oghia (2010) discovered in their New York State longitudinal study that transitional conflict prior to and after the separation of two-parent households are likely to increase the risk of delinquency. Similarly, research found that reported youths (n=35) who lived with separated biological parents are likely to result in truancy and remaining outside for longer periods of time without parents to monitor them (Magpantay, Malabrigo, Malijan, & Manarin, 2014). Therefore, the presence of biological parents is important for emotional support and positive behavioral development. (Magpantay, Malabrigo, Malijan, & Manarin, 2014;

Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia, 2010). However, yet again, researchers do find that the immediate presence of biological parents may drive their child onto peer associations and delinquent behavior (Booth, Farrell, & Varano, 2008; Church II, Wharton, & Taylor, 2009).

Likewise, Esmaeili & Yaacob (2011) reviewed literature on post-parental divorce and delinquency to deduce that the process and transition of parental conflict decreases warmth, communication, and discipline (Esmaeili & Yaacob, 2011). As a result, parental divorce and separation increases the risk of youth behavioral problems and marks the beginning of antisocial or delinquent behavior (Church II, Wharton, & Taylor, 2009; Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia, 2010). Therefore, within certain findings, broken homes are a predictor of delinquency because family structure and dynamics are crucial for youths and parents to live in a healthy and positive environment. Despite the supportive findings, the authors have yet to uncover the extent to which the dynamics of parental involvement are disrupted that could draw the youths outside of their homes.

Another perspective of broken homes research implies that household conflict disturbs the psychological processes of youths, which can cause emotional and mental challenges (Apel & Kaukinen, 2008; Davidson & Cardemil, 2009). Omoruyi (2014) stated, broken homes “may present very serious danger to the emotional personality, and mental adjustment of the young adolescent”. Therefore, both Omoruyi (2014) and Singh & Kiran (2014) found that single parent households or households with parental conflict can affect the child’s personality and cause them to display antisocial behavior (Omoruyi, 2014; Singh & Kiran, 2014). Furthermore, broken households with low socioeconomic statuses (SES), or low-income neighborhoods/households, is significantly associated with academic achievement and the level of parent-child connectedness (Omoruyi, 2014; Singh & Kiran, 2014). In short, children exposed to broken

households are likely to struggle with emotional and cognitive development of appropriate behaviors. Despite the findings, both studies have yet to yield the correlational risks of both broken homes and parental involvement to measure delinquency.

On the other hand, Theobald, Farrington, & Piquero (2013) conducted a quantitative study on cohabitation and youth males (n=411) to contend that disrupted families result in low income, lack of parent-child bond, and low school performance for youths. For instance, Theobald and colleagues found that youths who live in a cohabitating household can cause youth maladjustment and psychological stress due to the absence of the biological parent (Theobald, Farrington, & Piquero, 2013). Similarly, Apel & Kaukinen's (2008) quantitative study on family structure and youth antisocial behavior (n=8,984), between 1980 and 1984, found that non-intact households are associated with higher levels of antisocial behavior due a lack of parent-child bond and financial conflict arise from a single-parent household. Therefore, Apel & Kaukinen (2008) and Theobald, Farrington, & Piquero (2013) contended that two biological parent households are important because parents are likely to remain involved physically and emotionally in their child's life rather than place their attention at the workplace for financial stability.

In regard to Hirschi's (1969) social control theory, Rebellon (2002) and Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia (2010) found that single-parent households and cohabiting households result in lower family involvement and parenting skills, conventional beliefs, and youths drawn to substance use and peer associations (Rebellon, 2002; Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia, 2010). Rebellon's (2002) longitudinal examination on youths (n=1,725) between the ages of 11 and 17 found that divorced/separated parents draws youths to peer associations and may likely increase their risk of delinquent behavior than intact households, or households with minimal family

conflict and biological parents (Rebellon, 2002). Likewise, Schroeder and colleagues examined a longitudinal study of youths (n=1,725) in two-biological parent households to assert that the absence of biological parents lacks the parental ability to monitor their child's surroundings, academic performance, and potentiality of antisocial behavior, such as substance use (Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia, 2010). Despite the longitudinal, conceptualization, and operationalization gaps of broken homes' measures, the overarching goal of their studies is to use Hirschi's (1969) social control theory to explain the significance of parents who can provide a thorough outreach of youth prosocial behavior than the likelihood of subsequent delinquency (Rebellon, 2002; Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia, 2010).

Lastly, Koolaee, Lor, Soleimani, & Rahmantizadeh (2014) measured the relationship between family structure and family qualities between delinquent and non-delinquents in Tehran (Koolaee, Lor, Soleimani, & Rahmatizadeh, 2014). Although the results derived from an international study, the findings did contend, from the parental involvement literature, that parents are an essential role on how a child develops antisocial or delinquent behavior (Fosco, Stormshak, Dishion, & Winter, 2012; Omoruyi, 2014; Singh & Kiran, 2014). Surprisingly, effective parental methods and styles are more important than the structure of the parental household because parents who are simply connected lures the child to household activities and remain present within their parents (Koolaee, Lor, Soleimani, & Rahmatizadeh, 2014). Overall, the current research study will draw on the broken homes' literature collected above to provide a basis of knowledge on the dynamics or abilities of parental involvement on subsequent delinquency.

IV. Parental Involvement Dynamic Measures

Parental dynamic or involvement indicates the ability of parents to monitor, such as being aware of their child's surrounding and who they associate with, supervise, and spend time/activities with their child which can predict the likelihood of antisocial or delinquent behavior and control for academic failure and deviant peer associations (Peterson, Buser, & Westburg, 2010; Baba, Ahmad, & Jaafar, 2008). Family dynamic measures is an important aspect of the current study because parents who are attached, involved, and effectively communicate with their child is associated with lower levels of delinquency because youths may caution the risks of certain deviant activities (Alboukordi, Nazari, Nouri, & Sangdeh, 2012; Davidson & Cardemil, 2009). Peterson and colleagues' quantitative study on youth substance use and parental involvement among 610 minority high school students found that lower levels of parental involvement and self-esteem is associated with higher levels of substance use (Peterson, Buser, & Westburg, 2010). For instance, the authors claim that low socioeconomic status (SES) is associated with risky sexual behavior and substance use, specifically "cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine" (Peterson, Buser, & Westburg, 2010). As a result, SES is a mediating factor for broken homes since parents are likely to focus on their financial struggles more than their ability to stay connected with their children. Therefore, parents who are strongly involved in their child's lives promote higher self-esteem and confidence which can positively affect their academic performance and lower substance use.

i. Attachment/Communication

With reiteration to Hirschi's social control theory on attachment and involvement elements, attachment and communication are two important measures of parental involvement because effective communication and the amount of time parents spend with their children

reduces the risk of delinquency (Rankin & Kern, 1994; Dubas & Gerris, 2002). Furthermore, effective parental involvement may correct the child's behavior and interaction which promotes positive psychological outcomes during the child's maturation process (Davidson & Cardemil, 2009; Dubas & Gerris, 2002; Kerns, Tomich, Aspelmeier, & Contreras, 2000). A cross-sectional and longitudinal study on children at local schools focused on the significance of parent-child relationship attachments as a predecessor of delinquency (Kerns, Tomich, Aspelmeier, & Contreras, 2000). Kerns, Tomich, Aspelmeier, & Contreras (2000) contended that parents who are open to their child and provide consistent support is associated with lower levels of delinquent behavior. Kerns and colleagues claim that parents who serve as an attachment figure are likely to be responsive and supportive to the child than making them feel rejected (Kerns, Tomich, Aspelmeier, & Contreras, 2000).

On a different perspective of youths, Davidson & Cardemil (2009) contended that healthy family relationships are associated with lower levels of delinquency. Their survey study of early childhood, parental involvement, and delinquency focused on Latino children (n=40) between 10 and 14 years and their parents (Davidson & Cardemil, 2009). Davidson & Cardemil (2009) reported that parents who were well invested in their lives from the get-go reported are associated with lower levels of risky behavior. Simply put, parents who are invested in their children are likely to correct what is inappropriate in the conventional society and allow them to feel important and supported (Davidson & Cardemil, 2009). Therefore, parental involvement allows children to understand the value of attachment with their parents (Davidson & Cardemil, 2009; Magpantay, Malabrigo, Malijan, & Manarin, 2014). Despite the supportive findings, the authors' failed to generalize their sample of Latino children to the representative population of children.

On the other hand, a longitudinal study on Dutch parents and their adolescent children reported that parents who spend time doing an activity, whether it be going outside or watching TV, is associated with lower levels of peer associations. Dubas & Gerris (2002) found that regardless of cultural specifics, parents who spend twenty hours a week with their child can reduce household conflict and maintain closeness, which can yield their child's ability to interact with others outside of their family structure. Surprisingly, the author's found that parents spend less time on activities and more on TV as their children get older. Therefore, it is important for parents to stay attached to their child to avoid the risk of later onset of antisocial behavior because scholars contended that adolescents are likely to increase their distance from parents during the pubertal stages; which promotes a likelihood of delinquent behavior (Laird, Criss, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates, 2008; Dubas & Gerris, 2002). Despite the supportive findings, Dubas & Gerris (2002) have yet to add a causal analysis of the structure and dynamic parental involvement risks that influences delinquency.

Another emerging perspective in the parental attachment literature implies that parent monitoring is a predictor of youth substance use. Pokhrel, Unger, Wagner, Ritt-Olson, & Sussman (2008) used a longitudinal survey of Los Angeles ninth grade students (n=2,418) that reported the significance of parent-child communication and youth substance use. Similarly, Tobler & Komro (2010) used a longitudinal study of Illinois' six through eight grade students (n=5,812) that reported alcohol use and parental support. Both Pokhrel, Unger, Wagner, Ritt-Olsen, & Sussman (2008) and Tobler & Homro (2010) found that decreasing family structure and relationships is associated with the increase risk of youth substance use (Pokhrel, Unger, Wagner, Ritt-Olson, & Sussman, 2008; Tobler & Komro, 2010). Therefore, scholar speculate that the quality of parent-child communication and connectedness may have an advantageous

positive effect on preventing youth substance use and delinquency altogether (Hoeve, et al., 2007; Kerns, Tomich, Aspelmeier, & Contreras, 2000; Pokhrel, Unger, Wagner, Ritt-Olson, & Sussman, 2008; Tobler & Komro, 2010). Despite the supportive findings, both studies left significance gaps in the literature on household conflict measures and substance use.

In view of parental attachment literature in so far, other longitudinal studies on parental communication have reported the significance of parent monitoring as a predictor of youths who increasingly associate with peers over time. Laird and colleagues examined longitudinal data on a sample of 504 youths between kindergarten and adulthood to measure parents who are aware and supervise their child's interactions with antisocial peers (Laird, Criss, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates, 2008). Laird, Criss, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates (2008) reported that parents who are less aware of their child's interactions increases adolescent risk of engaging in deviant peer activities, such as substance use and truancy. Parents who consistently monitor their child's interactions outside of the house increases the child's ability to reflect and differentiate their interactions with peers who may possibly engage in delinquency. (Laird, Criss, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates, 2008; Fosco, Stormshak, Dishion, & Winter, 2012). Overall, parent-child communication is an important function to control and prevent youths from associating with deviant peers and the possibility of learning antisocial behavior. However, Laird & colleagues did not uncover structural parental measures that can conceptualize the notion of peer associations and delinquency.

Finally, a more recent study by Fosco and colleagues notes that parents who are connected with their child through proper supervision and doing activities together is associated with lower levels of antisocial or delinquent behavior (Fosco, Stormshak, Dishion, & Winter, 2012). Although their longitudinal study reiterates the causal relationships implied in parental attachment literature, empirical evidence has found that youths who live in single-parent,

cohabitation, or “broken homes” households promotes a higher risk of youth antisocial behavior (Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia, 2010; Rebellon, 2002). Therefore, Fosco, Stormshak, Dishion, & Winter (2012) found the following: a) parental monitoring is a significant predictor for awareness of youth antisocial behavior, substance use, and deviant peer associations; and b) parental structure is an essential role for proper adolescent development against risky or problematic behavior. For this important reason, a mixture of parental broken homes and involvement measures are significant for the current study and the ability to provide an empirical analysis to control for subsequent delinquency.

Section #3: Methodology

The current research study is a quantitative study that statistically examines subsequent delinquency by using a secondary data analysis approach. The secondary analysis approach focuses on an existing public accessible survey data that contains the independent variable, parental involvement, and the dependent variable, juvenile delinquency, and its related outcomes (e.g. drinking, suspension, and truancy). Utilizing a readily available survey dataset is a standard and efficient methodological approach for criminal justice quantitative studies because it is both time-saving and manageable without as many privacy and confidentiality considerations. More importantly, utilizing secondary data helps draw gaps and deficiencies on primary data to determine what additional information needs to be collected. Therefore, the secondary analysis approach allows me to statistically address the association between parental involvement and subsequent delinquency, which is the goal of the current project.

I. Secondary Data Collection Procedure

This research project disseminates the secondary data analysis using the following youth survey: “Monitoring the Future: A Continuing Study of American Youth (12th-Grade Survey), 2017 (ICPSR 37182)” (Miech, Johnston, Bachman, O'Malley, & Schulenberg, 2017). This is an existing cross-sectional survey that is publicly accessible by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) and was conducted by the University of Michigan survey research center. The purpose of this survey study was to use a survey questionnaire methodology on sample of 12th grade American youths (n=13,000) to explore changes in American youth behaviors and lifestyles; primarily focusing on drug and substance use (Miech, Johnston, Bachman, O'Malley, & Schulenberg, 2017).

The *monitoring the future* survey is distributed onto seven different data forms. Some of the topics these data forms explore are race, sex, drug and substance use, academic abilities, youth and their peers, and youth and parent bonds. However, one of these seven data forms relate to the variables of interest which are parental involvement and subsequent delinquency. For example, Miech, Johnston, Bachman, O'Malley, & Schulenberg (2017) selected a subsample of youth participants that relate to their study of drug and substance use, and youth social life outside of the household. Like Miech and colleagues, this study uses a subsample of youths (n=1,272) from one of the survey forms that relate to alcohol use, household and parent bonds, academic behavior, and risky behavior (e.g. hanging out with friends). Hence, data on complete cases (n=1,272) were used to assess the hypotheses put forward in this thesis project.

II. Research Project Variables & Statistical Analysis

i. Demographic Variables

The current study contains two demographic variables to identify the characteristics of the youth subsample: "race" and "sex". "Race" is a survey variable that is categorized onto three different racial groups: "white", "black", and "Hispanic". Each of the categories are coded "0/1" to indicate which of the youth respondents reported one of the race categories, with white representing the base outcome in the multivariate analysis. Similarly, "sex" is a survey variable that is categorized based on the code "0/1". This measure was changed to "male" measure which is coded "1" for youths who reported they are males and "0" for youths who reported they are not males (i.e. they are females). It is important to note that because all respondents were in the 12th grade at the time they were surveyed, age was not used as a potential covariate due to lack of variation.

ii. Independent Variables

The current study employs two primary independent variables to identify the association between parental involvement and subsequent delinquency: “parental involvement” and “living with both parents”. “Living with both parents” is a measure that is operationalized from the broken homes context, which involves the household condition that does not conform to the nuclear family. In other words, “living with both parents” indicates youths live with both their parents, and caretakers, present in the household. Such measure was coded “Both Parents” which is the combination of two survey variables: fathers who are present in the household and mothers who are present in the household. To identify the influence of “both parents” and juvenile delinquency outcomes, the variable was coded with “1” and “0”. Code “1” represents both of a youth’s parents lived with the youth. However, code “0” represent only one of a youth’s parents lived with the youth or the possibility of a combination that involves caretakers that was similarly coded with the measure.

“Parental involvement” is operationalized through parental attachment and supervision context on adolescents. In other words, the “parental involvement” measure can statistically identify the association between parental bonds and subsequent delinquency (e.g. drinking, suspension, and truancy). In addition, this association can also measure other risky behavior of delinquency, such as youth going out with friends or partying. A new variable was created, called “Parental Involvement”, which captures parental involvement by summing the scores of 5 variables (all scored 1-5): parents who check homework, parents who help homework, parents who assign chores, parents who limit TV use, and parents who limit going outside. Prior to the summation, all 5 variables were originally coded “0/1” that indicates the “yes/no” influence of the variables individually. For instance, the survey variable “limiting the child from going out

with friends” may explain the likelihood that controlling youth engagement outside the household would reduce risky behavior. Hence, the new result measure is ranged from “1” which indicates low parental involvement and “5” which indicates high parental involvement.

iii. Control Variables

The current study applies two control measures as predictors of subsequent delinquency: “school challenges” and “risky behavior”. “School challenges” is a measure created by the summation of two survey variables: “fail an assignment” and “attended summer school”. Such measure is an ordinal variable (i.e. 0,1,2) because there is no categorical frequency that reports whether youths face school challenges. In other words, “school challenges” is a measure that collects youth reports of the survey variables together. In a similar vein, “risky behavior” is a measure created by the summation of two survey variables: “go out with friends” and “going out to parties or nightclubs”. Such measure is also an ordinal variable, coded “0” for youth who did not participate in either of the risky activities, “1” for those who participated in one and “2” for those that reported participating in both. Overall, the purpose of these *control variables* is to account for other youth-specific characteristics which may contribute to delinquent behavior in order to isolate the effect of the parental involvement variables.

Four Year/Grad School. Youth from the survey data were asked whether they would “attend a four-year college” or “attend graduate school”. Both these survey variables were originally coded “0/1”. However, for the current study, both the survey variables were summed and operationalized into “Four Year/Grad School” measure. The purpose of this categorical measure is to determine the association between school challenges and delinquency outcomes. For example, this measure is coded “0” for youth without the intention of attending a four year college and/or graduate school, “1” for youth with the intention of attending a four year college

or graduate school (assuming they would see a four year college first), and “2” for youth with the intention of attending both a four year college and graduate school.

iv. Dependent variables

The primary dependent variable, juvenile delinquency, is operationalized in the presence or absence of its outcomes. The outcomes of juvenile delinquency, measured in the survey data, involve the following variables: “drinking”, “suspension”, and “skipping school”. The purpose of these three measures is to indicate where juvenile delinquency may occur if nuclear family, parental involvement, and school challenge measures are compromised. In other words, juvenile delinquency can be identified when it is determined that the independent variables and measures have a significant effect on one of the three outcome measures. The “drinking” measure was coded “1” for youths who reported that they had drink alcohol in the past and was also coded “0” for youths who reported that they did not drink alcohol in the past. Similarly, the “suspension” measure was coded “1” for youths who were suspended prior to participating in the survey and was also coded “0” for youths who reported that they were not suspended prior to participating in the survey. Moreover, “skipping school” was coded “1” for youths who skipped classes in high school, and “0” was coded for youths who did not skip classes in high school.

III. Analysis

Prior to employing the quantitative analysis on the youth survey data, it was determined that the independent and dependent variables of this research study are of a categorical and nominal nature. For instance, “living with both parents” measure is categorical because it determines youth reports of the broken homes context or the standards that does not meet the nuclear home criteria. Similarly, “parental involvement” measure is also categorical because parent bonds are distributed in different levels that determine the likelihood of youth risky and

delinquent behavior. On the other hand, the dependent variables of juvenile delinquency are categorical because substance use, truancy, and academic failure are groups distributed from the overall dependent variable of juvenile delinquency. Hence, the above measures and variables provide proper statistical tests to investigate the association between parental involvement and subsequent delinquency.

Based on the categorical nature of the independent and dependent variables, it is determined that a multivariate logistic regression and chi-square analysis are the proper tests to examine the statistical association between parental involvement and juvenile delinquency. This study will administer these statistical analyses using the IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 software. SPSS version 25 is an accessible and integral software tool to conduct the multivariate and chi-square analysis. A multivariate logistic regression test would demonstrate a prediction of the independent variables individually towards each dependent variable to uncover which measures are a higher risk of subsequent delinquency. On other hand, a chi-square test would analyze the relationship between categorical variables of parental involvement and juvenile delinquency to determine the risks with one another. Simply put, both statistical tests would help research the intended objective of this research study in identifying parental involvement on subsequent delinquency.

Section #4: Results

I. Descriptive Statistics

Regarding the *Monitoring the Future* youth survey (n=13,000), the current study conducted its statistical test using a sample of youths that focused on the independent and dependent variables related to the study (n=1,272). In other words, the results of the study focused on a subsample of youths who relate to variables of interest and juvenile delinquency: drinking, household conditions, and other risky behavior on subsequent delinquency (Patrick, Terry-McElrath, Evan-Polce, & Schulenberg, 2020). It is important to consider that the variables with more than two categories should not be collapsed together because there are very different relationships between the independent variables the three dependent variables explored.

Based on the survey data and measures, the results of the outcomes are distributed between the following: “drinking”, “suspension”, and “skipping school”. Based on Table #1’s “drinking” measure, youths who reported using alcohol was 29% (n=369) vs 71% of youths who reported that they did not use alcohol (n=903). The “suspension” measure report youths who were suspended is 17.6% (n=224) vs 82.4% youths who were not suspended (n=1,048). In addition, the “skipping school” measure indicate that 21.2% of youths reported skipping school (n=270) vs 78.8% of youths who reported that they did not skip school in the past (n=1,048).

Table #1 displays the independent and focal measures of the current study, such as “living with both parents” and “parental involvement”. For the “living with both parents” measure, 67.3% youths reported that they live with both their parents (n=856) vs 32.7% youths who reported that they do not live in a household with both the parents (n=416). For the “parental involvement” measure, the summation of survey data variables reported that parents assign chores, help with homework, and limit activities outside of the household ($M=2.24$;

$SD=1.30$). For example, on average, youth reported that their parents are involved in just 2 of these activities, although this number ranged from 1-5. On the other hand, table #1 depicts three demographic distributions with regards to race, such as whites, blacks, and Hispanics. In terms of race, the analysis sample was comprised of 57.9% white ($n=736$), 13.4% Black ($n=171$), and 14.9% Hispanic ($n=190$). Furthermore, in terms of sex, the analysis sample was also comprised of 46.8% males ($n=595$) and 53.2% females ($n=677$).

| Table 1: Descriptive Statistics (n=1,272) | | |
|--|------|------|
| | N | % |
| Used Alcohol | | |
| No | 903 | 71.0 |
| Yes | 369 | 29.0 |
| Suspension | | |
| No | 1048 | 82.4 |
| Yes | 224 | 17.6 |
| Skipped School | | |
| No | 1002 | 78.8 |
| Yes | 270 | 21.2 |
| Living with both parents | | |
| No | 416 | 32.7 |
| Yes | 856 | 67.3 |
| Race | | |
| White | 736 | 57.9 |
| Black | 171 | 13.4 |
| Hispanic | 190 | 14.9 |
| Sex | | |
| Males | 595 | 46.8 |
| Females | 677 | 53.2 |
| Earn Money From Other Sources | | |
| No | 781 | 61.4 |
| Yes | 491 | 38.6 |
| Four Year/Grad School | | |
| 0 (No Intention of Attending) | 176 | 13.8 |
| 1 (Intend on Attending One) | 412 | 32.4 |
| 2 (Intend on Attending Both) | 684 | 53.8 |
| | Mean | SD |
| Parental Involvement | 2.2 | 1.29 |
| Risky Behavior | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| School Challenges | 0.6 | 0.75 |

II. Chi-Square Results

A chi-square statistical test was employed to measure the relationship between two categorical variables, such as the independent variable of parental involvement and the dependent variable of subsequent delinquency. This bivariate analysis displays three different independent variable tests with three outcomes: drinking, suspension, and skipping school. Therefore, please refer to Table #2 which is incorporated at the end of the discussion regarding the outcomes of the chi-square test.

Drinking. “OUTCOME 1 (Drinking)” model demonstrates a chi-square test employed for the independent variable, *living with both parents*, and the focal variable, *parental involvement*, on the dependent and outcome variable, *drinking*. The p-value chi-square test statistic for *living with both parents* and *drinking* is not statistically significant ($x^2 = .559$, $p > .05$). The chi-square results of the first model in Table #2 indicate that youth living with both parents are not significantly less likely to report that they drink alcohol more than when they are not living with both parents. Specifically, 29.7% of youth living with both parents reported using alcohol, whereas 27.6% of youth not living with both parents did, this small difference was not statistically different from zero. Regarding parental involvement ($x^2 = 14.63$; $p < .05$), youths who are exposed to higher levels of parental involvement (coded “5”) are 15.10% significantly less likely to report drinking alcohol than youths who are exposed to lower levels of parental involvement (coded “1”) (19.70% vs 34.80%), this difference was statistically significant.

Suspension. “OUTCOME 2 (Suspension)” model demonstrates a chi-square test employed for the independent variable, *living with both parents*, and the focal variable, *parental involvement*, on the dependent and outcome variable, *suspension*. The p-value chi-square test statistic for *living with both parents* and *skip school* is statistically significant ($x^2 = 40.867$, $p <$

.05). The chi-square results of the second model in Table #2 indicate that youth living with both parents are less likely to be suspended than those living without both parents. Specifically, 12.90% of youth living with both parents reported that they had been suspended, whereas 27.40% of youth not living with both parents reported being suspended. Regarding parental involvement ($\chi^2 = 3.791$; $p > .05$), there is no significant relationship between youths who are exposed to low, moderate, and high levels of involvement and their likelihood of suspension. In other words, there is a 0.90% change in suspension rates between youths who are exposed to higher levels of parental involvement (coded “5”) and youths who are exposed to lower levels of parental involvement (coded “1”) (16.70% vs 17.60%).

Skip School. “OUTCOME 3 (Skip School)” model demonstrates a chi-square test employed for the independent variable, *living with both parents*, and the focal variable, *parental involvement*, on the dependent and outcome variable, *skip school*. The p-value chi-square test statistic for *living with both parents* and *skip school* was statistically significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2 = 10.058$, $p < .05$). The chi-square results of the third model in Table #2 indicate that youth living with both parents are less likely to skip school than those youth living without both parents. Specifically, 18.70% of youth living with both parents reported that they skipped school and 26.40% of youth not living with both parents skipped school. Regarding parental involvement ($\chi^2 = 24.727$; $p < .05$), youths who are exposed to higher levels of parental involvement (coded “5”) are 10.50% significantly less likely to report skipping school than youths who are exposed to lower levels of parental involvement (coded “1”) (18.20% vs 28.70%).

| Table 2: Chi-Square Results | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| OUTCOME 1 (Drinking) | | | |
| | Did not Drink | Drank | χ^2 (p-value) |
| Living with Both Parents | | | |
| No | 72.40% | 27.60% | .559 (.454) |
| Yes | 70.30% | 29.70% | |
| Parental Involvement | | | |
| 1 (Low) | 65.20% | 34.80% | 14.628 (.012) |
| 2 | 69.40% | 30.60% | |
| 3 (Moderate) | 75.60% | 24.40% | |
| 4 | 76.40% | 23.60% | |
| 5 (High) | 80.30% | 19.70% | |
| OUTCOME 2 (Suspension) | | | |
| | Never Suspended | Were Suspended | χ^2 (p-value) |
| Living with Both Parents | | | |
| No | 72.60% | 27.40% | 40.867 (.000) |
| Yes | 87.10% | 12.90% | |
| Parental Involvement | | | |
| 1 (Low) | 82.40% | 17.60% | 3.791 (.580) |
| 2 | 82.80% | 17.20% | |
| 3 (Moderate) | 83.80% | 16.20% | |
| 4 | 77.10% | 22.90% | |
| 5 (High) | 83.30% | 16.70% | |
| OUTCOME 3 (Skip School) | | | |
| | Did Not Skip School | Skipped School | χ^2 (p-value) |
| Living with Both Parents | | | |
| No | 73.60% | 26.40% | 10.058 (.002) |
| Yes | 81.30% | 18.70% | |
| Parental Involvement | | | |
| 1 (Low) | 71.30% | 28.70% | 24.727 (.000) |
| 2 | 79.00% | 21.00% | |
| 3 (Moderate) | 83.80% | 16.20% | |
| 4 | 86.60% | 13.40% | |
| 5 (High) | 81.80% | 18.20% | |

III. Logistic Regression Results

A multivariate / logistic regression statistical test was employed to measure the relationship between the independent, focal, demographic, and control variables (living with both parents, parental involvement, risky behavior, school challenges, sex, black, Hispanic, will attend a 4 year college or graduate school, earn money from other sources) on the dependent and outcome variables (drinking, suspension, skipped school). Please refer to Table #3 which is incorporated at the end of the discussion regarding the outcomes of the logistic regression test.

Drinking. The “OUTCOME 1 (Drinking)” section of Table 3 displays the results of the regression test with the independent, focal, and control variables, and one of the outcome variables explored, drinking. There were a number of significant relationships observed between the included independent variables and drinking noted by the asterisk (*): parental involvement, risky behavior, school challenges, Black, and Hispanic. In addition, the *Nagelkerke R-Square* reports that the independent variables in the logistic regression model together account for 19.2 percent of the explanation for why students drink or not. Results of the first model suggested that parental involvement was significantly related to the probability of youth alcohol use net of other predictors included. Specifically, for each unit increase in the parental involvement measure, the chances that youth reported having drunk alcohol was reduced by 18% (OR =0.820 $p < .05$). The other focal measure, living with both parents, was not significantly related to the first outcome of interest, however a number of the controls were. For example, Black (OR =0.605; $p < .05$) and Hispanic (OR =0.454; $p < .05$) youth were both significantly less likely to have reported drinking alcohol, whereas youth who reported engaging in other risky behaviors such as going out at night were more likely to have used alcohol (OR =2.945; $p < .05$). Similarly, youth who reported

school challenges such as failing an assignment or going to summer school were nearly 1.25 times more likely to have used alcohol as well (OR =1.248; $p < .05$).

Suspension. The “OUTCOME 2 (Suspension)” portion of the table displays the results of a logistic regression model which included the independent, focal, and control variables, and the second outcome variable explored which was suspension. There are five statistically significant relationships between the row variables and drinking noted by the asterisk (*): living with both parents, school challenges, sex, black, and will attend 4-year college or graduate. In addition, the *Nagelkerke R-Square* reports that the independent variables in the logistic regression model together account for 19.9 percent of the explanation for student suspension. Results of the second model suggested that living with both parents was significantly related to the probability of youth suspension net of other predictors included. Specifically, for each unit increase in the living with both parents measure, the chances that youth reported suspension was reduced by 47% (OR = .535 $p < .05$). The other focal measure, parental involvement, was not significantly related to the second outcome of interest, however many of the controls were. For example, Black (OR =2.684; $p < .05$) and male (OR =2.01; $p < .05$) youth were both significantly more likely to have reported suspension, as well as youth who reported school challenges (OR =1.932; $p < .05$). Similarly, youths who reported that they will attend a 4-year college or graduate school had a significantly lower probability of being suspended (OR =0.747; $p < .05$) net of all other variables included.

Skip School. “OUTCOME 1 (Skip School)” table demonstrates the regression test with the independent, focal, and control variables, and the third and final outcome variable explored. There are five statistically significant relationships between the independent variables included in the model and skipping school noted by the asterisk (*): parental involvement, risky behavior,

school challenges, Hispanic, and will attend 4-year college or graduate school. In addition, the *Nagelkerke R-Square* reports that the independent variables in the logistic regression model together account for 14.5 percent of the explanation of skipping school. Results of the third model suggested that parental involvement was significantly related to the probability of youth skipping school net of other predictors included. Specifically, for each unit increase in the parental involvement measure, the chances that youth reported skipping school was reduced by 20% (OR =.80 $p < .05$). The other focal measure, living with both parents, and control variable, Black, was not significantly related to the third outcome of interest, however many of the controls were. For example, Hispanic youth (OR =2.138; $p < .05$) was significantly more likely to have reported skipping school and youths who reported engaging in risky behavior, such as going out with friends, were more likely to have skipped school (OR =1.876; $p < .05$). Similarly, youth who reported school challenges such as failing an assignment or going to summer school were more likely to have skipped school as well (OR =1.486; $p < .05$). Moreover, youths who reported that they will attend a 4-year college or graduate school were 26% significantly less likely to have reported skipping school (OR =0.742; $p < .05$).

Table 3: Logistic Regression Predicting Adolescent Outcomes (n=1,272)

| | OUTCOME 1 (Drinking) | | |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| | B | OR | p-value |
| Living with Both Parents | 0.76 | 1.079 | 0.618 |
| Parental Involvement | -0.199 | 0.82 | 0.000* |
| Risky Behavior | 1.08 | 2.945 | 0.000* |
| School Challenges | 0.221 | 1.248 | 0.02* |
| Sex | -0.63 | 0.939 | 0.646 |
| Black | -0.502 | 0.605 | 0.025* |
| Hispanic | -0.79 | 0.454 | 0.000* |
| Will Attend 4 Year College or Graduate | 0.142 | 1.152 | 0.152 |
| Earn Money from Other Sources | 0.224 | 1.251 | 0.103 |
| Constant | -1.311 | 0.269 | 0.000* |
| Nagelkerke R-Square | 0.192 | | |
| | OUTCOME 2 (Suspension) | | |
| | B | OR | p-value |
| Living with Both Parents | -0.626 | 0.535 | 0.000* |
| Parental Involvement | 0.088 | 1.092 | 0.154 |
| Risky Behavior | 0.132 | 1.141 | 0.224 |
| School Challenges | 0.659 | 1.932 | 0.000* |
| Sex | 0.698 | 2.01 | 0.000* |
| Black | 0.987 | 2.684 | 0.000* |
| Hispanic | -0.156 | 0.856 | 0.523 |
| Will Attend 4 Year College or Graduate | -0.292 | 0.747 | 0.008* |
| Earn Money from Other Sources | 0.252 | 1.287 | 0.121 |
| Constant | -1.543 | 0.214 | 0.000* |
| Nagelkerke R-Square | 0.199 | | |
| | OUTCOME 3 (Skip School) | | |
| | B | OR | p-value |
| Living with Both Parents | -0.306 | 0.736 | 0.053 |
| Parental Involvement | -0.215 | 0.807 | 0.000* |
| Risky Behavior | 0.629 | 1.876 | 0.000* |
| School Challenges | 0.396 | 1.486 | 0.000* |
| Sex | -0.027 | 0.973 | 0.855 |
| Black | -0.088 | 0.916 | 0.707 |
| Hispanic | 0.76 | 2.138 | 0.000* |
| Will Attend 4 Year College or Graduate | -0.298 | 0.742 | 0.003* |
| Earn Money from Other Sources | 0.279 | 1.321 | 0.06 |
| Constant | -0.895 | 0.409 | 0.000* |
| Nagelkerke R-Square | 0.145 | | |

Section #5: Discussion & Conclusion

The final section of the current study focuses on the interpretation, implications, and limitations of the research process. For instance, a secondary analysis is recommended for a quantitative approach because examining an existing youth survey is a standard and time-saving approach in the criminal justice field. With an existing survey, there is no concern for IRB human subject approval since it is publicly accessible. Hence, refer below for a concluding discussion on the study that identified the research problem with juvenile delinquency.

I. Interpretation of Results

The scope of the research study was statistically examining parental involvement as a predecessor of juvenile delinquency. For example, the study demonstrated the association between parental involvement and parent household structure on delinquency outcomes, such as drinking, suspension, and skipping school. The results indicated that parental involvement had a significant impact on drinking outcomes because youth drinking habits are influenced by highly in-tuned parents who are cautious of their child's behavior. Youth who reported higher levels of parental involvement also reported less drinking or no drinking at all, while lower parental involvement was associated with a higher likelihood of drinking. Therefore, the analysis suggest that parent bonds are a significant influence on the risks of delinquency and drinking. However, in contrary to the hypothesized association, the structural variable, parent household, was not significantly associated with youth alcohol use. Whether or not both parents were present in the household, youth did report drinking habits. This result cautions whether a single parent household can significantly associate with successful parental involvement and the changes in delinquency rates.

In line with the hypothesis, the parental involvement analysis also suggests that higher involvement is associated with lower suspension rates and higher reports of non-suspension. For example, this unexpected result might suggest that parental involvement was too effective for youth to withdraw from getting suspended. Based on similar studies, a more plausible explanation is that too much parental involvement can encourage negative behavior because youth are constrained to the idea of parental supervision. The probabilities of parental involvement reducing suspension rates can be influenced by youth who may be triggered to engage in greater suspension rates. Despite the parental involvement and suspension outcome result, the hypothesis of parental household is supported by youth who live with both parents and its association with lower suspension rates. Youth who live with both their parents can receive enough parent bonds that encourage higher academic abilities.

Similarly, in line with the hypothesis, the parental involvement analysis also suggests that higher involvement is associated with lower suspension rates and higher reports of non-suspension. For example, the results indicated that higher levels of parental involvement influence the probabilities of youth less likely to skip school and youth who do not skip school at all. This outcome can be attributed to the existing notion that parents who pay more attention to youth academic abilities and limit their social life could encourage youth practicality of applying parental norms to the consequences of skipping school. In a similar vein, the hypothesis of parental household is supported by the result that youth who live with both parents was associated with lower skipping school rates. In other words, both parents present in the household was associated with decreases in youth skipping school and contributes to the expectation of the parental involvement measure because it can be assumed that both parents in the household will offer more parent-bond attachment skills.

Lastly, the study also demonstrated the association between school challenges and risky behavior on the outcomes of the dependent variable. The overall focus of these measures was to understand the possibilities of delinquency if school challenges, such as failing an assignment, or risky behavior, such as going outside with friends, were not controlled by parental involvement. Specifically, the analysis confirms a significant change in suspension and skipping school rates which suggest that parents who are not attached and supervise the child can encourage behavior outside of the prosocial character. Hence, the results indicate that parental involvement plays a role in determining whether academic responsibilities and social life influences the rates of delinquent behavior. In this case, the current study applies the results and findings to possible implications that surround the scope of the research study.

II. Current Implications

In the current study, a quantitative analysis was employed on parental involvement and juvenile delinquency which significantly relates to the scholarly work surveyed in the literature review. The findings of this study have several implications for theory and future research on social control theory and social learning theory. First, the results contend that social control theory, which emphasize attachment and involvement measures, is significantly correlated with mitigating delinquent and risky behavior (Booth, Farrell, & Varano, 2008; Hill & Pollock, 2015). For example, the results indicated that effective parent-child bonds can promote prosocial growth that would dissuade youth from delinquent behavior. In addition, the results added that the attachment and involvement measure are significant when parents help their child with academic responsibilities and limit outside social activities.

Second, the results build on existing evidence of social learning theory through the parental supervision perspective that reinforces youth to engage in prosocial social interaction.

For instance, a study by Pratt and colleagues found that the social learning and parental involvement is effective when youth can reflect the parental norms onto their interactions with peers (Pratt, et al., 2010). Moreover, Winfree and colleagues also found that social interaction and youth deviance is associated with parental strictness and supervision (Winfree II, Mays, & Vigil-Backstrom, 1994). Taken together, these findings highlighted that the function of parental involvement is necessary to dissuade youth from delinquent activity. Therefore, the data contributes to a clearer understanding that higher levels of parental involvement, which can mean more supervision and attachment, was associated with lower risks of delinquency and more positive reinforcement.

The study's implications of broken homes focus on the context between weak parental involvement and the structure of youth household. First, the findings build on recent empirical developments relating to single parent households that influence the risks of youth to engage in truancy and extended periods of social life outside of the household (Magpantay, Malabrigo, Malijan, & Manarin, 2014; Schroeder, Osgood, & Oghia, 2010). In other words, single parent households do not provide efficient parental involvement and bond skills that mitigate youth skipping school. However, the results of "drinking" outcome challenges this theory that a nuclear family decreased probabilities of youth drinking habits. Youth reported that with or without a single parent household they are likely to drink. Although, these results should be taken into account when considering the rates of delinquency and risky behavior through parental involvement measures. For example, it can be assumed that delinquency outcome rates will decrease if there are significant reports of higher parental involvement regardless if both parents and/or caretakers are not present in the household. Therefore, the statistical experiment provides

a new insight into the relationship between the structure of the household and parental involvement.

Lastly, the study's implications of attachment were examined through the hypothesis of parental involvement since researchers speculated that parental involvement is distributed between attachment, communication, and supervision. The results build on existing evidence of parents who can provide a supportive environment to the child. For instance, a study by Kerns and colleagues found that parents who provide a supportive environment symbolize attachment responsibilities, such as being opened with their child and provide academic guidance (Kerns, Tomich, Aspelmeier, & Contreras, 2000). The data, therefore, provides a clear understanding that higher levels of involvement reduce suspension and skipping school rates. On the other hand, while previous research has focused on effective communication and supervision skills to mitigate youth interaction with peers, the results of the current study demonstrated that school challenges and risky behavior are measures that should be taken into consideration with delinquency (Dubas & Gerris, 2002; Laird, Criss, Pettit, Dodge, & Bates, 2008). Although these results do not fit into the literature framework, it does provide a new insight on how youth report a greater risk of delinquency based academic abilities and social life which may require more parental attention.

III. Limitations

Before concluding, it is important to illuminate the caveats to the current study on the association between parental involvement and juvenile delinquency. First, the results and models are based on quantitative and secondary analysis studies, which, therefore, is subject to underlying assumptions about parental involvement. For example, the findings can assume that higher levels of parental involvement, which significantly decreased delinquency rates, involves

all the fundamental skills of parenting onto youth. However, existing literature identified that a bombardment of parental involvement can trigger youth to engage in negative behavior than the anticipated notion of mitigating delinquency. Therefore, the estimates of the current study may underestimate the full meaning of parental involvement as in which of the parenting skills proved a more effective influence on dissuading youth from delinquency. In this case, the study did not include a qualitative approach for a much clearer understanding of which parenting skills hone into the parent-child bonds context; rather, a summation of this measure was provided with the simple idea of low to high parental involvement levels.

The second limitation concerns the methodological sample size for statistical measurement of youth respondents. The limitation here is not whether the sample size is too small, but the statistical analysis that was conducted using a subsample of youth participants (n=1,272) from the overall sample size from the *Monitoring the Future* youth survey (n=13,000). For instance, the study used a subsample of youths (n=1,272) that was appropriate and concluded a valid research result that pertain to the parental involvement and delinquency outcome measures. However, in identifying this subsample, there were a considerable amount of “missing cases” or youth who did not respond to the specific survey form of interest. Hence, there had been limited ability to gain access to the appropriate scope of participants who responded to the survey questions. This limits the generalizability of the obtained results to the full population of high-school students.

Similarly, the sample size is also subject to a possible limitation which concerns the methodological design for the quantitative analysis. For example, the current research study used a *Monitoring the Future* youth survey that focused on a cross sectional design approach on 12th grade youth participants. Although the data provided a clearer understanding on parental

involvement literature, the research focus would reach a different explanation of the findings through a longitudinal design approach. In this case, the research problem would be measurable through a change over time that is not constrained by a single report of youth, parental involvement, and delinquency. This data-gathering process would give possibilities to understanding the significance of parental involvement and the changes in delinquency rates between 9th and 12th grade youths involved in the survey study.

The identified limitations have a potential impact on the quality and ability to reach the findings on the research focus. Regardless, this study only furthers the existing literature and certain measures that draw conclusions about the phenomenon they are meant to capture. For instance, the qualitative analysis may potentially uncover an observational perspective of parental involvement that is not measurable with statistics. However, the quantitative approach became a useful and manageable approach for a thesis research project with a projected deadline and a large sample size from an existing survey. Second, the subsample size with missing cases (n=1,272) is sought to be a decent representative size of youth respondents that helped answer the research questions. In addition, a cross-sectional design approach is efficient for analyzing youth surveys because a longitudinal design may not be reliable to uncover the scope of parental involvement where the youth sample size is likely to be compromised throughout high school.

IV. Direction of Future Research

To reiterate, the purpose of this research study was to examine the risks between parental involvement and parent household structure on subsequent delinquent and risky behavior. This quantitative study employed a secondary analysis to statistically test the association of the independent variables, parental involvement and parent household, and the dependent variable, juvenile delinquency. The research process consisted of a statistical test on an existing youth

survey publicly accessible by the Inter-Consortium for Political and Social Science Research. A publicly accessible survey was useful for this thesis project because it is a time-saving and manageable approach for the criminal justice discipline. More importantly, a publicly accessible survey did not require IRB human participant approval or consent on the 12th grade youth sample (n=1,272) since the data was collected with full anonymity and confidentiality. Hence, future researchers may benefit from this study which displayed its strengths of a secondary data approach on youth reports with delinquency.

The key finding of this study is that parental involvement, bonds, and structure of the youth household are risky measures for subsequent delinquency. The results indicated significant associations between parental involvement and subsequent delinquency, which support existing research and theory on social control, attachment, involvement, and commitment with juvenile delinquency. Parents who are simply involved in their child's social life, abilities, and future aspiration would encourage behavior outside of delinquency. On the other hand, the parental household measure is synonymous to broken homes theory of juvenile delinquency because it is an indication of how the context of marriage, divorce, and cohabitation can influence rates of parent bonds and delinquency outcomes. Therefore, both key independent variables successfully supported the research hypothesis and questions, the theoretical and literature framework, and the research processes that reached the discussed findings.

With consideration to the implications and limitations of the current study, future research is needed to establish a more practical recommendation on which of the outcomes (e.g. drinking, suspension, and skipping school) has a greater influence on juvenile delinquency rates. For example, the findings revealed the association with drinking, suspension, and skipping school without consideration to which of the three outcomes are representative of the increase in

delinquency rates. Future work could build on areas that the current research was unable to address by testing which delinquency outcome is closely associated with the changes in parental involvement. This kind of specific data can demonstrate that parental involvement is a significant measure with reducing an outcome that represents the higher rates of delinquent behavior.

Hence, statistically testing the parental involvement measure with the representative outcome of delinquency rates could significantly dissuade youth from engaging in negative behavior. As such, the scope of the research study transcends juvenile delinquency studies through a hypothesis that highlights how the entirety of parent-child bonds play a significant role in delinquency and risky behavior.

Bibliography

- Akers, R. L., & Jensen, G. F. (2007). *Social learning theory and the explanation of crime: A guide for the new century*. New Jersey: Transaction.
- Alboukordi, S., Nazari, A. M., Nouri, R., & Sangdeh, J. K. (2012). Predictive factors for juvenile delinquency: The role of family structure, parental monitoring and delinquent peers. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory*, 770-777.
- Apel, R., & Kaukinen, C. (2008). On the relationship between family structure and antisocial behavior: Parental cohabitation and blended households. *Criminology*, 46(1), 35-70.
- Baba, M., Ahmad, S., & Jaafar, J. R. (2008). Juvenile delinquency: Definition, trends, and government efforts to curb the problem.
- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1977). *Social learning theory* (Vol. I). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Booth, J. A., Farrell, A., & Varano, S. P. (2008). Social control, serious delinquency, and risky behavior. *Crime and Delinquency*, 54(3), 423-456.
- Chung, H. L., & Steinberg, L. (2006). Relations between neighborhood factors, parenting behaviors, peer deviance, and delinquency among serious juvenile offenders. *American Psychological Association*, 319-331.
- Church II, W. T., Wharton, T., & Taylor, J. K. (2009). An examination of differential association and social control theory. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 7(1), 3-15.
- Davidson, T. M., & Cardemil, E. V. (2009). Parent-child communication and parental involvement in latino adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 29(1), 99-121.
- Dillon, F. R., Pantin, H., Robbins, M. S., & Szapocznik, J. (2008). Exploring the role of parental monitoring of peers on the relationship between family functioning and delinquency in

- the lives of african american and hispanic adolescents. *Crime & Delinquency*, 54(1), 65-94.
- Dubas, J. S., & Gerris, J. R. (2002). Longitudinal changes in the time parents spend in activities with their adolescent children as a function of child age, pubertal status, and gender. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16(4), 415-427.
- Esmaeili, N. S., & Yaacob, S. N. (2011). Post-divorce parental conflict and adolescents' delinquency in divorced families. *Asian Culture and History*, 3(2), 34-40.
- Ford, J. A. (2005). Substance use, the social bond, and delinquency. *Sociological Inquiry*, 75(1), 109-128.
- Fosco, G. M., Stormshak, E. A., Dishion, T. J., & Winter, C. E. (2012). Family relationships and parental monitoring during middle school as predictors of early adolescent problem behavior. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 41(2), 202-213.
- Hill, M. C., & Pollock, W. (2015). Was Hirschi right?: A national-level longitudinal examination of religion as a social bond. *Deviant Behavior*, 36, 783-806.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Hoeve, M., Smeenk, W., Loeber, R., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Van de Laan, P. H., Gerris, J. R., & Dubas, J. S. (2007). Long-term effects of parenting and family characteristics on delinquency of male young adults. *European Journal of Criminology*, 4(2), 161-194.
- Indiana Department of Correction. (2016). *Juvenile recidivism rates*. Indiana: Division of Youth Services.
- Kerns, K. A., Tomich, P. L., Aspelmeier, J. E., & Contreras, J. M. (2000). Attachment-based assessments of parent-child relationships in middle childhood. *Developmental Psychology*, 36(5), 614-626.

- Koolae, A. K., Lor, H. S., Soleimani, A. A., & Rahmatizadeh, M. (2014). Comparison between family power structure and the quality of parent-child interaction among the delinquent and non-delinquent adolescents. *International Journal of High Risk Behaviors & Addicton*, 3(2), 1-7.
- Laird, R. D., Criss, M. M., Pettit, G. S., Dodge, K. A., & Bates, J. E. (2008). Parents' monitoring knowledge attenuates the link between antisocial friends and adolescent delinquent behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 36(3), 299-310.
- Magpantay, M. J., Malabrigo, P., Malijan, R. J., & Manarin, M. G. (2014). Behavioral problems and coping strategies of selected adolescents belonging to a broken family. *CAM Research Journal*, 2(1), 112-135.
- Miech, R. A., Johnston, L. D., Bachman, J. G., O'Malley, P. M., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2017). *Monitoring the future: A continuing study of american youth (12th-grade survey)*. Michigan: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Omoruyi, I. V. (2014). Influence of broken homes on academic performance and personality development of the adolescents in lagos state metropolis. *European Journal of Educational and Development Psychology*, 2(2), 10-23.
- Ozbay, O., & Ozcan, Y. Z. (2006). A test of Hirschi's social bonding theory. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 50(6), 711-726.
- Patrick, M. E., Terry-McElrath, Y. M., Evan-Polce, R. J., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2020). Negative alcohol-related consequences experienced by young adults in the past 12 months: Differences by college attendance, living situation, binge drinking, and sex. *Addictive Behaviors*, 105, 1-9.

- Peterson, C. H., Buser, T. J., & Westburg, N. G. (2010). Effect of familial attachment, social support, involvement, and self-esteem on youth substance use and sexual risk taking. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 18(4), 369-376.
- Pokhrel, P., Unger, J. B., Wagner, K. D., Ritt-Olson, A., & Sussman, S. (2008). Effects of parental monitoring, parent-child communication, and parents' expectation of the child's acculturation on the substance use behaviors of urban, hispanic adolescents. *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse*, 7(2), 200-213.
- Pratt, T. C., Cullen, F. T., Sellers, C. S., Winfree Jr, T., Madensen, T. D., Diagle, L. E., . . . Gau, J. M. (2010). The empirical status of social learning theory: A meta-analysis. *Justice Quarterly*, 27(6), 765-802.
- Puzzanchera, C. (2019). *Juvenile arrests, 2017*. Laurel, Maryland: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Rebellon, C. J. (2002). Reconsidering the broken homes/delinquency relationship and exploring its mediating mechanism(s). *Criminology*, 40(1), 103-136.
- Schroeder, R. D., Osgood, A. K., & Oghia, M. J. (2010). Family transitions and juvenile delinquency. *Sociological Inquiry*, 80(4), 579-604.
- Singh, A., & Kiran, U. V. (2014). Effect of single parent family on child delinquency. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 3(9), 866-868.
- Theobald, D., Farrington, D. P., & Piquero, A. R. (2013). Childhood broken homes and adult violence: An analysis of moderators and mediators. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(1), 44-52.

- Tobler, A. L., & Komro, K. A. (2010). Trajectories of parental monitoring and communication and effects on drug use among urban young adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 46*(6), 560-568.
- United States Department of Justice. (2018, October 22). *Juvenile Arrest Rate Trends*. Retrieved from Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention:
https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/crime/JAR_Display.asp?ID=qa05200&selOffenses=1
- Vitulano, M. L., Fite, P. J., & Rathert, J. L. (2010). Delinquent peer influence on childhood delinquency: The moderating effect of impulsivity. *Journal of Psychopathol Behavioral Assessment, 315-322*.
- Winfrey II, J. T., Mays, G. L., & Vigil-Backstrom, T. (1994). Youth gangs and incarcerated delinquents: Exploring the ties between gang membership, delinquency, and social learning theory. *Justice Quarterly, 11*(2), 229-256.