
Rochester Youth Development Study

Working Paper Series

123959

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/OJJDP

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

**Rochester Youth Development Study
Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center
The University at Albany
135 Western Avenue
Albany, NY 12222
Telephone: 518-442-5600
Fax: 518-442-5603**

Prepared under Grant No. 86-JN-CX-0007 (S-3) from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Grant No. 5 R01 DA05512-02 from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and Grant No. SES-8912274 from the National Science Foundation.

Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the funding agencies.

123959

Rochester Youth Development Study
Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center
The University at Albany
Albany, NY 12222

Working Paper No. 3

**Family Processes and Initiation
of Delinquency and Drug Use: The Impact
of Parent and Adolescent Perceptions**

**Marvin D. Krohn
Susan B. Stern
Terence P. Thornberry
Sung Joon Jang**

NCJRS

JUN 26 1990

ACQUISITIONS

Prepared under Grant No. 86-JN-CX-0007 (S-3) from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Grant No. 5 R01 DA05512-02 from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and Grant No. SES-8912274 from the National Science Foundation.

We would like to thank Bonnie Carlson, Dante Cicchetti, Rex Forehand and Rolf Loeber for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the funding agencies.

A prominent role has been attributed to the family in socializing children (Winch and Gordon, 1974) and, therefore, in preventing or controlling delinquent behavior (Hirschi, 1969). Numerous studies have found that parenting skills and relationships within the family are directly or indirectly related to delinquency (Elliott et al., 1985; Krohn and Massey, 1980; Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986; Snyder and Patterson, 1987; Wiatrowski et al., 1981). Yet, despite the attention family relationships have received in the literature on delinquency, research has been limited, for the most part, to an assessment of children's perceptions of their relationships with their parents. McKenry et al. (1981) identify the failure to tap the several realities represented in the family as a major methodological problem, while Jessop (1981) has characterized the study of the sociology of the family as "children's family sociology."

This study examines the effect of a number of dimensions of family relationships and parenting skills on adolescent delinquent behavior and drug use. These dimensions are measured from the perspective of both adolescents and parents, allowing for an examination of the concordance of parent and child perceptions. Moreover, by incorporating the perceptions of both parents and their children into the same analyses it is possible to examine which set of views are more important in explaining delinquent behavior and whether the relative effect of parental and adolescent perceptions differs depending on the specific dimension of family life examined. Before proceeding with this examination, a brief review of the research on family processes and their relationship to adolescent misbehavior will be presented.

Research on Family Processes

A number of family processes hypothesized as contributing to antisocial behavior, delinquency and drug use have received empirical support in both cross-sectional and longitudinal studies. These processes include specific parenting skills and practices and more global family relationship characteristics. Findings regarding the relationship of family

processes to delinquency and drug use closely parallel each other (Hawkins et al., 1987) and, therefore, will be referred to together.

Family processes have been categorized in a number of different ways and, unfortunately, there is little agreement on the appropriate categories or even the labels given specific dimensions. In a particularly comprehensive summary of the literature on family processes and delinquent behavior, Snyder and Patterson (1987) identify four different areas which will serve to organize the discussion: the use of discipline, positive parenting, monitoring, and problem-solving conflict.

A number of studies have found that lax, neglectful, erratic, inconsistent, overly harsh or punitive discipline is associated with a range of problematic child behaviors as well as self-reported and official delinquency (Hawkins et al., 1987; Snyder and Patterson, 1987). On the other hand, positive parental behaviors encourage social, academic and achievement related skills that play a preventive role vis-a-vis delinquency. Positive parenting occurs when parents express their approval, either verbally or nonverbally, of child prosocial behavior.

The concept of monitoring or supervision refers to the parent's awareness of the child's activities, whereabouts, and associates. Neither positive parenting nor negative discipline consequences can be appropriately applied if a parent is not attuned to what the child is doing. Parents of nonaggressive children differ from parents of aggressive children in their ability to perceive and track deviant behavior (Bogaard, 1976; Rutter and Garnezy, 1983), and parents of delinquents are less likely to monitor and supervise their children's activities than parents of nondelinquent children (Hirschi, 1969; Krohn and Massey, 1980; Parke and Slaby, 1983).

The final parental socialization skill noted by Snyder and Patterson (1987), problem-solving conflict, refers to the ability of families to communicate and cope successfully both with major and minor problems of everyday life. As with the other parenting skills, several studies have provided empirical support for the expected negative relationship between problem-solving ability and delinquent outcomes (e.g., Alexander, 1973; Hanson et al., 1984)

as well as between parent-child and parent-parent conflict and adolescent delinquent behavior (Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986; Snyder and Patterson, 1987).

In addition to these specific parenting skills, family characteristics which more directly tap the affective domain of parent-child relationships have been examined in research on juvenile delinquency and adolescent drug use. The most important of these is parent-child attachment, the lack of which strongly contributes to the explanation of initiation of delinquent and substance use behaviors (Hirschi, 1969; Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986). Positive family relationships, which appear to buffer against delinquency and drug use, also include high levels of parent-child involvement (Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1986).

In sum, these specific parenting behaviors can be collapsed into three general categories for the purpose of this analysis: the provision of control, guidance, and affective attachment. Control mechanisms, such as parental monitoring of child behavior, clear rules and expectations, and the use of consistent, contingent, and appropriate discipline, establish a base for effective control over unacceptable behavior. Guidance mechanisms, such as open communication and positive parenting practices, allow parents to model and reinforce desired behavior, shaping and supporting prosocial behavior. Affective bonds between parents and their children make control and guidance efforts more effective, as well as establishing a link between parent and child that insulates them from delinquency and drug use.

While it is evident from the general research literature that these family processes influence the behavior of children, the measurement of these processes in studies of delinquency has been largely limited to data from youth interviews and self-report instruments. The difficulty with such information is that it only provides the perspective of the child about these relationships within the family despite the obvious fact that "relationship variables" refer to interactions involving the parent(s) and the child. While it can be argued that it is the perceptions of the adolescents that are most relevant, since their behavior constitutes the dependent variable, parental perceptions should also be of importance and may contribute independently to the explanation of delinquent behavior. For example, parents may

be more accurate observers of family life and if the actual interactions influence the child's behavior more than his or her perceptions of them, then the parental reports about family processes would be better predictors of delinquency. Unfortunately, little is known about the extent of parent-child agreement on these crucial variables in juvenile delinquency research. The dual tasks of the current effort, therefore, are to: a) examine the possibility that parents have different perspectives than their children on relationships and processes in the family, and b) assess the significance of those different perspectives in explaining delinquent behavior.

Research on Parent-Child Agreement

Most of our information on parent-child agreement on self-report measures and structured interviews comes from two bodies of literature. The first is the literature on assessment of child behavior problems, most often using clinical samples. Parent-child agreement in most of these studies ranges from low to moderate (e.g. Angold et al., 1987; Kazdin et al., 1983; Kazdin et al., 1983; Leon et al., 1980), although a few investigations have found much higher rates of parent-child agreement (Herjanic et al., 1975; Orvaschel et al., 1981). There tends to be higher parent-child agreement on the presence or absence of symptoms than on respondent ratings of severity or precise frequency of symptoms. In general, parent-child agreement is also higher for specific questions about facts and behavior than for questions on internal states and mental status.

Less information is available in the clinical literature on parent-child agreement regarding specific parenting practices and family life in general. Ollendick and Meador (1984) suggest there may be lower agreement on general information about parenting attitudes and practices than more specific information about problematic behavior. Using a structured diagnostic interview, Herjanic and Reich (1982) compared mother-child agreement over a broad range of symptoms and behaviors. The area in which there was the lowest agreement was family relationships at home, with poor agreement on 14 of 15 questions. Robin and Foster (1989) found higher correlations between parents and teens on measures of

their perception of dyadic interaction than they did on frequency and severity of conflict. Agreement was also significantly higher for nondistressed parents and teens on the dyadic interaction measure than for the those who were distressed, suggesting there may be less agreement between parents and delinquent adolescents than parents and nondelinquent adolescents.

Research based on samples of the general population provides additional information on parent-child agreement. These studies report correlations generally in the .10 to .25 range (Gegas and Schwalbe, 1986; Jessop, 1981; Tims and Masland, 1985), although Demo et al. (1987) report slightly higher correlations. As in the clinical literature, parent-child agreement on family relationships appears relatively low compared to other topics in the family sociology literature. For example, Jessop (1981) found little parent-child agreement on family life and on individual problem behaviors and attitudes in a study using Kandel's drug survey data (Kandel et al., 1976). Interestingly, Jessop found a systematic trend in where parent-child differences lie. Although there was no systematic difference in parent and child reports of the affective dimension of family life, both parents and youths tended to exaggerate their power relative to the other on the control and guidance domain of family life (e.g. extent to which teen depends on parent for advice and guidance, existence of rules, frequency of conversation). These differences can probably best be understood in the context of the adolescent phase of the family life cycle and the adolescent push for independence.

As part of a larger study on coping across the family life cycle, Olson, McCubbin and Associates (1983) examined parent-adolescent agreement on a number of dimensions of family life. Agreement ranged from a low of .05 on a specific coping strategy to .46 on family cohesion. The authors address the possible circularity or reciprocal nature of differing realities in the family life of an adolescent. It may be that the adolescent phase of the family life cycle triggers stress and parent-child conflict which leads to increasingly discrepant views of family relationships. It is also possible that parent and adolescent perspectives begin to differ as adolescents begin the developmental tasks of individuation and separation and the discrepant

views which emerge at this time are a cause of increased conflict in the family. Similar to the findings of Robin and Foster (1989), Olson and his colleagues (1983) found that families with extreme scores exhibited higher stress and greater parent-adolescent disagreement on several aspects of family life.

Although the emphasis in much of the literature is on whether or not children can be reliable reporters, this emphasis may be somewhat misplaced. Indeed, there are reasons to suspect that the parent's perspective is not necessarily in more accordance with "reality" than the child's report. A number of factors have been shown to influence parent perceptions and reports (e.g. depression), while many voice the suspicion that reports of family life are biased in a socially desirable direction and "this bias occurs in parents' reports more than in children's, and that children are therefore better reporters of family life than parents" (Niemi, 1968, pp. 20-22 cited in Jessop, 1981). In support of this hypothesis, McKenry et al. (1981) found that mothers' reports of discipline methods used conformed to techniques advocated by child-rearing experts and differed significantly from their children's reports.

Parent and child reports may each provide unique and important information for understanding delinquency. However, the relative importance of child versus parent perception in actually influencing delinquent behavior is not clearly known. For example, it may be the way the child perceives parent behavior rather than the way the parent intended it or perceives it that actually influences youth behavior. In one of the few studies that directly investigates the relative importance of parents' and adolescents' perceptions of adolescent delinquent or drug use behavior, teens' perceptions of parent attitudes and verbal behaviors concerning drug use had a greater impact than did parents' perceptions on both their current and future substance use (Andrews et al., 1988).

In sum, most research on family relationships has been limited to assessing only the child's perception of family life. When both parental and adolescent perspectives have been assessed, researchers have relatively low agreement on perceptions of basic family processes. This paper further explores parent-youth agreement on reports of family relationships and

specific parenting skills. In addition to assessing overall concordance, however, the relative effect of parental and adolescent perceptions on explaining self-report delinquency and drug use is also examined. Specific attention is given to whether variables measuring control mechanisms, guidance mechanisms, and affective attachments relate differently to delinquent behavior depending on whether parental or youth perceptions are used.

METHODS

The data for the present analysis are drawn from the Rochester Youth Development Study (RYDS). This study is designed to examine the development of delinquent behavior and drug use in a high-risk, urban sample. The RYDS is a seven wave panel study in which each student and the person who has primary responsibility for his or her care (a parent, guardian or some other relative)¹ are interviewed at six month intervals. Data are also collected from the Rochester schools, police department, and other agencies that deal with youth. Although the RYDS uses this broad-based data collection strategy, the present analysis is based solely on responses collected during the first wave of adolescent and parent interviews, conducted in the spring of students' seventh or eighth grade year.

Sample. The sample consists of 987 students who attended the seventh and eighth grades of the Rochester City schools during the 1987-1988 academic year. To ensure that serious, chronic offenders are included in the study, the sample over-represents high-risk youth in the following manner. Males are oversampled (74% versus 26%) because they are more likely to be chronic offenders and to engage in serious delinquent behavior than are females. In addition, students were selected proportionate to the resident arrest rates of the census tracts in which they lived. Thus, students from the areas of the city with the highest rates of arrest are proportionately over-represented and students from the lowest arrest rate areas are proportionately underrepresented. The sample is 69% black, 17% Hispanic², and 14% white. Students range in age from 11 to 14 although 76% are either 13 or 14. The current analysis is based on the 949 adolescents for whom completed Wave 1 interviews are available for both students and their primary caretaker.

Family Life Measures

Previous research has identified a number of dimensions of family life that can be grouped into three broad categories: affective bonds, guidance mechanisms, and control mechanisms. Attachment and involvement constitute the affective bonds category, positive parenting and problem solving conflict together form the guidance mechanisms, while discipline and monitoring comprise the control mechanism category. The family life measures were developed as part of the core measures of the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency of which the RYDS is a part. The Program also includes the Denver Youth Survey (Huizinga et al., 1986) and the Pittsburgh Youth Study (Loeber et al., 1986) and many of the measures used here were developed jointly by the three projects. Also, many of the family measures are shortened versions of scales developed in the earlier work of Patterson, Loeber, and Stouthamer-Loeber.

With one exception, the counter control scale, which, for conceptual reasons, was only asked of parents, scales and individual items are based on both the students' and parents' interviews.³ Items were assigned to the scales based on their conceptual meaning and confirmatory factor analyses. The latter were conducted separately for parent and student data and the results suggest remarkably consistent structures for these scales in the two data sets. By and large the parent and adolescent measures are comprised of identical or virtually identical items, although, to make the items appropriate and realistic, there are some minor differences. (See Appendix A for a complete listing of measures and their component items.)

Affective bond. Two measures assess the affective bonds that parents and their children have with one another. Attachment is measured by an 11 item scale derived from Hudson's Index of Parental Attitudes and the Child's Attitude Toward Mother (Father) Scale (Hudson, 1982). The scale is identical for parents and child with the exception of interchanging the appropriate referent. For parents, the alpha coefficient of reliability is .80, while for adolescents it is .83. A higher score indicates that the parent has more positive feelings toward the child or the child has more positive feelings toward the parent.

Involvement is measured by a three item index indicating how often the child does things with his/her parents or family, and helps with jobs around the house. Items included in this index are not necessarily unidimensional. That is, parents who do one type of activity with their child do not necessarily do another kind of activity. Hence, the measure is treated as an index rather than a scale and no alpha coefficient is reported.

Guidance mechanisms. Guidance mechanisms refer to parental actions to facilitate open communication and to reinforce positive feelings and behavior. Two scales are used to represent this dimension of parenting. Positive parenting is a six item scale measuring what parents are likely to do if their child has done something that meets with their approval. Items include material rewards such as money or food as well as verbal or physical rewards, such as approval or a hug. Higher scores indicate that parents are likely to respond positively to approved behaviors. The reliability coefficients are .78 and .70 for students and parents, respectively.

Communication is a seven item scale measuring how often parents and their children try to work things out by discussing them. A higher score indicates that they communicate in this fashion more frequently. The scale based on parent data has a reliability coefficient of .69, while the scale computed using student data has a coefficient of .79.

Control mechanisms. This category includes the type of discipline used by parents, the degree of supervision parents exercise over their children, and the consistency and consequences of disciplinary efforts.

Two indicators of the type of discipline are included. The first is a single item asking how often parents hit or spank their child (Hit). More severe responses such as calling the police or locking the child out of the house are represented in a three item index (Severe). Again, this measure is not assumed to be unidimensional and is therefore treated as an index rather than a scale.

For parents, a six item scale is used to measure consistency of discipline. This scale indicates how often parents are consistent in how they punish their children and in following

through on their punishments (Alpha = .64).⁴ The adolescent scale is comprised of five items (Alpha = .59). A higher score indicates more consistency in punishment.

A ten item scale is used to measure countercontrol. These items ask parents if they think that their disciplinary practices have counterproductive effects and whether they avoid disciplining their child in some circumstances. The coefficient of reliability is .86. These items were not included in the student schedule.

Supervision is measured with an eight item scale for parents and a four item scale for adolescents. The parental scale is comprised of items measuring whether parents know what their child is doing, with whom and where he or she is, and how important they think it is to know this information. The adolescent scale only includes those items asking whether adolescents think their parents know with whom and where they are. The alpha coefficients for the parent and student scales are .73 and .57, respectively. High scores indicate a perception of more supervision by parents.

Delinquent Behavior

A total of 44 types of delinquent behavior and drug use are included on the student interview schedule. These items are also part of the core measures used by The Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency. They are derived in large part from the National Youth Survey (Elliott et al., 1985). Although questions concerning prevalence and frequency are included on the schedule, only prevalence measures are used for the purposes of the current analyses since most of the respondents had not become heavily involved in delinquency at their ages. Since delinquent behavior is a multidimensional variable, five indices are used to measure it. A general delinquency index is comprised of 29 items ranging from running away from home to using a weapon to try to hurt someone. The other four indices are grouped by type of delinquent behavior: drug use (12 items); status offenses (3 items); crimes against property (13 items); and crimes against person (6 items). All indices are computed by summing the items coded as either ever having done the behavior or not.

RESULTS

Basic Relationships

To set the stage for examining the relationship among parental and adolescent perceptions of family life, analysis begins by examining the intercorrelations among the various family process variables and their zero-order correlations with delinquency. These relationships are examined separately for parent and adolescent data.

Parent data. With the exception of the two forms of discipline--hitting the child or severe discipline--the family process scales tend to be moderately highly intercorrelated and in all cases the signs are in the expected directions (Table 1). These correlations range from .20 to .50 and tend to cluster between .30 and .40. In general, attachment, involvement, positive parenting, communication, supervision and consistency of discipline are positively correlated and all of these factors are negatively correlated with countercontrol.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Milder physical discipline, here represented by hitting or spanking the child, is negatively correlated with attachment and communication but is not correlated with the other family process variables. Severe discipline on the other hand, is consistently related to these measures (inversely in all cases except for countercontrol) but the magnitude of the coefficients is only between .10 and .20.

The zero-order correlations between these family process measures and self-reported delinquency are similar to those generally reported in the literature. Attachment, involvement, positive parenting, supervision and consistency of discipline are negatively associated with delinquency while countercontrol and severe discipline are positively related. These coefficients are in the .10 and .20 range. On the other hand, communication and hitting are not significantly related to delinquency.

The family process scales derived from the parent interviews appear to behave as expected. In general, they are positively interrelated at the .30 to .40 level and related to the

adolescent's delinquency in the theoretically expected direction at approximately the .10 to .20 level.

Student data. The same correlations based on data collected in the student interviews are presented in Table 2. These results are remarkably similar to those based on the parent data. Attachment, involvement, positive parenting, communication, supervision and consistency of discipline, perceived by the child, are all positively correlated with coefficients ranging from .16 to .59 and clustering from .30 to .50. As with the parent data, hitting is not significantly related to the other scales and severe discipline is only mildly related to the other parenting skills.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Finally, with the exception of hitting, all of these scales are significantly related to delinquency in the expected direction. These correlations are somewhat more consistent and of slightly greater magnitude as compared to the parallel coefficients in Table 1. This is especially so for the impact of communication and supervision.

Summary. Although some specific differences emerge between the parent data and student data with respect to these family process scales, the two sources of data provide remarkably similar pictures of family life in this sample. Whether the observer is the parent or the adolescent, parenting skills are seen to be intercorrelated and related in the expected direction to the adolescent's delinquent behavior.

Parent and Adolescent Concordance

The similarity of these results hints that these parents and adolescents would be highly concordant with respect to their views of their family life. The consistency of the linkages of the family process scales to delinquency would seem to imply that the parents and adolescents are in basic agreement about levels of attachment, the amount of supervision and so forth in the household. To test this assumption directly, the concordance of parent perceptions and adolescent perceptions for each of the family process scales is examined.

The coefficients for complementary scales range from .09 to .24 (Table 3). When the correlations are corrected for unreliability they range from .15 to .29. At best, these are modest correlations. Based on them, one wonders if these parents and adolescents live in the same household; they certainly perceive levels of attachment, communication, discipline and so forth quite differently.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Examining the correlation coefficients by the categories of family dimensions, it is evident that parents and their children are least likely to concur on control mechanisms and more likely to concur on attachment and guidance mechanisms. Control mechanisms are likely to be the most controversial area of family life as adolescents try to assert their independence and parents attempt to retain control of their child's behavior. It is not surprising that the level of concordance on variables reflecting control mechanisms is so low. Jessop (1981) also found low concordance on items relating to control mechanisms.

The lack of overall concordance makes the consistency of the earlier results quite puzzling. Given these low concordance rates, why do the parent data and the student data each behave so consistently with respect to the intercorrelations of the family process scales and the correlation of these with delinquency? The remainder of the analysis is concerned with this issue. Specifically, it is concerned with assessing if one of these two perspectives on family life--the perceptions of the parent or the perceptions of the adolescent--is irrelevant to explaining the adolescent's delinquency or if each offers unique and independent explanatory power.

Relationships to Delinquency

To examine this issue, two approaches are used. The first is to examine the contributions of each set of variables using block-recursive models (Blalock, 1969). This technique assesses the significance of the increment to explained variance for one set or block of variables after the other block is forced into the equation. Examining first the additional contribution offered by the parent data when the student data is entered first and then

reversing the order, the independent contributions of each set of perceptions to explaining delinquency can be assessed.

The second way of examining the relative importance of parent and student data is more substantive. It involves comparing the specific family process variables that are significantly related to delinquency in the parent data as compared to the student data. The results for these analyses are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

General delinquency. Beginning with the general delinquency index, it can be seen that both the parent and the student measures of family processes add significantly to the explanation of self-reported delinquency.⁵ The R^2 for the combined equation is .21. This coefficient is of the same relative magnitude as is typically reported in the literature on family and delinquency. Comparing the two blocks of scales it is seen that the parent scales increase R^2 by .04, a significant increment ($p < .001$), after the contribution of the student scales is taken into account. On the other hand, the student scales increase R^2 by .12 ($p < .001$) after the contribution of the parent scales is taken into account. Two conclusions appear warranted. First, each set of variables adds significantly to an understanding of adolescent delinquency. Second, in terms of relative contribution, the student scales are vastly more influential; the student data add .12 to the total R^2 while the parent data add only .04. In other words, the student scales alone account for 75% of the R^2 from the combined model (.16 divided by .21) while the parent scales alone account for 38% of the combined R^2 .

Examining the pattern of significant effects is also informative in understanding the relative contributions of parent and adolescent perceptions of family life. Based on the parent data, attachment and positive parenting are inversely related to delinquency. Communication, however, is positively related to delinquent behavior. The direction of the first two effects is theoretically expected but the direction of the effect for communication is not. Since the zero-order correlation between communication and delinquency is negative and not significant, the sign reversal may be due to collinearity or some other variables suppressing the positive

correlation. Diagnostic tests did not find a collinearity effect that would bias this estimate. Rather, some variable or combination of variables must be suppressing the relationship. Efforts to determine what variable or combination of up to three variables were unsuccessful.⁶ In general, therefore, parental perceptions of family life suggest that affective bonds and guidance strategies are most important for understanding delinquency, while none of the scales tapping control mechanisms contribute significantly.

Based on student perceptions, however, the role of control mechanisms increases substantially and the guidance scales drop out of the explanation. Attachment, this time measured from the adolescent's perception, is again negatively related to delinquency. In addition, however, supervision and consistent discipline tend to reduce delinquency while the use of severe discipline is positively related to delinquency. It is not clear from these cross-sectional data if discipline increases delinquent behavior or is a parental response to prior delinquency, but the positive relationship is not inconsistent with previous results found in the delinquency literature.

In sum, for the general delinquency scale, it appears that both parent and adolescent perceptions are important to the understanding of delinquency. Based on the block-recursive models, the student data are clearly more influential, but the parent scales add significantly to explained variance. Moreover, the parent perceptions highlight the importance of attachment and guidance, while the student perceptions highlight the importance of attachment and control.

Types of delinquency. The remaining sections of Table 4 present equations for four specific types of delinquency: violent, property, drug, and status offenses. Results by offense type are remarkably similar to those for general delinquency.

First, for all four types of delinquency the block-recursive models suggest that both the parent scales and the student scales contribute to the total coefficient of determination; in every case the increase in R^2 is significant beyond the .001 level. It is also clear, however, that the scales based on the student data are substantially more important than those based on

parent data. The contributions of the student scales are approximately twice the magnitude of the contributions of the parent scales.

Turning to an examination of significant effects, it is seen that in the parent data the only consistently significant effect is for attachment. Strong parental attachment to children is inversely related to each of the types of delinquency. On the other hand, the guidance variables are inconsistently related to delinquency, primarily being associated with property offenses. Finally, the control mechanisms measured in the parent interviews are only marginally related to specific forms of delinquency. Supervision reduces drug use, and countercontrol is negatively related to violent, property and drug offenses--the reverse of the theoretically expected direction.

Examining the student scales, it is clear that attachment to parents has a significant dampening effect on delinquent conduct for each of these subtypes. The guidance variables, on the other hand, are unrelated to delinquency, while the control mechanisms are clearly important. As measured through the eyes of the adolescents, parental supervision and consistency of discipline are negatively associated with delinquency, while severe discipline is positively related.

Summary. It does not appear that the type of delinquency makes a great deal of difference in understanding the relative importance of parent and adolescent perceptions of family process variables in explaining delinquency. For a general delinquency scale and for four subtypes of delinquency, both sources of data are important and student perceptions are relatively more important. Moreover, regardless of the type of delinquency, attachment is the only parent scale consistently related to delinquency; the guidance scales are only modestly related and the control scales are virtually unrelated to delinquency. For the student data, however, both attachment and the control scales make important and consistent contributions.

Substantively these results suggest a clear answer to the question posed at the outset of this section. Both parent and adolescent perceptions appear to have a substantial role to play in explaining adolescent delinquency. The perceptions of parents play a more limited role and

explain less of the variance, but their perceptions do contribute significantly to these equations.

Demographic Comparisons

The effect of family process variables on delinquent behavior has often been hypothesized to vary systematically by gender (Krohn and Massey, 1980) and by ethnicity (Cernkovich and Giordano, 1987). Because of this, the issues addressed above for the total sample are reanalyzed here for male and female and for white, black and Hispanic subjects⁷. Only the general delinquency scale is used in this analysis; the results for the four types of delinquency are substantively the same as those reported here.⁸

Models by gender. The results for males and females are reported in Table 5. In both cases the scales on family process variables derived from the student interviews are considerably more important than the scales derived from the parent interviews. Indeed, for female delinquency, while the R^2 for the parent scales alone (.09) is significant, once the student scales are entered into the equation, the parent scales do not offer a significant increment to the coefficient of determination (R^2 change = .03, $p < .43$).

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

The pattern of significant effects is also consistent with this conclusion. For the males, parental scales concerning attachment and guidance are significant and student scales concerning attachment and control mechanisms are significant. For the females, however, none of the parent scales attain statistical significance and only one student scale, attachment, does. It should be noted however that two of the control scales for the females have unstandardized regression coefficients that, while not significant, are of similar magnitude to the coefficients observed for the males. They are: supervision (males = .29; females = .21) and severe discipline (males = .94; females = .88). This suggests that, even though they lack statistical significance, perhaps because of the smaller number of females, these variables appear to have the same magnitude of effect on delinquency for females and males.

In brief, these data suggest that the earlier conclusions based on the full sample apply equally as well to the males. This is not surprising since males represent three-quarters of the total sample. For the females, however, the role of parental perspectives in explaining delinquency appears even more limited. None of the family process scales based on the parent data are significant and, as a block, they do not add significantly to the magnitude of the coefficient of determination. In addition to the significance level being affected by smaller number of female subjects, the size of the coefficients may be attenuated because of more limited variation in the dependent variable than that observed for males.

Models by ethnicity. Equations for the three ethnic groups--black, white and Hispanic--are presented in Table 6. Results for the blacks are the most consistent with those for the total sample which is not unexpected since they are proportionately the largest group (69%). For black respondents the student scales are more strongly related to delinquency than are the parent scales. Significant effects for the parent data are found only for the guidance scales and for the student data they are found for attachment and three of the four control scales.

For white subjects the parent scales, taken as a block, do not add significantly to the amount of explained variance (R^2 change = .07, $p < .11$). Moreover, there are relatively few significant effects observed for either parent or student scales. For the parent scales only the use of hitting as a form of discipline is significant and the coefficient is positive. It should be noted though that the guidance scales--positive parenting and communication--while not significant, have unstandardized coefficients quite similar to those observed for the total sample and for blacks. Among the white subjects the only student scale significantly related to delinquency is severe discipline. Attachment, while not significant, has the same magnitude of effect as observed for the black subjects.

TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

The largest differences between the total sample and any subgroup are observed for the Hispanic subjects. First, this is the only instance in which the relative contribution of the parent scales exceeds that of the student scales in explaining delinquency. The student scales,

as a block, add .11 to the total R^2 of .39 while the parent scales add .17; both increments are significant.

For the parent data among Hispanic subjects attachment is strongly and inversely related to delinquency, as is hitting as a form of discipline. For the student scales, none of the regression coefficients attain statistical significance. It should be noted however, that three of these scales--attachment, supervision and consistency of discipline--have unstandardized coefficients that are quite similar in magnitude to those observed for the other groups.

Summary. Analysis by demographic subgroups suggests one major departure from the results based on the total sample. For Hispanic subjects, the scales based on parent interviews are somewhat more influential in accounting for delinquency than those based on student interviews. For all other groups the student scales are substantially more important and, in two cases (for females and whites), the increment to R^2 based on parent data is not significant. Although there are differences by subgroup, the pattern of results still suggests that the parental effects operate through attachment and guidance mechanisms while the student effects operate through attachment and control mechanisms. Clearly, the affective attachment between parent and student has the most consistent impact on dampening delinquency based on both parent and student perceptions. Based on student perceptions only, supervision has a consistent negative impact and severe discipline has a consistent positive impact on delinquent behavior.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Most prior investigations of the effect of relationships within the family on delinquency have relied exclusively on adolescent perceptions of family life. This study examined both adolescent and parental perceptions of basic family processes to determine a.) whether those perceptions were congruent and b.) how they related to adolescent drug use and delinquent behavior. Results clearly indicate that parents and children have distinct perceptions of family processes; nevertheless, both sets of perceptions are significantly related to the explanation of delinquency.

The findings reported above indicate that parents have a somewhat different perception of family life than do their children: correlations among adolescent perceptions and those of their parents were low. Variables relating to control mechanisms evidenced the least concordance, while those measuring affective attachment are most concordant.

If discrepant views emerge during adolescence because children are beginning the developmental tasks of individuation and separation (Olson et al., 1983), then it is reasonable to expect greater discrepancy on variables reflecting the exertion of parental control. Prior to adolescence, parents exert considerable influence over their child's behavior. The independence seeking behavior of young adolescents interrupts established patterns of family interaction, however, and may create discordant perceptions about control mechanisms. Also, adolescents may consider punishments meted out by parents to be inconsistent and severe because of distorted beliefs that they should have freedom from parental restrictions and that parental rules are inherently unfair (Robin and Foster, 1989). On the other hand, more general feelings of warmth and affection may not be as adversely influenced by the conflict over control of the adolescent's behavior. These results are consistent with Jessop's (1981) findings that parents and adolescents systematically enhance their power base relative to each other and that adolescents stress independence on power but not affective dimensions of family life. Similarly, Olson et al. (1983) found the highest parent-child agreement on reports of family cohesion, a measure of emotional bonding.

It is possible that the lack of concordance may be due to parental reports being biased toward socially acceptable parental practices. For example, parents would not want to be seen as ineffective or overly severe in their disciplinary practices. There is some support for this explanation in that the means on all the family life variables, with the exception of severe discipline, are greater among parents than for adolescents. Parents see their relationships with their children as being closer and their parenting practices as being more consistent and clearer than do their children. Additionally, adolescent responses to these questions vary more

than do responses of their parents, possibly suggesting that parents are providing socially desirable responses.

The reliance on the self-report method for assessing family life and delinquency may affect the findings regarding the relative contribution of adolescent and parental perceptions to explaining delinquency. Although both sets of variables contribute independently to the explanation, adolescent perceptions account for substantially more of the variance in all forms of self-reported delinquent behavior. Higher correlations among variables can be expected when the source of the data is the same respondent because of response styles, cognitive consistency, and similar factors. For example, adolescents may decrease the dissonance between their delinquent behavior, which is likely to be considered inappropriate by their parents, and their feelings toward their parents, by reporting poorer family relationships, perhaps as a way of assigning responsibility to their parents rather than themselves. Therefore, one might expect higher correlations among variables within the student data set than among variables measured across the adolescent and parent data sets.

Among the individual indicators of family life, low attachment, whether measured through the eyes of parents or children is the most consistent predictor of delinquency. In addition, parental perceptions of guidance mechanisms and adolescent perceptions of control mechanisms contribute significantly to the explanation of delinquency. For the control mechanisms, the felt presence of the parent in supervising the child decreases the probability of delinquency whereas parental perceptions of whether they are supervising their child are not significant. Moreover, the type of discipline only has a deterrent effect for Hispanics (see below). It appears that parents who are effective in convincing their children that they are in control can be successful in constraining their child's behavior regardless of the type of disciplinary measures they use to exert such control.

Prior research in this area has relied almost exclusively on samples of white males. When separate equations by ethnic groups are examined, substantially different findings emerge, especially for Hispanics. For these respondents, parent perceptions account for a

greater amount of the variance in general delinquency than do student perceptions. On the other hand, the models for blacks and whites are substantially the same, with more significant effects observed for the much larger number of black subjects.

Why parental perceptions have a greater influence for Hispanics than they do for either whites or blacks is difficult to determine. The literature suggests that Hispanic families rely more on respect for parents than on specific control practices in raising their children (Bartz and Levine, 1978; Durrett et al., 1975; Smith, 1989). While no direct measure of respect for parents is available here, the finding that parental perception of the quality of relationships with their children has a stronger effect for Hispanics than it does for the other two groups is consistent with this suggestion. Perhaps Hispanic parents are better able to exert control through their affective feelings toward their children than are black or white parents.

The other difference between Hispanic families and either black or white families is that when Hispanic parents hit or spank their children when they misbehave, delinquency is less likely. This is particularly interesting since in white families that variable is positively related to delinquent behavior. While these findings may seem to contradict those regarding the importance of attachment in Hispanic families, they are not when the prevalence of spanking in all families is taken into consideration. It is possible that the use and meaning of physical punishment is different in Hispanic and white families. In Hispanic families, spanking or hitting may be a more acceptable means of exerting control and therefore, a more effective deterrent in part because of the respect that Hispanic children accord their parents. In white families, hitting may be used as a response to delinquent behavior after other control techniques have failed. Future analyses with this data set will be able to make use of the panel design and examine these possible explanations in more detail.

It is tempting to speculate on the meaning of affective bonding for females in light of the finding that the only family scale that achieves significance for females is the student perception of attachment. However, it would be premature to draw any conclusions from this study's findings regarding gender differences because the sample contains a smaller

percentage of females than males and the relative size of the coefficients for the girls' perceptions of control mechanisms, although not significant, is similar to that for males. While Cernkovich and Giordano (1987) found that various aspects of family attachment operated differentially for female versus male delinquents, other investigators have not found this to be the case (Canter, 1982; Figueira-McDonough, 1985). Unfortunately, relatively little attention has been paid to female delinquency in the research literature. The panel design of the Rochester Youth Development Study will allow us to continue to investigate the differences family life processes may have on female and male youths.

Evidence of the lack of concordance between parental and adolescent perceptions suggests that it might be important to determine which families are more or less likely to have discrepant views and if those discrepancies are related to future delinquent behavior. Such research will provide a number of avenues that may prove fruitful in understanding the effect the family has on delinquent behavior, as well as the dynamics of family life.

In general, these findings underscore the importance of assessing both parent and adolescent views on relationships in the family. The inclusion of both sets of perceptions improves the explanation of delinquent behavior. Additionally, some measures of family life are significant when perceived by adolescents while different family variables are significant when perceived by parents. These differences may have important implications for understanding the dynamics of parent-child relationships and how family-based intervention strategies should be structured to reduce delinquent behavior.

FOOTNOTES

1. In 87.2% of the cases, the primary caretaker was the mother (including by birth (84.8%), adoption (1.2%), by marriage (.7%), and through foster care (.5%)). In only 7.5% of the cases was the primary caretaker the father (by birth (6.3%), by adoption (.2), by marriage (.7%), and through foster care (.2%)).

2. For Hispanic respondents who did not speak English or felt uncomfortable responding to questions in English, the interview schedule was translated into Spanish and the interview itself was conducted by a bilingual interviewer.

3. Items that asked adolescents their feelings toward their parents and how their parents reacted to them referred to the primary caretaker specifically.

4. Reliability coefficients for all scales were computed for each ethnic group used in the analyses. The only scale for which the subgroup reliability analysis did not mirror that for the total sample was consistency of discipline. For Hispanic adolescents and parents, the alpha coefficient is significantly lower than those for blacks or whites. Further analysis failed to identify any items that are primarily responsible for the low reliability. There is no difference for Spanish speaking Hispanics and those for whom the interview was conducted in English. Hence, no explanation is apparent for these findings. In order to assure comparability across ethnic groups, the same items are used in constructing this scale for the three ethnic groups. If consistency of discipline is eliminated from all analyses, the substantive conclusions derived from the results remain the same.

5. The distributions on the delinquency and drug use items are skewed toward the lower end. To determine if the results from regression analyses are affected by the distribution, the dependent variables were dichotomized and a logit analysis performed. The results are substantially similar to those obtained in the OLS regression analyses. The latter are reported here since they provide estimates of the explained variance.

6. We did not pursue this analysis beyond three variables because even if we successfully identified the combination of variables responsible for the suppression effect, interpretation would be meaningless.

7. Separate equations were also run by age. No significant differences are observed.

8. These results are available on request.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, J.F. 1973. "Defensive and supportive communication in normal and deviant families." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 40:223-231.
- Andrews, J., H. Hops, D. Ary, E. Lichtenstein, and E. Tildesley. 1988. "The influence of parent attitude, encouragement, verbal behavior and use on adolescent substance abuse." Paper presented at the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy Annual Meeting. New York.
- Angold, A., M. Weissman, K. Merikangas, B. Prusoff, P. Wickramaratne, G.D. Gammon, and V. Warner. 1987. "Parent and child reports of depressive symptoms in children at low and high risk of depression." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 28:901-915.
- Bartz, K. W. and E. S. Levine. 1978. Childrearing by black parents: A description and comparison to Anglo and Chicano parents." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 40:708-719.
- Blalock, H. M. 1969. *Theory Construction: From Verbal to Mathematical Formulations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bogaard, C. 1976. "Relationship between aggressive behavior in children and parent perception of child behavior." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Canter, R. 1982. "Family correlates of male and female delinquency." *Criminology*. 20:149-167.
- Cernkovich, S. and P. Giordano. 1987. "Family relationships and delinquency." *Criminology* 15:295-321.
- Demo, D.H., S.A. Small, and R.C. Savin-Williams. 1987. "Family relations and the self-esteem of adolescents and their parents." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 49:705-715.
- Durrett, M.E., S. O'Bryant, and J. W. Pennebaker. 1975. "Child-rearing reports of white, black, and Mexican American families." *Development Psychology* 11:871.
- Elliott, D., D. Huizinga, and S. Ageton. 1985. *Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Figueira-McDonough, J. 1985. "Are girls different? Gender discrepancies between delinquent behavior and control." *Child Welfare*. 64:273-289.
- Gegas, V. and M.L. Schwalbe. 1986. "Parental behavior and adolescent self-esteem." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 48:37-46.
- Hanson, C.L., S. Henggeler, W. Haeefe, and J. Rodick. 1984. "Demographic, individual and family relationship correlates of serious and repeated crime among delinquents and their siblings." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 52: 528-538.

- Hawkins, D., D. Lishner, J. Jensen, and R. Catalano. 1987. "Delinquents and drugs: What the evidence suggests about prevention and treatment planning." Pp. 89-131 in B. Brown and A. Mills (eds.), *Youth at High Risk for Substance Abuse*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, DHHS Publication No. 87-1537.
- Herjanic, B., M. Herjanic, F. Brown, and J. Wheatt. 1975. "Are children reliable reporters?" *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychiatry* 3:41-48.
- Herjanic, B. M. and W. Reich. 1982. "Development of a structured psychiatric interview for children: Agreement between child and parent on individual symptoms." *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 10:307-324.
- Hirschi, T. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hudson, W. 1982. *The Clinical Measurement Package: A Field Manual*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Huizinga, D. and D. Elliott. 1986. *Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency: A Longitudinal Multidisciplinary Study of Developmental Patterns*. Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO. Proposal submitted to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Jessop, D. 1981. "Family relationships as viewed by parents and adolescents: A specification." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 43:95-107.
- Kandel, D.B., E. W. Single, and R. C. Kessler. 1976. "The epidemiology of drug use among New York State high school students: Distributions, trends and changes in rates of use." *American Journal of Public Health* 66:43-53.
- Kazdin, A. E., N.H. French, A. S. Unis, and K. Esveltd-Dawson. 1983. "Assessment of childhood depression: Correspondence of child and parent ratings." *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry* 22:157-164.
- Kazdin, A. E., K. Esveltd-Dawson, A. S. Unis, and M. Rancurello. 1983. "Child and parent evaluations of depression and aggression in psychiatric inpatient children." *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 11:401-413.
- Krohn, M. and J. Massey. 1980. "Social control and delinquent behavior: An examination of the elements of the social bond." *Sociological Quarterly* 21:337-349.
- Leon, G.R., P. Kendall, and J. Garber. 1980. "Depression in children: Parent, teacher and child perspectives." *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology* 8:221-235.
- Loeber, R. and M. Stouthamer-Loeber. 1986. "Family factors as correlates and predictors of juvenile conduct problems and delinquency." Pp. 29-149 in M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.), *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research* (Vol. 7). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Loeber, R., M. Stouthamer-Loeber, A. Costello, and D. P. Farrington. 1986. *Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency: Progressions in Antisocial and Delinquent Child Behavior*. Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. Proposal submitted to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

- McKenry, P., S. Price-Bonham, and S. O'Bryant. 1981. "Adolescent discipline: Different family members perception." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 10:327-337.
- Moore, D. and J. Arthur. 1983. "Juvenile delinquency." Pp. 357-387 in T. Ollendick and M. Hersen (eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychotherapy*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Ollendick, T. and A. Meador. 1984. "Behavioral assessment of children." Pp. 351-368 in G. Goldstein and M. Hersen (eds.), *Handbook of Psychological Assessment*. New York: Pergamon.
- Olson, D. and H. McCubbin and Associates. 1983. *Families: What Makes Them Work*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Orvaschel, H., M.M. Weissman, N. Padian, and T. Lowe. 1981. "Assessing psychopathology in children of psychiatrically disturbed parents: A pilot study." *Journal of American Academy of Child Psychiatry*. 20:112-122.
- Parke, R. and R. Slaby. 1983. "The development of aggression." Pp. 547-646 in P. Mossen (ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Robin, A. and S. Foster. 1989. *Negotiating Parent-adolescent Conflict: A Behavioral Family System Approach*. New York: Guilford.
- Rutter, M. and N. Garnezy. 1983. "Developmental psychology." Pp. 775-911 in P. Mussen (ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Smith, C. 1989. "Family and delinquency: The role of ethnicity." *Dissertation Prospectus*, University at Albany, Albany, New York.
- Snyder, J. and G. Patterson. 1987. "Family interaction and delinquent behavior." Pp. 216-243 in H.C. Quay (ed.), *Handbook of Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Tims, A. R. and J.L. Masland. 1985. "Measurement of family communication patterns." *Communication Research* 12:35-57.
- Wiatrowski, M.D., D. B. Griswold, and M.K. Roberts. 1981. "Social control and delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 46:525-541.
- Winch, R.F. and M.T. Gordon. 1974. *Familial Structure and Function as Influence*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Book.

Table 1. Correlation Matrix of Family Process Variables as Measured through Parent Data and Student Delinquency

	Attachment	Involvement	Positive Parenting	Communication	Supervision	Counter-Control	Consistency of Discipline	Hit	Severe
Attachment	--								
Involvement		.38*	.30*	.38*	.33*	.50*	.45*	-.12*	-.22*
Positive Parenting			--	.44*	.24*	-.20*	.24*	-.01	-.11*
Communication				--	.30*	-.23*	.32*	-.07*	-.14*
Supervision					--	-.23*	.22*	-.04	-.11*
Countercontrol						--	-.41*	-.01	.20*
Consistency of Discipline							--	-.01	-.21*
Hit								--	.03
Severe									--
Delinquency:									
General	-.24*	-.17*	-.13*	-.05	-.11*	.12*	-.12*	-.04	.10*
Personal	-.17*	-.14*	-.10*	-.06*	-.09*	.06*	-.05	-.02	.08*
Property	-.17*	-.11*	-.11*	-.01	-.07*	.07*	-.12*	-.03	.06*
Drug	-.15*	-.08*	-.05	-.04	-.12*	-.05	-.09*	-.05	.05
Status	-.24*	-.16*	-.11*	-.07*	-.12*	.17*	-.13*	-.04	.09*

* $p \leq .05$ (two-tailed test)

Table 2. Correlation Matrix of Family Process Variables as Measured through Student Data and Student Delinquency

	Attachment	Involvement	Positive Parenting	Communication	Supervision	Consistency of Discipline	Hit	Severe
Attachment	--							
Involvement		--						
Positive Parenting			--					
Communication				--				
Supervision					--			
Consistency of Discipline						--		
Hit							--	
Severe								--
Delinquency:								
General	-.28*	-.19*	-.17*	-.22*	-.28*	-.24*	-.02	.18*
Personal	-.22*	-.15*	-.10*	-.18*	-.20*	-.19*	-.02	.15*
Property	-.22*	-.17*	-.15*	-.18*	-.22*	-.18*	.01	.17*
Drug	-.21*	-.12*	-.14	-.16*	-.18*	-.20*	-.07*	.08*
Status	-.27*	-.14*	-.14*	-.18*	-.21*	-.17*	-.02	.16*

* $p \leq .05$ (two-tailed test)

Table 3. Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients Between Parent and Adolescent Perceptions of the Quality of Family Life.

VARIABLE	BEFORE CORRECTION	AFTER CORRECTION**
ATTACHMENT INVOLVEMENT	.18* .28*	.22 --
COMMUNICATION POSITIVE PARENTING	.21* .14*	.29 .19
SUPERVISION CONSISTENCY OF DISCIPLINE	.12* .09*	.18 .15
HIT SEVERE	.18* .08*	-- --

* $p \leq .05$ (two-tailed test)

** The formula for calculating corrected correlation is

(Pearson Correlation between A and B)

$$\frac{\text{(Pearson Correlation between A and B)}}{\{ (\text{Reliability of A}) * (\text{Reliability of B}) \}^{1/2}}$$

Table 4. Unstandardized and Standardized Coefficients for OLS Regression of Adolescent's Delinquent Behavior Measures on Both Adolescent's and Parent's Perceptions of Quality of Family Life (n = 949) (Standardized regression coefficients in parentheses)

Variable Name	General Delinquency	Personal Offense	Property Offense	Drug Offense	Status Offense
ADOLESCENTS:					
Attachment	-.092* (-.149)	-.026* (-.125)	-.026* (-.112)	-.021* (-.130)	-.026* (-.179)
Involvement	-.115 (-.053)	-.041 (-.056)	-.059* (-.072)	-.015 (-.025)	-.010 (-.020)
Communication	-.052 (-.058)	-.022 (-.074)	-.013 (-.039)	-.005 (-.021)	-.005 (-.023)
Positive Parenting	.052 (.053)	.029* (.090)	.007 (.018)	-.003 (-.011)	.005 (.023)
Supervision	-.327* (-.162)	-.073* (-.109)	-.095* (-.124)	-.038* (-.071)	-.047* (-.099)
Consistency of Discipline	-.131* (-.112)	-.034* (-.087)	-.034* (-.076)	-.037* (-.120)	-.017 (-.062)
Hit	-.220 (-.025)	-.063 (-.022)	-.024 (.007)	-.161* (-.070)	-.045 (-.022)
Severe	.991* (.112)	.288* (.098)	.390* (.117)	.069 (.030)	.193* (.093)
PARENTS:					
Attachment	-.114* (-.167)	-.029* (-.125)	-.032* (-.124)	-.022* (-.119)	-.025* (-.156)
Involvement	-.126 (-.064)	-.051* (-.077)	-.013 (-.018)	.005 (.010)	-.024 (-.051)
Communication	.153* (.137)	.023 (.061)	.062* (.145)	.019 (.063)	.024* (.090)
Positive Parenting	-.084* (-.069)	-.017 (-.042)	-.036* (-.077)	.002 (.005)	-.008 (-.029)

(Table 4. -- continued)

Variable Name	General Delinquency	Personal Offense	Property Offense	Drug Offense	Status Offense
Supervision	-.041 (-.022)	-.014 (-.022)	-.004 (-.006)	-.045* (-.092)	-.016 (-.037)
Countercontrol	-.037 (-.056)	-.017* (-.075)	-.019* (-.074)	-.013* (-.075)	.002 (.016)
Consistency of Discipline	-.007 (-.008)	.017 (.052)	-.023 (-.062)	-.008 (-.030)	-.001 (-.002)
it	-.270 (-.039)	-.063 (-.027)	-.083 (-.032)	-.084 (-.046)	-.078 (-.048)
Severe	.374 (.049)	.147 (.058)	.068 (.024)	.042 (.021)	.065 (.037)
R ² :	.21*	.13*	.14*	.11*	.15*
R ² Change:					
Parent	.04*	.03*	.03*	.03*	.04*
Student	.13*	.08*	.09*	.07*	.08*

* p ≤ .05 (two-tailed test)

Note: The total sample size for drug offense is 948.

Table 5. Unstandardized and Standardized Coefficients for OLS Regression of Adolescent's General Delinquent Behavior Measures on Both Adolescent's and Parent's Perception of Quality of Family Life for Gender Groups (n = 949) (Standardized regression coefficients in parentheses)

Variable Name	Male (n=702)	Female (n=247)
ADOLESCENTS:		
Attachment	-.090* (-.128)	-.124* (-.305)
Involvement	-.164 (-.070)	-.001 (-.001)
Communication	-.087 (-.086)	.012 (.020)
Positive Parenting	.090 (.084)	-.051 (-.075)
Supervision	-.293* (-.141)	-.208 (-.122)
Consistency of Discipline	-.171* (-.131)	-.096 (-.119)
Hit	-.082 (-.009)	-.714 (-.100)
Severe	.941* (.107)	.879 (.105)

PARENTS:		
Attachment	-.135* (-.182)	-.047 (-.092)
Involvement	-.126 (-.059)	-.081 (-.057)

(Table 5. -- continued)

Variable Name	Male (n=702)	Female (n=247)
Communication	.166* (.134)	.084 (.109)
Positive Parenting	-.112* (-.086)	-.010 (.011)
Supervision	-.027 (-.014)	-.056 (-.036)
Countercontrol	-.050 (-.072)	.005 (.010)
Consistency of Discipline	.015 (.014)	-.064 (-.087)
Hit	-.357 (-.049)	-.144 (-.027)
Severe	.424 (.056)	.034 (.005)
R ² :	.21*	.29*
R ² Change: Parent Data	.04*	.03
Student Data	.12*	.20*

* $p \leq .05$ (two-tailed test)

Table 6. Unstandardized and Standardized Coefficients for OLS Regression of Adolescent's General Delinquent Behavior on Both Adolescent's and Parent's Perception of Quality of Family Life for Racial Groups* (n = 949) ((Standardized regression coefficients in parentheses)

Variable Name	White (n=152)	Black (n=638)	Hispanic (n=159)
ADOLESCENTS:			
Attachment	-.074 (-.104)	-.096* (-.163)	-.114 (-.166)
Involvement	-.381 (-.156)	-.106 (-.051)	.049 (.021)
Communication	-.162 (-.153)	-.046 (-.054)	-.018 (-.019)
Positive Parenting	-.067 (-.067)	.068 (.073)	-.040 (-.034)
Supervision	-.018 (-.009)	-.361* (-.184)	-.371 (-.160)
Consistency of Discipline	-.041 (-.041)	-.132* (-.111)	-.130 (-.097)
Hit	-1.267 (-.119)	-.256 (-.030)	.025 (.003)
Severe	1.948* (.207)	1.078* (.128)	-.294 (-.030)

PARENTS:			
Attachment	-.044 (-.063)	-.061 (-.090)	-.311* (-.422)
Involvement	-.179 (-.084)	-.133 (-.068)	-.142 (-.076)

(Table 6. -- continued)

Variable Name	White (n=152)	Black (n=638)	Hispanic (n=159)
Communication	.167 (.154)	.167* (.150)	.122 (.106)
Positive Parenting	-.175 (-.144)	-.104* (-.083)	-.011 (-.010)
Supervision	.006 (.003)	-.032 (-.016)	-.024 (-.015)
Countercontrol	.095 (.147)	-.049 (-.073)	-.086 (-.117)
Consistency of Discipline	.088 (.081)	-.060 (-.064)	.095 (.076)
Hit	1.591* (.181)	-.309 (-.047)	-1.088* (-.138)
Severe	-.544 (-.071)	.452 (.065)	1.183 (.092)
R ² :	.31*	.20*	.39*
R ² Change:			
Parent Data	.07	.03*	.17*
Student Data	.18*	.14*	.11*

* $p \leq .05$ (two-tailed test)

Note: Racial groups are based on adolescent's race.

Appendix A.

List of Items That Comprise Scales and Indices⁺

ATTACHMENT	Parent:	Alpha = .80 Mean = 37.62 S.D. = 4.65	Student:	Alpha = .83 Mean = 36.47 S.D. = 5.16
------------	---------	--	----------	--

How often would you say that ...

- 1 You get along well with (SUBJECT)?
- 2 You feel that you can really trust (him/her)?
- 3 You just do not understand your child?
- 4 Your child is too demanding?
- 5 You really enjoy (SUBJECT)?
- 6 Your child interferes with your activities
- 7 You think your child is terrific?
- 8 You feel very angry toward your child?
- 9 You feel violent toward your child?
- 10 You feel very proud of your child?
- 11 You wish your child was more like others that you know?

INVOLVEMENT	Parent:	Mean = 9.99 S.D. = 1.62	Student:	Mean = 10.08 S.D. = 1.47
-------------	---------	----------------------------	----------	-----------------------------

- 1 How often does (SUBJECT) help with jobs around the house?
- 2 How often do you and (SUBJECT) do things together?
- 3 How often does (he/she) do things with other members of the family?

⁺ The questions are from the Parent Schedule. For the Student Schedule, the wording is slightly changed.

COMMUNICATION

Parent: Alpha = .69
Mean = 20.04
S.D. = 2.85

Student: Alpha = .74
Mean = 22.40
S.D. = 3.55

- 1 How often do you (or _____) talk with (SUBJECT) about what is going on in (his/her) life?
- 2 How often do you ask (SUBJECT) what (he/she) thinks before making decisions about (him/her)?
- 3 How often do you give reasons to (SUBJECT) for your decisions?
- 4 How often does (he/she) talk to you about things that bother (him/her)?
- 5 When you and (SUBJECT) have a problem, how often can you figure out how to deal with it?
- 6 How often do you and (SUBJECT) listen to each other even when you argue?
- 7 How often do you and (SUBJECT) compromise (give in a little bit) during arguments?

POSITIVE PARENTING

Parent: Alpha = .70
Mean = 20.49
S.D. = 2.63

Student: Alpha = .78
Mean = 19.84
S.D. = 3.30

When (SUBJECT) has done something that you like or approve of, how often do you ...

- 1 Say something nice about it (praise him/her) or give (him/her) approval?
- 2 Talk with (SUBJECT) about it?
- 3 Give (SUBJECT) something like a hug, kiss or pat on the back for it?
- 4 Give (him/her) some reward for it, like a present, money, or food?
- 5 Give (SUBJECT) a special privilege (staying up late, special activity)?
- 6 Go someplace or do something special with (him/her) as a reward?

SUPERVISION

Parent: Alpha = .73
Mean = 30.98
S.D. = 1.73

Student: Alpha = .57
Mean = 14.56
S.D. = 1.59

- 1 In the course of a day, how often would you (or _____) know where (SUBJECT) is?
 - 2 How often would you (or _____) know who (SUBJECT) is with when (he/she) is away from home?
- How important is it to you ...
- 3 To know if (SUBJECT) is doing well in (his/her) schoolwork?*
 - 4 To know if (SUBJECT) is keeping out of trouble in school?*
 - 5 To know what courses (he/she) is taking each school year?*
 - 6 To know what (SUBJECT) is doing when (he/she) is not at home?*
 - 7 To know where your child is?
 - 8 To know who your child's friends are?

COUNTERCONTROL

Parent: Alpha = .86
Mean = 18.86
S.D. = 4.82

Student: N.A.

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

- 1 When I punish (SUBJECT), (he/she) gets worse and harder to control.
- 2 I am concerned about how to deal with (SUBJECT) without making (him/her) more stubborn.
- 3 I fear that (SUBJECT) is going to hurt someone when I enforce the rules with (him/her).
- 4 I feel like tip-toeing around (SUBJECT) in order not to upset (him/her).
- 5 I have to tell other family members not to upset (SUBJECT).
- 6 In order to keep the peace I do not ask (SUBJECT) to do things.
- 7 I am worried about (SUBJECT) taking it out on other children when I try to make (him/her) obey me.
- 8 When another adult is present, it's easier for me to control (SUBJECT).
- 9 It is easier just to do things myself instead of asking (SUBJECT) to do them.
- 10 When (SUBJECT) is very grouchy or irritable, it is best to just leave (him/her) alone.

CONSISTENCY OF DISCIPLINE

Parent: Alpha = .64
Mean = 18.54
S.D. = 3.18

Student: Alpha = .59
Mean = 14.81
S.D. = 2.73

- 1 How often do you follow through with a punishment after (SUBJECT) is warned to stop doing something but doesn't stop?
- 2 How often do you let (SUBJECT) get away with things?
- 3 When (SUBJECT) is punished, how often does the punishment work?
- 4 Once a punishment has been decided, how often can (SUBJECT) get out of it?
- 5 How often do you give up when you ask (SUBJECT) to do something and (he/she) doesn't do it?*
- 6 How often do you feel that you can correct (SUBJECT'S) behavior?*
- 5 In general, how often do you feel _____ (is/are) fair about punishing you?*

HIT

Parent: Mean = .31
S.D. = .46

Student: Mean = .16
S.D. = .37

When (SUBJECT) does something that (he/she) shouldn't do, how often do you hit or spank (him/her)?
(Includes any form of physical punishment.)

SEVERE

Parent: Mean = .15
S.D. = .42

Student: Mean = .12
S.D. = .36

When (SUBJECT) does something that (he/she) shouldn't do, how often do you ...

- 1 Tell (him/her) to get out or lock (him/her) out of the house?
- 2 Call police or authorities?
- 3 Let someone else deal with it?

*On Parent Schedule only.

**On Student Schedule only.