

Parental Influence on Juvenile Delinquency

by

Jayne Corbett

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Science

in the

Criminal Justice Program

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

May, 2019

Parental Influence on Juvenile Delinquency
Jaynee Corbett

I hereby release this thesis to the public. I understand that this thesis will be made available from the OhioLINK ETD Center and the Maag Library Circulation Desk for public access. I also authorize the University or other individuals to make copies of this thesis as needed for scholarly research.

Signature:

Jayne Corbett, Student

Date

Approvals:

Dr. Christopher Bellas, Thesis Advisor

Date

Dr. John Hazy, Committee Member

Date

Dr. Monica Merrill, Committee Member

Date

Dr. Salvatore A. Sanders, Dean of Graduate Studies

Date

Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to provide current research regarding juvenile delinquency and poor parenting, and the demographic factors that contribute to such parenting. There are four hypotheses explored in this thesis:

Hypothesis One: Juveniles that do not receive quality parental supervision are more likely to become delinquent.

Hypothesis Two: Low income families have an increased risk of juvenile delinquency.

Hypothesis Three: The size of the correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting will not depend on the measure of parenting used (quality or supervision).

Hypothesis Four: Race will have an effect on whether a juvenile becoming delinquent.

The theoretical framework selected for this study revolved around Travis Hirschi's 1969 Social Bond Theory particularly for its component of the parent child relationship. The methodology behind this study was a fifty article systematic review inclusive of juvenile delinquency as the dependent variable and parenting as the independent variable, as well as other demographic factors such as race and socioeconomic status to see how those variables are related to juvenile delinquency. The results of this study showed a small connection poor parenting and juvenile delinquency. This thesis also revealed a strong positive relationship between low income families and juvenile delinquency. This thesis did not show a relationship between race and juvenile delinquency.

Acknowledgements

To my Mother and Father,

You constantly reminded me how important my goals and aspirations were. You have shown me to never give up on something you believe in. Thank you for believing in me and all the support you have given me over the years.

To my thesis advisor, Dr. Christopher Bellas,

I could never put into words how thankful I am for you and everything you have done for me to get to this point. You believed that I could do this more than I did at times. I could not have done this without your guidance and patience throughout this process.

To my thesis committee members, Dr. John Hazy and Dr. Monica Merrill,

Both of you have taught me so much over the years. The knowledge you have given me, I will take with me for the rest of my life. Thank you for your time and support.

Finally, to my friends,

Thank you for all the laughs in the times of stress. I could not have made it without you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	7
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	27
Chapter Four: Results.....	32
Chapter Five: Conclusion.....	44
References.....	48
Appendix	
Articles for Systematic Review.....	57

Chapter 1

Introduction

An Overview

In 2017 law enforcement agencies estimated that there were 809,700 arrests made with respect to juveniles under the age of 18 (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention). These arrests accounted for all crimes both violent and property offenses. This number of arrests in 2017 was 59% lower than the number of arrests made in 2008; however it seems that juvenile arrest rates have been making a steady increase since 2013. Statistics showed juvenile arrest rates in 2013 began to rival that of 2008 which is when juvenile arrests were at an all-time high (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention). The majority of arrests in juvenile cases are due to property crimes, namely theft and larceny. The second highest arrest rate was for simple assault (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention). Similar to adults, conviction and arrest rates fluctuate over time. Historically there are periods where arrest rates reach an all-time high and then decrease for a number of years before they begin to increase again. For juveniles, arrest rates may be lower today than in prior years and it is important to understand what elements are contributing to juvenile delinquency. While juvenile delinquency has been tied to a wide variety of demographic factors, ranging from socioeconomic status, education, race and gender, family circumstances are also consistently cited as a cause of juvenile crime across most academic research.

Topic Selection

The choice of juvenile delinquency as a topic for this thesis is due to this researcher's work within the field of criminal justice as a case manager for a lockdown facility in a Northeastern city of Ohio. This researcher deals with adult males that have had criminal careers. Among the duties of this researcher's job is official drug and alcohol assessments (DAT) and the well-known and respected Ohio Risk Assessment System (ORAS) done on each offender to assess likelihood of recidivism, whether or not this offender will be diagnosed with a substance abuse disorder and the offender's willingness to change. Most importantly, these assessments take into account the variables that will be examined during this research. On each assessment, questions about socioeconomic status, education, race, gender and family dynamics are answered by the offender during a face to face interview. Though this research does not use the data gathered from this researcher's career, the reason for choosing the topic of parental effects on juvenile delinquency stems from the anecdotal evidence and experiences this researcher has encountered. With every intake done into the Community-Based Lockdown facility from which this researcher works, the pattern seen in these criminals (experiencing a lack of quality parenting) has become evident. Many offenders assessed for placement in the facility share in common an upbringing that lacked the basic parental supervision afforded to non-delinquent children. These offenders often grew up in households that suffered from a low family income or single parent households as a result of parental incarceration or parental death. Being that neglected children and those who

are exposed to abuse are more likely to be prosecuted for juvenile delinquency (American Society for Positive Care of Children 2015), an overwhelming cyclical pattern of poor parenting and inadequate supervision becomes clear. Offenders now placed into the custody of the state were not given the quality parental involvement as children, and now their children may end up becoming delinquent.

Theoretical Framework

Family structure places a certain amount of responsibility on parents as they are seen to be the primary socializing agents to children from the beginning stages of their development. Parents are expected to provide warmth and protection as well as guidance during their children's upbringing. Consequently, the absence of affection and inadequate supervision has been seen as sources of juvenile delinquency. The theoretical framework behind this research comes from Travis Hirschi's Social Bond Theory, also known as Social Control Theory. Social Bond Theory was created in 1969 and under this theory the belief is socialization and the forming of personal relationships are among the most significant aspects of human development and these relationships are what keep citizens from becoming deviant. In writing this theory Hirschi laid out four basic principles: attachment, commitment, involvement and the value system the individual follows (Hirschi, 1969).

Attachment is the most important element of Social Bond Theory to this present thesis which refers to interpersonal relationships. For example, the earliest and most influential attachment that a person can form is with their parents, who presumably help

us to form an understanding of the world around us. Commitment is similar to attachment in that this phase is assumed to prevent individuals from becoming deviant and it refers to the willingness to adhere to social norms and behaviors (Hirschi, 1969). Under this theory youths with well-defined goals are much less likely to engage in delinquent behavior than those who are not looking towards the future. Involvement is the third of the four elements. Involvement is a juvenile spending a great deal of time doing conventional activities, leaving less time to engage in delinquent behavior. The final element has to do with an individual's values. The more rule-bound one feels, the less likely they are to commit a crime that would violate those rules. Socialization allows all individuals, including deviants, to recognize the importance of one dominant set of values. The difference between deviants and those that do not commit crime, is that even though deviants recognize the same set of values, they do not feel bound by them due to their weakened social bond. This weakened social bond to prosocial activities can be the result of a parent that was not present to properly teach appropriate behaviors (Hirschi, 1969).

Research conducted in this study will focus mainly on the attachment element of this theory. If there is no initial bond formed between the parents and the child in the attachment phase, the remaining three elements to this theory cannot fully form. Without a strong attachment to parents created from discipline and supervision a child is not guided in the proper direction to form commitment to pro social activities, and they lack a strong moral belief system. Research has shown that parental attachment can impact young people's involvement in criminal activities (Henrich et al. 2005) and Social Bond Theory is placed among other sociological theories that focus on the role of familial

bonds as constraints on offending. It is proposed that for young people, a key aspect of social control is found within the family, particularly through interactions with and feelings towards parents. Of the studies that have examined the impact of social control on delinquency, large proportions have found a negative relationship between parental attachment and delinquency. As such, it has been found that the greater the attachment to parents, the lower the likelihood of involvement in delinquent behavior (Brannigan et al., 2002).

The Four Hypotheses

Two of the hypotheses posed in this study relate to Hirschi's attachment concept in his Social Bond Theory, stating without a connection or relationship to parents, a bond is unable to be formed. The lack of a bond to ones parents has been found as a predictor of delinquency (Hirschi, 1969). The remaining two hypotheses relate to demographic factors. The theory that poor parenting can predictor juvenile delinquency, coupled with crime being geographically concentrated in particular neighborhoods and in more localized areas surrounding low income households leads racial and ethnic minorities to be the most effected (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development 2013). The following hypotheses will be tested in this thesis:

Hypothesis One: Juveniles that do not receive quality parental supervision are more likely to become delinquent.

Hypothesis Two: Low income families have an increased risk of juvenile delinquency.

Hypothesis Three: The size of the correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting will not depend on the measure of parenting used (quality or supervision).

Hypothesis Four: Race will have an effect on whether a juvenile becoming delinquent.

Although many criminological theories assume that a link between parenting and delinquency exists, clear conclusions concerning the strength of this link have been difficult to demonstrate. A reason for this difficulty are the studies that vary on the kinds of delinquency as well as parenting dimensions that are investigated, the way correlations and demographic factors are measured, and on the populations from which the samples are taken. The importance of this research lies in the ability to construe the common denominators of prior literature. In a fifty article systematic review of literature, this present study will lay out the primary demographic factors related to juvenile delinquency and parenting. In the next chapter a complete overview of prior literature related to the impact parenting and demographic factors have on juvenile delinquency will be examined.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

An Overview of the Literature on Juvenile Delinquency

More than 70 million Americans, which is roughly 1 in 4, are younger than 18. This age group has increased consistently since the mid-1980s and is projected to continue increasing until at least 2060 (*Juvenile Crime, Juvenile Justice*, 2001). Given the state of this population, it is important to uncover what risk factors can contribute to juveniles choosing a criminal lifestyle. Zigler (1992) concluded the most significant family risk factors for the later onset of delinquency include: poor parental supervision, family members with criminal involvement, low socioeconomic status, large family size, poor housing, and low educational achievement. Since the establishment of the first juvenile court in Cook County, Illinois in 1899, states have recognized that children who commit crime are different from adults; as a class, they are less blameworthy, greatly impacted by their environmental and social surroundings and they have a greater capacity to change from delinquent to conforming individuals. Law makers decided that juveniles are developmentally susceptible to the highest level of influence by the environment and the people around them.

Since then, there have been studies developing theories to explain why juveniles commit crime. For example, Case and Katz (1991) find that a direct relationship exists between delinquency and geographic location. When a juvenile is forced to relocate by their families or respective guardians into a neighborhood where 10% or more of the

youths are involved in crime than their initial neighborhood, researchers found this transition to raise the probability that youth will become involved in crime by 2.3%. Studies of criminal activity by age consistently find that rates of offending begin to rise in early adolescence, where a child is beginning to create a social network outside of the home. Offending tends to then reach a peak in late adolescence where juveniles are now out of the house more and are experiencing more freedom from their parents. Finally the rate of offending decreases in young adulthood where individuals are at a place of heightened maturity (*Juvenile Crime, Juvenile Justice* 2001). Weinberg 2010 finds that the majority of youth who enter the juvenile justice system or child protective services, enter at the peak adolescence phase and have often experienced abuse, neglect, dysfunctional home environments, inconsistent parenting practices or styles, poverty as well as emotional and behavioral disorders. Consistently, researchers have concluded that there is no single path to delinquency and note the presence of several demographic risk factors often increase a youth's chance of offending (Zigler, 1992). This current research is meant to draw attention to the critical effects that parenting and environments have on juvenile delinquency. The existing literature related to juvenile delinquency can be overwhelming. In order to allow the reader a clear picture of prior literature related to juvenile delinquency and its contributing factors, this review will be separated and organized into sections based on the four hypotheses proposed in this research. The hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis One: Juveniles that do not receive quality parental supervision are more likely to become delinquent.

Hypothesis Two: Low income families are more likely to have a juvenile become delinquent.

Hypothesis Three: The size of the correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting will not depend on the measure of parenting used.

Hypothesis Four: Race has an effect on whether a juvenile becomes delinquent.

Hypothesis One: Juveniles that do not receive quality parental supervision are more likely to become delinquent.

Parental supervision has emerged as one of the most researched predictor of adolescent delinquency (Gottfreson and Hirschi 1990). The relationship between parent and child can manifest into the determining factor of a child's behavior. The way children imitate parental behavior, or the neglect from a mother or father can impact their thinking. One of the key components to Travis Hirschi's Social Bond Theory, also known as Social Control Theory was the element of attachment. Attachment is the first of four elements laid out in the theory's attempt to explain juvenile delinquency. The link between deviance and attachment lies within the bond a child has with their parents, school or other prosocial activities. The stronger the positive relationship, the less likely they are to gravitate toward delinquent peers and criminal behaviors. Patacchini and Zenou (2008) tested the role of weak attachments in explaining criminal activities, revealing that weak ties to family and school have a statistically significant and positive effect on both the probability to commit crime and on its level of seriousness. Hirschi has suggested in Social Bond Theory (1969) that attachment to parents, attachment to school,

and attachment to non-deviant peers act as deterrents to delinquent behaviors. To support one of the hypotheses in this research, the argument is as follows; the more often a child is supervised by their parents, the more time they have to build a bond and be taught appropriate, conforming behaviors. There is research that tends to support this argument, such as Elliot and Voss (1974) who find attachment to parents and attachment to school deter youth from being deviant. The strongest links have been found for parental monitoring, psychological control, and negative aspects of support such as rejection and hostility, accounting for up to 11% of the variance in delinquency (Hoeve et. al 2009). An argument can be made that parental supervision and parental attachment are formed together. A parent or guardian that is consistently present in their children's lives in a positive, non-criminal way will open the door for a bond to form over time. The more children see their parents, the more time there is available for parents to instill them with a moral code and a belief system that would improve their decision making when it comes to being involved in delinquent activities.

An essential time in a child's life is time spent with their parents. Social Bond Theory focuses on the attachment that a child has with their parents, suggesting that the weaker the attachment, the more likely crime will occur; this theory runs parallel to one of the hypotheses presented here. Without adequate supervision, the likelihood of attachment decreases. Adequate parental supervision suggests there is time spent together, essentially time for a relationship to be formed. Webber, Miracle and Skehan (1995) used Social Bond Theory and tested this idea across multiple ethnic and racial backgrounds: Caucasian, African American and Hispanic. While conducting this study on eighth grade respondents, the strongest predictors of delinquency in this study were when

there was a weak male caretaker attachment, weak female caretaker supervision, weak female caretaker communication and a low sense of family pride. Poor integration into the family has a positive relationship to juvenile delinquency and poor supervision allowing more time for children to engage in pro-criminal activities with delinquent peers. There have been findings between self-reported delinquent behavior with social control variables such as attachment to parents, supervision of parents, motivation for school, and unconventional attitudes toward delinquent behavior (Junger 1985). Children that receive an increased amount of supervision, decrease the frequency at which crime is committed. Juvenile's ability to commit crime lessens, the more they are supervised. In comparison, juveniles who are permitted to be outside of the house for long periods of time are afforded more time to surround themselves with delinquent peers. The effects of peers on a youth's behavior have been documented as well. Agnew (1991), found the relationship to respondents' own delinquency was considerably stronger for those respondents who were more attached to their peers and who spent more time with them without their parent's supervision.

One consequence that occurs with lack of parental supervision is the time allotted for juveniles to form their identity without parental approval. Weerman's (1994) study tested Hirschi's Social Control Theory's four elements: attachment, commitment, involvement and beliefs against juvenile delinquency. He found among 3,000 juvenile respondents, those with an accumulation of weak conventional bonds and strong relationships with delinquent peers were more often serious delinquents. If social bonding is low, adolescents will shape who they are according to their social circumstances and as a result are more likely to choose a less prosocial and a more delinquent reputation than

those who have stronger conventional ties to their families (Carroll, 1999). Research done by Walker-Barnes and Mason (2001) focused on the effect of parenting, peer relationships and gang involvement. Taking an ethnically diverse sample of juvenile respondents they concluded that parenting across all ethnicities continued to be significant when looking at gang and peer involvement. In the African American community, over other races, researchers found parenting to be principal in lessening gang involvement and poor behavior. To briefly talk about juvenile involvement in gangs it is important to consider that a gang can feel like a family or home to a juvenile. Youth's involvement in gangs can be a result of the lack of a strong family dynamic (Johnstone, 1981). Gang mentality offers juveniles lacking a family structure the same ideas that a positive family dynamic does: a formal structure, identifiable leaders, strong attachment and loyalty within the group and norms and taboos regarding certain behaviors. Unfortunately, gangs often promote a criminal mentality and have criminal involvements. For a juvenile that lacks attachment to parents, a gang may be the home they felt they never had.

A study done by William and Steinberg (2011) focused on the reciprocal effects that parental supervision has on juveniles starting at the age of 16, where researchers followed the sample for three years into late adolescence. This research found the higher the amount of supervision, the less likely behavioral problems were to occur. Parental monitoring in this study was found to be a significant predictor of both positive and problematic adolescent adjustments. They found adolescents who characterized their parents as "higher" in monitoring were more likely to show declines in delinquency. Factors such as low socioeconomic status, low educational status, and criminal

involvement have all been found to increase the likelihood of finding poor parental supervision.

Parents that fail to provide adequate supervision to their child are still able to benefit from parental intervention. Intervention can consist of parents being ordered to participate in parenting classes or having the child placed into the custody of another guardian. Data collected from the Chicago Longitudinal study by Mann and Reynolds (2006) show that of the 1,500 low income youth's that were used to study whether or not early education intervention and other peer and family factors affected the rate of delinquency, they found that preschool intervention saw the greatest reduction in severity and frequency of delinquency by age 18. The idea is that the earlier a parent's technique or parenting skills can be improved; the juvenile's disruptive behavior should also see an improvement. Bernazzani, Cote, and Tremblay (2001), analyzed and reviewed early parenting intervention programs to see the effectiveness in limiting delinquency. They found positive correlations between juvenile delinquency and early intervention programs. Teaching proper parenting techniques becomes essential when beginning to look at the way children perceive their parents view of them. Liu (2000) conducted research based on the idea of real and perceived labels having an effect on juvenile delinquency. This study found that a child's real and perceived labels given by a parent could drastically effect peer involvement and subsequent delinquency. This shows the effect a parent's approval has on a youth's behavior which in turn greatly affects their child's decision making.

Hypothesis Two: Low income families are more likely to become delinquent.

Parental quality may be one important mechanism through which income, family structure, and employment affect child well-being. Literature suggests that parenting quality is positively related to a family's income (Amato, 2005). Associations between low socioeconomic status and child maltreatment have been well documented, as have associations between poor parenting skills and child maltreatment (Coohey 1998; Shahar 2001). Low income families may lack the proper resources afforded to those in the middle to upper classes to help further their children's prosocial activities. For instance, Cohen (1995) argues that parents in a lower socioeconomic class lack the resources to prepare their children for success in middle-class institutions, such as schools. Researchers often found children to repeatedly fail in these institutions and as a response lower income families would form opposing subcultures in which delinquency and criminality are valued more positively over education and economic success. Research consistently finds that rates of violent crime, such as homicide, are highest in areas with the highest concentration of people from disadvantaged social classes (Crutchfield 1989; Parker 1989). To support this idea, self-report studies suggest that serious and violent delinquency are most likely to happen among low income juveniles (Brownfield 1986). Gardner and Shoemaker (1989) conducted research based around Travis Hirschi's Social Bond Theory, finding that bonding to parents has a stronger effect on the delinquency among rural youth, and the lack of bonding between parents had the strongest effect on urban youth. All juveniles need to feel a bond with their parents and be committed to a positive family dynamic. This further implies juveniles surrounded by more urban,

poverty stricken areas are in even more need of parental supervision than children in a rural area due to an increase in population allowing for more criminal activity to take place. A larger population obviously entails more people in one location (i.e. inner cities) and allows for an increase in criminal activity (Shaw and McKay 1969).

In contrast, one study found that parents actually increased their levels of supervision and involvement with their children in lower income neighborhoods. In a study done by Letiecq and Koblinsky (2004) it was found that African-American fathers employed three general strategies to keep their children safe in dangerous, higher crime neighborhoods. These included monitoring children more closely, teaching children about the risks of their subsequent environment, and taking direct action in the neighborhood. Parenting styles were found in a study by Kling et al., (2001), to increase in quality as parents reported fear for their own safety in high crime neighborhoods leading mothers to intensively monitor their children and restrict children's outdoor activities.

Low income families and the environments they are forced to live in (based on economic restriction) is less desirable when it comes to trying to limit the exposure to criminality. Although there is a debate about what exactly causes juvenile delinquency, most researchers agree that "living in a neighborhood where there are high levels of poverty and crime increases the risk of involvement in serious crime for all children growing up there" (McCord, Widom, and Crowell, 2001:89). In part, this stems from the notion that the more time children are permitted to be out in the neighborhood unsupervised, the more likely they will begin associating in the criminal or delinquent characteristics of the low income neighborhood they are surrounded. However, exposure

to the neighborhood a child lives in is likely and almost definitely necessary for daily activities such as coming home from school, or riding the bus. Parents will not be able to shield their children from the world around them and they shouldn't try to. According to Bartlett (2002), children's experience in their environment differs in significant ways from that of adults and there is good reason to believe that children's interaction with the physical and social world is critical to their growth and development.

The overall theoretic framework of this study argues that one should not shield their child but, rather attachment to parents, involvement in socially acceptable activities, commitment to school and a strong moral code taught by a child's parent would lessen the chances of him/her being influenced by delinquency. Pebley and Sastry (2003) found the more similar a neighborhood environment is from household to household and the more like-minded people are in the same neighborhood allows for the same behaviors. For example, in a neighborhood that is over run with criminal activities such as vandalism, status offenses etc. the more likely that behavior is to be tolerated across the community. The more each part of the neighborhood is similar in their disciplinary actions or lack thereof for certain behaviors, the easier it will be for children to adhere to prevailing norms or adhere to delinquent tendencies. However the enforcement of positive norms outside of the family may be more impactful because families know that their neighbors share their beliefs and values with respect to their children's behavior. Therefore the entire neighborhood is involved raising children with similar conforming values and acceptable non-deviant behaviors, and families know their children will be participating in pro-social activities they themselves would deem appropriate. Neighborhoods where criminal activity is at times promoted or tolerated across all homes

are at an increased risk for a child to not only be exposed to crime, but also commit crime.

One study finds that African Americans are more likely to reside in deviant neighborhoods than Caucasians and that neighborhood deviance is related to juvenile delinquency (Palmore and Hammond 1964). The most common locations for deviant behavior take place in lower socioeconomic neighborhoods; these neighborhoods encompass families that are all similarly situated when it comes to household income. These families often have restricted access to legitimate avenues of success forcing some into crime and delinquency. Shaw and McKay (1969) studied twenty cities in the United States examining thousands of official delinquent reports. In all of these communities they found that juvenile delinquency was concentrated in certain areas which they called "delinquency areas." Delinquency areas are the lower income and lower social classes of large cities. Often times they have poor housing, they are overcrowded and not afforded the same legitimate recreational facilities. These are undesirable areas to raise children based on the limited resources and more illegitimate means of income happening within them. Juvenile delinquency rates are the highest among geographic locations where low income families are also more abundant (Shaw and McKay, 1969). There is research however that does not find socioeconomic status to have a direct effect on juvenile delinquency. (Joseph 1995) finds that there is an overwhelming amount of blame placed solely on the strain of a low socioeconomic status. Research has concluded that socioeconomic status is usually coupled with parental criminal history, education status and geographic location. In the study conducted by Joseph (1995) the overall result

suggest that conventional attachments, such as attachment to parents serve as a deterrent from involvement in delinquent behavior, regardless of socioeconomic status.

Hypothesis Three: The size of the correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting will not depend on the measure of parenting used (quality or supervision).

Single parent homes can be the result of divorce, parental death or parental imprisonment or often time's children are born to single parents. The distinction between children born to single parents and children who have lost a parent due to death or a break up in single parent families is important to make considering single-parents families as a result of separation and divorce have considerable differences in the child's experiences. In their longitudinal study of family disruption, Juby and Farrington (2001) found that boys who stayed with their mothers following divorce had delinquency rates that were almost identical to those found in intact families. In contrast, among juveniles who live with one parent, 41 percent of the males and 23 percent of the females had manifested delinquent behavior (Gove and Crutchfield 1984). When the single parent goes to work, juveniles are often left with peers or less suitable guardians allowing a window of opportunity to become delinquent. However, one study raises an interesting perspective when they look at juvenile delinquency and divorce. The increased risk of delinquency experienced among children of broken homes is related to the family conflict prior to the divorce or separation, rather than to family breakup itself (Rutter et al., 1998). This supports some researcher's ideas that divorce itself does not have a direct effect on

delinquency; rather it is the toxic home environment that may have existed prior to the divorce or disruption in the family.

Household income is another risk factor when researching juvenile delinquency. Household income is negatively associated with inadequate parenting for several reasons. A family's access to financial resources may directly affect parenting behaviors. Poverty or low income may also indirectly affect parenting as a result of the behavior of the parents. One possibility is that low income may result in increased parental stress and, thus, in harsher parenting (McLeod and Shanahan 1993). The important relationship between socioeconomic conditions and single parent families is highlighted by the absence of differences in delinquency between children in single-parent and two-parent homes within identical socioeconomic classes (Austin 1978). Simply, single parent homes can see the same level of delinquency in their children as dual parent homes when they have the same income. The analyses of juvenile court cases in the United States shows that economic conditions rather than family composition influenced children's delinquency (Chilton and Markle 1972). One study found that of single parent mothers, low income or poor families that received child support from the absent father are less likely to have delinquent teens. In single parent homes, research has found that 74% of nonresidential fathers do not pay child support (Garfinkle 1998). This suggests that single parent homes run by mothers are not solely to blame for juvenile delinquency; rather it is the lack of access to funds from the father that has a greater impact (Harris 1998). Although some research has linked being raised in a single-parent family with increased delinquency (McCord, Widom, and Crowell, 2001), when researchers controlled for socioeconomic conditions, the differences between being raised by a single parent and

being raised by both parents were no longer significant. This suggests that overall being raised by a single parent is not the direct cause of juvenile delinquency, rather the prevalence of a low socioeconomic status is more influential. In addition to ineffective parenting styles, African American and Caucasian juveniles were found to have higher rates of delinquency the more economically disadvantaged they were. In 2009, children younger than 18 years of age constituted 25% of the population in the United States. However, these children represented 36% of people in poverty and 42% of those children lived in low-income families (*Youth Involved with the Juvenile Justice System* 2008). Those most likely to be effected by low incomes are African American, Latino, and Native American children, and children in single-mother families (Wright 2009). It becomes evident that ethnic minorities are affected at a greater level by poverty than others (Wright 2009). This coupled with a poor parenting style may be a possible explanation to the overall crime trends we see in America today as they are related to race.

Berger (2004) finds that single-mother families and families with a mother and nonbiological father figure are more likely to provide low-quality caregiving environments. Among single-mother families, these effects are stronger if the mother works. Having research in the past to support the effect of single parent homes on a juvenile's criminal lifestyle, it also become necessary to visit what exactly those effects are. Loeber & Dishion (1983) find parental involvement in criminal activities to be predictors of delinquency by age 10; the earliest predictors have even been seen by age 6. This tends to reflect an overall dysfunctional family and parenting dynamic. More specifically, single parent homes that are coupled with family risk factors such as

domestic violence, drug and alcohol abuse, and involvement in the criminal justice system by the parents, have been identified as behaviors that dramatically increase delinquency probability. In a socioeconomically disadvantaged single parent home, when the only parent goes to work, that juvenile is often left with peers or less suitable guardians due to financial limitations, allowing for an opportunity to become delinquent. Single-parent households become significantly more susceptible to juvenile delinquency if the home is facing a low socioeconomic status. In a working class area, in which single parents are often forced to work full time, a number of factors surface that contribute to juvenile delinquency. These factors consist of inadequate parental control and supervision. Early researchers tended to find small positive effects of maternal employment on delinquency, which they usually assumed was the consequence of low maternal supervision, while the father was also working (Hirschi 1969; Roy 1963). In contrast, parents who could afford financially to monitor their juvenile's interactions more strictly taught their children definite standards of behavior, which were effective when it came to limiting delinquency (Wilson 1980). More contemporary and new age researchers however have found that there is a weak or nonexistent correlation when it comes to maternal work and juvenile delinquency. This could be attributed to the increase in female employment in the last 40 years and allowing a working mother to become more normalized, if not the standard idea in American culture (Farnworth 1987).

Research indicates that youth who live in socially and economically disadvantaged urban environments are at disproportionately higher risk for serious educational, social, and physical health problems than are more affluent youth (Carswell et. Al 2007). The Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development done by Juby and

Farrington (2001), is a prospective longitudinal survey of the development of offending and antisocial behavior in 411 males. During the course of this study they uncovered that of the 75 boys from disrupted families, 29 percent of boys were convicted as juveniles which is a significant contrast from the 18 percent of boys from intact families' conviction rate. To add further support, Smith and Stern (1997) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of 50 studies on family structure and delinquency suggesting that delinquency is about ten to fifteen percent higher among adolescents from homes in which one biological parent is absent. The correlation is significantly stronger when looking at less serious forms of delinquency. Though gender is not examined closely in this research, in the past when it comes to the effects of single parent homes, gender has been examined in an effort to see who is affected more by parental criminality, young boys or girls. The effects of single-parent households become more relevant when the parents gender is taken into consideration. Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber (1986) found in a meta-analysis of concurrent and longitudinal research parental behavior was related to child conduct problems to the same degree for each sex, concluding that both young boys and girls can be affected by juvenile delinquency to the same degree, even though the majority of juvenile delinquency and adult criminal behavior is committed by males.

Hypothesis Four: Race has an effect on juvenile delinquency.

We have now examined prior literature on socioeconomic status, single parent households and adequate parenting as they impact juvenile delinquency. The fourth and final hypothesis of this study examines race. Race is a factor taken into account in many, if not most research conducted that is related to crime; this study will be no different.

Diana Baumrind (1971) originally defined three parenting styles: authoritarian, permissive or authoritative all of which have an effect on the behavior of a child. A permissive parent allows their child to control their own behavior. This type of parent acts more as a resource instead of being active in controlling the behavior. An authoritarian parent values obedience, and favors forceful measures when the child's behavior conflicts with what the parent believes to be correct. Finally, an authoritative parent attempts to direct the child's behavior in the right direction but does not insist on complete obedience. This parent is realistic about the use of punishments and restrictions, consistently explaining to the child the reasoning behind the firm control (Baumrind 1971).

Chambers, Power, Loucks, and Swanson (2001) found that high parental control, such as in an authoritarian parenting style, leads to a faster first arrest. Though race and cultural ideals effect which parenting styles are utilized, studies have found (regardless of race), neglectful and authoritarian parenting styles were associated with the highest levels of delinquency in youths. They also discovered that low parenting care, such as in a permissive parenting style is related to high levels of distress in adolescents. These findings would also indicate harmful results from being raised in a permissive or

authoritarian home. Parenting practices are shown to influence children's adjustment. Supportive parenting, for example, has been related to children's self-esteem, compliance, and absence of aggression within all families regardless of race (Maccoby and Martin 1983). On the other hand, inconsistent discipline and absentee parenting has been linked to conduct problems among all races as well (Patterson et al., 1989). For example, African-American youth have the highest rates of involvement in crime compared to other racial groups. They make up 16 percent of all youth in the general public; however African Americans account for 30 percent of juvenile court referrals, 38 percent of youth in residential placement, and 58 percent of youth admitted to state adult prison (*Youth Involved with the Juvenile Justice System* 2008). From the research gathered thus far it seems that across all races and different parenting styles, that absent parents do not benefit any child of any race when it comes to adhering to a non-criminal lifestyle.

In addition, Chipman, Olsen, Klein, Hart and Robinson (2000) conducted a study where researchers had one hundred inmates and 337 non-inmates fill out a parenting questionnaire that allowed them to gain perspective into what participants thought about the relationships they had with their mothers and fathers parenting styles. They gave them the options of permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. Permissive parenting styles as well as authoritarian parenting styles have been linked with negative behavioral outcomes in children. With that being said a higher number of inmates reported higher levels of association with permissive parenting than non-inmates.

When examining race and ethnicity, one should also take the varying cultural and subcultural atmosphere created by each race. Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) argued that violence is more common among groups whose subcultural attitudes, norms, and values

favor aggressive solutions to problems. They suggested that such subcultures may be more common among African Americans and Southerners, which would account for higher rates of violent crime in those groups than in others. When researching different races and their cultures it becomes evident there is a distinction in parenting styles. Across races there are different methods of parenting based on different cultural ideals. Mowen and Schroder (2015) have shown that African American mothers are most often categorized by their children as authoritarian along with Hispanic mothers, while Caucasian mothers are most likely to be classified by their children as permissive. Among Caucasian mothers; it was found that those who were uninvolved showed higher delinquency rates in their children than the mothers that were permissive. In contrast, the results of the analysis for African American youth, suggest that authoritarian parenting is significantly related to greater levels of delinquency. Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, and Dornbusch (1991) found that African American and Caucasian adolescents who characterized their parents as authoritative reported "significantly higher academic competence, lower levels of problem behavior, and higher levels of psychosocial development." These studies suggests that although there is a difference between parenting across different races and cultures, the contributing factor still falls back onto parenting, whether an African American family parents in an authoritarian manner or a Caucasian family parents in a permissive way, both can lead to delinquency. Fagan, Van Horn, Hawkins and Jaki (2013) examined the degree to which parental controls effect juvenile substance abuse. They found poor family management and more favorable parental attitudes regarding their children's drug use had higher levels associated with the

juveniles continued delinquency. They found the juvenile's attachment to parents and the parental influence to be strong among Caucasian students.

There is an ongoing debate in criminology about the effects of status versus culture. Studies that argue the effects of culture find although economic inequality is an important predictor of violence; it does not completely account for variation in overall homicide rates across race (Messner 1982, 1983; Williams 1984). In contrast there is research suggesting that economic disadvantages have a higher influence among criminal activity than the subcultures of parenting between races (Heimer 1997). Independent variables relating to backgrounds, adverse parenting, mental health and school-related disabilities contributed to more than 25% of the variance in recidivism for both African American and Caucasian youth (Barrett and Antonis Katsiyannis 2015).

Now that prior literature has been reviewed as it related to juvenile delinquency and parenting, in the next chapter will be an in depth examination of the methodology that will be used in this study to examine the validity of the four hypotheses proposed.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Hypotheses and Research Question

The research question posed in this systematic review of literature is: Does parenting have an effect on juvenile delinquency? Other factors such as socioeconomic status and race will be taken into consideration due to the impact these factors have on one's ability to parent and the quality and style in which parenting happens. The previous chapter discussed the prior literature regarding juvenile delinquency and the multiple risk factors that are involved with predicting a juvenile's propensity to commit crime. In this chapter the methodology used to uncover common trends across previous research and the statistical analysis that will be used to test the hypotheses will be discussed.

Research Design

The design for this research is a systematic review of literature. A systematic review provides an answer to the research question posed in this study by collecting and summarizing fifty empirical studies that fit the pre-specified eligibility criteria. Essentially a systematic review covers a large number of current and past data gathered from research studies from a certain field in an effort to identify, evaluate, and summarize the findings of all relevant individual studies. The purpose of this systematic review is to deliver a beginning summary of relevant available research in the field of parenting and

juvenile delinquency while also being tested against the hypotheses proposed. The idea behind this systematic review specifically is to highlight the collection of data in regards to the research on parental supervision and delinquency.

All fifty articles were selected based on a pre-designed set of guidelines for each article. Each of the articles chosen must have pursued a relationship between parenting and juvenile delinquency.

There were other demographic factors taken into consideration when creating this systematic review, which align with the current trends in research. Low socioeconomic status and race have been well documented to have a correlation to criminal activity and in particular juvenile delinquency. The compilation of articles does not contain any that were published before 1980, in an attempt to analyze the more recent data that has been collected on juvenile delinquency and parenting. Systematic reviews are beneficial to this specific study primarily due to the original researchers engaging in data collection that is rigorous and time consuming as well as detailed, allowing this systematic review to be equip with well tested information.

The premise of this study is to provide a collection of information to show what current researchers are taking into account when researching parenting and its possible correlation to juvenile delinquency, while also attempting to provide support for the hypotheses posed. Keywords were used together in an attempt to narrow the search to find the most appropriate articles for the study. For each research article, there was a list of factors taken into account as stated previously. The hypotheses to be tested in this present study are as follows:

Hypothesis One: Juveniles that do not receive quality parental supervision are more likely to become delinquent.

Hypothesis Two: Low income families have an increased risk of juvenile delinquency.

Hypothesis Three: The size of the correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting will not depend on the measure of parenting used (quality or supervision).

Hypothesis Four: Race will have an effect on whether a juvenile becomes delinquent.

Article selection and Sample

There was only one search engine used in the data collection to limit the chances of repetitive articles or inconsistency among keywords. This research has gathered fifty peer reviewed publications from the research engine and digital library, Journal Storage also known as JSTOR. This search engine has a vast number of journals, articles and research studies related to countless fields of study. This researcher was able to gain access to JSTOR through the Criminal Justice and Forensic Sciences Department at Youngtown State University.

Keywords were utilized to drive the article selection process. Every key word that was entered related for the four hypotheses being tested. This being said, keywords related to parenting were: “parental supervision”, “poor parenting”, “criminal parents”, “incarcerated parents”, “divorce”, “parental death” or “parents and substance abuse”. Keywords related to juvenile delinquency were: “juvenile delinquency”, “problem

youth”, “juvenile trouble”, “school attachment” and “children’s poor school performance”. Key words related to single parent homes and low socioeconomic statuses were: “low income”, “poor families”, “single parent mothers/fathers”. Keywords selected to find articles related to race were: “African American”, “Black”, “Caucasian”, “different ethnicities”, “opposing cultures”, “Hispanic” and “Latino”. There were other key words used in the search engine that will take into account factors that increase the likelihood of poor parenting and limited supervision. These terms will be: “education level”, “employment”, “geographic location” and “gender”.

For every article that was selected to be reviewed the author must have taken into account juvenile delinquency and parenting, and there must have been a correlation that was tested. If those criteria were met, the article was chosen for the data set. When selecting the sample though no specific demographic factors needed to be present, it was important for there to be a relatively even number of articles that accounted for socioeconomic status and race compared to those that did not.

Analytic Approach

The analytic approach in this methodology is a three step statistical analysis. The first phase gives a clear picture of each study’s sampling process and specific definitions through the use of descriptive statistics for each of the variables that were accounted for. The second phase of the statistical analysis will include a breakdown of percentages for the entire sample. For each variable a percentage will be shown to further specify what certain studies accounted for based on sampling and variable definitions. The third and

final phase of statistical analyses consisted of either averages or independent t tests which were chosen based on the nature of the variable.

Parenting Quality

The independent variable in this study was parenting quality. The fifty articles were analyzed to determine what they defined as parental supervision or parenting quality and the definitions of each were listed descriptively (parental supervision, parental attachment, parenting quality etc.). Following this, the percentages for each one of the definitions were listed to show the composition of the variable itself. The last method of analysis for this variable was an average created from gathering all fifty articles. In doing so, the strength of the overall average correlation can be uncovered. Also created was a descriptive table accounting for the minimum and maximum individual Pearson's r correlation.

Juvenile Delinquency

The dependent variable in this study is juvenile delinquency. The articles were analyzed descriptively to identify what researchers defined as juvenile delinquency. Percentages were calculated to show how the authors gathered the data (self-reports, interviews, official records etc.). For each study, the Pearson's r correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting was taken from the original research study and was one factor used in the dataset file. After the data were gathered an independent t-test was

run to determine which of the categories for parenting, either parental quality or parental supervision had a greater effect on juvenile delinquency.

Demographic Variables

Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic status and the relationship it has to crime have been well documented in prior literature. This variable was analyzed three ways. The first method included the use of descriptive statistics which allowed the sample to be broken down to include which of the individual studies accounted for socioeconomic status in the sample. The second method used was percentages. This statistic was able to show out of the studies that accounted for this variable, the way each of the studies defined socioeconomic status (single parent homes, household income, education level etc.). The third method of analysis was an average which compared studies that accounted for socioeconomic status to those that did not.

Race

For the studies that included race there were descriptive statistics done to show which of the studies included an either limited or diverse sample of race in their analysis. Of those studies that accounted for race, they were broken down by percentages to determine which studies had a limited sample of race (Caucasian only, African American only, etc.) and which studies included a diverse sample of race (African American, Caucasian, or African American, Caucasian, Hispanic, other etc.). Following the

categorization of this variable and independent t test was conducted to uncover the relationship that exists between race and juvenile delinquency.

Conclusion

In this chapter a systematic review was described in detail along with the efficiency this method of research will have in the current study. Also, in this section the complete methodology that was used to conduct this systematic review was discussed as well as all the variables that will be included. In the chapter to follow the results of the systematic review will be stated.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this section is to present all findings related to the hypotheses proposed. The primary statistics used in this research were independent t tests and descriptive statistics. For the first hypothesis: Juveniles that do not receive quality parental supervision are more likely to become delinquent, was tested through the use of averages. After the collection of all fifty articles, it was important to find what the mean p-value was, so there is an ability to compare other averages to this base line. This mean did not factor in any of the other demographic variables collected in this dataset. This mean alone was found to be weak overall, which was not anticipated in this research.

Moving to the second hypothesis which is, low income families have an increased risk of juvenile delinquency. This hypothesis focuses on the impact demographic variables can have on juvenile delinquency. This hypothesis was tested also through the use of means. When examining the studies that included socioeconomic status in their research there was a much stronger average found than the ones that did not. This result gives support to the idea that socioeconomic status has an effect on juvenile delinquency and parenting. The third hypothesis: the size of the correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting will not depend on the measure of parenting used (quality or supervision), tested to see if there was a difference between studies that accounted for parenting quality and studies that accounted for parental supervision. This hypothesis was examined through the use of t tests and gained support when the results showed there was no statistically significant difference between studies that measured for supervision

versus the studies that focused more on quality. This concludes that poor parental supervision and poor parental quality can both have the same effect of juvenile delinquency. The fourth and final hypothesis states: race will have an effect on juvenile delinquency. This hypothesis did not gain support in this research. Again, running an independent t test found there was no statistically significant difference between studies that included a diverse examination of race versus a limited examination of race to be found. Other than the lack of support found for race as it is examined in this research, all other hypotheses presented in this research gained support and had results aligned with the previous literature discussed in chapter two.

Following the above summary, results have further been detailed in the section below. All results have been separated by hypothesis to depict a clear and detailed picture of the findings from this current research. All statistics that are referenced will have corresponding results or descriptive tables that can be viewed just below their respective sections. As referenced before each hypothesis was analyzed using either descriptive statistics or independent t tests depending on the variable. In Table 1, there is a complete summary of the entire dataset that was collected for the systematic review.

Table 1. Breakdown of the Hypotheses Tested

Variable Measures	Number of Articles	% of Measures per Variables
Measure of Juvenile Delinquency	50 studies	100% of studies
Self-Reported	24	48%
Official Records	14	28%
Teacher and School Reports	7	14%
Parent Reports	4	10%
Measure of Socioeconomic Status	31 studies	62% of studies
Household Income	20	64%
Households on Welfare	4	13%
Students Receiving Free Lunch	2	6%
Parental Employment and Education	5	16%
Measure of Parenting Quality	50 studies	100% of studies
Parental Supervision	16	32%
Parenting Style	5	10%
Parental Attachment	9	18%
Parenting Quality	6	12%
Single Parent Homes	8	16%
Incarcerated Parents	6	12%
Measure of Race	30 studies	60% of studies
African American, Caucasian, Hispanic, Other	15	50%
African American Only	5	17%
Caucasian Only	1	3%
Hispanic Only	8	27%
African American and Caucasian	1	3%

Hypothesis One: Juveniles that do not receive quality parental supervision are more likely to become delinquent.

When looking at this hypothesis it was expected to find a strong correlation between juvenile delinquency and parental quality, meaning as parenting quality increases, the rate of juvenile delinquency will decrease. To investigate this hypothesis there was a mean deduced from the Pearson's r correlation gathered from each of the fifty research articles to show the strength of the relationship, the result was -0.15. This is overall a correlation; however this is the average relationship when juvenile delinquency and parenting are observed on their own with none of the other demographic factors included. This relationship was expected to be stronger than this. In order to show a clearer picture of the overall collection of Pearson's r correlations gathered from each study, there were certain descriptive statistics run. The minimum strength of a correlation that was recorded from all fifty studies was -.093, the maximum correlation found was .73.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Pearson's r Correlation between Juvenile Delinquency and Parenting (N=50)

	Average	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Pearson's r Correlation	-0.15	0.35	-.093	0.73

Hypothesis Two: Low Income families have an increased risk of juvenile delinquency.

To examine low income and juvenile delinquency, this variable was coded into 0 and 1. This allowed the articles to be separated according to which ones included a measure of socioeconomic status. For the studies that did not include socioeconomic status in their research it was coded as 0 and the studies that did include socioeconomic status were coded as 1. The research studies that accounted for socioeconomic status were compared to their corresponding studies Pearson's r correlation to see if a relationship existed. Shown below in Table 3, of the 31 studies that accounted for socioeconomic status the mean correlation found was $-.261$. The same statistics were run to analyze the remaining 29 studies that did not include socioeconomic status. Of these 29 studies the average correlation found was $-.06$. This reaffirms the hypothesis that low income has an effect on the strength of the relationship between parenting and juvenile delinquency. Of the 31 studies that accounted for socioeconomic status, the correlation to juvenile delinquency was stronger ($-.261$) than the average given by only juvenile delinquency and parenting (-0.15). This suggests as income is factored into the equation, the relationship between parenting and juvenile delinquency becomes stronger.

Table 3. Comparison of Studies that Accounted for Socioeconomic Status vs. No Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic Status	% of Studies	N	Average
Yes = 1	62%	31	-.261
No = 0	58%	29	-0.06

Hypothesis Three: The size of the correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting will not depend on the measure of parenting used.

The variable parenting was broken down into studies either accounting for quality parenting (attachment, style, and quality) coded as 0 or supervision (incarceration, single parents, supervision) coded as 1. For this hypothesis it was expected that regardless of how the studies measured parenting (quality or supervision) it would not impact juvenile delinquency as long as there was some type of measure of poor parenting. As depicted in Table 4, an independent t-test was run. A t-test effectively compares the means of the two groups and shows the probability of those results happening by chance. In other words an independent t test compares the means of two independent groups in order to determine whether there is statistical evidence that the means of the populations are significantly different. This test was run with an alpha of $p = <.10$, this is a threshold value used to judge whether the finding is statistically significant or not. The p-value that was obtained from this test was 0.66. This result shows support for this hypothesis considering that 66% of the difference in the data was left to chance or that 66% of the data in both samples were statistically similar. Whether studies used parenting quality or parental supervision as their measure of poor parenting, did not affect the outcome of juvenile

delinquency. As long as studies had some measure of poor parenting, a relationship to delinquency existed.

Table 4. Comparison of Studies that Accounted for Parental Supervision Versus Quality

Measure of Parenting	% of Studies	N	Sig. (2-tailed)
Supervision = 1	66%	33	
Quality = 0	34%	17	.663

Hypothesis Four: Race will have an effect on whether a juvenile becomes delinquent.

Race was coded similarly to the other variables. Studies were examined on whether or not their sample of race was diverse in their analysis. Studies defined as having a diverse sample of race included (African American, Caucasian, Hispanic and Other) and studies with this breakdown were coded as 1. Studies that were defined as having a limited racial composition included (African American only, Caucasian only or Hispanic only) were coded as 0. Similar to low income families, the studies that accounted for race were expected to increase the strength of the correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting.

In order to analyze these variables an independent t-test was done with an alpha of $p = < .10$. The t test obtained a p value of .28, this result does not show support for this hypothesis considering this result suggests only 28% of the results were left to chance

leaving a large window for difference between studies that were limited in their analyses of race and studies that were diverse in their analyses.

Table 5. Comparison of Studies that were Diverse Versus Limited with Race

Measure of Race	% of Studies	N	Sig. (2-tailed)
Diverse = 1	44%	22	
Limited = 0	56%	28	.280

Conclusion

In this chapter, the methodology used in this research along with current results and findings were discussed. Findings were listed by hypothesis and depicted by tables in order to show a detailed account of information. In the final chapter a summary of major findings along with research limitations, research contributions and the hopes for future research will be discussed.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

Summary of Major Findings

The most prevalent finding in this thesis was the correlation between studies that accounted for socioeconomic status and the Pearson's r correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting. Studies that accounted for socioeconomic status not only had a higher correlation to juvenile delinquency than studies that did not, but also had a stronger correlation than the overall average correlation gathered from all fifty studies. This finding shows support for the hypothesis that low income families have an impact on poor parenting and how it negatively affects juvenile delinquency.

The Pearson's r correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting that was recorded from each study when averaged was found to be weak overall when not including any other demographic factors from the sample.

Whether or not studies accounted for quality or supervision when it came to defining poor parenting did not affect juvenile delinquency, as predicted. Studies were categorized in this thesis by either parental supervision or parenting quality based on the original measure used. This result shows support that poor parenting effects juvenile delinquency regardless of whether studies measured for parenting quality or parental supervision. The following four hypotheses were tested in this research:

Hypothesis One: Juveniles that do not receive quality parental supervision are more likely to become delinquent.

Hypothesis Two: Low income families are more likely to have a juvenile become delinquent.

Hypothesis Three: The size of the correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting will not depend on the measure of parenting used (quality or supervision).

Hypothesis Four: Race has an effect on whether a juvenile becomes delinquent.

Hypothesis one resulted in an overall weak correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting when not examining any other demographic factors. However, hypothesis two resulted in a strong correlation between socioeconomic status and parenting and juvenile delinquency, showing support that socioeconomic status has a strong effect on parenting and juvenile delinquency. Hypothesis three suggests that poor parenting will affect juvenile delinquency regardless of whether it is parental supervision or parental quality being examined by researchers. Both were found in this research to affect juvenile delinquency to the same degree. Unfortunately, hypothesis four was not supported in this research. This thesis examined whether studies were diverse in their examination or race, meaning the sample included more than two races, or limited in their racial composition, meaning the researchers did not specify their racial sample to only include one race. This categorization means studies either did not include race, or only included one race in their examination. This variable was then compared through an independent t test to find its relationship to parenting and juvenile delinquency. The

statistics that were conducted relating to race in this study was not able to show support for the theory that race has an effect on parenting and juvenile delinquency.

Limitations

One limitation of this study is the size of the final sample. Due to time constraints, the sample size was only fifty articles. However smaller than most systematic reviews, these fifty studies provide fairly current research. The most recent publication used in this review was 2014 and the most dated was 1985. When averaged, the average publication year for all fifty studies was 2004, and the average data collection year no older than 1985. Systematic reviews in the past have consisted of more dated research, most articles coming from earlier bodies of work. With more resources more recent data could have also been collected.

This study also had research bias involved in the selection of the articles. As stated before this systematic review only included articles which had a statistically significant relationship between parenting and juvenile delinquency. This distinction was made in an attempt to analyze what other demographic factors current researchers were taking into account when looking at juvenile delinquency.

If this study was to be done again, publication selection would include less restrictive criteria when choosing the articles related to juvenile delinquency. This would allow researchers to analyze more specifically what each article researched when there was no correlation between juvenile delinquency and parenting to be found, and what

factors the studies were inclusive of when they found a correlation between those two variables. This method of research would highlight the most impactful factors on juvenile delinquency. The same manner of research could be done as it relates to parenting, discerning which demographic or environmental factors induce ineffective parenting.

Another limitation of this study may be the search engine selected to collect the articles. There was only one search engine used and that was Electronic Journal Storage (JSTOR) in an effort to stay consistent with keyword searches and limit the chance of duplicate articles. For future researchers with more time, it may be beneficial to use multiple search engines to gather more data. If this study was to be done again more than one search engine would be used to collect articles.

Contributions

This systematic review would be an excellent and informative starting place for a researcher beginning to study the field of juvenile delinquency. This review lays out a relatively current account of juvenile delinquency publications and lays a foundation for what most researchers today account for when studying juvenile delinquency as a whole. The smaller size of this systematic review works to a beginner's advantage allowing the reader to not become overwhelmed by information, while still constructing a detailed account of what demographic factors are important in today's research.

Based on the relationship between juvenile delinquency and socioeconomic status gathered from this study, the present research would be a good starting point to further analyze public policy related to low income families. There are currently many programs

in place to help families struggling to survive financially and with this present study, future researchers would be able to show how low income families and juvenile delinquency are related and design an approach geared toward aiding low income parents.

With this research acting as a catalyst, other studies can research in more detail the effects of parenting and juvenile delinquency and aim more public policy toward parenting programs, classes and even intervention strategies allowing for a more accessible plan to help parents.

This thesis could act as a starting place to implement public policy that attaches course requirements to certain financial assistance programs related to families. As this study has shown, low income and a lower socioeconomic status have an impact on parenting. Parents that are seeking to obtain financial aid from government assistance programs may benefit also from parenting classes to enhance their parenting skills as their financial situation becomes less stressful. Attaching parenting improvement courses to the ability to receive family benefits would enhance the quality of life for children and parents inside the home.

Future research

Researchers in the future examining juvenile delinquency should expand this study to include more articles with less restrictive criteria. A systematic review in this field of study would be beneficial when looking at all causes of juvenile delinquency in

order to examine what environmental or demographic factors have the greatest impact on childhood crime.

Future studies could also benefit if researchers separated the variables of this thesis and analyzed them individually as they affect parenting and juvenile delinquency. For example studies could be done that only research the effects of socioeconomic status, or race as they are related to parenting. Studies could also look at factors such as socioeconomic status and race as they affect only juvenile delinquency.

Due to the limited size of this sample there were only certain statistics that could be conducted. Another suggestion for future research would be to collect a larger sample for systematic review and included regression as a form of analysis. This method would assist future researchers by allowing them to see how closely an independent variable of juvenile delinquency relates to dependent variables, which could be either demographic factors or parenting as done in this study.

Regardless of which direction future researchers take this study, as an academic community it would be fair to state that scholars and researchers alike can agree that the work on juvenile delinquency must continue in order to discover which demographic factors impact juveniles lives in the most damaging ways to begin creating policy and programming that can limit the pathways for juveniles to come in contact with crime.

References

- Agnew, Robert. 1991. "The Interactive Effect of Peer Variables on Delinquency." *Criminology* 29:47-72
- Amato, Paul R. 1987. "Family Processes in One-Parent, Stepparent, and Intact Families: The Child's Point of View." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 49 (2): 327-37.
- Barrett, D., Katsiyannis, A., Zhang, D., & Zhang, D. (2014). A Structural Equation Modeling Analysis of Influences on Juvenile Delinquency. *Behavioral Disorders*, 39(3), 113-127. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/43153591>
- Barrett, D., & Katsiyannis, A. (2015). Juvenile Delinquency Recidivism: Are Black and White Youth Vulnerable to the Same Risk Factors? *Behavioral Disorders*, 40(3), 184-195. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/43740446>
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescence competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56-95.
- Bernazzani, Odette, et al. "Early Parent Training to Prevent Disruptive Behavior Problems and the Delinquency in Children." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol. 578, 2001, pp. 90-103. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/1049869
- Brannigan, A., W. Gemmell, D. Pevalin and T. Wade. (2002). Self-control and social control in childhood misconduct and aggression: The role of family structure, hyperactivity, and hostile parenting. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 44(2), 119-142.
- Brownfield, David. 1986. "Social Class and Violent Behavior." *Criminology* 24:421-3

Burgess, E. (1952). The Economic Factor in Juvenile Delinquency, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*

Carroll, A., Green, S., Houghton, S., & Wood, R. (2003). Reputation enhancement and Involvement in delinquency among high school students. *International Journal of Disability, Development, & Education*, 50, 30-35

Case, A., and L. Katz, "The Company You Keep: The Effects of Family and Neighborhood on Disadvantage Youths," National Bureau of Economic Research working paper 370, 253-273.

Carswell, S. B. (2007). *Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 43(1), 29-42. doi:10.2307/1138990

Chipman, S., Olsen, S., Klein, S., Hart, C., & Robinson, C. (2000). Differences in Retrospective Perceptions of Parenting of Male and Female Inmates and Non-Inmates. *Family Relations*, 49(1), 5-11. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.yzu.edu:2059/stable/585697>

Chau M, Thampi K, Wight VR. Basic facts about low-income children, 2009, children under age 18. New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty; October 2010. Available at: www.nccp.org/publications/pub_975.html.

Chilton, Roland and Gerald E. Markle 1973 "Family disruption, delinquent conduct and the effect of subclassification." *American Sociological Review* 37 (February):93

Chambers, I., Power, K, Loucks, N. & Swanson, V. (2001). The Interaction of Perceived Maternal and Paternal Parenting Styles and Their Relation With the

Psychological Distress and Offending Characteristics of Incarcerated Young Offenders. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24, 209-227.

Cohen, A. K. (1964). *Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press of Glencoe.

Coohy, Carol. 1998. "Home Alone and Other Inadequately Supervised Children." *Child Welfare* 77 (3): 291–310 *Delinquency among African American youth*. New York: LFB

Dishion, T. J., & Owen, L. D. (2002). A longitudinal analysis of friendships and substance use: Bidirectional influence from adolescence to adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, 38(4), 480-491.

Farnworth, M. 1984 "Family structure, family attributes, and delinquency in a sample of low-income, minority males and females." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 13:349–364.

Garfinkel I, McLanahan SS, Meyer DR, Seltzer JA, eds. 1998. *Fathers Under Fire: The Revolution in Child Support Enforcement*. New York: Russell Sage Found.

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

Gove, W., & Crutchfield, R. (1982). The Family and Juvenile Delinquency. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 23(3), 301-319. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/4106072>

Gottfredson MR, Hirschi T (1990) *A general theory of crime*. Stanford University Press, Standford.

Harris KM, Furstenberg FF, Manner JK. 1998. Paternal involvement with adolescents in intact families: the influence of fathers over the life course. *Demography* 35:201-16

Haynie, D., & Osgood, D. (2005). Reconsidering Peers and Delinquency: How do Peers Matter? *Social Forces*, 84(2), 1109-1130. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/3598492>

Henrich, C.C., K.A. Brookmeyer and G. Shahar. (2005). Weapon violence in adolescence: Parent and school connectedness as protective factors. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 37(4), 306–312.

Heimer, K. (1997). Socioeconomic Status, Subcultural Definitions, and Violent Delinquency. *Social Forces*, 75(3), 799-833. doi:10.2307/2580520

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Eichelsheim, V. I., van der Laan, P. H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J. R. (2009). The relationship between parenting and delinquency: a meta-analysis. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 37(6), 749-75.

Juby, H., & Farrington, D. (2001). Disentangling the Link between Disrupted Families and Delinquency. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 41(1),

John W. C. Johnstone. (1981). Youth Gangs and Black Suburbs. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 24(3), 355-375. doi:10.2307/1388811

Joseph, J. (1995). Juvenile Delinquency Among African Americans. *Journal of Black Studies*, 25(4), 475-491. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/2784405>

LeGrande Gardner, & Shoemaker, D. (1989). Social Bonding and Delinquency; A Comparative Analysis. *The Sociological Quarterly* 30(3), 481-499. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/4120853>

Letiecq, B.L. and S.A. Koblinsky: 2004, 'Parenting in violent neighborhoods: African-American fathers share strategies for keeping kids safe', *Journal of Family Issues* 25, pp. 715-734.

Mcdonell, J. (2007). Neighborhood Characteristics, Parenting, and Children's Safety. *Social Indicators Research*, 83(1), 177-199. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/20734484>

Nelson, T. (2004). Low-Income Fathers. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30, 427-451. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/29737701>

Junger, Marianne, and Ineke Haen Marshall. 1997. "The Interethnic Generalizability of Social Control Theory: An Empirical Test." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34:79–112.

Institute of Medicine and National Research Council. 2001. *Juvenile Crime, Juvenile Justice*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/9747>.

Liu, X. (2000) The Conditional effect of Peer Groups on the Relationship between Parental Labeling and Youth Delinquency." *Sociological Perspectives*, 43(3), 499-514. JSTOR www.jstor.org/stable/1389540

Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1986). Family Factors as Correlates and Predictors of Juvenile Conduct Problems and Delinquency. *Crime and Justice*, 7, 29-149. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/1147516>

Lamborn, S. D.; Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 62, 1049-1065.

Laybourn, A. (1986). Traditional Strict Working Class Parenting—An Undervalued System. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 16(6), 625-644. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23705528>

Mann, E., & Reynolds, A. (2006). Early Intervention and Juvenile Delinquency Prevention: Evidence from the Chicago Longitudinal Study. *Social Work Research*, 30(3), 153-167. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/42659625>

McLeod, Jane D., and Michael J. Shanahan. 1993. "Poverty, Parenting, and Children's Mental Health." *American Sociological Review* 58 (3): 351–66.

McCord, J. 1979. Some child-rearing antecedents of criminal behavior in adult men. *Journal of Risk Factors for Delinquency: An Overview* 10 *Personality and Social Psychology* 37(9):1477–1486.

McCord, J., Widom, C.S., and Crowell, N.A., eds. 2001. *Juvenile Crime, Juvenile Justice*. Panel on Juvenile Crime: Prevention, Treatment, and Control. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.ojjdp.gov/>

Osborne, H. (1980). Juvenile Delinquency: A Survey Review of Recent Texts (1977-1979). *Contemporary Sociology*, 9(3), 358-367. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/2064238>

Palmore, E., & Hammond, P. (1964). Interacting Factors in Juvenile Delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 29(6), 848-854. Retrieved from

<http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/2090867>

Patacchini, E., and Y. Zenou. 2008. "The Strength of Weak Ties in Crime," 52 *European Economic Review* 209-36.

Patacchini, E., & Zenou, Y. (2012). Juvenile Delinquency and Conformism. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 28(1), 1-31. Retrieved from

<http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/41499481>

Roy, P. 1963 "Adolescent roles: Rural-urban differentials." In *The Employed Mother in America*, F. I. Nye and L. Hoffman, eds., 165–181. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Shahar, Golan. 2001. "Maternal Personality and Distress as Predictors of Child Neglect." *Journal of Research in Personality* 35 (4): 537–45.

Smith, C., & Stern, S. (1997). Delinquency and Antisocial Behavior: A Review of Family Processes and Intervention Research. *Social Service Review*, 71(3), 382-420.

Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/30012625>

Simons, R., Chao, W., Conger, R., & Elder, G. (2001). Quality of Parenting as Mediator of the Effect of Childhood Defiance on Adolescent Friendship Choices and Delinquency: A Growth Curve Analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(1), 63-79.

Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/3599959>

Ven, T., Cullen, F., Carrozza, M., & Wright, J. (2001). Home Alone: The Impact of Maternal Employment on Delinquency. *Social Problems*, 48(2), 236-257.

doi:10.1525/sp.2001.48.2.236

Walker-Barnes, C., & Mason, C. (2001). Ethnic Differences in the Effect of Parenting on Gang Involvement and Gang Delinquency: A Longitudinal, Hierarchical Linear Modeling Perspective. *Child Development*, 72(6), 1814-1831. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.yosu.edu:2059/stable/3654380>

Weerman, F. (2007). Juvenile Offending. *Crime and Justice*, 35(1), 261-318. doi:10.1086/501510

Weber, L., Miracle, A., & Skehan, T. (1995). Family Bonding and Delinquency: Racial and Ethnic Influences among U.S. Youth. *Human Organization*, 54(4), 363-372. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.yosu.edu:2059/stable/44127460>

Leone, P., & Weinberg, L. (2010). Educational needs of children and youth in the juvenile justice and child welfare systems. Center for Juvenile Justice Reform: Georgetown University.

Wiatrowski, M., Griswold, D., & Roberts, M. (1981). Social Control Theory and Delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 46(5), 525-541. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2094936>

Williams, L., & Steinberg, L. (2011). Reciprocal Relations Between Parenting and Adjustment in a Sample of Juvenile Offenders. *Child Development*, 82(2), 633-645. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.yosu.edu:2059/stable/29782856>

Wilson, H. (1980). Parental Supervision: A Neglected Aspect of Delinquency. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 20(3), 203-235. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23636506>

Youth Involved with the Juvenile Justice System 2019, Retrieved from <https://youth.gov/youth-topics/juvenile-justice/youth-involved-juvenile-justice-system>

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

Appendix: Articles for Systematic Review, N = 50

1. Agnew, R., & Petersen, D. (1989). Leisure and Delinquency. *Social Problems*, 36(4), 332-350. doi:10.2307/800819
2. Aseltine, R. (1995). A Reconsideration of Parental and Peer Influences on Adolescent Deviance. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36(2), 103-121. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/2137219>
3. Barrett, D., Katsiyannis, A., Zhang, D., & Zhang, D. (2014). A Structural Equation Modeling Analysis of Influences on Juvenile Delinquency. *Behavioral Disorders*, 39(3), 113-127. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/43153591>
4. Beaver, K. (2011). The Effects of Genetics, the Environment, and Low Self-Control on Perceived Maternal and Paternal Socialization: Results from a Longitudinal Sample of Twins. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 27(1), 85-105. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23883810>
5. Berger, L., & Brooks Gunn, J. (2005). Socioeconomic Status, Parenting Knowledge and Behaviors, and Perceived Maltreatment of Young Low Birth Weight Children. *Social Service Review*, 79(2), 237-267. doi:10.1086/428957
6. Berger, L. (2007). Socioeconomic Factors and Substandard Parenting. *Social Service Review*, 81(3), 485-522. doi:10.1086/520963
7. Block, S., Brown, C., Barretti, L., Walker, E., Yudt, M., & Fretz, R. (2014). A Mixed-Method Assessment of a Parenting Program for Incarcerated Fathers. *Journal of Correctional Education (1974-)*, 65(1), 50-67. Retrieved from <https://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2251/stable/26507640>

8. Boehnke, K., & Bergs-Winkels, D. (2002). Juvenile Delinquency Under Conditions of Rapid Social Change. *Sociological Forum*, 17(1), 57-79. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/685087>
9. Chen, C., Symons, F., & Reynolds, A. (2011). Prospective Analyses of Childhood Factors and Antisocial Behavior for Students with High-Incidence Disabilities. *Behavioral Disorders*, 37(1), 5-18. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23890722>
10. Craine, J., Tanaka, T., Nishina, A., & Conger, K. (2009). Understanding Adolescent Delinquency: The Role of Older Siblings' Delinquency and Popularity with Peers. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 55(4), 436-453. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23096234>
11. Dumka, L., Roosa, M., & Jackson, K. (1997). Risk, Conflict, Mothers' Parenting, and Children's Adjustment in Low-Income, Mexican Immigrant, and Mexican American Families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 59(2), 309-323. doi:10.2307/353472
12. Fagan, A., Van Horn, M., Hawkins, J., & Jaki, T. (2013). Differential Effects of Parental Controls on Adolescent Substance Use: For Whom is the Family Most Important? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 29(3), 347-368. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/43551963>
13. Greenman, E. (2011). Assimilation Choices Among Immigrant Families: Does School Context Matter? *International Migration Review*, 45(1), 29-67. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23016188>

14. Haynie, D., & Osgood, D. (2005). Reconsidering Peers and Delinquency: How do Peers Matter? *Social Forces*, 84(2), 1109-1130. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/3598492>
15. Hoffmann, J., & Dufur, M. (2008). Family and School Capital Effects on Delinquency: Substitutes or Complements? *Sociological Perspectives*, 51(1), 29-62. doi:10.1525/sop.2008.51.1.29
16. Hope, T., Grasmick, H., & Pointon, L. (2003). The Family in Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime: Structure, Parenting, and Self-Control. *Sociological Focus*, 36(4), 291-311. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/20832211>
17. Joseph, J. (1995). Juvenile Delinquency Among African Americans. *Journal of Black Studies*, 25(4), 475-491. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/2784405>
18. Johnson, J., Smailes, E., Cohen, P., Kasen, S., & Brook, J. (2004). Anti-Social Parental Behaviour, Problematic Parenting and Aggressive Offspring Behaviour during Adulthood: A 25-Year Longitudinal Investigation. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 44(6), 915-930. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23639069>
19. Juby, H., & Farrington, D. (2001). Disentangling the Link between Disrupted Families and Delinquency. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 41(1), 22-40. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23638892>
20. Kiesner, J., Poulin, F., & Dishion, T. (2010). Adolescent Substance Use With Friends: Moderating and Mediating Effects of Parental Monitoring and Peer Activity Contexts. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 56(4), 529-556. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23097954>

21. Keijsers, L., Branje, S., Hawk, S., Frijns, T., Koot, H., Van Lier, P., Meeus, W. (2012). Friends as Forbidden Fruit: Parental Supervision of Friendships, Contact With Deviant Peers, and Adolescent Delinquency. *Child Development, 83*(2), 651-666. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.yosu.edu:2059/stable/41416112>
22. Kelley, M., & Sokol-Katz, J. (2011). Examining Participation in School Sports and Patterns of Delinquency Using "The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health". *Sociological Focus, 44*(2), 81-101. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.yosu.edu:2059/stable/41633878>
23. Kevin C. Runions, Frank Vitaro, Donna Cross, & Michel Boivin. (2014). Teacher–Child Relationship, Parenting, and Growth in Likelihood and Severity of Physical Aggression in the Early School Years. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 60*(3), 274-301. doi:10.13110/merrpalmquar1982.60.3.0274
24. Krohn, M., Stern, S., Thornberry, T., & Jang, S. (1992). The Measurement of Family Process Variables: The Effect of Adolescent and Parent Perceptions of Family Life on Delinquent Behavior. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 8*(3), 287-315. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.yosu.edu:2059/stable/23365815>
25. Loeber, R., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1986). Family Factors as Correlates and Predictors of Juvenile Conduct Problems and Delinquency. *Crime and Justice, 7*, 29-149. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.yosu.edu:2059/stable/1147516>
26. Liu, H., Li, Y., & Guo, G. (2015). Gene by Social-Environment Interaction for Youth Delinquency and Violence: Thirty-Nine Aggression-Related Genes. *Social Forces, 93*(3), 881-903. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.yosu.edu:2059/stable/24754207>

27. Maschi, T. (2006). Unraveling the Link between Trauma and Male Delinquency: The Cumulative Versus Differential Risk Perspectives. *Social Work*, 51(1), 59-70. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23720797>
28. Matsueda, R., & Heimer, K. (1987). Race, Family Structure, and Delinquency: A Test of Differential Association and Social Control Theories. *American Sociological Review*, 52(6), 826-840. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/2095837>
29. Meldrum, R., Young, J., Hay, C., & Flexon, J. (2012). Does Self-Control Influence Maternal Attachment? A Reciprocal Effects Analysis from Early Childhood through Middle Adolescence. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 28(4), 673-699. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/43551950>
30. Mennemeyer, S., & Sen, B. (2006). Undesirable Juvenile Behavior and the Quality of Parental Relationships. *Southern Economic Journal*, 73(2), 437-460.
doi:10.2307/20111900
31. Miller, W., & Matthews, R. (2001). Youth Employment, Differential Association and Juvenile Delinquency. *Sociological Focus*, 34(3), 251-268. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/20832123>
32. Murray, J., & Farrington, D. (2008). The Effects of Parental Imprisonment on Children. *Crime and Justice*, 37(1), 133-206. doi:10.1086/520070
33. Murray, K., Haynie, D., Howard, D., Cheng, T., & Simons-Morton, B. (2013). Adolescent Reports of Aggression as Predictors of Perceived Parenting Behaviors and Expectations. *Family Relations*, 62(4), 637-648. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/43695362>

34. Oshima, K., Huang, J., Jonson-Reid, M., & Drake, B. (2010). Children with Disabilities in Poor Households: Association with Juvenile and Adult Offending. *Social Work Research*, 34(2), 102-113. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/42659752>
35. Peeples, F., & Loeber, R. (1994). Do Individual Factors and Neighborhood Context Explain Ethnic Differences in Juvenile Delinquency? *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 10(2), 141-157. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23366040>
36. Pearce, L., & Haynie, D. (2004). Intergenerational Religious Dynamics and Adolescent Delinquency. *Social Forces*, 82(4), 1553-1572. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/3598445>
37. Ramirez, F. (2008). Juvenile Delinquency: Current Issues, Best Practices, and Promising Approaches. *GPSolo*, 25(3), 10-15. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23673536>
38. Sarah M. Chilenski, Ty Ridenour, Amanda W. Bequette, & Linda L. Caldwell. (2015). Pathways of Influence: How Parental Behaviors and Free Time Experiences are Associated with African American Early Adolescent Development and Academic Achievement. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 84(3), 401-415.
doi:10.7709/jnegroeducation.84.3.0401
39. Simons, R., Chao, W., Conger, R., & Elder, G. (2001). Quality of Parenting as Mediator of the Effect of Childhood Defiance on Adolescent Friendship Choices and Delinquency: A Growth Curve Analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(1), 63-79. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/3599959>

40. Survey, D., Huizinga, D., Esbensen, F., & Weiher, A. (1991). Are There Multiple Paths to Delinquency? *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (1973-), 82(1), 83-118. doi:10.2307/1143790
41. Swanston, H., Parkinson, P., O'Toole, B., Plunkett, A., Shrimpton, S., & Oates, R. (2003). Juvenile Delinquency, Aggression and Delinquency after Sexual Abuse: A Longitudinal Study. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 43(4), 729-749. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23639002>
42. Swisher, R., & Shaw-Smith, U. (2014). Parents Behind Bars | Third in a Series: Parental Incarceration and Adolescent well-being: Life Course Contingencies and other Moderators. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (1973-), 104(4), 929-959. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/44113414>
43. Tremblay, R., & Craig, W. (1995). Developmental Crime Prevention. *Crime and Justice*, 19, 151-236. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/1147597>
44. Van de Rakt, M., Nieuwbeerta, P., & De Graaf, N. (2008). Like Father, Like Son: The Relationships between Conviction Trajectories of Fathers and their Sons and Daughters. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 48(4), 538-556. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23639536>
45. Wakefield, S. (2014). Accentuating the Positive or Eliminating the Negative? Parental Incarceration and Caregiver-child Relationship Quality. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (1973-), 104(4), 905-927. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/44113413>

46. Wallace, G. (2013). African-American Mothers' Community Social Capital and Parenting Quality: Does Personal Outlook Make a Difference? *Sociological Perspectives*, 56(2), 261-285. doi:10.1525/sop.2013.56.2.261
47. Wiatrowski, M., & Anderson, K. (1987). The Dimensionality of the Social Bond. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 3(1), 65-81. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23365518>
48. Williams, L., & Steinberg, L. (2011). Reciprocal Relations between Parenting and Adjustment in a Sample of Juvenile Offenders. *Child Development*, 82(2), 633-645. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/29782856>
49. Wilson, H. (1980). Parental Supervision: A Neglected Aspect of Delinquency. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 20(3), 203-235. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/23636506>
50. Yok-Fong Paat. (2010). Influences of Mothering and Neighborhood on Children's Behavioral Outcomes. *Children, Youth and Environments*, 20(1), 91-122. Retrieved from <http://eps.cc.ysu.edu:2059/stable/10.7721/chilyoutenvi.20.1.0091>