2009

Parental competencies of juvenile probationers and adherence to curt sanctions and recidivism rates

Amy Cook
Virginia Commonwealth University

L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Political Affairs
Virginia Commonwealth University

This is to certify that the dissertation prepared by Amy Kyle Cook entitled PARENTAL COMPETENCIES IN JUVENILE PROBATIONERS AND ADHERENCE TO COURT SANCTIONS AND RECIDIVISM RATES has been approved by her committee as satisfactory completion of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Dr. Jill A. Gordon, Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs

Dr. Robyn L. Diehl

Dr. Mark C. Williams

Dr. Julie Molloy

Carolyn L. Funk, Ph.D., Director, Ph.D. Program

Fred M. Hawkridge, Ph.D., Interim Dean, College of Humanities and Sciences

Dr. F. Douglas Boudinot, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

March 16, 2009

PARENTAL COMPETENCIES IN JUVENILE PROBATIONERS AND ADHERENCE TO COURT SANCTIONS AND RECIDIVISM RATES

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

by

AMY KYLE COOK
Bachelor of Science, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1997
Master of Liberal Arts, University of Richmond, 2005

Director: DR. JILL A. GORDON
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia
May, 2009

Acknowledgements

Kyle and Tyler, you guys have been the best supporters any mom could ask for, and I am forever grateful to you for your love and support. Moma and Daddy, thank you for being my biggest fans! Moma, one of the most important things I learned from you was that I would never get what I didn't go after and it was better to fail trying than to never have tried. Daddy, your message was a bit simpler, it was "just do it" and I did.

Dr. Gordon, I don't have the words to express my sincere thanks for your support, commitment, dedication, and friendship. You have been there for me in every capacity. Robyn, Mark, and Dr. Molloy, your guidance and support over the years has been much appreciated. Lewis, you have been the best friend to me throughout these trying times! What can I say? Thank you! Thank you! Thank you!

I owe much thanks to the families that gave their time to participate in this research study, for without them, this project would not have been possible. To the 14th CSU and Kay, what a way to support this endeavor! Thank you.

Lastly, but most importantly, thank you Bryan…really, without you, I would not have come this far! Again, thank you from the bottom of my heart!

With love,

Amy Kyle

Table of Contents

Page

List of Tables

Page

Abstract

PARENTAL COMPETENCIES IN JUVENILE PROBATIONERS AND ADHERENCE TO COURT SANCTIONS AND RECIDIVISM RATES

By Amy Kyle Cook, MA

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Public Policy and public Administration at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2009

Major Director: Dr. Jill A. Gordon
Associate Professor, Criminal Justice

The purpose of this exploratory study was to further investigate the notion of parental competencies through the use of the Juvenile Offender Parent Questionnaire as previously developed by Rose and colleagues (2004). The parent questionnaire was administered to 88 parents of juvenile probationers placed on probation in a Virginia county. Exploratory Factor Analysis revealed an eight-factor solution: parental exasperation, parental resignation, mistrust of the juvenile justice system, shame over

parenting efficacy, parental monitoring, fear of the child, parent perceptions of child's exposure to violence, and anger towards child.

Regression analyses indicate that parental exasperation and parental resignation were not significant predictors of whether a juvenile violates their probation or subsequently offends while on probation; however, parental monitoring was significant. Moreover, this study highlights the significance of maintaining passing grades and refraining from substance use as predictors of offending patterns in probationers. This document was created in Microsoft Word 2003.

Chapter 1

Statement of the Problem

Historically speaking, the treatment of children in our civilization has had a dark and twisted side. In the seventeenth century, children accused of being "possessed" by the devil through the work of witches during the Salem Witch Trials were imprisoned, drowned, and hanged so that they could be "relieved" of all bad spirits. During the eighteenth century, prior to the Enlightenment period, children were viewed as dispensable members of society. Nineteenth century children as young as three years old were used as chimney sweeps, since their small bodies allowed them to more easily slide through the chimney to rid it of soot build-up. Young chimney sweeps were generally abused and neglected children sold inexpensively to Master Sweeps at auctions. Because so many children died as a result of this practice, legislation was eventually passed to prohibit the use of children to clean chimneys.

In 1828, a boy named James Guild, age 13, was executed for murder (Shepherd, 1999; Coalition of Juvenile Justice, 1998). Press accounts of Guild's trial and execution report that he acted as if he did not comprehend the reality of his situation (Shepherd, 1999; Coalition of Juvenile Justice, 1998). Although murder is a heinous crime, this execution begs the question of whether Guild or any thirteen year old has the mental capacity to understand the seriousness of such an offense. Under common law, children

under the age of seven were conclusively immune from prosecution due to the infancy defense, meaning children of this age lacked moral responsibility for their actions (Shepherd, 1999). However, children as young as seven were processed through the system in the same way as adult offenders and sentenced to prison or death (Mackenzie, 2006). Youth were treated and punished identically to adults because there was no system in place to protect or address the problems of abused, neglected or delinquent children.

Eventually, a series of institutions were established to reform children (such as the "houses of refuge"). Following the apparent failure of these programs, public sensibilities began to change, and from 1875 on those progressive citizens opposed to current practices gained momentum in their efforts to relieve children of the deplorable conditions they faced. Although no single event caused a "big bang" that resulted in the creation of the juvenile court, collectively the shocking accounts of mistreatment had a direct impact on the establishment of a separate justice system for juveniles. After a long and determined campaign by reformers, legislation was introduced in 1899 in Chicago, Illinois and the juvenile court was born.

The Juvenile Court Act of 1899 articulated the rules to be followed in cases before the juvenile court and moved it squarely under the political umbrella of *parens patriae*. The ancient British doctrine of *parens patriae*, meaning "father of the country", was resurrected as a "guiding philosophy" of the court (Shepherd, 1999). This philosophy firmly embraced the idea that the juvenile court was established to rescue juveniles from a life of crime by providing care and protection not provided by the natural parents (Secret & Johnson, 1996). Dating back to the English equity courts that provided judicial protections

to orphans and widows, the *parens patriae* doctrine became the rationale used by the state to intervene in the life of a child (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 1998). The state could now act as the parent when the parent is seen as unable or unwilling to nurture or provide appropriate supervision to the child (Shepherd, 1999; Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 1998; Mears, 2002; Fox, 1996). The philosophy of *parens patriae* was also used to justify informality and paternalism as the way the court conducted business in dealing with children (Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 1998).

The Juvenile Court Act specified that the new court had original jurisdiction over children charged with crimes, but it also had jurisdiction over children under age 16 that were destitute, homeless, abandoned, dependent upon the public for support, habitual beggars or in receipt of alms, those having no proper care or guardianship, or living in any house of ill fame or with a disreputable person, or whose home was unfit, or any child under the age of 8 found peddling or selling any article, or singing or playing a musical instrument upon the street, or giving any public entertainment (Illinois Juvenile Court Act, 1899).

In addition to giving the court jurisdiction over just about any child who did not have an "ideal" family life, the Juvenile Court Act also introduced several unique characteristics that set this special court apart from previous courts and institutions governing children. Its goal was to be treatment-oriented rather than punitive, it mandated that court records be kept confidential to minimize any stigma, it required children and adults to be incarcerated separately, it prohibited children under 12 from being detained,

and it allowed the court to operate using informal procedures (Illinois Juvenile Court Act, 1899).

By 1925, the juvenile court initiative had spread rapidly throughout the country, with all but two states having established juvenile courts (Mears, 2002; Shepherd, 1999). Staff members of the juvenile court included untrained, volunteer "social workers" acting as probation officers on behalf of the judge (Shepherd, 1999). As the role of the juvenile court advanced, the need for professional staff was recognized and the role of volunteers diminished (Fox, 1970).

From 1899 to the mid 1960's juvenile judges, acting under the broad scope of *parens patriae*, had unrestrained discretion in deciding cases before the court. The criminal law doctrines of responsibility, guilt, and punishment were almost unheard of in juvenile justice practices (Watkins, 1999). Rhetoric about treatment and *parens patriae* created a sense of pride that separated the juvenile justice system from that of an adult system full of "criminal law dogma and rigidity" (Watkins, 1999: 110). But although a certain level of discretion is an integral component of an effective judiciary, too much is potentially hazardous, with likely negative consequences for criminal justice legitimacy. *Parens patriae,* contrary to rule-of-law, withstands a high level of discretion used by the judge to individualize treatment efforts (Secret & Johnson, 1996). Since the juvenile court was founded upon the philosophy of *parens patriae*, it was able to deflect constitutional arguments by robustly upholding the civil nature of juvenile law and delinquency proceedings (Watkins, 1999).

For the first sixty years of the juvenile court's existence, the burden of proof required was a preponderance of the evidence, rather than the "beyond a reasonable doubt" standard needed to determine guilt in criminal court. Acting as a civil court, the procedures of juvenile courts nationwide generated concern among the public over what were perceived as unfair practices (Mears, 2002). Specifically, the juvenile court's "validity and vitality" was called into question because of its informal approach, treatment focus and lack of regard for due process (Coalition of Juvenile Justice, 1998).

Conservatives complained that the juvenile court was not capable of dealing with the delinquents of this era, while liberals complained that the court was ignoring the rights of the juveniles before it (Coalition of Juvenile Justice, 1998). Regardless of political beliefs, by the 1960's many observers agreed that the *parens patriae* philosophy had not lived up to its original expectations of effectively treating rather than punishing young offenders. The outcome would be a number of Supreme Court rulings on juvenile procedural matters. Just as law enforcement and the adult criminal justice system were revolutionized during the 1960's as a result of landmark Supreme Court decisions, so was the juvenile justice system.

Specifically, there were four Supreme Court verdicts that would significantly change juvenile court proceedings forever (Watkins, 1999): *Kent v. United States,* 383 U.S. 541 (1966), *In Re Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967), *In Re Winship*, 397 U.S. 358 (1970), and *McKeiver v. Pennsylvania*, 403 U.S. 528 (1971). Each successive ruling impacted juvenile justice as a whole and built upon the logical foundation of the prior case. These decisions would mark the beginning of a paradigm shift in juvenile justice.

Through these four cases, juveniles became protected under the 14th Amendment and were afforded the same constitutional rights as adults, with the exception of a jury trial. Although other juvenile cases with constitutional issues had been argued before the Supreme Court, none have affected the practices of juvenile justice as drastically as these four; in fact, Watkins (1999) proclaimed that "Gault completely fractured the *parens patriae* mold, and once broken it was unable to be reassembled" (111). It was then (the late 1960's) that the juvenile justice system began to be conducted parallel to the adult court. In fact, Fox (1996) asserts that from that point on, the juvenile court became purely a court of law. For some, these changes raise the question of whether juveniles as a class are "better off legally and correctionally as a result of this constitutionalizing" (Watkins, 1999: 111).

In 1974, Congress passed the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, which required states to deinstitutionalize status offenders and separate delinquents from adults in locked facilities. In addition, the Act created the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (to institutionalize Federal presence in juvenile legislation), established a National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (to conduct research so that information could be disseminated to juvenile justice professionals), and encouraged development of national juvenile justice standards and coordination of Federal programs for delinquency and prevention (Shepherd, 1999).

Since the "get tough on crime" era began in the 1980's, juvenile justice has been the focus of politics and policy changes directed towards increased efforts to hold juveniles accountable for their actions as the public demanded that politicians "do something" about

juvenile crime. Some forty years after the Supreme Court rulings, many believe that conceptually we have returned full circle to where we were before the first juvenile court was established, to a time when juveniles were treated as adults. The events discussed herein, along with many other trends and shifts, have substantially altered the face of the juvenile court. However, there is no disputing the fact that there now exists a separate justice system for juveniles, built upon rehabilitative ideals rather than exclusively on punishment.

Today, juvenile delinquency is not only a threat to public safety, but a threat to the welfare and stability of families in general. Furthermore, delinquency more broadly affects policy, and can have draining effects on the court's resources and programs (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). According to Snyder & Sickmund (2006), in 2002, the United States juvenile courts collectively handled more than 4,400 delinquent cases per day, as compared to only 1,100 in 1960. Between 1985 and 2002, the number of delinquent youth receiving court ordered out-of-home placements (detention and residential) rose from 100,400 to 144,000, an increase of 44% (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). The number of adjudicated cases receiving supervised probation as a disposition nearly doubled during the same time frame, from 189,600 to 385,400 (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006), and supervised probation was the most common disposition ordered for delinquent youth.

When juveniles are placed on probation, they are not alone - to some degree the parents and other family members are on probation as well. Parents have the responsibility of cooperating with juvenile justice officials and adhering to conditions of supervision. Often times when parents are not cooperative, they can be criminally charged for failing to

abide by the conditions of their child's probation. In considering a best practices model, the parent should be an equal partner with the probation officer, other justice officials and service providers as change agents. Due to a number of attitudinal factors and emotions, this is not always the case. Given the fact that the juvenile justice system now parallels the adult system so closely, one of the few remaining differences is the involvement and influence of the parent. For this reason, it is crucial to understand the ramifications of the "baggage" each parent brings to the table when dealing with the juvenile justice system, with the hope that this understanding may lead to more effective intervention with and better outcomes for our youth. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine how parents' thoughts, feelings, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors impact their child's adherence to court sanctions and recidivism rates.

Chapter 2

Parental Competencies in Juvenile Probationers and Adherence to Court Sanctions and Recidivism Rates

Researchers typically rely on various criminological theories to test delinquency hypotheses with regard to parental predictors of delinquency. For example, social learning theory (Akers, 1985; Patterson 1982) posits that deviance is seen as an acceptable form of behavior learned through interactions with others, including antisocial family members. The general theory of crime (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990) claims that delinquency is the result of low-self control due to parents failing to monitor their children's behavior effectively. The general strain theory (Agnew, 1992) considers the emotional state of the child as a predictor of delinquency. More specifically, emotions such as anger and frustration on behalf of the parents are theorized to be the main influence on delinquency. Social control theory asserts that bonds to society serve to protect individuals from engaging in delinquent acts. Conversely, when one's bonds to society are weakened, delinquency is more likely to result (Hirschi, 1969).

Although each of these briefly summarized theories offers a different personal characteristic as a means conducive to delinquency, there is also an associated parental behavior central to its explanation of delinquency (Simons, Simons, Chen, Brody, & Lin,

2007). While each perspective is in agreement that parenting in some way contributes to delinquent behavior, they do not agree on which parenting practices are most crucial (Simons et al., 2007). While the above theories typically compete with one another, Simons et al. (2007) suggests that given the complex nature of human behavior, it would be "truly amazing" if a single mechanism such as low-self control or anger was completely able to account for the link between parenting and delinquency.

Simons et al. (2007) goes on to further state that a single theoretical explanation of delinquency would be contrary to the wealth of psychosocial research showing a wide variety of emotional and cognitive factors that influences people's responses to situations. Rather than trying to explain delinquency through a competition of theories, Simons et al. (2007) believes that theories should be used as complimentary frameworks formed for a more comprehensive theory of delinquency. This suggests that a more comprehensive model of delinquency not only includes family variables but structural and community variables as well. As a result, developmental models will be presented in order to provide various complementary explanations of delinquency from a familial perspective.

Developmental Models

Ecological models recognize the importance of the environment in shaping human development (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998; Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Bradshaw, Glaser, Calhoun, & Bates, 2006; Garbarino, Bradshaw, & Kostelny, 2005). Given the many ways in which human behavior is influenced, it is important to discuss how a bioecological model and a coercive model of delinquency contributes to family mismanagement practices. Bronfenbrenner (1986: 723) states that "the family is the principal context in

which human development takes place, it is but one of several settings in which developmental process can and do occur." This means that events occurring at home can affect the child's progress at school and vice versa (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). Bronfenbrenner (1986) also points out that the development of the child is not only affected by other environments in which the child has contact, but also, indirectly through environments and interactions of the parents. Specifically, in modern societies and through their influence on family processes, parents' place of employment, parents' social networks, and community are three systems (referred to as exosystems) that are especially likely to have an affect on the development of the child and family functioning (Bronfenbrenner, 1986).

Bronfenbrenner & Morris (1998) articulate four principal components of their bioecological model (biologically based due to the characteristics of the person) that define the dynamic and interactive relationship between them. The four principals include *process, person, context, and time*. The p*rocess* is the core of the model and refers to the various forms of interactions between organisms and their environment - referred to as *proximal processes* operating over time (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998). These interactions are what Bronfenbrenner & Morris (1998) refer to as the primary mechanisms in which human development occurs. Second, the power of the influence varies as a function of the characteristics of the developing *person* depending on the environmental *context* (third) and the *time* periods (fourth) in which these *proximal processes* occur.

Bronfenbrenner & Morris (1998) further expand upon the four components differentiating between "environment" and "process" in two propositions. First, *process*

refers to the way in which human development occurs among reciprocating interactions between humans and the environment. Playing with a child, problem solving, child-child activities, reading, learning new skills, and caring for others in distress are a few examples of *proximal processes* (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998) and must occur over *time* (fairly regular basis) in order to be effective. The second proposition set forth by Bronfenbrenner & Morris (1998) is that the form, power, content, and direction of the *proximal processes* vary as a function of the developing *person* and the environment over *time* and through the life course in which the person has lived.

Bronfenbrenner & Morris (1998) highlight the fact that in their bioecological model the characteristics of the *person* are in both propositions. This is because "the characteristics of the *person* function both as an indirect producer and as a product of development" (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998: 996). In terms of *proximal processes,* the following characteristics give rise to its distinctive features: in order for development to occur, activity must be engaged in, "taking place on a fairly regular basis, over an extended period of *time*", becoming more complex as *time* passes, with effective *proximal processes* having an influence in both directions but not being limited to interactions with *people*, allowing for opportunities in the immediate environment that "invite attention, exploration, manipulation, elaboration, and imagination", and lastly, that power, form, content and direction substantially changes the content, timing, and effectiveness of *proximal processes* (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998: 997).

Bronfenbrenner & Morris (1998: 997) explains that as children grow older, their capacity for development increases in level and range, and in order to continue to be

effective the *proximal processes* must become more complex and extensive to provide for "evolving potentials"; otherwise, the development of the *person* slows and the direction may even reverse itself. Moreover, Bronfenbrenner & Morris (1998) asserts that the principal persons with whom young persons interact over long periods of time are parents. Naturally, as children age, these persons begin to vary by context to include caregivers, teachers, relatives, siblings and peers. Bronfenbrenner's developmental perspective not only provides insight into how and why the developmental process actually occurs, it essentially places the family at the heart of the process. Bronfenbrenner's developmental models include genetics and the environment (hence the bioecological model), the family and various environmental influences such as schools, peer groups, parents' place of employment, family support networks, and the community as opportunities for *proximal processes* to occur. It is such interactions that will likely influence family processes either prosocially or antisocially.

Similar to Bronfenbrenner & Morris' (1998) developmental/ecological perspective, Patterson, DeBaryshe, & Ramsey (1989) assert that delinquency is developed from early childhood through adolescence in an action-reaction formulation, which they term a coercive model of delinquency. Patterson et al. (1989) hypothesize a social-interactional model in which child behaviors result in predictable responses from the social environment, followed by further reactions from the child; thus creating a cycle of negative reactions (Patterson et al., 1989). With the furtherance of this negative action-reaction cycle, the child increases the risk of developing long-term social maladjustment and eventually criminal behavior (Patterson et al., 1989). Accordingly, it is these parents that

do not provide positive reinforcers for prosocial behavior or effective punishment for deviant behavior (Patterson et al., 1989; Patterson, 1982).

Patterson (1982) and Patterson et al. (1989) hold the view that children are taught by their parents to model behavior. Through daily interactions, inept parenting practices permit negative child behaviors that are reinforced by family members who fail to administer discipline (Patterson, 1982; Patterson et al. 1989). Patterson et al. (1989: 330) further describes that inept parenting practices lead to the child using "aversive behaviors to terminate aversive intrusions by other family members" because coercive behaviors are viewed as normal in such families. These aversive interactions are what Patterson et al. (1989: 330) refers to as "training." While in training, the child learns how to control family members through repressive means (Patterson et al. 1989). As the training continues, the intensity of the interactions between the child and other family members escalate, as well as coercive behaviors, eventually leading to physical attacks such as hitting (Patterson et al. 1989).

Patterson (1982) and Patterson, Reid, & Dishion's (1992) research suggests that there is a lack of training for prosocial skills measured by in-home observations of distressed families suggesting that the child's prosocial behavior is either ignored or inappropriately responded to. As a result, these children learn to use coercive techniques such as anger and defiance as problem solving techniques. Patterson et al. (1989) also contend that these coercive behaviors learned in the family are transferred to interactions in peer groups and school.

Specifically, Patterson et al. (1989) present a linear perspective on the progression of antisocial behavior. During early childhood, poor parental discipline and monitoring leads to child behavior problems, causing rejection by pro-social peers and failure in school during middle childhood. Having been rejected by pro-social peers and failing in school, the child commits to a deviant peer group, turning to delinquency. Patterson & Stouthamer-Loeber (1984) found evidence in support of this claim in a study of parents of seventh and tenth grade boys. They found that disruptions in parenting practices, such as lower levels of parental monitoring, are associated with increased delinquency rates of adolescents. Patterson & Stouthamer-Loeber (1984) asserts that a lack of parental monitoring may actually serve a dual role; initially, it may determine youth involvement in delinquent behavior and second, it may determine who recidivates.

Family mismanagement practices are what Patterson et al. (1989) refers to as "disrupters" having a negative effect on parenting skills and an indirect negative effect on the child's antisocial behavior. These disrupters may include, but are not limited to, family and demographic characteristics such as antisocial behaviors in other family members, socioeconomic status, marital conflict, and divorce (Patterson et al., 1989). Furthermore, Patterson et al. (1989) contends that the effect of disruptive behaviors is mediated through "perturbations in parenting" (Patterson et al., 1989: 332). Some of the factors that influence parental behaviors are actually passed on from the child's grandparents as a function of antisocial behavior and poor family management. These family mismanagement practices influence parental traits because they become susceptible to stressors that include family and demographics. Demographic stressors include income,

education, neighborhood, and ethnic group, whereas family stressors include unemployment, marital conflict, and divorce. It is these stressors, regardless of type, that influence disruptive family management practices, which influence the child's antisocial behavior (Patterson et al., 1989).

To examine the influence of disruptive family management practices among a known sample of parents with a history of antisocial parental behaviors, Johnson, Smailes, Cohen, Kasen, & Brook (2004) found that parents having a history of antisocial behavior were significantly more likely to engage in problem parenting behaviors. Problematic parenting behaviors included inconsistent enforcement of household rules, cigarette smoking, educational aspirations for the child, problems controlling anger towards the child, supervision towards child, affection towards child, communication, availability and support, home maintenance, maternal punishment, anti-social personality disorder, substance abuse, and other psychiatric disorders. Problematic parenting was also associated with children's use of aggression during adulthood even after problematic parenting behaviors were controlled for (Johnson et al., 2004). This finding supports the hypothesis that problematic parenting is a crucial component in the development of delinquent behavior (Patterson, 1982; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Sampson & Laub, 1993).

Other researchers have also found that parental mismanagement is a major factor contributing to delinquency (Simons, Johnson, Conger, & Elder 1998; Stewart, Simons, Conger, & Scaramella, 2002). Parental mismanagement includes behaviors such as providing children with a lack of supervision, lack of discipline, and a lack of emotional

support (Simons, Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber 1986). In a study of 407 adolescents and their parents, Stewart et al. (2002) measured poor parenting practices, which they conceptualized as harsh parenting and discipline techniques, and poor supervision. An eight-item scale was used as an indicator of poor parenting practices. Parents independently reported how often they engaged in harsh and inconsistent parenting practices. Items included questions such as when your child does something wrong, how often do you lose your temper, yell at him/her, spank or slap, punish, hit him/her with a belt, paddle or something else, and how often do you tell your child to get out of the house or lock him/her out of the house if they have done something wrong?

Poor supervision was an assessment of the extent to which parents displayed a limited range of knowledge regarding their child's behaviors and activities. Poor supervision also focused on whether parents showed little interest in their child's activities and did not pursue information on their child's daily activities. Harsh discipline was the combination of several observational scales including harsh punishment, hostility, physical attack, and inconsistent discipline to form a measure of harsh discipline, which they used as an indicator of poor parenting. These scales have been used in previous studies and have been predictive of internalizing and externalizing problems in youth (Stewart et al., 2002). Stewart et al. (2002) found that earlier poor parenting led to increases in delinquency and that delinquency led to increases in poor parenting (Stewart et al., 2002).

Ecological Models

Critics of parenting research contend that influences other than parents need to be investigated in order to account for differences in children (Collins, Maccoby, Steinberg, Hetherington, & Bornstein, 2000). Collins et al. (2000) asserts that however important families are in the lives of their children, the effects can only be understood in light of the simultaneous influence of social spheres such as peers and schools; and furthermore, that these influences must be understood within the broader context of neighborhoods, culture, and historical epochs that shape and moderate the effects of the family.

In an effort to expand upon the notion that parenting practices serve as an explanation for understanding delinquency while simultaneously considering the environment, Calhoun, Glaser, and Bartolomucci (2001) contend that delinquency is a result of three things: child characteristics, ecological context, and the interaction between all of these variables. Calhoun et al. (2001) developed the Juvenile Counseling and Assessment Model and Program (JCAP) to account for the etiology of delinquency, propose a strategy for treating delinquents in a variety of settings, train student counselors in counseling research to work with delinquent youth, and further the research through continually evaluating treatment modalities. Calhoun et al. (2001) claim that the JCAP model is consistent with other multidimensional and multicausal models. The models focus is on child characteristics, ecological contexts, and the interaction between the two.

Child characteristics. Child characteristics include genetic predisposition, gender, personality and intelligence dimensions, social competence, life skills, and cognitive factors. Research is mixed regarding genetics/heredity, some supports genetics as a risk

factor for delinquency (DiLalla & Gottesman, 1989) while others do not (Cadoret, Cain, & Crowe, 1983). For example, Cadoret et al. (1983) found that genetics alone is not substantial in explaining delinquency; however when coupled with adverse environmental factors delinquency was likely to increase.

The child characteristic research highlights several areas of caution. Historically, research conducted on males has been generalized to females; however, Calhoun (2001) found that females are unique in terms of behavior and emotions and therefore requiring specialized treatment. Child deficits in social competence and life skills may be the result of a learning disability or a problematic learning environment, resulting from violence exposure, substance abuse, or a chaotic family (Calhoun et al., 2001). Social competence may include poor interpersonal skills, anger management skills, and poor decision making skills (Dishion, Loeber, Stouthamer-Loeber, & Patterson, 1984). In terms of cognitive factors, the percentage of youth having mental health disorders and involved in the juvenile justice system is disproportionately high (Pullman, Kerbs, Koroloff, Veach-White, Gaylor, Sieler, 2006).

Ecological contexts. Ecological contexts include the family, peers, school, and the community (Calhoun et al., 2001). Family processes (interactions between family members) and management techniques have been found to be important variables as it relates to delinquency (Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Patterson et al., 1984; Patterson et al., 1989; Simons et al., 1998; Stewart et al., 2002; Simons, Loeber and Stouthamer-Loeber 1986). Providing additional support for the significant impact that the family has on delinquent behavior, Patterson, Forgatch, Yoerger, & Stoolmiller, (1998: 533) state that it is disrupted

parenting practices that are the "proximal mechanism for the production of antisocial forms of deviancy." In addition to family influences, peers have also been found to be one of the strongest correlates of delinquency (Warr, 2002).

Moreover, numerous studies involving performance in school have been conducted (Sprott, Jenkins, and Doob, 2005; May, 1999; Wallace and May, 2005; Jang, 2002; Gavazzi, Yarcheck, and Lim, 2005). As far as school variables are concerned, a strong bond to school has been identified as a protective factor against delinquency (Sprott, et al., 2005). In addition, Sprott et al. (2005) found evidence that a strong bond to school served as a protective factor against certain types of delinquency when children were exposed to certain risks, regardless of their interaction with deviant peers. Weaker bonds are indicative of unsuccessful school performance resulting in poor grades, expulsion, isolation from teachers, poor attitude towards school rules, and dropping out of school. As it relates to the aforementioned influences, an ecological model clearly recognizes the importance of the child's environment in the development of delinquency (Bronfenbrenner, 1989).

Interactive processes. Although researchers have individually found the previous discussed variables important in the etiology of delinquency, it is the interactions between the variables in this model that Calhoun et al. (2001) consider to be most important. In fact, they claim that understanding the interaction between the variables outlined is "key." The JCAP model is referred to as a fluid model rather than a static model because it recognizes that the level of youth interactions within each of the domains varies depending on the stage of development (Calhoun et al., 2001). Jessor, Van Den Bos, Vanderryn,

Costa, & Turbin (1995) found that protective and risk factors, as represented by one's personality and the environment helped to either protect youth from engaging in delinquent behavior or furthering participation in delinquent activities. Considering the model recognizes youth interactions in various settings, Calhoun et al. (2001), believe that their model is comprehensive and research driven.

To this point the literature has shown the various ways in which human development and family processes impact behavior, more specifically delinquent behavior. Parenting behaviors are a central variable in the etiology of delinquency, according to various developmental and ecological models. Although parenting behaviors are important, Rose, Glaser, Calhoun, & Bates (2004) claim that the impact of parental attitudes and emotional responses, which they term parental competencies, on child behaviors is the most important factor in delinquency. This notion of parental competency is a different concept from those discussed previously because it considers the influence of attitudes and the emotional state of parents rather than just a narrow view of parental behaviors only. Rose et al. (2004) hypothesize that parental competency is made up of the following constructs: exasperation in regard to the child (parental hopelessness), mistrust of the juvenile justice system, shame over parenting self-efficacy, parental monitoring, fear of the child, and parent perceptions of the child's exposure to violence. It is hypothesized by Rose et al. (2004) that each of these constructs affects the level of parental competency by having a negative effect on court involved youth. Accordingly, each will be discussed in relation to the ways in which it may serve as a disruptor to parenting court involved juveniles.

Theoretical model of parental competency. Exasperation in regard to the child, also referred to as parental hopelessness, is the idea that parents become frustrated, angry, and foster a hopeless attitude towards the child, resulting in a sense of resignation (Rose et al., 2004); in other words, the parent has "had it" with their child. According to Rose et al. (2004) parents become so frustrated with their children that they are ready to hand them over to the court system because they cannot deal with them. Furthermore, these parents have negative expectations regarding the future of their children.

The level of anger towards the child refers to parental emotions such as "irritation, inflammation, and strong passion of displeasure excited by a sense of antagonism toward the child, child's behavior(s), and involvement with the court" (Rose et al., 2004: 30). Additionally, parents may be angry with their children because they are afraid of them, sparking emotions such as alarm, dread, and concern that the child will harm them; this notion is fear of the child. Theoretically, parents that are afraid of their children are less likely to set parameters for appropriate behavior, monitor behavior, and/or provide consequences for inappropriate behavior because they are in fear that the child will retaliate against them in a physical manner.

For parents, knowing that they are incapable of controlling or parenting their child may produce feelings of shame over their parenting efficacy. Parents of court involved juveniles have often presented as humiliated, embarrassed, and discouraged about parenting their child (Rose et al., 2004). A low estimate of one's self-efficacy means that parents are more likely to give up when challenged with a stressful situation, such as having a difficult child. These parents also tend to blame themselves for the problems with

the child. Furthermore, because parents experience negative emotions such as shame over their parenting efficacy, they may be more likely to enable the child, make excuses and "diminish the seriousness of the child's involvement with the court" (Rose et al., 2004: 31). This may lessen the likelihood of the juvenile and the parent responding to court intervention.

Parental monitoring of the child is also a construct of parental competency because of its strong correlation to delinquent behavior (Nye, 1985; Dishion & McMahon, 1998; Patterson et al., 1989). Although monitoring a child's whereabouts and activities are an important part of parenting in general (of both pro-social and antisocial youth), it is an especially critical component to parenting known delinquents ((Nye, 1985; Dishion & McMahon, 1998; Patterson et al., 1989) and substance abusing youth (Dishion & Loeber, 1985). Monitoring affects the level of parental competency in that a child left unsupervised is more easily able to become involved with delinquent peers and activities.

Extending parenting to include community influences, mistrust of the juvenile justice system is identified by Rose et al. (2004) as a parental competency construct. A parent that mistrusts justice officials may express a lack of confidence in the administration of justice and doubt the integrity of the very system in which their child is involved. According to social learning theory, parental feelings of mistrust of officials can easily be passed on to the child in various ways. For example, if a parent bad mouths the job that the police or the courts do, then the child is likely to produce similar negative feelings towards justice officials. Harboring negative feelings towards justice system officials can not only have negative effects on the parent's ability to "parent" but can also have a

negative impact on the child's behavior. Of utmost importance for the child's current (court involved) circumstances and future would be the child's inability to comply with the conditions imposed by the court.

The last construct related to parental competency is that of parent's perceptions of the child's exposure to violence. Research has shown that children are both victims and witnesses to violence (Richters & Martinez, 1993a). Exposure to violence, regardless of type (whether a victim or a witness), is a serious matter for parents, courts, and the public to be concerned about, considering its association with mental health disorders (Richters & Martinez, 1993b). Rose et al. (2004: 30) specifically state that, "this construct is one that needs to be examined in further detail in order to understand the impact that it is having on youth." In addition to the constructs described above, Rose et al. (2004) contend that parental competency is influenced by disruptors such as family stressors, family demographics, and antisocial parents and grandparents as set forth in the model offered by Patterson et al. (1989).

Though Rose et al. (2004) did not actually perform any statistical analysis using their parental competency constructs, Bradshaw, Glaser, Calhoun, and Bates (2006) did. Specifically, in a study of 203 parents of juveniles before the juvenile court, Bradshaw et al. (2006) examined violent (delinquent) and oppositional (disobedient) behavior as a function of parental competencies and also created parental stress models. Violent behaviors as defined by Bradshaw et al. (2006) include initiating a physical fight, carrying or having used a weapon, getting angry easily, having a bad temper, bullying or

threatening others, having been physically cruel to people, and torturing or abusing an animal.

Oppositional behaviors included arguing with parents, defying rules, blaming others for his/her mistakes, lying to obtain goods or to avoid obligations, staying out all night without permission, running away from home overnight, and skipping school. Bradshaw et al. (2006) grouped their predictor variables into three categories: family-level and community-level variables and parental stress models. Community-level variables consist of violence exposure and support of the justice system. Family-level variables were comprised of the inadequacy subscale (shame over parenting effectiveness), enabling, hopelessness, anger towards child, fear of child, and monitoring. Parental stressors include unemployment, being a single parent, income, number of children in the home, and having another child involved with the juvenile justice system (Bradshaw et al., 2006).

As for community-level variables, perceptions of violence exposure were positively associated with both violent and oppositional behavior (Bradshaw et al., 2006). Furthermore, perceptions of violence exposure were moderately but positively related to inadequacy, hopelessness, anger towards child, and fear of the child; it was negatively related to monitoring. Support for the justice system was negatively associated with inadequacy, enabling, and hopelessness. This means that the more support from the justice system a parent feels they have, the less likely they were to enable negative behaviors, feel their parenting skills were inadequate, and feel hopeless about the future of their child (Bradshaw et al., 2006). Support for the justice system was positively correlated with

parental monitoring, meaning that more support for the justice system was likely to result in higher levels of parental monitoring.

In addition, Bradshaw et al. (2006) examined community and family variables based on the level of the child's behavior. That is, the sample was divided into three groups dependent upon the level of violent behavior reported by the parent: low (28.6% with no violent behaviors reported), moderate (38.9% with 1 to 2 behaviors) and high (30% with 3 to 7 violent behaviors reported). The high group approximates a DSM-IV diagnosis of conduct disorder (Bradshaw et al., 2006). Given that there were three groups of levels of reported violence, a MANOVA was conducted to determine group differences. The analyses revealed that significant differences between the groups do exist on violence exposure, hopelessness, anger, and monitoring (Bradshaw et al., 2006).

Similarly, categories for oppositional behavior were created: low (34% with 1 to 2 behaviors reported), moderate (29.6% with 2 to 3 behaviors reported) and high (34% with 4 to 7 behaviors reported). Those in the high group are consistent with a DSM-IV diagnosis of Oppositional Defiant Disorder (Bradshaw et al., 2006). MANOVA analyses for oppositional youth also revealed significant group differences on violence exposure, inadequacy, hopelessness, and anger. In addition to individual violent behavior and oppositional behavior categories, Bradshaw et al. (2006) developed a behavior problem composite score (a combination of the violent and oppositional behavior scores) since they hypothesize that the cumulative effect of both violent and oppositional behavior is thought to have an emotional burden on parents.

They found that 21.7% of youth were categorized as both highly violent and highly oppositional with correlational analyses on the composite score showing slightly stronger effects for hopelessness, anger towards child, and monitoring (Bradshaw et al., 2006). According to Bradshaw et al. (2006), these analyses suggest that the cumulative effects of having a child with both violent and oppositional behaviors exacerbates hopelessness and level of anger towards the child and is associated with lower levels of monitoring.

To determine if parental stress variables were factors related to the six family-level variables (inadequacy, enabling, hopelessness, anger towards child, fear of child, and monitoring), Bradshaw et al. (2006) created six models of parental stress. In other words, they were interested in whether the added stress experienced by a parent would result in a significant increase in the amount of variation in family level and child behavior variables. Regression analyses found that parental stressors were not significantly related to parental beliefs or behaviors. Of the five stress variables, Bradshaw et al. (2006) they found that unemployment status was a significant predictor of enabling. As a result, Bradshaw et al. (2006) concluded that family-level variables were not significantly exacerbated by their measures of parental stress. Furthermore, according to Bradshaw et al. (2006) it appears that violent and oppositional behaviors had a greater impact on family and community-level variables than did parental stress. Although there has been limited research on parental competencies (JOPQ developed by Rose et al., 2004), further examination of the impact of community and family-level variables and specific impact on parenting is warranted.

Community-Level Factors

As we have seen from the previously discussed research, families do not exist in a vacuum. Rather they are influenced by a number of other factors such as the neighborhood in which they reside. Garbarino et al. (2005) explains that families and environments constantly negotiate and renegotiate their relationships because they are influencing, changing, and depending on one another. Consistent with the JCAP model developed by Calhoun et al. (2001), Garbarino et al. (2005) also contend that behavior is constantly shifting and evolving based on the interplay between the child's biology, parent's behavior, and the environment. Parenting is a complex process and is often times exacerbated by high risk situations such as poverty, employment and family instability, with violence in the neighborhood adding to the already difficult job of parenting (Osofsky, 1995). In examining community-level factors which are considered in the quest to understand family dynamics and/or delinquency, two major areas are considered. They are being exposed to violence and mistrust of the justice system.

Violence exposure. Violence is a public health problem and is recognized as an epidemic in the United States (Rosenberg, O'Carroll, & Powell, 1992). In addition to being a public health concern, community violence is also a concern for the development of children. Shahinfar, Fox, & Leavitt (2000: 115) define community violence as "the presence of violence and violence related events within an individual's proximal environment, including home, school, and the neighborhood; it may involve direct or threatened harm, be witnessed or experienced, and involve known or unknown persons." Between 1993 and 2003, those ranging in age 12-17 were 2.5 times more likely than adults

to be the victim of a nonfatal violent crime such as rape, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault and simple assault (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006).

In a study of 165 children ranging from Kindergarten to 6th grade, living in Southeast Washington D.C., Richters & Martinez (1993a) found that both younger and older children were significantly more likely to report that they had witnessed violence versus having been victimized themselves. In terms of the location of witnessing violence, 68% of 5th and 6th graders reported that the violent act took place near their home.

As a result of exposure to violence, children may also be at increased risk for developing distress symptoms.

In the same sample of children from Southeast Washington, D.C., Richters & Martinez (1993b), found that exposure to violence was associated with symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder that included feelings such as intrusive thoughts about upsetting events, feeling lonely, nervous, scared and upset, having a hard time getting to and staying asleep, being afraid they may not live long, and not caring about anything. Due to the cross-sectional nature of this study, there may be other reasons that these children exhibited signs of distress (Richters & Martinez, 1993b).

Although children's reports and parent's reports of exposure to violence were consistent with one another, this was not the case for girls, raising questions as to who provides the most accurate reports (Richters & Martinez, 1993a). In older girls, Richters & Martinez (1993a) are more inclined to place credence with the child because they were asked to report the violence they had been exposed to, whereas the parents' reporting of violence exposure was reliant upon what the child had revealed to them.

Shahinfar et al. (2000) reported similar findings in terms of reported exposure to community violence by children and parents, 78.1% and 66.5% respectively. These findings lead Shahinfar et al. (2000) to the conclusion that community violence appears to be part of young children's lives even though they presumably spend a substantial amount of their time with a parent or caretaker. These findings beg the question of the role that parents play in protecting from or exposing their children to violence.

These previous studies indicate that children's behavior is influenced by exposure to violence. Using this same framework, parenting may also be influenced by the environment, including exposure to violence. Simons, Lin, Gordon, Brody, & Conger (2002) examined the way in which community context is related to two dimensions of parenting behaviors among 867 families living outside of two metropolitan areas. The two dimensions of parenting were caretaker control (sets behavioral standards, reinforces successes, and disciplines non-compliant behaviors) and reliance on corporal punishment as a form of discipline. In examining the differences by neighborhood context and parenting dimensions, Simons et al. (2002) identified two competing hypotheses regarding the way in which the community might influence caretaker control and child behavior problems.

The first is the parental buffering perspective. The parental buffering perspective asserts that parental controls such as setting behavioral standards may be a must in high-risk areas where there are pressures to engage in delinquent behavior; coined the buffering perspective due to the fact that parental controls may serve as a "buffer" protecting the child from involvement in antisocial behavior. The second hypothesis identified by

Simons et al. (2002) is the evaporation hypothesis. The evaporation hypothesis runs counter to the buffering hypothesis because it posits that the deterrent effect of caretaker control decreases as delinquent behavior in the community increases (Simons et al., 2002). In other words, parenting practices may become less effective, thus the term evaporating, in a community where deviant behavior is prevalent.

In reference to community crime, children reported that criminal behavior was common in their community ranging from fights with weapons (35%), violent arguments (55%), robberies (31%), and murders (17%), public drinking (35%), and the selling of or using drugs was a problem (39%). Despite the levels of crime reported by children, caretakers viewed themselves as monitoring their children in a high capacity and that they used positive and negative consequences for children's behavior. As for corporal punishment, most parents reported using corporal punishment only as a discipline technique (Simons et al., 2002). Simons et al. (2002) found that their results supported the evaporation hypothesis since caretaker control was negatively associated with behavior problems regardless of the prevalence of community crime; however, the effect was significantly stronger in communities where delinquency was low. According to Simons et al. (2002), this finding suggests that caretaker control and discipline strategies that are effective in non-violent neighborhoods may not be as effective in high-risk neighborhoods involving delinquent activity.

Parents' emotional response to their child's exposure to violence has been found to be important (Garbarino, Dubrow, Kostelny, & Pardo, 1992) and one of the best predictors of how children will respond to stress and trauma (Osofsky, 1995). Garbarino et al. (2005:

302) points out that "As long as parents are not pushed beyond their "stress absorption capacity," children will continue to cope with difficult environments. But once a parent's stress absorption capacity is exceeded, the well-being of young children deteriorates rapidly and markedly." Moreover, these parents become emotionally unavailable to their children because of their tendency to deny or misinterpret their signals and needs (Garbarino et al., 2005). Consequently, parents that are forced to cope with dangerous communities adapt in ways that tend to be dysfunctional for their families (Garbarino et al., 2005). Considering the complexities of parenting, the barrage of violence in the community may contribute to parents' feelings of helplessness and hopelessness (Osofsky, 1995).

Exposure to violent situations in many cases means police presence and response is necessary. Often times, the police become involved in matters where victims and witnesses are unwilling to cooperate. Although there are a number of reasons as to why cooperation may be lacking and sometimes completely absent, it may be that one of the reasons victims and witnesses are unwilling to "talk to the police" may be due to mistrust.

Mistrust of the justice system. Mistrust is a phenomenon that develops in communities where "resources are scare and threat is common, and among individuals with few resources and who feel powerless to avoid or manage the threat" (Ross, Mirowsky, & Pribesh, 2001). Living in a socially disorganized community where crime is experienced on a daily basis fosters mistrust in other residents. More specifically, living under threatening conditions such as a high crime area may promote mistrust. Ross et al.

(2001) hypothesizes that trust in communities is a crucial component because they contend the ability to form positive social relationships is dependent upon trust in others.

Ross et al. (2001) found support for their theory in a study of 2,482 Illinois residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods. These residents reported lower levels of trust due to higher levels of disorder in their neighborhoods. Neighborhood effects were not the only factors found to be associated with mistrust; Ross et al. (2001), also found that minorities, poverty, family structure (mother-only-families), and those with little education were more mistrusting than others. In their definition of collective efficacy, Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls (1997) assert that trust in neighbors and social bonds are likely to be important factors in decreasing crime.

There have been a number of studies examining adult attitudes towards the police (Brandl, Frank, Worden, & Bynum, 1994; Bartsch & Cheurprakobkit, 2004; Frank, Brandl, Cullen, Stitchman, 1996). Brandl et al. (1994) compared assessments of police performance such as satisfaction with the police during specific incidents and global attitudes of police, such as general satisfaction with the job that police do. In both measures, they found general and global support for police. More specifically, they found that global attitudes (general satisfaction) had substantial effects on specific assessments of police. It is no surprise and almost goes without saying that police misconduct has been attributed to widening the gap between citizens and the police. Police mistrust has also become a problem among inner city youth. In fact, Borrero (2001: 399) claims that "hostility and strain between police and inner city youth, particularly youth of color, are increasing." Children living in families where mistrust is prevalent may be likely to foster

negative feelings towards justice officials perhaps because of the views held by parents in addition to their own experiences.

With concerns of tension growing between police and youth, the Institute for Violence Reduction interviewed youth ages 13-24 to determine the extent to which police were forcefully carrying out their duties (Borrero, 2001). Of the 132 youth interviewed (gang and non-gang members), approximately 400 negative experiences were reported (Borrero, 2001). Specifically, 39% of respondents reported physical encounters, 24% involved verbal harassment, 3% involved sexual contact, with 34% reporting being harassed due to repeated harassment, denial of medical care, intimidation during searches, theft of property, and detention for no reason. Furthermore, when gang and non-gang member groups were compared, gang members reported more frequent and aggressive interactions with police. Borrero (2001) also found that positive experiences with the police were more likely to occur at younger ages.

Race and class differences in attitudes towards justice system officials among citizens have also been conducted. Using a conflict perspective to examine perceptions of injustice, Hagan & Albonetti (1982) found that blacks were more likely than whites to perceive criminal injustice. In terms of class structure, the surplus population, those not employed, regardless of race are also more likely to perceive criminal injustice (Hagan & Albonetti, 1982). In addition, they found evidence that race and class differences were stronger in metropolitan areas as compared to peripheral parts of the nation. Although Hagan & Albonetti's (1982) results support the findings that race and class differences

exist, the researchers caution against attempting to understand perceptions of criminal injustices without one another.

Leiber, Nalla and Farnworth (1998) also indicate that race is a factor in attitudes towards police. In a sample of known delinquents in Iowa, they found that minority males consistently reported negative views of the police compared to Whites, with race being the strongest predictor of police fairness and discrimination. Leiber et al. (1998) also report that youth from certain neighborhoods are resentful and resistant and harbor disrespect for the law, and more importantly, that these views are a function of the youth's social environment. To be more specific, the social environment was a measure of race, family's economic position, family structure (single vs. two parent home), and characteristics of the neighborhood in which they reside. All of the social environment variables significantly predicted attitudes towards the police, with the exception of family structure.

Attitudes towards police have also been examined from the perspective of the amount of contact and contact expectations with police. Bartsch & Cheurprakobkit (2004) found among those having contact with police in the past two years that the amount of contact with police was not predictive of attitudes towards police. More importantly, they found that positive experiences were associated with more positive attitudes, while negative experiences were correlated with negative attitudes. Contact expectations among respondents, while accounting for the experience did not predict attitudes (Bartsch & Cheurprakobkit, 2004). Bartsch & Cheurprakobkit (2004) highlight the importance of these findings suggesting that police should not necessarily worry about placing citizens in

situations where they believe they will have a negative experience. Instead, the researchers indicate that police should focus on making the situation a positive experience.

Police are not the only mistrusted "players" in the justice system. Trust has also been studied in the relationship between attorneys and juveniles. Walker (1971) found that juveniles associated their attorney with the police, especially when the attorney was a public defender. Pierce & Brodsky (2002) found that trust was related to the juveniles understanding of the role his/her lawyer played, with lower levels of trust correlated with lower levels of understanding. In addition to understanding the role of the attorney, the type of attorney was also significantly predictive of mistrust. Pierce & Brodsky (2002) indicate that those represented by private (hired) attorneys were more trusting than those that were court appointed. Race and intellectual differences were also found. Lower intellectually functioning Whites were found to be less trusting with their attorney compared to higher functioning Whites (Pierce & Brodsky, 2002).

The opposite was found for Blacks; lower intellectually functioning Blacks were more trusting with their attorneys compared to those that were higher functioning (Pierce & Brodsky, 2002). It may appear implicit that parents are involvement with their children and the attorney, but this was not the case based on age. There were no differences found in the amount of time a parent assisted in the defense process based on age (Pierce & Brodsky, 2002). This finding is important for two distinct reasons. First, it begs the question of the degree to which parents are involved. Secondly, one would assume that if juveniles are lower functioning, then assistance from the parent would be a vital part of the juvenile's defense strategy. Although this study did not address the reasons parents were

not involved with the defense of their child, it may be due to their own levels of mistrust in the justice system.

While police have the huge responsibility of protecting public safety and maintaining public order, the relationship they maintain with the public is of utmost importance so that citizens can feel safe and confident that the police are a legitimate entity, necessary for legal order. Unfortunately, mistrust of justice system officials creates a vicious cycle. For any number of reasons citizens do not feel that the police are trustworthy; cooperation with information sharing is limited at best. This creates a no win situation for the police and community members. The police lose the ability to exchange important information with citizens, while citizens may lose the opportunity to improve their situations by getting to know and cooperating with police. Research indicates that mistrust is a negative emotion and fosters negative attitudes towards others. Attitudes of mistrust towards the police can easily be expanded to include other justice officials, including the courts. In addition to community level variables, family level variables will also be discussed in order to show their influence on delinquency.

Family Level Factors

Consistent with an ecological approach, the Gluecks (1950) advocated for an eclectic approach to the study of human motivation and behavior. Considering the complexity of the biosocial problem (delinquency), the approach taken should not ignore any promising leads to explaining delinquency (Glueck et al., 1950). Furthermore, the Gleucks (1950) contend that the focus of such behavior should occur when the environment and the organism interact. Their study included 500 institutionalized male

delinquents matched to 500 non-delinquents in Massachusetts with data collected on the boys' physique, temperament, and family factors. Glueck & Glueck (1950) found that the family was the most important factor in explaining delinquency. They refer to the inadequacy of parents being reflected in their lax and harsh discipline techniques and carelessness of supervision that often times turns to neglect. Moreover, the Gluecks assert that it is the family setting that allows for the development of deep-rooted and persistent character and personality distortions.

To account for differences in the home environments of delinquents and non-delinquents, the Gluecks reviewed the backgrounds of parents in the study and found that parents are transmitters of "biosocial heritage" and their biosocial handicaps should be taken into consideration as at least partially influencing their ability to rear their child appropriately (Glueck & Glueck, 1950). Mothers of delinquents were found to have greater incidence of emotional disturbances, mental retardation, alcoholism, and criminal histories even after controlling for economic differences when compared to non-delinquent mothers (Glueck & Glueck, 1950). As highlighted by the Gluecks study, the influence of the family is certainly an important factor to consider, but more importantly, consideration must be given to parents' beliefs, thoughts, feelings, and behaviors with regard to anger towards the child, fear of the child, shame over their parenting effectiveness, hopelessness, and monitoring ability.

Anger towards child. Patterson (1982) contends that aversive events that occur in the family are from conflicts among family members in addition to sources outside the family [and] that it is such events that alter moods and shape behavior. In clinical contacts

with a study of chronic delinquents, Patterson (1982) found that anger was a salient feature in the behavior of parents and children. In fact, Patterson (1982) describes that family members were palpably angry and involved in "intense, long-standing struggles" with one another. In particular, Patterson (1982) found this to be true of mothers who were very angry with their problem child. Moreover, Patterson (1982: 68) found that these same mothers seemed to be "angry with the world in general." In addition feeling angry towards their child, some parents continued to make negative statements about the child such as "he is really bad" and "you can't trust him" (Patterson, 1982: 68). Patterson (1982) found that statements such as these made by parents turned out to be self-fulfilling prophecies.

In addition to feelings of anger towards the child, Patterson (1982) also found that parents seemed to have spiteful intentions towards the child. Thus, it is the combination of anger and spiteful feelings that leads to physical assaults toward the child (Patterson, 1982). Patterson (1982: 68) further indicates that these "angry struggles" characterized a number of the cases to the point that treatment was impaired. These families were so tangled up in their own series of crises that it impacted family interactions to the point that the parents ability to use effective family management skills was seriously disrupted (Patterson, 1982).

Fear of child. Typically the term "abuse" is associated with spousal abuse or child abuse that for many years was thought to be a "family problem" that should be dealt with inside of the home. Parent abuse or parent battering has also been identified as a type of family abuse, with distinct intrapsychic, interpersonal, and structural dynamics (Harbin & Madden, 1979). The victims of this type of abuse are parents, while the perpetrators are

their adolescent or young adult child (Harbin & Madden, 1979). Verbal threats to harm or actual violent behavior by one's child invokes a sense of fear among parents (Harbin & Madden, 1979). Harbin & Madden (1979) claim that attacks and threats by an adolescent may represent the opportunity to control or replace an ineffective parent or punish them for permissiveness and a lack of leadership. Although the most lethal form of parent battering is parricide, most attacks range from destruction of furniture to physical assaults (Harbin & Madden, 1979). The assault then leads to a further deterioration of the relationship between the parent and the child.

Often times, abused parents fail to report being assaulted to the authorities and even when the assault is detected they tend to underestimate the seriousness of the problems and tend to go to great lengths to keep the abusive behavior a secret (Harbin & Madden, 1979). Brezina (1999) found that youth-on-parent battering occurred more often than other types of family violence, but that it was the least likely to be reported. In addition, Brezina (1999) found that sons were more likely to resort to physical violence or use weapons. Livingston (1986) found that 29% of single mothers reported being assaulted by their children.

Agnew & Huguley (1989) developed an integrated framework from three theories of delinquency: social control, differential association, and strain theories in order to explain assaults on parents. Specifically, they hypothesized that parent battering is a result of: internal (beliefs, attachment, and drug use) and external social controls (formal and informal factors), differential association factors (beliefs and involvement with those who

engage in violence), and strain factors (stress, socioeconomic level, achievement of immediate goals, and environment adversity).

Using data from the 1972 National Survey of Youth (NSY), Agnew & Huguley (1989) found that parent battering is extensive with approximately 5% of youth reporting they had assaulted their parent in the past year, particularly daughters, a finding that is contradictory to Brezina (1999). In terms of gender, race, SES, family structure, and the size of the juvenile, Agnew & Huguley (1989) found no significant relationship existed between the variables and assaults. Although non-significant relationships were uncovered between those particular variables, overall, there were some findings that shed light on their theoretical considerations. Adolescents who assault their parent are also likely to have friend who do the same, they approve of delinquency such as assaultive behavior under certain conditions, feel as if they will escape sanctioning, be weakly attached to their parents, and be White (Agnew & Huguley, 1989). Being in fear of the child is likely to produce devastating emotional problems not only for the parent, but the developing child as well.

Shame over parenting effectiveness. Shame is an emotion in response to a negative view of one's self (Harper & Hoopes, 1990). According to Rose et al. (2004) shame is one emotion found in parents of juvenile offenders; other common feelings include humiliation, embarrassment, and discouragement. Years of clinical experience by Rose and colleagues have linked these emotions to parent's statements about the poor job they feel they have done as parents. Shame over parenting efficacy was also seen in the Philadelphia Study (Furstenburg, Cook, Eccles, Elder, & Sameroff, 1999). The

Philadelphia Study, an ethnography, conducted in 1991 to specifically examine how community conditions influence and are influenced by family and parenting processes.

One of the mothers in the study, Lisa, expressed feeling little confidence in her parenting ability and furthermore, reports having never felt like an effective parent, regretting letting things get out of hand when her children were young (Furstenburg et al., 1999). In this example, Lisa reported having no control over her son's behavior, in that he comes and goes as he pleases, quit school, drinks alcohol several times a week, and is involved in high levels of delinquency (Furstenburg et al., 1999). Harper & Hoopes (1990) contend that when someone is shameful, they want to disappear, be someone else, and turn back time to undo what has been done that is viewed as shameful.

According to Bandura (1982), self-perceptions of efficacy influence patterns of thoughts and emotional reactions during anticipatory and actual events with the environment; they are not inert estimates of future actions. Judgments of self-efficacy, regardless of whether true or false, have an influence on one's choice of activities and environmental settings and for that reason acting on misjudgments of personal efficacy can produce adverse effects (Bandura, 1982). Social learning theory postulates whether judgments of self-efficacy are faulty or not, they are based on four principal sources of information: enactive attainments (experiences), vicarious experiences (witnessing the successful performance of others), verbal persuasion (works best on those that believe that they can produce productive effects through action), and physiological state (judging capability, strength, and vulnerability) (Bandura, 1982). Enactive attainments are thought

to provide the most influence on efficacy because it is based on "authentic mastery" experiences (Bandura, 1982).

Activities viewed as being able to successfully perform are undertaken, while activities that are thought to exceed their coping capacity are avoided (Bandura, 1982). The amount of effort expended coupled with the amount of time one will persist is determined largely by judgments of self-efficacy (Badura, 1982). In fact, Bandura (1982: 123) writes,

> High self-percepts of efficacy may affect preparatory and performance effort differently, in that some self-doubt bestirs learning but hinders adept execution of acquired capabilities. In applying existing skills strong self-efficaciousness intensifies and sustains the effort needed for optimal performance, which is difficult to realize if one is beleaguered by self-doubts.

Although shame is an emotion marked by judgments of self-efficacy based on previous experiences, it appears to have an influence on the psychological welfare of the parent but more importantly, on parenting efficacy. Perceived inefficacy can lead to parents' giving up because of the doubt created (efficacy-based) or because they feel certain that their efforts are based in futility due to unresponsiveness, negative bias, or punitiveness of the environment (outcome-based) (Bandura, 1982). In order to overcome efficacy-based futility, it requires development of essential competencies and strong perceptions of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982).

Outcome-based futility necessitates a change in the social environment in order for people to gain the benefits of competencies they already gain (Bandura, 1982). According to Bandura's model, behavior is best predicted by both efficacy and outcome based beliefs.

Furthermore, the negative influence of both self-efficacy and outcome beliefs leads to apathy and resignation (Bandura, 1982). This means that when people have a low sense of personal efficacy and nothing they do produces results, they feel resigned to a dreary life (Bandura, 1982).

Hopelessness. Hopelessness has been defined as "a system of cognitive schemas whose common denomination is negative expectations about the future" (Beck, Weissman, Lester, & Trexler, 1974: 864). Hopelessness has been studied in patients suffering from depression (Beck, 1967), abused suicidal women (Thompson, Kaslow, & Kingree, 2002), female substance abusers (Butler, 2000), and adolescent cancer survivors and their parents (Kazak, Christakis, Alderfer, & Coiro, 1994); however, there has been limited research on hopelessness as it relates to parents' thoughts, feeling, and beliefs reference their delinquent child (Rose et al., 2004; Bradshaw et al., 2006).

Beck et al. (1974) measured hopelessness from a series of pessimistic statements made by psychiatric patients whom were adjudged hopeless by clinicians and attitudes about the future. Sample false items were I might as well give up because I can't make things better for myself, my future seems dark to me, there's no use in really trying to get something I want because I probably won't get it, all I can see ahead of me is unpleasantness rather than pleasantness, and I don't expect to get what I really want. A sample of true items were I look forward to the future with hope and enthusiasm, when things are going badly, I am helped by knowing they can't stay that way forever, in the future, I expect to exceed in what concerns me most, and I have great faith in the future.

Each item was scored with 0 or 1, with the total hopelessness score ranging from zero to twenty. In a sample of 294 hospitalized patients who had recently attempted suicide, factor analysis produced three factors: feelings about the future, loss of motivation, and future expectations. The final scale comprised of twenty true and false questions, yielding a reliability coefficient of .93, furthermore, all inter correlations were significant.

According to the hopelessness theory of depression, as developed by Abramson, Metalsky, & Alloy (1989: 360), some individuals experience negative events that serve as "occasion setters" contributing to hopelessness. Since not all people that experience negative events become hopeless and depressed, Abramson et al. (1989) assert that there are three types of inferences that people make when faced with negative life situations that accentuate whether they become hopeless and furthermore, develop the symptoms of hopelessness depression. First are judgments about why the negative event occurred, second, judgments about the consequences resulting from the negative event, and finally, inferred self-characteristics (Abramson et al., 1989). Taken together, these negative interpretations lead one to develop hopelessness, which is a cause of hopelessness depression. Moreover, Abramson et al. (1989: 360) assert that symptoms of hopelessness depression are "retarded initiation of voluntary responses, sad affect, suicide, lack of energy, apathy, psychomotor retardation, sleep disturbances, difficulty in concentration, mood-exacerbated negative cognitions."

In a study of African-American women, Butler (2000) cited hopelessness and despair as reasons for crack-cocaine use. Specifically, participants resorted to use of crack

to escape misery from urban decline, job loss, residential segregation, family instability, and communal dysfunction (Butler, 2000). In addition, Harm & Phillips (2001) interviewed thirty-eight female prisoners in the Arkansas Department of Corrections who had previously served a prison sentence to elicit information about demographics, relationships with family and children, number of children, placement of children while mother served time, income information, and participation in programs while in prison and the community.

Many of the women in the study had drug addiction problems that were part of the reasons they returned to prison (Harm & Phillips, 2001). In the interviews, the women reported five major factors as reasons why the relapsed: returning to the family where other family members used, re-establishing friendships with drug users, economic difficulties, isolated crises, and "negative emotions such as frustration, hopelessness and isolation." Harm & Phillips (2001) concluded that these women appeared to lack the necessary skills or encouragement to handle the pressures without resorting to drug use, lacked resources, or were constrained by the conditions of parole.

Hopelessness has also been found to be a risk factor among suicidal abused African-American women (Thompson et al., 2002). In their study of one-hundred suicide attempters compared to one-hundred non-attempters, Thompson et al. (2002) report that attempters are significantly more likely to report higher levels of depressive symptoms, hopelessness, drug abuse, and childhood abuse and neglect, compared to non-attempters.

Postnatal depression has also been associated with hopelessness. Leahy-Warren & McCarthy, (2007) found that women suffering from postnatal depression exemplify other

feelings such as loneliness, anxiety, and loss of control at a time typically associated with joy. The researchers found that psychotherapeutic treatment options were more successful in treating postnatal depression better than antidepressants. In addition, they found that the social support system of postnatal mothers is important (Leahy-Warren & McCarthy, 2007).

Parents of juvenile delinquents have been found to present as hopeless as it relates to the future of their child (Rose et al., 2004; Bradshaw et al., 2006). Specifically pertaining to hopelessness, Bradshaw et al. (2006) found that parents of juvenile delinquents with higher levels of violent and oppositional behavior reported higher levels of hopelessness regarding the future of their child. Hopelessness is a pervasive state that colors behaviors, interactions, and impacts every facet of life. Due to the limited amount of research conducted with hopelessness as a salient variable among parents of known delinquent populations, future studies would benefit from this endeavor.

Parental monitoring. Poor parental monitoring; that is, providing lower levels of parental control and supervision, places juveniles at risk of becoming delinquents (Nye, 1958). A lack of parental monitoring may send the message to a child that his/her parent doesn't care where he is and in return the child is more likely to act out if he has an opportunity. Parental monitoring has been defined as "a set of correlated parenting behaviors involving attention to and tracking of the child's whereabouts, activities, and adaptations [and] is a necessary, but not sufficient parent behavior for effective parenting and improved adaptation for the child" (Dishion & McMahon, 1998: 61). A number of studies have been conducted with parental monitoring as a central variable and its impact

on antisocial behavior (Cernkovich & Giordano, 1987), monitoring peers and its influence on delinquency (Dillon, Pantin, Robbins, & Szapocznik, 2008), what parents know and how they know it (Kerr & Stattin, 2000), and drug use and aggression (Richards, Miller, O'Donnell, Wasserman, and Colder, 2004).

In an effort to explain the role of the family, Patterson (1980, 1982) claims that direct parental controls include monitoring, supervision, clearly articulated family rules, and rational punishments for wrongdoings. Similar to Patterson's contentions and expanding and building upon previous social control theorists, Gottfredson & Hirschi (1990) developed their theory of low self-control in A General Theory of Crime. At the heart of their theory is the idea that effective parenting includes monitoring of the child's behavior, recognition of deviant behavior, and consistent and proportional punishment for the child when deviant acts are recognized (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990).

Furthermore, failing to monitor children's behavior effectively results in children at risk for developing low self-control (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). The concept of low self-control includes behaviors and traits such as impulsivity, insensitivity, risk-taking, physicality, short-sightedness and a non-verbal style (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990: 90). Unnever, Cullen, & Agnew (2006) found that the absence of effective monitoring contributes to both low-self control and aggressive attitudes. Moreover, in a meta-analysis on self-control, Pratt & Cullen (2000: 953) state, "low self-control is an important predictor of criminal behavior and the general theory warrants a measure of acceptance."

Dishion & Loeber (1985) found that parental monitoring was directly and indirectly related to substance abuse. Consistent with their finding, Dishion, Reid, & Patterson,

1988) found that parental monitoring was a factor in the likelihood of children as young as nine or ten years old sampling drugs. Patterson (1982) in his study of delinquent children referred for clinical services found that parents were lacking in monitoring. Patterson & Dishion (1985) found that parental monitoring had direct and indirect effects on delinquent behavior, being mediated by involvement with delinquent friends.

Youth who are monitored by their parents report less delinquency, drug use, and aggression (Richards, Miller, O'Donnell, Wasserman, and Colder, 2004). In a sample of urban African-American youth, Richards et al (2004) reported differences between parental monitoring and gender. Although boys reported more involvement in delinquency, they found that boys were monitored less than girls, perhaps because of the perception that girls engage in riskier behaviors (Richards et al, 2004). Previous researchers produced results that indicate otherwise; boys are at greater risk when they are not monitored. Such risks include exposure to violence (Richards et al, 2004) and adaptation to a street culture, where boys can become involved in delinquency, drug use, and aggressive behaviors (Reese et al, 2001). Greater levels of parental monitoring (direct controls) are also associated with lower levels of personal victimization, witnessing violence among children, fewer depressive symptoms and less hopelessness (Ceballo, Ramirez, Hearn, and Maltese, 2003).

Bahr, Hoffman, and Yang, (2005) studied parental and peer influences on alcohol and drug use within the past thirty days using a sample of 7^{th} -12^{th} graders in a comparison of social learning and social control theories. For measures specific to social control, they measured attachment to mother and father as separate and distinct indicators, along with

parental monitoring. Items for attachment included, do you feel close to your mother/father, do you share your thoughts with your mother/father, and do you enjoy spending time with your mother/father. Parental monitoring was measured by asking the following questions: "If you drank some beer or wine or liquor without your parents' permission, would you be caught by your parents?" and "If you carried a handgun without your parents' permission, would you be caught by your parents?" The last question measuring parental monitoring was, "If you skipped school, would you be caught by your parents"? Although Bahr et al (2005) found more support for the social learning theory; they conclude that of the three social control variables tested, parental monitoring was the most important (Bahr et al, 2002). Specifically, parental monitoring had the strongest effect on marijuana and illicit drug use.

Though researchers have included monitoring as part of effective parenting strategies, not all researchers even agree on the meaning of parental monitoring. For example, Kerr & Stattin (2000) assert that most measures of parental monitoring only tap into what parents know, not how they know what they know. For Kerr & Stattin (2000), this is problematic because monitoring implies parental action but current parental monitoring measures inquire about knowledge only; that is they do not inquire about how parents learn what the child behaviors are.

Similar to monitoring measures, Kerr & Stattin (2000) identified three potential sources of parental knowledge that were closely related to parental monitoring: child disclosure (child's willing disclosure of information), parental solicitation (parental initiatives at gathering information from the child or their child's friends or friend's

parents), and parental control (controlling child's freedom to come and go as they please and like behaviors). Based on the how parents know what they know rather than what they know, Kerr & Stattin (2000) believe that the three constructs capture Dishion & McMahon's (1998: 61) previously discussed definition of parental monitoring, that is the "tracking of the child's whereabouts, activities, and adaptations".

Using these constructs, Kerr & Stattin (2000) found that from both the parent and child's perspective, child disclosures provided a better explanation of how parents get their information about the child's activities. Furthermore, child disclosure was related to better adjustment as compared to parental solicitation or parental control (Kerr & Stattin, 2000). As for parental controls, Kerr & Stattin (2000) are also critical of parental controls considering the nature of their measures. Their measures consisted of items such as requiring permission to stay out late, telling of Saturday night plans in advanced, tell where and with whom they have been, and if they have been out past curfew, they have to explain why (Kerr & Stattin, 2000).

They found that higher levels of parental control were correlated with children's feeling they were controlled and furthermore, that feelings of being controlled were associated with poorer adjustment such as depression, poorer self-esteem, and greater expectations of failure (Kerr & Stattin, 2000). Kerr & Stattin (2000) acknowledge their methodological limitations (low strengths) and caution that they do not know the direction of causality. Although parental monitoring has been operationalized in various ways, its link to effective parenting cannot be denied. Regardless of how parents learn what they know about their child's behavior it does not negate the action of "monitoring"; that is,

tracking and knowing the child's activities. Rather, how parents know what they know may be a function of some other parenting component such as attachment or strategy employed as a result of the parent being aware that their child had previously committed a delinquent act (Kerr & Stattin, 2000).

Parental Control and Support

Conformity cannot be taken for granted, and as such delinquency is expected when social controls are not effective (Lilly, Cullen, and Ball, 1995). In taking this approach to the explanation of conformity, social control theory assumes that humans are rational, sharing the same norms and values, and that their motivation for behavior can be explained by the fact that humans are by nature pleasure-seeking and pain-avoiding; therefore, controls are needed to keep behavior in check. This definition implies that the motivation for delinquency is inherent in humans, and therefore no special motivation for delinquent behavior is required.

In order to maintain and promote conformity, social controls must be in effect (monitoring by parents, teachers, community members, and punishment), or it is likely that delinquency will result. According to Knepper (2001), social control theory is concerned with the controlling and restraining forces in play to prevent criminal behavior. At the heart of social control theory is the assertion that strong bonds to society serve to protect individuals from engaging in delinquent activity. Accordingly, when one's bonds to society are weakened, delinquency is more likely to result.

In an effort to explain how social controls are effective, Kornhauser (1978) explains that social controls can be either rewards for conformity to norms or punishments

for deviating from norms. Moreover, these social controls may be internal (self-control) or external (control by others or institutions) (Kornhauser, 1978). Although micro-social control theorists (informal systems) have remained dedicated to internal and external controls as reasons for conformity, they have conceptualized internal and external controls, as they pertain to delinquency, in different ways.

Borrowing the concept of "collective efficacy" from Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls (1997) to explain how neighborhoods exert control and provide support to reduce crime, Wright & Cullen (2001) refer to "parental efficacy" as the crime reducing effects of parents who control and support their children. In other words, "parental efficacy" is the effort aimed at keeping their children out of trouble. F. Ivan Nye, in Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior, (1958) focused his attention on the family as the most important source of social control. Nye's (1958:5) version of social control theory embraces four types of related social controls: internal, indirect, direct, and need satisfaction.

According to Nye (1958:5) internal controls are attempts by society to internalize mores and develop the conscience of the child. Nye (1958) claims that the level of internalized control is dependent upon the type of relationship the parent has with the child, stating that the child will accept the teachings of the parent if they accept the parent. Internal controls are important because if the child does not "identify" with the parent, then there is less of a chance that the parent will be able to influence the child's behavior. Indirect controls are controls that deal with one's affection towards their parent. Therefore, indirect controls are also dependent upon the relationship between the parent

and the child. In fact, Nye (1958) hypothesizes that as negative feelings towards parents increase, indirect controls decrease.

No society is solely dependent upon internal and indirect controls (Nye, 1958). Direct controls in the form of restriction and punishment are also seen as necessary. Nye asserts that parents can exercise control over their child's behavior by doing things such as restricting the amount of time spent away from home and restricting their choice of companions and participation in certain types of activities. Consequently, when children do not adhere to the rules established by the parent, the parent should impose punishment for the infraction or violation of the norm (Nye, 1958). The last type of social control is that of need satisfaction. This refers to meeting the needs of the child by way of affection, recognition, and security (Nye, 1958: 8).

Nye (1958:8) claims that the family, through needs satisfaction, affects "the chances the adolescent will have in satisfying his needs in the school, in his peer group, and later, in his occupation." In other words, internal, indirect, and direct controls are not the only types of control necessary to adequately ensure conformity (Nye, 1958). Nye (1958) acknowledges that satisfying children's needs in their entirety is not possible, but believes that families can go far in meeting the needs of children.

Nye (1958) found general support for his theory in a sample of 780 9^{th}-12^{th} graders in three Washington towns. Specifically, Nye (1958) tested the relationships between family attitudes and behavior and delinquency. He found that only about two percent of parent-child relationships (seven such relationships) were not consistent with his theory. Nye further asserts that in no instance do the results of his study show a relationship

opposite to that of his theory. Nye (1958:8) concludes that the family is the most important factor in exercising social control.

Hirschi (1969) developed his theoretical perspective by re-conceptualizing and combining the ideas of previous control theorists like Toby (1957) and Nye (1958). For Hirschi, the elements of the bond are multi-dimensional, to include attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief. Attachment refers to the bond between an individual and his or her parents, peers, and school. Hirschi (1969) argues that a lack of attachment to others is indicative of psychopathic attributes, in that one who lacks attachment is free from moral constraints, conscience and superego, resulting in delinquency.

Although parental controls are operationalized differently, they are essentially measuring similar constructs, such as supervision/ monitoring, the emotional bond to parents, and the presence of rules to guide behavior. Moreover, researchers have expanded upon and reconceptualized the work of previous theorists such as Nye (1958) and Hirschi (1969) in order to test elements of social control theory to determine their impact as it relates to parenting and delinquency. To more closely examine the theoretical concepts within social control theory, especially the different types of parental controls, consistent with Nye (1958), direct and indirect parental controls are examined.

Direct parental controls. Direct parental controls refer to supervising and controlling the behaviors of children. Wells & Rankin (1988) contends that previous research found weak and often non-significant relationships between various measures of parental controls. Responding to this claim and relying on Patterson's (1982)

developmental psychology model as previously discussed, Wells & Rankin (1988) reconceptualized direct control so that more specific components are included. Specifically, Wells & Rankin (1988) claim that direct controls have three components: normative regulation (rules, constraints, and criteria for behavior), monitoring, and discipline and/or punishment. Wells & Rankin's (1988) measures of direct parental control include regulation/restriction (the degree to which parents monitor their son's friends and activities), strictness (how strict respondents rated their parents), punishment contingency (the frequency of parents ignoring rather than punishing wrongful behavior), and punitiveness (how vigorously and frequently punishment ranged from yelling to hitting) (Wells and Rankin, 1988).

They found that measures of direct parental control do relate to delinquency (Wells & Rankin, 1988). Even after controlling for the effects of attachment, direct controls were significantly related to delinquency (Wells & Rankin, 1988). Not to dismiss the effects of indirect controls or attachment, Wells & Rankin (1988) indicate that direct controls are at least as effective as measure of indirect controls. In another test, Rankin & Wells (1990) also found direct controls are at least as effective as indirect controls in adolescent males. They also found that regardless of parental attachments, when punishment is too strict there exists a greater possibility of delinquent behavior (Rankin & Wells, 1990). Although Burton, Cullen, Evans, Dunaway, Kethineni, & Payne (1995) recognized Wells & Rankin's (1988) and Rankin & Wells (1990) salient contributions to understanding family interactions and delinquency, and reviving the interest in studying direct controls, they also point out their limitations. Burton et al. (1995) are critical of the fact that both studies

were only conducted using attachment, while leaving out the other three elements of Hirschi's (1969) theory: commitment, involvement, and belief, the lack of testing direct controls against competing theories, and the omission of females from their analyses.

Using the 1991 Youth Lifestyle Survey of 10^{th}-12^{th} grade high school students from a large metropolitan area in Virginia, Burton et al. (1995) tested direct and indirect parental controls similar to that of Wells & Rankin (1988) and Rankin & Wells (1990). Although measures of direct controls are guided by that of Wells & Rankin (1988), modified items include whether parents impose sanctions, express disappointment, restrict participation in extracurricular activities at school if the juvenile had committed a delinquent offense or did something wrong, and an assessment of parental monitoring (Burton et al., 1995).

They found that direct parental controls were significantly and inversely associated with general crime and drug use. Furthermore, lower levels of direct parental controls by parents were related to higher levels of delinquent behavior (Burton et al., 1995). Similar results were found by Scholte (1999), in a study of 150 Dutch adolescents arrested for a delinquent or status offense in 1984. Scholte (1999) found that two major risk factors for arrested youth during their adolescent years were perceived lack of parental supervision (knowledge of whereabouts when away from home, a system of rules to guide behavior, and leisure time activities monitored) and perceived deviancy of peers.

Consistent with previous control theorists, Wright & Cullen (2001) include three dimensions of direct parental controls: parental supervision, parental expectations of the child, and parental household rules. Parental supervision taps into the extent to which parents know what their children are doing and who their friends are. The two items included how often do they know where their child is and how many of their child's close friends do they know well; these items produced an alpha of .52. Parental expectations taps into the extent to which parents expect their children to make their bed, clean their room, help with household maintenance, complete routine chores, and to manage their time wisely (alpha .80); the scale included mother and child reports. To account for the presence of household rules, children were asked about the rules in the home. Specifically, they were asked about their being monitored watching television, keeping parents informed about their whereabouts, doing homework, and dating habits (alpha .45).

Parental support was measured in two dimensions: parental reliability and parental support (Wright & Cullen, 2001). The parental support scale was a fifteen item scale designed to tap into the extent to which parents were supportive through two avenues, emotional support and instrumental support. Parental reliability was measured by asking two questions, how often both their mother and father missed important events or activities. Encouraging hobbies, whether the child receives special lessons or activities, how often the child is praised, shown affection, and complimented are all measures of parental support taken from the perspective of the mother. Likewise, children were asked if they had gone to the movies, to dinner, gone shopping specifically for them, gone on an outing, to church, done things together, worked on school work, or played a game or sports

with their parent(s) in either the last week or month. These measures have alpha coefficients of .75. These measures of support appear to be consistent with what Nye (1958) asserts are those of needs satisfaction by way of making sure that the parent is "taking" care of the child's needs outside of an emotional context.

Wright & Cullen (2001) found that attachment, the presence of household rules, and parental supervision reduces delinquency. They also found that "notably, the effects of parental supports withstood the effects of parental controls; both parental reliability and support were significantly and inversely related to delinquency" (Wright & Cullen, 2001:690). Furthermore, this leads Wright & Cullen (2001:690) to conclude that "parental support does not appear to be able to be subsumed under control theory constructs." Given the independent effects of parental control and supports on delinquency, Wright & Cullen (2001) also examined the interrelationship between control and support. By controlling for "child effects" or individual differences, they limited the possibility that their findings were due to either (Wright & Cullen, 2001).

Wright & Cullen (2001) note that most importantly, controls are related inconsistently to other controls, specifically, attachment is significantly and positively related to supervision, inversely related to expectations, and unrelated to parental rules. According to Wright & Cullen (2001), these findings suggest that parents who support their children are also the parents that are more likely to supervise and be attached to their children. In fact, Wright (personal communication May 16, 2007) states, "it was very clear in my original study that direct controls occurred under the broad umbrella of parental supports." Further support for Wright & Cullen's use of parental expectations is offered

by Scales, Benson, Leffert, & Blyth (2000) who claim that parents having high expectations for the child, provide support, and promote open communication may serve as a protective factor or a developmental asset for the child.

According to Scholte (1999), parental support is the affectionate bond or attachment between parent and child. Furthermore, parental support refers to the emotional aspect of parenting to include "responsiveness, attachment, love, understanding and/or emotional support" (Scholte, 1999:6). Scholte's conceptualization of parental support appears to be consistent with other measures of indirect and direct controls (attachment) in that he includes emotions and responsiveness to needs (such as Wright & Cullen, 2001; Nye, 1958).

In a diverse representative sample of tenth-grade students assessed as part of the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS), evidence was found to support the link between parental bonds and peer relations, and further, that parental support is associated with positive perceptions of the self (Parker and Benson 2004). Parker and Benson (2004) also found that adolescents were less likely to engage in delinquent behaviors, have school problems, and engage in substance abuse if they perceived their parents to be supportive.

Holsinger and Holsinger (2005), using The Parent Scale (nine different items, such as parents knowing where their child was at all times, parents providing a curfew, parents punishing their child if rules are broken, knowing friends, and effectiveness of punishment in changing behavior) found that scores were significantly different for girls in a juvenile correctional facility who had committed violent versus non-violent offenses. Specifically, less positive parenting was an indictor of both violent offending and suicide attempts.

Conversely, more positive parenting was an indicator of decreased delinquent activity (Holsinger & Holsinger (2005).

Considering the contradictory effects parenting has on antisocial behavior, Jones, Cauffman, & Piquero (2007), explored the relationship between parental support and self-control (impulse control and consideration of others) in a sample of incarcerated youth in California. The parental support variables were similar to those used by Wright & Cullen (2001) where respondents were asked about the degree to which they received support from their parents (Jones et al., 2007). They found parental support was significantly and inversely related to antisocial behavior and that parental support was significantly related to serious offenders. As it relates to self-control, the effect of parental support was moderated by impulse control and consideration of others (Jones et al., 2007). Specifically, they found that parental support had more influence in reducing antisocial behavior in youth lower in impulse control than those lower in consideration of others (Jones et al., 2007).

It is clear that parents play a major role in their child's life. Moreover, parental control and support require the parent to invest time and energy with their child; referred to as parental "capital" (Wright and Cullen, 2001). Current social control theorists place more emphasis on direct parental controls such as close monitoring, supervision, family rules, and rational punishment for transgressions (Wright and Cullen, 2001; Jones et al., 2007). While this may be true, indirect controls (attachment) are logical and theoretical components that influence the relationship between parenting and delinquency.

Indirect parental controls. Attachment to parents has been examined in a number of studies to determine the effects of attachment on infants, gender differences, drug use, general delinquency, and violence (Although not called attachment, Nye (1958) looked at indirect control, which he described as affection for parents. Hirschi, (1969) in his landmark study, posits that attachment to parents is the most critical of the bonds for understanding delinquent behavior. In fact, Hirschi (1969:88) claims, "If the bond to the parent is weakened, the probability of delinquent behavior increases; if this bond is strengthened, the probability of delinquent behavior declines." Attachment is concerned with emotional ties between children and parents to the extent that the closer the child is to the parent, the less likely they will want to disappoint them by engaging in delinquent behavior (Hirschi, 1969). Hirschi (1969) took a step in a more thorough and positive direction by including parental supervision and monitoring as components of attachment, rather than taking a narrow view of attachment as only affection. Hirschi (1969) found support for boys' attachments to their mothers and fathers, concluding that attachment is a protective factor against delinquency. In fact, most empirical tests of Hirschi's (1969) social control theory have been conducted on attachment (Kempf, 1993).

In the first year of life, positive interactions with sensitive and responsive caregivers leads to relationships that offer secure patterns of attachment (Osofsky, 1995). The infant feels that the caregiver is available, reliable, and responsive; these feelings contribute to the child's ability to form positive relationships as the child becomes more socialized (Osofsky, 1995). Osofsky (1995) suggests that maltreatment in infants is a form

of violence exposure. Furthermore, these infants may form insecure attachments characterized by avoidance or resistance to their caregiver (Osofsky, 1995).

This was found to be true in a study of maltreated infants (mean age 12 months) who were receiving child protective services due to abuse or neglect (Carlson, Cicchetti, Barnett, & Braunwald, 1989). Specifically, Carlson et al. (1989) compared 22 families receiving services with 21 families not receiving services both having similar characteristics such as low socioeconomic status and presently receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or sometime in the past having received AFDC, education, maternal age, religious preference, and the presence of a spouse or partner residing in the home. The groups however differed in racial make-up; those in the control group were all White, while two mothers in the maltreatment group were African-American and two were Hispanic. Carlson et al. (1989) found that there were gender differences in attachment to mothers. Specifically, boys were 14% less likely to be attached to their mothers than girls and the maltreated children in general were less likely to be attached than non-maltreated children.

Whereas some research indicates that there are reciprocal effects between poor parenting and delinquency (Stewart et al. 2002), other researchers have found no bidirectional relationship between attachment and delinquency (Liska & Reid, 1985; Agnew, 1985). In a short term longitudinal study of the reciprocal relationship between internalizing and externalizing problem behavior, adolescents with a higher quality of attachment to parents showed fewer behavior problems (Buist et al, 2004). Buist et al.

(2004) concluded that positive relationships with parents diminish the tendency of children to violate norms.

van der Vorst et al. (2006) examined whether low attachment is predictive of early adolescence alcohol use and whether parental attachment moderates the relationship between psychological control or strict control and alcohol consumption. To accomplish this they used the Strict Control Scale consisting of eight items measuring parental monitoring and supervision (van der Vorst et al., 2006). The Psychological Control Scale consists of nine items measuring the extent to which parents use coercive, non-democratic discipline, and whether parents were discouraging their youth from expressing individuality in the family (van der Vorst et al., 2006). van der Vorst et al. (2006) found parental attachment was negatively associated with alcohol consumption. As far as whether or not parental attachment moderates the relationship between psychological control or strict control and alcohol consumption, van der Vorst et al. (2006) found that use of coercive psychological control does not have less effect on drinking alcohol when parental attachment is high, and that monitoring behavior does not have a stronger effect on drinking alcohol when parental attachments are good.

Huebner and Betts (2002) assessed attachment, conceptualized as parental quality, which was determined using a scale consisting of items such as "my parents are good to me"," my parents trust me", "my parents are there for me", "my parents care about me", and "my parents are fair." One additional item measuring family fun was also included. Huebner and Betts (2002) found that attachment bonds are the only type that serve as a protective function for girls.

In a study of binge drinking among college students, the relationship between Hirschi's social bonds and binge drinking was examined and it was found that the bond attachment had a positive relationship to binge drinking; that is, the more attached students reported being to their parents, the more they drank alcohol (Durkin, Wolfe, & Clark, 1999). These results were somewhat surprising, given the assertions of the social bond theory that a strong attachment to parents should reduce the likelihood of delinquent behavior (Durkin et al., 1999). Durkin et al. (1999) explains that these results may be related to the fact that parental approval of alcohol may have sent a message to their children that drinking is acceptable. Conversely, Jang (2002) found that respondents who reported higher levels of attachment reported lower levels of drug use (Jang 2002).

Given the extent to which the literature has shown ways that both family and community level variables influence parental competency and its negative impact on delinquent behavior, Rose et al. (2004: 26) assert that "there has been little research into developing a measure of facilitating or hindering constructs associated with parent competency. Presently there exists no comprehensive measure of parent belief and practices that specifically relate to juvenile delinquency." Using a developmental and ecological framework informed by years of clinical experience working with families of delinquent youth, Rose et al. (2004) developed the Juvenile Offender Parent Questionnaire (JOPQ) in order to measure parent competencies.

Parental Competencies

The JOPQ is a sixty-seven item instrument designed to measure parents' thoughts, feelings, and attitudes in reference to their child before the juvenile court. The JOPQ was

first administered to parents of juveniles 12-17 being arraigned in juvenile court in two southeastern cities. Each parent/guardian who completed the JOPQ reported being the primary caregiver in the past year. Study participants were 38% black, 49% white, 1% other, while 12% did not disclose their race. In terms of education, 64% of respondents had less than a 12th grade education with 29% having a 12th grade education. Fifty-five percent of respondents were single parents, 35% reported being from two parent households, while 10% reported other. Exploratory factor analysis revealed the following constructs to represent parent attitudes and emotional responses to their child: exasperation in regard to the child, mistrust of the juvenile justice system, shame over parenting self-efficacy, parental monitoring, fear of the child, and parent perceptions of the child's exposure to violence.

Exasperation in regard to the child (parental hopelessness) is designed to measure parents' hopelessness as it relates to the future of their child. Fear of the child is designed to measure "parent's emotions marked by alarm, dread, and anxious concern brought on by the prospect of being harmed by the child." Mistrust of the juvenile justice system (factor 3) is designed to measure if parents have a lack of confidence in the juvenile justice system and doubt the integrity of the courts. Parental perception of the child's exposure to violence is designed to measure if, in the parent's view, the child is unprotected from or exposed to violence.

Shame over parenting self-efficacy, is designed to measure a range of variables such as parental humiliation, embarrassment, and discouragement in reference to the "poor job that they think they have done as parents." Parental monitoring is designed to measure

whether or not parents keep track of their child's whereabouts. Parents were asked to respond on a four-point scale from completely false to completely true. Understanding the ways in which parenting behaviors are impacted by these constructs as a function of parental attitudes, beliefs, thoughts, emotions, and behaviors is an integral part of working with court involved juveniles. Furthermore, by expanding the theoretical perspectives of psychologists and criminologists to include an ecological context, it is suggested that the model set forth by Rose et al. (2004) will shed light on the issues that parents of court involved juveniles and the juveniles themselves are facing.

Summary

In summary, parenting is a "transactional process" (Bradshaw et al., 2006) influenced by a number of factors as presented herein. Most researchers have studied delinquency from the viewpoint of the parent in reference to their child and vice versa, but limited research has been completed that examines parents' thoughts, feelings, attitudes, emotions, and beliefs in reference to juveniles involved with the juvenile justice system. To accomplish this, and to assess the needs of parents of juveniles before the juvenile court, the JOPQ and other demographic variables will be used to assess parental needs and competencies. The present study is an attempt to bridge gaps in the literature and provide measures to more precisely connect risk factors with parental needs in order to best match juvenile probationers and their parents to appropriate services and increase compliance with the Court's expectations.

The gaps in the literature have to do with assessing parents of juvenile offenders in order to determine how their needs impact their parenting ability. For example, some

parental needs are basic like employment or simply transportation to get to and from the places the Court has ordered the family to go, such as a diversion group or counseling sessions. Other needs are more complex, such as help with mental health and/or substance abuse problems (Rose et al, 2004). As sometimes seen in delinquent populations, parents have a multitude of the problems discussed here, resulting in lower levels of parental competencies.

This condition may have serious repercussions because as previous studies and models have indicated, parental competencies impact parenting ability. It is also possible that the combination of family stressors may be more significantly correlated with delinquency more than any of the factors individually. This possibility is certainly worthy of further study. Studying the relationship between these parent measures and delinquency is important for many reasons, but mainly so that families can be productive and safe places for children.

Parents that are hopeless, angry, mistrusting of justice officials, in fear of their child are less likely to cooperate with court officials, creating a further strain on all involved, with little progress on the part of the family to be made. Furthermore, parents that are afraid of their child, mistrusting of the justice system, have feelings of shame over their parenting efficacy, and provide poor monitoring may be resentful that the court is involved in their lives, thus creating another strain on the part of the parent.

These behaviors as well as delinquent behaviors can have reciprocating effects making it difficult to fully assess family dynamics and delinquency. This effect was clearly found in the study by Stewart et al. (2002) in which poor parenting was found to

increase delinquency, and conversely, delinquency increased poor parenting. It is essential that court officials recognize and attempt to provide appropriate services for families before the Court. Although this study will not provide a temporal order of events, it seeks to add to the body of literature on parents' thoughts, attitudes, feelings, beliefs, and behaviors among delinquent probationers.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to determine whether or not parental competencies are predictive factors in the re-offending patterns of juveniles on probation. Examining variations in youth outcomes based on parental competencies should provide useful information to assist in designing programs for youth and families. In addition, it is important to assess the parents of juveniles on probation to determine the level of support they provide to their children. As such, the goal of the proposed project includes assessing parents of juveniles on probation in order to understand any variations in families that may help minimize out of home placements (detention, group homes, or treatment facilities) and maximize successful compliance with the Court's orders.

Hypotheses:

The study addresses the following hypotheses:

1. Youth whose parents report higher levels of parental exasperation are more likely to have more technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent charges.

2. Youth whose parents report higher levels of parental resignation are more likely to have more technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent charges.
3. Youth whose parents report higher levels of mistrust of the juvenile justice system are more likely to have more technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent charges.
4. Youth whose parents report higher levels of shame over parental effectiveness are more likely to have more technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent charges.
5. Youth whose parents report lower levels of parental monitoring are more likely to have more technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent charges.
6. Youth whose parents report higher levels of fear of the child are more likely to have more technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent charges.
7. Youth whose parents report higher levels of child's exposure to community violence are more likely to have more technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent charges.
8. Youth whose parents report higher levels of anger towards the child are more likely to have more technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent charges.

Due to limited information available in the literature on parental competencies, using a convenience sample, this study employs a non-experimental cross-sectional design. Specifically, youth are tracked for one year following their placement on supervised probation by the 14th District Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court in Henrico County, Virginia. Initially, the parent/guardian's level of certain competencies is assessed within

three months of placement on probation. Youth progress on probation is measured through court records at baseline (three), six, and twelve-month intervals. Additionally, the parent/legal guardian's level of parental competencies is assessed at baseline after obtaining consent.

Sample Selection and Characteristics

The sample consists of all juveniles placed on probation in Henrico County from June 4, 2007 to October 30, 2007. During the selected time frame, 115 juveniles were placed on probation, with 90 parent/legal guardians approached by the researcher to ask for consent to participate in the study. The twenty-five families not approached consisted of juveniles supervised by other jurisdictions, in the custody of the Department of Social Services, in residential placement, in the post-dispositional detention program, or identified as non-English speaking. Parent/legal guardians were informed that researchers would not approach their child, but the probation files would be monitored and that consent also includes a willingness to complete a parent/guardian survey. Ninety families were approached with 88 families agreeing to participate; this resulted in a 98 percent response rate. The sample characteristics, as gathered from the parent questionnaire are reported in Table 1.

As shown in Table 1, those completing the survey consist of mothers (70.5%), fathers (15.9%), and other (13.6%). The majority were female (74%) with most between the ages of 31-50 (73.9%). The parent/guardian can be described as non-White (77.3%) with most receiving at least a high school diploma or equivalent (83%), and half reported being married. The mean number of family members in the home is 3.28 with a range of 1

to 8 individuals. The majority of the respondents reported being employed (66%), with a mean income of $2,186.25 in the past 30 days.

Other financial resources included 27.6% receiving SSI, Disability or Social Security, 18.2% receiving food stamps, 5.7% receiving public assistance (TANF), 20.5% receiving child support or alimony, and 40.9% were receiving money from others to help pay rent, buy food, get medical care, or anything else they may need, and 2.3% reported receiving money from other sources such as retirement and unemployment. Eighteen percent reported having been diagnosed with a mental health disorder. As far as physical health condition is concerned, 58.8% reported being healthy, 35.2% reported their health as fair, and 8% reported poor health.

Beyond the demographic information, the respondent was asked to report on overall health, mental health, and criminal involvement of the family. In general, the respondents report being healthy and most did not indicate the presence of a mental health condition. Additionally, among the respondents most (64.8%) have never been arrested and do not indicate having a substance abuse problem. However, there is exposure to criminal activity in that respondents reported that 35.2% of mothers, 45.5% of fathers, 35.2% of siblings, 6.8% of grandparents, 14.8% of aunts, 27.3% of uncles, and 2.3% of other family members had been arrested. As for the youth in the study, Table 2 indicates the demographic information from probation files (official data source).

As shown in Table 2, the mean age for youth in the study is 15.3 years old with 67% being Non-White males (78.3%). Seventeen percent of youth have previously been

Table 1: Demographic Variables of Parent/Legal Guardians

Variable	N	%
Relationship to child		
Mother	62	71%
Father	14	16%
Other	12	14%
Gender		
Female	74	84%
Male	14	16%
Age		
30 and under	6	7%
31-40	40	46%
41-50	25	28%
51-60	13	15%
61-70	4	5%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	20	23%
Non-White	68	77%
Highest level of education		
Did not graduate from high school	15	17%
High school graduate or GED	32	36%
Some college	25	28%
College graduate	16	18%
Marital status		
Married	44	50%
Separated	10	11%
Divorced	13	15%
Never married	20	23%

Variable	N	%
Who regularly resides in the home?		
Mother or equivalent	76	86%
Father or equivalent	37	42%
Siblings	63	72%
Grandmother	12	14%
Grandfather	2	2%
Aunt	8	9%
Uncle	3	3%
Cousins	13	15%
Friend	6	8%
Mean number of members	3.28	
Employment status		
Employed	66	76%
Unemployed	7	10%
Other	12	14%
Average income in the past 30 days		
Mean	$2186.25	
Have you ever been diagnosed with any mental health problems?		
Yes	18	21%
No	70	79%
Describe your physical health		
Healthy	50	57%
Fair	31	35%
Poor	7	8%
How many times have you been arrested?		
0 times	57	65%
1-2 times	25	28%
3-4 times	3	3%
5 times or more	3	3%
Mean	.84	

Variable	N	%
Do you have a problem with…		
Drinking alcohol?	7	8%
Yes	81	92%
No		
Using legal or illegal drugs?		
Yes	2	2%
No	86	98%
Please indicate all family members who have been arrested		
Mother	31	35%
Father	40	46%
Siblings	31	35%
Grandparent	6	7%
Aunt	13	15%
Uncle	24	27%
Cousins	34	39%
Other	2	2%

Table 2: Demographic Variables of Youth

Variable	N	%
Age		
Mean	15.3	
Gender		
Male	59	67%
Female	29	33%
Race/Ethnicity		
White	19	22%
Non-White	69	78%
Previously on probation		
Yes	15	17%
No	73	83%
Placed on probation for		
Assault and battery	28	32%
Property offenses	41	47%
Disorderly offenses	31	35%
Truancy or runaway	16	18%
Substance abuse related offenses	15	17%
Other	3	3%

on supervised probation. Currently, these juveniles are on supervised probation for the following types of offenses: assault and battery (31.8%), property offenses (46.6%), disorderly type offenses (35.2%), truancy or runaway offenses (18.2%), substance abuse related offenses (17%), and "other" to include weapons violations and gang related offenses (3.4%).

Data Collection

There are two primary sources of data used to examine the research hypotheses: a parent questionnaire (self-report) and probation files (official statistics). Data concerning the issues of parental competencies (independent variables) are collected through the parent questionnaire. Again, 88 parents/guardians consented to participate in the study. The method of survey administration varied. Specifically, 60 were interviews (47 in-person and 13 via telephone) and 28 were self-administered. Of those interviewed in person, four of the surveys were administered at the home of the family due to a lack of transportation. Of those self-administered, three respondents completed the survey at their home due to time constraints. Two were mailed back to the researcher, while the researcher picked up one survey at the parent/guardian's place of employment. Otherwise, all surveys were completed in a private office at the Henrico County Juvenile Court building.

The dependent variable, technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent charges and a number of control variables are gathered through the assistance of the juvenile's probation officer. Each probation officer responded to a probation officer data collection instrument addressing home, school, and community involvement at baseline (3), 6, and 12

months; this constitutes examination of the youths official data as documented by the probation officer.

Measurement

There has been limited research on the collective notion of parental competencies and how these family variables impact the behavior of court-involved juveniles, specifically, how parental competencies relate to adherence to court sanctions and recidivism rates. In fact, Rose et al. (2004) claim, "there exists no comprehensive measure of parent beliefs that specifically relate to juvenile delinquency" (26). Therefore, in order to study parental competencies of juveniles involved with the court, Rose et al (2004) developed the Juvenile Offender Parent Questionnaire from theoretical constructs established through clinical experience and research.

Independent Variables

The conceptual idea of "parental competencies" is developed from prior research examining parenting issues associated with a court-involved juvenile and juveniles in general. Rose et al. (2004) found that parent attitudes and emotional responses to the child collectively form parental competencies that include parental exasperation, parental resignation, mistrust of the criminal justice system, shame over parental effectiveness, parental monitoring, fear of the child, and parent perceptions of community violence. Although most of the original items were used as developed by Rose et al. (2004), a few items were modified to provide clarification and/or ask a more content specific frame of reference. For example, "They are out to get my child" (Rose et al., 2004), was modified

to "The police are out to get my child." In addition, the current parent survey also includes variables not considered by Rose et al. (2004).

The current study measures parental competencies from the following constructs: parental exasperation, parental resignation, mistrust of the juvenile justice system, shame over parental effectiveness, parental monitoring, fear of the child, and parental perceptions of community violence. The survey items are shown in Appendix B. Although the measures used were developed by Rose et al. (2004), once analyzed, varying themes emerged. The inconsistency can be attributed to (1) varying samples, (2) modification of items, and (3) lack of clarity regarding factor loadings from prior research. To expand on the last point, Rose and colleagues did not provide information regarding which single items created each factor discussed. This material was not available in published material or through requests. However, an attempt to recreate each factor using logic and theoretical considerations occurred. In beginning any exploratory factor analysis, a correlation matrix was examined.

Only the variables with a significant correlation and value of .4 and above (Hedderson, 1987) were selected for inclusion in the study. Of the 65 variables examined, 27 were not significantly correlated or did not maintain a strong relationship. Each of the following sections details the primary parental variables of interests. Table 3 presents each of the variables, the questions entered into the factor analysis, whether or not the variable loaded, and whether or not an honest response is expected on the part of the parent/guardian. Table 4 presents the number of items, response categories, and Cronbach's alpha for each parental competency variable.

Table 3: Itemized Variables Loadings

Variable	Questions	Loaded with variable	Honesty expected
Parental exasperation	My anger with my child is interfering with my relationship with him/her	Yes	Yes
	I feel like giving up on my child	Yes	Yes
	When it comes to my child I feel hopeless	Yes	Yes
	Sometimes I wonder if my child should live somewhere else	Yes	Yes
	I am angry with my child	Yes	Yes
	I get so angry with my child that I can't deal with him/her	Yes	Yes
	I have had it with my child	No	Yes
	The future looks bad for my child	No	Yes
	It bothers me that I can't trust my own child	No	Yes
	My child will mess up again	No	Yes
	I am tired of him/her getting into trouble	No	Yes
Parental resignation	The future looks bad for my child	Yes	Yes
	My child will mess up again	Yes	Yes
	I am tired of him/her getting into trouble	Yes	Yes
Mistrust of the juvenile justice system	The court system is against my child	Yes	Yes
	The court system treats my child poorly because of who he/she is	Yes	Yes
	The court is out to get my child	Yes	Yes
	The court misunderstands what it is like for my child	Yes	Yes
	I think they are making too big a deal out of what my child has been accused of	Yes	Yes
	Sometimes I get the feeling that everyone in the court see people as guilty	Yes	Yes
	My child is being unfairly accused	Yes	Yes
	The police don't treat people like us very well	Yes	Yes
	The PO cares about my child	No	No
	The people in the court system treat my child with respect	No	No
	The police are out to get my child	No	Yes
	The court wants to help my child	No	No
	If the police will leave us alone then things will turn out okay for my child	No	Yes

Shame over parenting self-efficacy	Sometimes I feel like a horrible person for not raising my child better	Yes	No
	I should have spent more time with my child	Yes	No
	I have raised my child the best way I know how	No	Yes
	Others who know me think I am a good parent	No	No
Parental monitoring	My child listens to me	Yes	Yes
	My child keeps me informed about where he/she is going	Yes	Yes
	My child lets me know when he/she will be home from school	Yes	Yes
	I know the names of the kids who my child hangs out with	Yes	Yes
	I never know what my child is doing from day to day	No	Yes
Fear of the child	My child physically threatens me	Yes	Yes
	I think my child could seriously hurt me	Yes	Yes
	Sometimes I am afraid of my child	Yes	Yes
	My child threatens or bullies me to get what he/she wants	Yes	Yes
	Sometimes my child explodes with anger and it scares me	Yes	Yes
	I fear that my child will physically hurt me	Yes	Yes
	My child has hit me within the past year	Yes	Yes
Parent perception of child's exposure to violence	The violence in our community has been a bad influence on my child	Yes	Yes
	I find it stressful to raise a child with all of the violence in our community	Yes	Yes
	I worry about the influence of gangs on my child	Yes	Yes
Anger towards child	I get angry when I think of the bad things my child has done	Yes	Yes
	My child's backtalk makes me very angry	Yes	Yes
	Sometimes I think my child does things to make me angry	Yes	Yes
	My child has an attitude	Yes	Yes
	My child irritates me when he she misbehaves	Yes	Yes
	I am angry with my child	No	Yes
	I lose my temper with my child	No	Yes

Table 4: Independent Variables Formed Through Factor Analysis

Variable	Number of items	Responses	Cronbach's alpha
Parental exasperation	6	Completely false, mostly false, mostly true, completely true	.877
Parental resignation	3	Completely false, mostly false, mostly true, completely true	.710
Mistrust of the Juvenile Justice System	8	Completely false, mostly false, mostly true, completely true	.880
Shame over parental effectiveness	2	Completely false, mostly false, mostly true, completely true	.650
Parental monitoring	4	Completely false, mostly false, mostly true, completely true	.837
Fear of child	7	Completely false, mostly false, mostly true, completely true	.879
Parent perceptions of child's exposure to community violence	3	Completely false, mostly false, mostly true, completely true	.775
Anger towards child	5	Completely false, mostly false, mostly true, completely true	.801

Exasperation in regard to the child. The original construct (Rose et al., 2004) examines feelings of frustration and anger in dealing with their child and the notion of the parent's willingness and readiness to give custody of their child to the probation officer or the court. Parental exasperation is designed to measure the parents' despondence as it relates to their relationship with their child. In other words, the parent is ready to "give up" on their child. Eleven variables were entered into the factor analysis, the items are: I have had it with my child, the future looks bad for my child, my anger with my child is interfering with my relationship with him/her, I feel like giving up on my child, it bothers me that I can't trust my own child, when it comes to my child I feel hopeless, sometimes I wonder if my child should live someplace else, my child will mess up again, I am angry with my child, I am tired of him/her getting into trouble, and I get so angry with my child that I can't deal with him/her. The results of the factor analysis produced two factors: factor 1 (parental exasperation) and factor 2 (parental resignation). Two items had low loadings with each factor and were dropped from consideration. The items are "it bothers me that I can't trust my own child" and "I have had it with my child."

Parental exasperation (factor 1) consists of the following six statements: my anger with my child is interfering with my relationship with him/her, I feel like giving up on my child, when it comes to my child I feel hopeless, sometimes I wonder if my child should live someplace else, I am angry with my child, and I get so angry with my child that I can't deal with him/her. This variable is referred to as parental exasperation because of the feelings and thoughts of anger, despondence, and hopelessness as felt by the parent/legal guardian in reference to their child. The parents responded on a 4-point scale from

completely false to completely true. Cronbach's alpha analyses yield a reliability factor of .877 for this factor. Eigenvalue is 3.742 with 62.37% of variance explained.

Parental resignation (factor 2) reflects the notion that the parent has accepted defeat in reference to parenting their child; the parent feels as if they have no control over their child. Moreover, the parent's outlook on their child's future is not only poor, but the parent is certain that the child will mess up again. Essentially, the parents are resigned to their fate with no hope for positive change. The factor consists of the following three items: the future looks bad for my child, my child will mess up again, and I am tired of him/her getting into trouble. This factor produced a Cronbach's alpha of .710, an Eigenvalue of 1.913, with 63.76% of the variance explained.

Mistrust of the Juvenile Justice System. The emphasis is on the juvenile court system and the police; these items attempt to measure the trust, or lack thereof, that a parent may have concerning the juvenile justice system (Rose et al. 2004). Initially, the following 13- items were entered into a factor analysis: the court system is against my child, the court system treats my child poorly because of who he/she is, the police are out to get my child, the court is out to get my child, the court wants to help my child, the court misunderstands what it is like for my child, if the police will leave us alone then things will turn out okay for my child, I think they are making too big a deal out of what my child has been accused of, sometimes I get the feeling that everyone in the court see everyone as guilty, my child is being unfairly accused, the police don't treat people like us very well, the PO cares about my child, and the people in the court system treat my child with respect.

However, five variables were dropped due to low loadings and negative correlations (the police are out to get my child, the court wants to help my child, the PO cares about my child, the people in the court system treat my child with respect, and if the police leave us alone then things will turn out okay for my child). Consequently, the remaining eight items measure parental mistrust of the juvenile justice system. Parents/legal guardians were asked to answer completely false, mostly false, mostly true, or completely true. Reliability of these items is .880, Eigenvalue is 4.465 with 55.81% of variance explained.

Shame over parenting self-efficacy. Parents experience a range of emotions in dealing with their child, such as shame in the form of humiliation, embarrassment, and discouragement. Parenting self-efficacy refers to the extent to which a parent feels competent and confident in raising their child (Rose et al., 2004). Four items were entered into the factor analysis: sometimes I feel like a horrible person for not raising my child better, I should have spent more time with my child, I have raised my child the best way I know how, and others who know me think I am a good parent.

Two variables "I have raised my child the best way I know how" and "others who know me think I am a good parent" were omitted from the analysis. This resulted in a two item factor, parental effectiveness, which measures the job that parent's feel they have done in raising their child. Response categories were completely false, mostly false, mostly true, or completely true. Reliability factor is .650, Eigenvalue is 1.485 and 74.27% of the variance is explained. Considering the low reliability produced by this factor, it will not be tested as a confident independent variable.

Parental Monitoring. Parental monitoring includes structuring of the home, school, community, and knowing the child's behavior in those environments. Five items were entered into the factor analysis: my child listens to me, my child keeps me informed about where he/she is going, my child lets me know when he/she will be home from school, I never know what my child is doing from day to day, and I know the names of the kids who my child hangs out with. One item was dropped from the analysis, resulting in a four-item scale with a Cronbach's alpha of .837, Eigenvalue is 2.699, with 67.48% of the variance explained.

Fear of the child. This concept examines parents' fear of their child, whether physically or emotionally. Fear of the child is measured with the following seven items: my child physically threatens me, I think my child could seriously hurt me, sometimes I am afraid of my child, my child threatens or bullies me to get what he/she wants, sometimes my child explodes with anger and it scares me, I fear that my child will physically hurt me, and my child has hit me within the past year (completely false, mostly false, mostly true, or completely true). The analysis produced one factor, fear of the child, with a Cronbach's alpha of .879, an Eigenvalue of 4.410 and 62.99% of variance explained.

Parent perception of child's exposure to violence. This construct is defined as "a child being unprotected from or exposed to violence" (Rose et al., 2004: 30). The items include the violence in our community has been a bad influence on my child, I find it stressful to raise a child with all of the violence in our community, and I worry about the influence of gangs on my child (completely false, mostly false, mostly true, or completely

true). These three items produced one factor, parent perceptions of child's exposure to community violence, a reliability factor of .775, an Eigenvalue of 2.085, and 69.51% of variance explained.

Anger towards child. Anger is a strong emotion felt by parents when they feel a sense of irritation with children; this creates a sense of displeasure which is passed on in the form of antagonism toward the child, their behavior, and involvement with the court (Rose et al., 2004). Originally, seven items were entered into the factor analysis; they are as follows: I get angry when I think of that bad things that my child has done, I lose my temper with my child, my child's backtalk makes me very angry, sometimes I think my child does things to make me angry, my child has an attitude, and my child irritates me when he/she misbehaves, and I am angry with my child. Two items were omitted due to low correlations: I lose my temper with my child and I am angry with my child. Once these two items were removed from the analysis, one factor was formed, anger towards child. These items yielded a reliability factor of .801, Eigenvalue of 2.791, with 55.82% of the variance explained.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variable in this study is recidivism as measured by subsequent delinquent offenses and technical violations. Specifically, the total number of offenses for both dependent variables are presented in Table 5. To measure whether a subsequent charge has been received, the researcher asks the probation officer whether the juvenile has received any subsequent delinquent offenses or technical violations since placement on probation. In addition, the type of offense in which the juvenile is arrested is reported

Table 5: Dependent Variables

Variable	Measure
Subsequent delinquent offense	
Total number of delinquent offenses	Number of offenses
Type	Assault and batter offenses Property offenses Disorderly offenses Truancy/Runaway Weapons offenses Substance abuse related offenses Other
Technical violation	
Total number of technical violations	Number of violations

and coded according to its classification in terms of being an offense against property, against persons, is drug-related, or is a weapons offense.

Although technical violations are considered "new charges", they do not carry the equivalent weight of new delinquent charges and are typically of a less serious nature. Therefore, technical violations will be measured separately from subsequent delinquent offenses as indicated by the offense and/or Virginia Criminal Code (VCC). Although receiving a subsequent delinquent offense is technically a violation of one's probation status, probation officers in Henrico County rarely file such a violation of probation charge, as more serious consequences usually result from the delinquent charge itself. Violations of probation are staying out past assigned curfew, testing positive for drugs, not attending school regularly, and failing to abide by any probation officer's instructions to name a few. Each of the stated hypotheses includes both dependent variables but each will be tested separately.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. First, the impact of the researcher personally meeting and discussing the questions with each of the respondents may have some effect on youth outcomes. In other words, it may be that parents/guardians are more aware of the fact that their child is being monitored, and perhaps putting them in a position to "do a better job" of parenting. Secondly, social desirability may be another factor considering the sensitive nature of the questions asked, specifically as it relates to the job parents think they do, along with their attitudes, thoughts, feelings, and behaviors toward their child. Lastly, although the response rate to the parent questionnaire was high (98%),

it is important to recognize that the sample size is somewhat small; however, demographic information from the sample is consistent with demographics from the population of juveniles on probation in Henrico County from January 1, 2007 to November 14, 2008. For example, the mean age in the sample is the same as that of the population (15.3). In addition, population data indicates that 72% are Non-White males (67%), whereas in the sample, 78.3% were Non-White males (67%).

Chapter 4

Results

The primary objectives of the study are to examine whether or not parental competencies are predictive factors in juvenile probationers' adherence to court sanctions and recidivism rates. In order to best determine the factors that contribute to recidivism, two types of models are presented. The first set of models considers juvenile demographics and how they relate to recidivism, while the second set of models considers how parental stressors influence parental competencies.

The descriptive statistics for both dependent variables, technical violations and subsequent delinquent offenses, are reported in Table 6. The range for technical violations is from 0-4, with 67 percent of probationers not having their probation status violated, 22.7 percent having between 1-2 violations filed against them, and 10.2 percent having 3-4 probation violations filed. The mean is .69 and the standard deviation is 1.03. The likelihood of receiving a technical violation is 33 percent.

Additionally, the range for subsequent delinquent offenses is from 0-8, with 54.5 percent of probationers having received any additional charges, 23.8 percent received 1-2 additional charges, 10.2 percent received 3-4 delinquent charges, and 11.3 percent received 5-8 new charges. The mean is 1.39 and standard deviation is 2.06. The likelihood of receiving a subsequent delinquent offense is 45 percent.

Table 6: Descriptors of Dependent Variables

Variable	N	%
Total number of technical violations		
0	59	67%
1-2	20	23%
3-4	9	10%
Mean	.69	
sd	1.03	
Total number of subsequent offenses		
0	48	55%
1-2	21	24%
3-4	9	10%
5-8	10	11%
Mean	.69	
sd	2.06	

Bivariate Analyses

To begin, bivariate regression models were conducted to determine if a relationship exists between the independent and dependent variables. Table 7 provides a bivariate examination of each of the independent variables and total number of technical violations. Three significant relationships are found: parental exasperation ($p<.05$), parental resignation ($p<.01$), and parental monitoring ($p<.01$) are significantly related to the total number of technical violations. The direction of the relationships indicate that that higher levels of parental exasperation and resignation will lead to more technical violations and subsequent delinquent offending while lower levels of parental monitoring will lead to more technical violations and subsequent delinquent offending.

Table 8 presents the second primary dependent variable: subsequent offenses received by the youth. The table indicates that the total number of subsequent delinquent offenses produced significant correlations for parental resignation ($p<.01$) and parental monitoring ($p<.01$). Specifically, youth whose parents have higher levels of parental resignation will receive more technical violations and subsequent delinquent charges while youth with parents providing lower levels of parental monitoring will likely receive more technical violations and subsequent delinquent charges.

Considering Table 7 and Table 8, there are a few variables found to be significant predictors of youth receiving technical violations and subsequent charges. Given the significant bivariate findings it is important to investigate whether or not the relationships will be sustained within a multivariate model. Specifically, the following independent variables will be examined: parental exasperation, parental resignation, and

Table 7: An examination of the relationship between the primary parental variables and technical violations by youth

Variable	F-test	Probability
Parental exasperation	4.028*	.043
Parental resignation	10.895**	.001
Mistrust of the juvenile justice system	.051	.821
Parental monitoring	23.474***	.000
Fear of the child	.049	.825
Parent perceptions of child's exposure to violence	.873	.353
Anger towards child	.423	.517

***Bivariare regression is significant at the 0.000 level
**Bivariare regression is significant at the 0.01 level
*Bivariate regression is significant at the 0.05 level

Table 8: An examination of the relationship between the primary parental variables and subsequent offenses by youth

Variable	F-test	Probability
Parental exasperation	2.281	.097
Parental resignation	11.885**	.001
Mistrust of the juvenile justice system	.013	.910
Parental monitoring	18.069***	.000
Fear of the child	.025	.876
Parent perceptions of child's exposure to violence	1.472	.228
Anger towards child	1.712	.194

***Bivariate regression is significant at the 0.000 level
**Bivariate regression is significant at the 0.01 level

parental monitoring. Given the non-significant relationships with the bivariate regression models with the independent variables of mistrust of the juvenile justice system, fear of the child, parent perceptions of child's exposure to violence, and anger towards child, the null hypotheses fails to be rejected.

Multivariate Analyses of Total Number of Technical Violations Committed by Youth

This section presents the multivariate model for technical violations and three independent variables, parental exasperation, parental resignation, and parental monitoring while controlling for race, gender, prior record, psychiatric disorder, maintaining passing grades, and a history of substance abuse. Although there were a number of non-significant relationships at the bivariate level, complete multivariate models were tested and the parental competency variables were still found to be non-significant. Table 9 presents the bivariate correlations of each of the significant parental competency variables, dependent variables, demographic, and control variables that will be tested in the multivariate models.

Parental exasperation. Parental exasperation is the notion that the parent feels like giving up on their child, is angry with their child, and feels hopeless about their child. It is expected that parents with higher levels of exasperation are more likely to have probationers with more technical violations. Table 10 presents the unstandardized and standardized beta coefficients and t-statistics for each of the variables in the model. The overall model is significant (F test = 2.867, $p<.01$, adjusted $R^2 = .133$) explaining

Table 9

Title: Correlations of parental exasperation, parental resignation, parental monitoring, juvenile control variables, and dependent variables

	Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	Parental exasperation		.557**	-.509**	.029	.123	.040	.168	-.245*	.158	.178	.216*
2	Parental resignation			-.509**	-.013	.276**	.312**	.266*	-.349**	.307**	.348**	.335**
3	Parental monitoring				.047	-.105	-.091	-.190	.378**	-.314**	-.419**	-.465**
4	Race of juvenile					-.134	.038	.102	.090	.119	.095	.087
5	Gender of juvenile						-.156	.042	.065	-.094	-.156	-.113
6	Prior record							.093	-.097	.291**	.233*	.208
7	Psychiatric disorder								-.439**	.041	.096	.166
8	Maintaining passing grades									-.195	-.342**	-.352**
9	History of substance abuse										.301**	.314**
10	Number of charges											.800**
11	Number of technical violations											

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level

Table 10: An examination of the relationship between parental exasperation and the total number of violations received while on probation

Variable	Total number of violations		
	b(SE)	β	t
Parental exasperation	.137(.148)	.099	.926
Race	.022(.184)	.013	.119
Gender	-.123(.226)	-.057	-.544
Prior record	.162(.222)	.078	.732
Psychiatric disorder	-.002(.269)	-.001	-.007
Maintaining passing grades	-.690(.296)	-.276*	-2.332
History of substance abuse	.457(.233)	.217*	1.957
Adjusted R^2	.133		
F test	2.867**		

p<.000***
p<.01**
p<.05*

about 13 percent of the variation in the total number of technical violations while considering parental exasperation and other control variables.

While the overall model is significant, the significant bivariate relationship between parental exasperation and the total number of technical violations is not maintained in the multivariate model. Therefore, the null hypothesis fails to be rejected. The model produces two significant variables: maintaining passing grades and having a history of substance abuse. Maintaining passing grades has a negative relationship with the total number of technical violations, meaning that probationers with failing grades are more likely to receive technical violations. The relationship between having a history of substance abuse and the total number of technical violations is in the positive direction, indicating that those with a substance abuse history are also more likely to receive technical violations as opposed to those with no history of substance abuse which is theoretically probable.

Parental resignation. It is anticipated that youth whose parents express higher levels of resignation are more likely to receive technical violations. The effects of parental resignation on the total number of technical violations while controlling for race, gender, prior record, psychiatric disorder, maintaining passing grades, and a history of substance abuse are reported in Table 11. Table 11 shows that the overall model is significant (F test = 3.145, $p<.01$, adjusted R^2 = .150) explaining 15 percent of the variation in the total number of technical violations while considering parental resignation and the other control variables. The significant bivariate relationship between parental resignation and the total number of technical violations is not sustained at the multivariate level; the null

Table 11: An examination of the relationship between parental resignation and the total number of violations received while on probation

Variable	Total number of violations		
	b(SE)	β	t
Parental resignation	.254(.163)	.195	1.555
Race	.028(.183)	.016	.156
Gender	-.245(.242)	-.114	-1.013
Prior record	.059(.228)	.028	.258
Psychiatric disorder	-.040(.268)	-.017	-.150
Maintaining passing grades	-.614(.299)	-.246*	-2.055
History of substance abuse	.400(.236)	.190	1.700
Adjusted R^2	.150		
F test	3.145**		

p<.000***
p<.01**
p<.05*

hypothesis fails to be rejected. The model reveals a significant negative relationship between maintaining passing grades and the total number of technical violations ($p<.05$). As previously reported, this indicates that probationers with failing grades are more likely to receive technical violations.

Parental monitoring. It is expected that youth whose parents report lower levels of parental monitoring are more likely to receive technical violations, while controlling for race, gender, prior record, psychiatric disorder, maintaining passing grades, and a history of substance abuse. Table 12 shows that the overall model is significant (F-test = 4.568, $p<.000$, adjusted $R^2 = .229$) explaining almost 23 percent of the variation in the total number of technical violations, taking into account parental monitoring and the other control variables. The significant bivariate relationship between parental monitoring and the total number of technical violations is maintained in the multivariate model, rejecting the null hypothesis. However, this model is only explaining roughly one quarter of the variance. The model does not produce any other significant relationships.

This section examined whether or not the bivariate relationships between parental exasperation, parental resignation, and parental monitoring were sustained at the multivariate level for the dependent variable total number of technical violations. The only significant bivariate relationship that maintained at the multivariate level was for parental monitoring, with the hypothesis being supported that youth whose parents report lower levels of parental monitoring are more likely to receive technical violations. In the multivariate models with parental exasperation and parental resignation as the independent

Table 12: An examination of the relationship between parental monitoring and the total number of violations received while on probation

Variable	Total number of violations		
	b(SE)	β	t
Parental monitoring	-.518(.158)	-.357**	-3.286
Race	.040(.177)	.023	.227
Gender	-.214(.215)	-.099	-.996
Prior record	.185(.211)	.089	.876
Psychiatric disorder	-.053(.257)	-.022	-.205
Maintaining passing grades	-.464(.293)	-.182	-1.586
History of substance abuse	.298(.229)	.141	1.302
Adjusted R^2	.229		
F test	4.568***		

p<.000***
p<.01**
p<.05*

variables, the significant relationships were not maintained once controlling for additional factors. Thus, the null hypotheses fail to be rejected.

Multivariate Examination of Total Number of Offenses Committed by Youth

The present section provides the multivariate model for subsequent delinquent offenses and two independent variables, parental resignation and parental monitoring while controlling for race, gender, prior record, psychiatric disorder, maintaining passing grades, and a history of substance abuse. While there were a number of non-significant relationships at the bivariate level, complete multivariate models were tested and the parental competency variables were still found to be non-significant.

Parental resignation. Parental resignation is the notion that the parent is resigned to the fact that their child has a poor future, believes the child will mess up again, and is tired of him/her getting into trouble. It is expected that parents with higher levels of parental resignation are more likely to have probationers with higher rates of offending. Entering parental resignation into the model as the independent variable while controlling for race, gender, prior record, psychiatric disorder, maintaining passing grades, and a history of substance abuse as a function of the total number of charges received while on probation is shown in Table 13.

In Table 13, the unstandardized and standardized beta coefficients and t-statistics are presented for each variable. The overall model is significant (F test = 3.053, $p<.01$, adjusted R^2 = .145) and explains 14.5 percent of the variation in the total number of charges by parental resignation and the other control variables. The significant bivariate

Table 13: An examination of the relationship between parental resignation and the total number of charges received while on probation

Variable	Total number of charges		
	b(SE)	β	t
Parental resignation	.508(.309)	.207	1.645
Race	.169(.346)	.051	.490
Gender	-.595(.459)	-.146	-1.295
Prior record	.184(.433)	.047	.426
Psychiatric disorder	-.361(.508)	-.081	-.710
Maintaining passing grades	-1.263(.567)	-.267*	-2.229
History of substance abuse	-.572(.446)	.144	1.282
Adjusted R^2	.145		
F test	3.053**		

p<.000***
p<.01**
p<.05*

relationship ($p<.01$) between parental resignation and the total number of offenses is not maintained in the multivariate model, thus, failing to reject the null hypothesis. However, it should be noted that parental resignation is approaching statistical significance; therefore, it may be inaccurate to fail to reject the null hypothesis. The model (Table 13) does reveal one significant relationship between maintaining passing grades and the total number of subsequent offenses. The direction of the relationship indicates that juveniles with failing grades are more likely to reoffend than juveniles that maintain passing grades.

Parental monitoring. Parental monitoring is the idea that the parent is aware of the child's whereabouts, knows the friends that the child hangs out with, and that the child listens to them. It is expected that youth whose parents provide lower levels of parental monitoring are more likely to have higher rates of offending. The overall model in Table 14 is significant (F test = 3.474, $p<.01$, adjusted $R^2 = .171$) and explains about 17 percent of the variation.

Table 14 reports the unstandardized and standardized beta coefficients and t-statistics for each variable in this model. The significant bivariate relationship between parental monitoring and total number of charges is maintained in this model. The relationship indicates, while controlling for additional influences, that youth whose parents provide lower levels of parental monitoring are more likely to have higher rates of reoffending and supports the research hypothesis. In addition, passing grades is also significant.

In summary, this section examined whether or not bivariate relationships between a number independent variables and subsequent offenses were maintained considering

Table 14: An examination of the relationship between parental monitoring and the total number of charges received while on probation

Variable	Total number of charges		
	b(SE)	β	t
Parental monitoring	-.684(.309)	-.249*	-2.212
Race	.220(.348)	.066	.632
Gender	-.468(.422)	-.115	-1.110
Prior record	.395(.414)	.101	.954
Psychiatric disorder	-.306(.504)	-.067	-.607
Maintaining passing grades	-1.219(.574)	-.252*	-2.125
History of substance abuse	.455(.449)	.114	1.013
Adjusted R^2	.171		
F test	3.474**		

p<.000***
p<.01**
p<.05*

additional control variables. Considering the total number of subsequent offenses, significance relationships were produced between parental monitoring, maintaining passing grades, and the total number of subsequent offenses received by the youth. Therefore, the null hypothesis can be rejected. The relationship between parental resignation and the total number of subsequent offenses did not maintain a significant relationship in the multivariate model as it did in the bivariate model, thus, the null hypothesis fails to be rejected; however, maintaining passing grades remained a significant variable in this model.

Multivariate Examination of Parental Contributors

Although the main purpose of this study is to determine if parental competencies are predictive factors in juvenile probationers' adherence to court sanctions and recidivism rates, considering the little variation produced by each of the multivariate models, it is instructive to take a step back and examine additional factors that may influence parental exasperation, parental resignation, and parental monitoring. The prior analyses focused solely on variables related to the juvenile; it is necessary to take into account parental factors as well.

There may be variations in the parents' background which are related to parental exasperation, parental resignation, and parental monitoring. The parental factors of interest are a parent's diagnosis of a psychiatric disorder, history of arrest, poverty, total number of family members living in the home, and parental mistrust of the juvenile justice system; such factors are potential contributors to their attitudes, thoughts, and behaviors towards their child on probation. From this point forward, these control variables are referred to as

parental stressors. It should be noted that youth factors are intentionally omitted from inclusion in the parent models for two reasons: the homogenous nature of the sample (delinquents) and to solely examine the effects of parental stressors on each of the parental competency variables.

These parental stressors of interest are thought to influence family management practices in a negative way, having an effect on parenting. Specifically, having a psychiatric disorder (0=no,1=yes), history of arrest (0=no, 1=yes), living in poverty (0=150 percent below the poverty level, 1=150 percent above the poverty level), total number of family members living in the home (number), and parental mistrust of the juvenile justice system (1=completely false, 2=mostly false, 3=mostly true, 4=completely true) will serve as independent variables with parental exasperation, parental resignation, and parental monitoring serving as the dependent variables in each of the models. The variable parental mistrust is being treated as if it is interval level data when in fact it is ordinal level data. Correlation analyses do not indicate multicollinearity problems.

Parental exasperation. It is expected that parental stressors will contribute to the parent's level of parental exasperation. This model is presented in Table 15. The overall model is not significant (F test = 1.360 and adjusted R^2 = .021) explaining only 2 percent of the variation in parental exasperation considering the diagnosis of a psychiatric disorder, history of arrest, poverty, total number of family members living in the home, and mistrust of the juvenile justice system. The only significant variable in the model is having a diagnosis of a psychiatric disorder ($p<.05$). This relationship is positive, indicating that

Table 15: An examination of the relationship between parental stressors and parental exasperation

Variable	Parental exasperation		
	b(SE)	β	t
Mistrust of the juvenile Justice system	-.164(.114)	-.160	-1.445
Psychiatric disorder	.403(.201)	.221*	2.002
History of arrest	-.100(.173)	-.065	-.577
150% below poverty line	.074(.173)	.050	.428
Total family members in the home	.023(.055)	.050	.417
Adjusted R^2	.021		
F test	1.360		

p<.000***
p<.01**
p<.05*

parents who report having a psychiatric disorder are more likely to be exasperated (angry, hopeless, and feeling like giving up on their child).

Parental monitoring. It is expected that parental stressors will influence the parent's level of parental monitoring. This model determines the effects of parental monitoring while considering the diagnosis of a psychiatric disorder, history of arrest, poverty, total number of family members living in the home, and parental mistrust of the juvenile justice system. The results are provided in Table 16. The model is not significant (F test = 1.119 and adjusted R^2 = .007) explaining less than one percent (.7) of the variation in parental exasperation. This model did not produce any significant relationships.

Parental resignation. Given the limited variation in parental resignation, the variable was recoded into a nominal level of measurement. Specifically, parental resignation was converted to a dummy variable based on either not being resigned (1-2.99, coded as 0) or being resigned to the belief that their child's future looks bad (3-4, coded as 1). As a result, logistic regression is used to predict parental resignation from a diagnosis of a psychiatric disorder, history of arrest, poverty, total number of family members living in the home, and parental mistrust of the juvenile justice system.

Table 17 shows the coefficients, odds ratio (Exp(B)), and the Chi square statistic. The likelihood ratio chi square of 13.077 is statistically significant ($p<.05$) and indicates that this model fits significantly better than the beginning model. In this model, mistrust of the juvenile justice system is the only variable that is a statistically significant predictor of parental resignation ($p<.05$). Specifically, as there is a one unit increase in the level of

Table 16: An examination of the relationship between parental stressors and parental monitoring

Variable	Parental monitoring		
	b(SE)	β	t
Mistrust of the juvenile Justice system	.151(.116)	.145	1.305
Psychiatric disorder	-.089(.205)	-.048	-.433
History of arrest	.262(.176)	.170	1.490
150% below poverty line	-.244(.177)	-.164	-1.381
Total family members in the home	.008(.056)	.018	.150
Adjusted R^2	.007		
F test	1.119		

p<.000***
p<.01**
p<.05*

Table 17: An examination of the relationship between parental resignation and parental stressors

Variable	Parental resignation	
	B(SE)	Exp(B)
Mistrust of the juvenile Justice system	1.343(.627)	3.831*
Psychiatric disorder	-.538(762)	.584
History of arrest	.132(.667)	1.141
150% below poverty line	-.880(.654)	.415
Total family members in the home	-297(.208)	.743
Cox & Snell R^2	.144	
Nagelkerke R^2	.237	
Chi square	13.077*	

p<.000***
p<.01**
p<.05*

mistrust of the juvenile justice system, the odds of being resigned increase by a factor of 3.83.

The objective in this section was to determine if parental stressors are factors that contribute to the parental competency variables of interest: parental exasperation, parental resignation, and parental monitoring. The only significant model developed was that of parental resignation considering parental stressors. Otherwise, parental exasperation and parental monitoring as the dependent variables did not produce significant models. Given the current sample and measures, these analyses indicate that parental competencies are not significantly exacerbated by parental stressors.

In conclusion, this chapter examined whether or not significant bivariate relationships would be maintained at the multivariate level considering additional control variables for dependent variables total number of technical violations and total number of subsequent offenses. In addition, parental stressors were examined to determine if they had an impact on parental exasperation, parental resignation, and parental monitoring. While the results are reported herein, it is essential to understand what the results mean in a practical sense. Therefore, the following chapter will provide a discussion of these findings.

Chapter 5

Discussion

Prior research of delinquent youth has primarily focused on factors related the youth such as peer influences, substance abuse, low-self control, and strain for example, while acknowledging that parental influences such as inept and disruptive parenting practices contribute to delinquent behavior as well. While prior research has shown that the role of parents is important, there is an absence of examining the influence of parents' emotions such as thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and beliefs and how they contribute to delinquency.

To the author's knowledge, this is the first study to consider these parental competency measures developed by Rose et al., (2004) in relation to the offending patterns of juvenile probationers. In addition to examining the role of parents, this study also examined factors that influence parents' emotions and behaviors. Consideration of parents is important because they are the principal persons with whom children socialize (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998); therefore, it is essential to understand how their emotions and behaviors influence delinquent behavior.

This study initially uncovered a number of relationships at the bivariate level, resulting in the analysis of the following relationships: (1) youth whose parents report

higher levels of anger, hopelessness, and feeling like giving up on the child (parental exasperation) are more likely to have higher rates of technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent offenses, (2) youth whose parents report higher levels of feeling like the future looks bad for their child (parental resignation) are more likely to have higher rates of technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent offenses, and (3) youth whose parents report higher levels of parental monitoring are more likely to have higher rates of technical violations and/or subsequent delinquent offenses.

Although most of the hypotheses were not supported, consistent with prior research, parental monitoring was found to be an important factor contributing to delinquency. The distinction may be the difference between feelings and actions. For example, it appears that the other hypotheses may not have been supported because of the clear distinction between parental thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and beliefs (such as mistrust of the juvenile justice system, fear of the child, perceptions of child's exposure to violence, and anger towards child) versus parental behaviors such as monitoring. According to this study, parental behaviors contribute to reoffending patterns of youth on probation whereas parental thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and beliefs do not based on the data provided by parents in this sample. Certainly, this does not mean that the thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and beliefs of parents do not matter, but it is not able to be shown statistically.

Offending Patterns of Probationers

The study revealed three predictors of delinquency across measures of offending and technical violations: maintaining passing grades, a history of substance abuse, and

parental monitoring. Maintaining passing grades was a significant variable in every model with the exception of the model with the dependent variable total number of technical violations while controlling for parental monitoring. These findings are consistent with that of previous researchers who have found that school performance is related to delinquency (Rhodes & Reiss, 1969; Ward & Tittle, 1994; Voelkl, Welte, & Wieczorek, 1999; Hirschi & Hindelang, 1977).

Although the link between school performance and delinquency has been established, none of these studies have offered conclusive evidence on why the relationships between school and delinquency exist, concluding only that a relationship does exist. Given this, alternative explanations are plausible. For example, it may be that personal characteristics such as low self-control (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1990) or poor social bonds (Hirschi, 1969) have an impact on delinquent behavior, mediated by school performance.

In addition to maintaining passing grades, having a history of substance abuse was a significant predictor in explaining the total number of technical violations while controlling for the notion of anger and feeling as if they want to give up on the child (parental exasperation). The significance of substance abuse is not a surprising finding given its association as a risk factor (Jessor, Turbin, & Costa, 1998) and with delinquency (Swahn & Donovan, 2004). Considering the nature of substance abuse, this finding is theoretically and logically plausible.

Parental monitoring is significantly related to the total number of technical violations and the total number of delinquent offenses. These findings are consistent with

others who have found that parental monitoring is a central variable in explaining delinquency (Patterson, & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984; Richards, et al. 2003; Flannery, Williams, & Vazsonyi, 1999; Dishion & Loeber, 1985; Patterson, 1982; Wells & Rankin, 1988). Comparing the variables related to thoughts, attitudes, feelings, and beliefs (exasperation and resignation) to that of behaviors (monitoring), there appears to be a clear difference in their effect on offending patterns of probationers.

Although the effect of parental monitoring on delinquency has been established, it must be acknowledged that a social desirability effect may have occurred as it relates to self-reporting of their monitoring behaviors. Simply put, this means that parents may not want to admit that they are not aware of what is going on in their child's life for fear that they will be perceived as ignorant by the probation officer, knowing that they are potentially accountable for their child's behavior.

In summary, the findings of this study indicate that maintaining passing grades, substance abuse, and parental monitoring are important factors in explaining youth outcomes. Furthermore, the salience of the variables maintaining passing grades and parental monitoring across models indicates the importance of academic performance and monitoring behaviors of parents for probationers' outcomes. The prominence of these variables throughout models makes a contribution to the literature as it relates to a sample of known delinquents and/or status offenders.

As previously noted, these findings suggest that parents' thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and beliefs (exasperation and resignation) are not predictive factors in whether the child violates probation or receives a subsequent delinquent offense but that parenting

behaviors (monitoring) are predictive factors for explaining such violations. Given that most of the hypotheses were not supported, to further explore factors that potentially influence parental competencies, this study also examined the role of parental stressors on each of the primary parental competency variables.

Parental Stressors as Factors for Predicting Parental Competencies

Considering the feelings of anger, hopelessness, and wanting to "give up" on the child (parental exasperation), a parent's diagnosis of a psychiatric disorder was a significant predictor in determining these feelings. A concern with the significant relationship between having a psychiatric disorder and parental exasperation is that the nature of hopelessness is related to depression. As research shows, depression is related to sad affect, lack of energy, apathy, suicide, and difficulty in concentration (Abramson et al., 1989). These negative emotions pose a threat to positive interactions between parents and their children. Researchers have found that problematic parenting behaviors such as the presence of psychiatric disorders are associated with delinquent behavior (Patterson, 1982; Johnson et al., 2004).

Parental stress factors were not found to be related to the parent's ability to monitor youth. This finding is consistent with that of Bradshaw et al. (2006) who found that similar parental stressors did not significantly impact parental monitoring. However, one parental factor is related to the notion that the future looks bad for their child. Specifically, mistrust of the juvenile justice system was a significant predictor of the parent believing that the future of their child looks bad (parental resignation). This is not a surprising

finding considering the nature of the variable mistrust of the juvenile justice system. Specifically, if parents believe that the system is against their child, out to get their child, treats their child poorly because of who he/she is, misunderstands what it is like for the child, feels the court is making too big a deal of what the child has been accused of, feels that everyone in the court sees people as guilty, feels the child is unfairly accused, and that the police do not treat people like them very well, then these feelings are likely to be transferred from the police and the court to the probation officer, even though the probation officer was not part of the initial process of arrest or adjudication. Prior studies examining mistrust of the justice system found that static factors such as race and class differences influence attitudes towards police (Hagan & Albonetti, 1982; Leiber et al., 1998). Parents likely see all members of the system as one and the same.

Policy Implications

Recognizing the robustness of maintaining passing grades, schools (to include teachers, administrators, social workers, and counselors alike), families, juvenile court officials, and community partners must make a concerted effort at engaging children in school throughout their educational years regardless of the challenge. The importance of academic performance is underscored - school performance is related to delinquency, and delinquency poses a threat to the safety of the individual as well as other members of society. Although this study did not examine the reasons probationers were not maintaining passing grades, given the nature of delinquent populations, a number of

behaviors are inherent, such as disruptive behavior, absenteeism, lower levels of student engagement, lack of knowledge of material, and lower levels of parental involvement.

A lack of parental involvement with the school and the child's academic experience may be a potential explanation for failure (DePlanty, Coulter-Kern, & Duchane, 2007). In examining methods that improve academic performance as it relates to parental involvement, parent-child discussions about school activities have been found to improve grades and behaviors, while open lines of communication between parents and teachers proved beneficial for middle school students (Sheldon & Epstein, 2005; Epstein & Sheldon, 2002).

Since parents are a vital resource and partner for involving their children in school, youth whose parents are actively involved are more likely to succeed in school (Sanders & Sanders, 1998). As for ways to involve parents in their child's education, Sanders & Sanders (1998) assert that schools should create an inviting atmosphere, inform parents of the school's mission and goals, employ regular forms of communication, hold open houses, provide opportunities for parents to witness school activities, and offer workshops on topic that parents' may need. Deplanty et al. (2007) suggests similar techniques, such as workshops focusing on the benefits of parental involvement, brochures sent home regarding parental involvement, and discussions with parents during parent-teacher conferences to actively involve parents.

Probation officers should continue contributing to the educational success of probationers by maintaining close contact with schools to ensure daily attendance and pro-social behavior, taking a strong stance against non-compliance, while also monitoring

grades. As far as academic performance is concerned, probation officers should be persistent in their efforts to work with the schools and parents and require probationers to attend tutoring sessions and/or extra help sessions offered by the schools, and to encourage parents to become involved in their child's education. Although the schools may make students and families aware of such tutoring sessions, they have little authority to require participation.

Probation officers may be more effective in their work if they are in the schools on a regular basis to immediately address these types of issues. School-based probation offers an important option in the continuum of interventions for courts and probation departments (Juvenile Sanctions Center, 2003). The benefits of school-based probation include more informed contacts with probationers, better school attendance, better communication between probation departments and schools, lower levels of serious recidivism, fewer placements, and fewer placement days as compared to traditional probation cases (Metzger, 1997).

Although juveniles receiving school-based probation had lower levels of serious new charges, they were significantly more likely to receive probation violations and status offenses due to the increased level of supervision (Metzger, 1997). Recognizing that closer supervision leads to the probation officer's awareness that violations may have occurred, the use of graduated sanctions involving both the probation department and the school may reduce the number of technical violations filed with the court.

Based on prior research, school-based probation appears to be effective in deterring serious levels of recidivism. This finding could be due to the effectiveness of school-based

probation or it could be due to some other factor associated with school-based probation. Nevertheless, school-based probation appears to be a better alternative than the traditional office-based probation. Moreover, given the current economic crises, it has become even more essential for probation departments to reallocate their already limited resources.

While there are a number of ways in which youth on probation can potentially benefit from school-based probation, the effects on the community can also be seen in a variety of ways, such as youth staying in school, increased and sustained levels of employment, more opportunity for higher education, desistence in criminal activity, living a healthier lifestyle, and an increase in trust among those in the juvenile justice system. Mistrust of the justice system runs parallel to the notion of criminal justice legitimacy - perceptions that the criminal justice system is just and effective (Forst, 2004). For example, if parents view the juvenile justice system as unjust and ineffective, mistrust increases and legitimacy suffers.

As for ways to enhance legitimacy while simultaneously increasing levels of trust among parents, a community approach is essential. For example, community organizations such as Police Athletic Leagues (PALS) are programs that offer positive police-youth interactions and serve to help juveniles develop and maintain a healthy lifestyle. In addition to the goal of enhancing the image of the police through its work with youth, PALS has the potential to also enhance its relationship with the community in general, specifically parents. Although positive interactions with law enforcement on behalf of youth and parents are likely to increase levels of trust which in turn promotes criminal justice legitimacy, the justice system should not be solely responsible for this

daunting task. This means that community agencies, businesses, police departments, educators, and the like must join together in ways that promote legitimacy. Given the findings in this study, school-based probation may begin to increase parents' levels of trust among juvenile justice practitioners, including police through the educational system, a primary institution for youth.

Limitations and Future Directions

Several limitations, such as small sample size, social desirability of parent responses, and generalizability issues exist as previously discussed in Chapter Three. Furthermore, in each of the models, there is a large amount of unexplained variance so conclusions should be taken cautiously. The findings of this study lay the foundation for future studies to examine the role of parental competencies and their relationship to adherence to court sanctions and recidivism rates. Although the present study shows the potential that these constructs have in explaining delinquency, more in-depth studies could be beneficial to our understanding of these factors and relationships.

In addition, future studies may consider employing qualitative methods, such as asking parents open-ended questions, to further analyze the parental competency constructs. It would also be beneficial to conduct the study with a larger sample to determine if the parental competency variables would reach significance. Since the JOPQ was developed with a sample of parents of juveniles being arraigned in two southeastern cities, use of the instrument should continue to be employed with various populations to hone in on parental perceptions that impact rehabilitative efforts (Rose et al., 2004).

Moreover, future studies should also include specific measures of probationers' behaviors such as anti-social and aggressive tendencies, psychological dysfunction, and low self-control. Theoretically, delinquents are low in self-control (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990); therefore, it would be instructive to identify variations in low self-control among a delinquent sample in order to determine differences in offending patterns. Rather than simply examining official records of probationers, self-reports may provide more accurate depictions of delinquency. Lastly, researchers should investigate the impact of the parents' feelings, emotions, and behaviors from the perspective of the probationer.

Bibliography

Bibliography

Abramson, L.Y., G.I. Metalsky, and L.B. Alloy. 1989. "Hopelessness depression: A theory-based subtype of depression". *Psychology Review.* vol.96. 358-372.

Agnew, Robert. 1992. "Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency". *Criminology.* vol. 30. 47-87.

Agnew, Robert and Sandra Huguley. 1989. "Adolescent Violence toward Parents". *Journal of Marriage and the Family.* vol. 51. 699-711.

Akers, R.L. 1985. Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bahr, Stephen J., John P. Hoffmann and Xiaoyan Yang. 2005. "Parental and Peer Influences on the Risk of Adolescent Drug Use". *Journal of Primary Prevention*. vol. 26:6. 526-551.

Bandura, Albert. 1982. "Self-Efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency". *American Psychologist.* vol.37:2. 122-147.

Bartsch, Robert A. and Sutham Cheurprakobkit. 2004. "The Effects of Amount of Contact Expectation, and Contact Experience with Police on Attitudes Towards Police". *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology.* vol. 19:1. 58-70.

Beck, Aaron, Arlene Weissman, David Lester, and Larry Trexler. 1974. "The Measurement of Pessimism: The hopelessness scale. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology.* vol. 42:6. 861-865.

Beck, Aaron T. 1967. Depression: Clinical, experimental and theoretical aspects. New York: Hoebner Medical Division, Harper & Row.

Bennett, David S., Margaret Wolan Sullivan, and Michael Lewis. 2005. "Young Children's Adjustment as a Function of Maltreatment, Shame, and Anger". *Child Maltreatment*. vol. 10:4. 311-323.

Berkowitz, Leonard. 1990. "On the Formulation and Regulation of Anger and Aggression". *American Psychologist.* vol.45:4. 494-503.

Borrero, Michael. 2001. "The Widening Mistrust Between Youth and Police". *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services.*

Bradshaw, Catherine P., Brian A. Glaser, Georgia B. Calhoun, and Jeffrey M. Bates. 2006. "Beliefs and Practices of the Parents of Violent and Oppositional Adolescents:An Ecological Perspective". *The Journal of Primary Prevention.* vol. 27:3. 245-263.

Brandl, Steven G., James Frank, Robert E. Worden, and Timothy Bynum. 1994. "Global and Specific Attitudes Toward the Police: Disentangling the Relationship 1". *Justice Quarterly.* vol. 11:1. 119-134.

Brezina, Timothy. 1998. "Adolescent Maltreatment and Delinquency: The question of Intervening processes". *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency.* vol. 35:1. 71-100.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. 1986. "Ecology of the Family as a Context for Human Development: Research Perspectives". *Developmental Psychology.* vol. 22:6. 723-742.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie and Pamela A, Morris. 1998. "The Ecology of Developmental Processes". In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds) Handbook of Child Psychology. vol 1: Theoretical Models of Human Development. 993-1028. New York: Wiley.

Broidy, Lisa M. 2001. "A Test of General Strain Theory". *Criminology.* vol 39:1. 9-35.

Buist, Kirsten L., Maja Dekovic, Wim Meeus, Marcel A. G. van Aken. 2003. "The Reciprocal Relationship Between Early Adolescent Attachment and Internalizing and Externalizing Problem Behaviour". *Journal of Adolescence*. vol. 27:3. 251-266.

Burton, Velmer, Francis T. Cullen, T. David Evans, R. Gregory Dunaway, Sesha R. Kethineni, and Gary L. Payne. 1995. "The Impact of Parental Controls on Delinquency". *Journal of Criminal Justice.* vol. 23:2. 111-126.

Butler, Robert C. 2000. The social construction of the African-American females' crack-cocaine-crime world in a small-size city: An ethnographic account in Racine, Wisconsin. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI.

Cadoret, Remi J., Colleen A. Cain, and Raymond R. Crowe. 1983. "Evidence for Gene-Environment Interaction in the Development of Adolescent Antisocial Behavior". *Behavior Genetics.* vol. 13:3. 301-310.

Calhoun, Georgia. B., Brian A. Glaser, and Christi L. Bartolomucci. 2001. "The Juvenile Counseling and Assessment Model and Program: A Conceptualization and Intervention for Juvenile Delinquency". *Journal of Counseling & Development.* vol. 78. 131-141.

Calhoun, Georgia. B. 2001. "Differences Between Male and Female Juvenile Offenders as Measured by the BASC". *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation.* vol. 33:2. 87-96.

Carlson, Vicki, Dante Cicchetti, Douglas Barnett, and Karen Braunwald. 1989. "Disorganized/Disoriented Attachment Relationships in Maltreated Infants". *Developmental Psychology.* vol. 25:4. 525-531.

Ceballo, Rosario, Cynthia Ramirez, Kimberly D. Hearn, and Kelly L. Maltese. 2003. "Community Violence and Children's Psychological Well-Being: Does Parental Monitoring Matter?". *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*. vol. 32:4. 586-592.

Cernkovich, Stephen A. and Peggy C. Giordano. 1987. "Family Relationships and Delinquency". *Criminology.* vol. 25. 295-321.

Coalition for Juvenile Justice. 1998. A celebration or a wake: The juvenile court after 100 years. Washington D.C.

Collins, Andrew W., Eleanor E. Maccoby, Laurence Steinberg, E. Mavis Hetherington, and Marc H. Bornstein. 2000. "Contemporary Research on Parenting: The case for Nature and Nurture". *American Psychologist.* vol. 55:2. 218-232.

DePlanty, Jennifer, Russell Coulter-Kern, and Kim Duchane. 2007. "Perceptions of Parent Involvement in Academic Achievement." *The Journal of Educational Research,* vol. 100(6): 361-368.

DiLalla, Lisabeth Fisher and Irving I. Gottsman. 1989. "Heterogeneity of Causes for Delinquency and Criminality: Lifespan Perspectives". *Development and Psychopathology.* vol. 1. 339-349.

Dillon, Frank R., Hilda Pantin, Michael S. Robbins, and Jose Szapocznik. 2008. "Exploring the Role of Parental Monitoring of Peers on the Relationship Between Family Functioning and Delinquency in the Lives of African American and Hispanic Adolescents". *Crime & Delinquency.* vol. 54:1. 65-94.

Dishion, T.J., R. Loeber, M. Stouthamer-Loeber, and G.R. Patterson. 1984. "Skill Deficits and Male Adolescent Delinquency". *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology.* vol. 12:1. 37-54.

Dishion, Thomas J. and Robert McMahon. 1998. "Parental Monitoring and the Prevention of Child and Adolescent Problem Behavior: A Conceptual and Empirical Formulation". *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review.* vol. 1. 61-75.

Dishion, Thomas J. and Rolf Loeber. 1985. "Male Adolescent Marijuana and Alcohol Use: The Role of Parents and Peers Revisited". *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse.* vol. 11. 11-25.

Durkin, Keith F., Timothy W. Wolfe, and Gregory Clark. 1999. "Social Bond Theory and Binge Drinking Among College Students: A Multivariate Analysis – Statistical Data Included." *College Student Journal*. vol. 33. 1-10.

Epstein, J.L. and S.B. Sheldon. 2002. "Present and Accounted For: Improving Student Attendance through Family and Community Involvement." *The Journal of Educational Research,* vol. 95: 308-318.

Felson, Richard B. and Jeremy Staff. 2006. "Explaining the Academic Performance-Delinquency Relationship." *Criminology,* vol. 44(2): 299-319.

Flannery, Daniel, Laura L. Williams, Alexander T. Vazsonyi. 1999. "Who Are They With and What Are They Doing? Delinquent Behavior, Substance Abuse, and Early Adolescents' After School Time." *American Journal of Orthopsychiarty,* vol. 69(2): 247-253.

Forst, Brian. 2004. Errors of Justice. Cambridge University Press.

Fox, Sanford. 1996. "The early history of the juvenile court". *The Juvenile Court*, 6(3): 29-39.

Fox, Sanford. 1970. "Juvenile justice reform: A historical perspective". *Stanford Law Review*, 6(3): 1187-1239.

Frank, James, Steven G. Brandl, Francis T. Cullen, and Amy Stichman. 1996. "Reassessing the Impact of Race on Citizens' Attitudes Toward the Police". *Justice Quarterly.* vol. 13:2. 321-334.

Furstenberg, F.F., T. Cook, J. Eccles, G.H. Elder, and A. Sameroff. Managing to Make It: Urban Families and Adolescent Success. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Garbarino, J., N. Dubrow, K. Kostelny, and C. Pardo. 1992. Children in Danger: Dealing with the Consequences of Community Violence. San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Garbarino, James, Catherine P. Bradshaw, and Kathleen Kostelny. 2005. "Neighborhood and Community Influences on Parenting". In Tom Luster and Lynn Okagaki (Eds). Parenting: An Ecological Perspective. 297-318.

Gavazzi, Stephen M., Courtney M. Yarcheck, and Ji-Young Lim. 2005. "Ethnicity, Gender, and Global Risk Indicators in the Lives of Status Offenders Coming to the Attention of the Juvenile Court". *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. vol. 49:6. 696-710.

Gelles, Richard J. 1992. "Poverty and Violence Toward Children". *American Behavioral Scientist*. vol. 35:3. 258-274.

Glueck, Sheldon, and Eleanor Glueck. 1950. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gottfredson, Michael R. and Travis Hirschi. 1990. A General Theory of Crime. Stanford University Press.

Hagan, John and Celesta Albonetti. 1982. "Race, Class, and the Perception of Criminal Injustice in America". *American Journal of Sociology.* vol. 88:2. 329-355.

Harbin, H.T. and D.J. Madden. 1979. "Battered Parents: A New Syndrome". *American Journal of Psychiatry.* vol. 136. 1288-1291.

Harm, Nancy J. and Susan D. Phillips. 2001. "You can't go home again: Women and Criminal Recidivism". *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation.* vol. 32:3. 3-21.

Harper, J.M. and M.H. Hoopes. 1990. Uncovering Shame: An Approach Integrating Individuals and Their Family Systems. New York: W.W. Norton.

Hedderson, J. (1987). Spssx made easy. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Hirschi, Travis. 1969. Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hirschi, T. and M. J. Hindelang. 1977. "Intelligence and Delinquency: A Revisionist Review." *American Sociological Review.* vol. 42: 571-586.

Holsinger, Kristi and Alexander M. Holsinger. 2005. "Differential Pathways to Violence and Self-Injurious Behavior: African American and White Girls in the Juvenile Justice System". *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. vol. 42:2. 211-242.

Huebner, Angela J. and Sherry C. Betts. 2002. "Exploring the Utility of Social Control Theory for Youth Development: Issues of Attachment, Involvement, and Gender". *Youth & Society*. vol. 34. 123-145.

Illinois Juvenile Court Act, 1899 Ill. Laws 132.

In Re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967).

In Re Winship, 397 U.S. 385 (1970).

Jang, Sung Joon. 2002. "The Effects of Family, School, Peers, and Attitudes on Adolescents' Drug Use: Do They Vary With Age?" *Justice Quarterly*. vol. 19:1. 97-126.

Jessor, Richard, Jill Van Den Bos, Judith Vanderryn, Frances M. Costa, and Mark S. Turbin. 1995. "Protective Factors in Adolescent Problem Behavior: Moderator Effects and Developmental Change". *Developmental Psychology.* vol. 31:6. 923-933.

Jessor, Richard, Mark S. Turbin, and Frances M. Costa. 1998. "Risk and Protection in Successful Outcomes Among Disadvantaged Adolescents." *Applied Developmental Science*. vol 2:4. 194-208.

Johnson, Jeffrey G., Elizabeth Smailes, Patricia Cohen, Stephanie Kasen and Judith S. Brook. "Anti-Social Parental Behaviour, Problematic Parenting and Aggressive Offspring Behaviour During Adulthood: A 25-Year Longitudinal Investigation". *British Journal of Criminology*. vol. 44:6. 915-930.

Jones, Shayne, Elizabeth Cauffman, and Alex Piquero. 2007. "The Influence of Parental Support Among Incarcerated Adolescent Offenders: The Moderating Effects of Self-Control". *Criminal Justice and Behavior.* vol. 34:2. 229-245.

Kazak, Anne E., Dimitri Christakis, Melissa Alderfer, and Mary Jo Coiro. 1994. "Young Adolescent Cancer Survivors and Their Parents: Adjustment, Learning Problems, and Gender. *Journal of Family Psychology.* vol. 8:1. 74-84.

Kempf, Kimberly. 1993. "The Empirical Status of Hirschi's Control Theory". *New Directions in Criminal Theory*. vol. 4. 143-185.

Kent v. United States, 383 U.S. 541 (1966).

Kerr, Margaret and Hakan Stattin. 2000. "What Parents Know, How They Know It, and Several Forms of Adolescent Adjustment: Further Support for a Reinterpretation of Monitoring". *Developmental Psychology.* vol. 36:3. 360-380.

Knepper, Paul. 2001. Explaining Criminal Conduct: Theories and Systems in Criminology. Durham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press.

Kornhauser, Ruth Rosner. 1978. Social Sources of Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leahy-Warren, Patricia and Geraldine MCCarthy. 2006. "Postnatal depression: Prevalence, Mothers' Perspectives, and Treatments. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing.* vol. 21:2. 91-100.

Leiber, Michael J., Mahesh K. Nalla, and Margaret Farnworth. 1998. "Explaining Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police". *Justice Quarterly.* vol. 15:1. 151-174.

Lilly, J. Robert, Francis T. Cullen, and Richard A. Ball. 1995. Criminological Theory: Context and Consequences. 2nd ed. Sage Publications.

Liska, Alen E. and Mark D. Reed. 1985. "Ties to Conventional Institutions and Delinquency: Estimating Reciprocal Effects". *American Sociological Review.* vol. 50. 547-650.

Livingston, L.R. 1986. "Children's Violence Towards Single Mothers". *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare.* vol. 13. 920-933.

Loeber, Rolf and Magda Stouthamer-Loeber. 1986. "Family Factors as Correlates and Predictors of Juvenile Conduct Problems and Delinquency". In *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*. vol. 7. 29-149. ed. Michael Tonry and Norval Morris. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Martinez, Pedro and John E. Richters. 1993. "The NIMH Community Violence Project: II. Children's Distress Symptoms Associated with Violence Exposure". *Psychiatry.* vol. 56:1. 22-35.

May, David C. 1999. "Scared Kids, Unattached Kids, or Peer Pressure: Why Do Students Carry Firearms to School?". *Youth & Society*. vol. 31:1. 100-127.

McKeiver v. Pennsylvania, 403 U.S. 528 (1971).

Mears, Daniel. 2002. "Sentencing guidelines and the transformation of juvenile justice in the 21st century". *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, vol. 18:1. 6-19.

Metzger, David and Danielle Tobin-Fiore, B.S. 1997. School-Based Probation in Pennsylvania: Final Report. University of Pennsylvania.

Nye, F. Ivan. 1957. Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Juvenile Sanctions Center. 2003. School-based Probation: An Approach Worth Considering. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Osofsky, Joy. 1995. "The Effects of Exposure to Violence on Young Children". *American Psychologist.* vol. 50:9. 782-788.

Parker, Jennifer S. and Mark J. Benson. 2004. "Parent-Adolescent, Relations and Adolescent Functioning: Self-Esteem, Substance Abuse, and Delinquency". *Adolescence*. vol. 39:155. 519-531.

Patterson, G.R. 1982. Coercive Family Process: A social learning approach. vol. 3. Eugene, Oregon: Castalia.

Patterson, G.R. and Magda Stouthamer-Loeber. 1984. "The Correlation of Family Management Practices and Delinquency". *Child Development*. vol. 55. 1299-1307.

Patterson, G.R. and T.J. Dishion. 1985. "Contributions of Families and Peers to Delinquency". *Criminology.* vol. 23. 63-79.

Patterson, G.R., Barbara D. DeBaryshe, and Elizabeth Ramsey. 1989. "A Developmental Perspective on Antisocial Behavior". *American Psychologist.* vol. 44:2. 329-335.

Patterson, G.R., Marion S. Forgatch, Karen L. Yoerger, and Mike Stoolmiller. 1998. "Variables that Initiate and Maintain an Early-Onset Trajectory for Juvenile Offending." *Developmental Psychology.* vol. 10. 531-547.

Patterson, G.R., J.B. Reid, and T.J. Dishion. 1992. Antisocial Boys. Eugene, Oregon: Castalia.

Pierce, Christine Schnyder and Stanley L. Brodsky. 2002. "Trust and Understanding in the Attorney-Juvenile Relationship". *Behavioral Sciences and the Law.* vol. 20. 89-107.

Pratt, Travis C. and Francis T. Cullen. 2000. "The Empirical Status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's Theory of Crime: A Meta-Analysis". *Criminology.* vol. 38:3. 931-964.

Pullman, Michael D., Jodi Kerbs, Nancy Koroloff, Ernie Veach-White, Rita Gaylor, and Dede Sieler. 2006. "Juvenile Offenders with mental Health Needs: Reducing Recidivism Using Wraparound". *Crime & Delinquency.* vol. 52:3. 375-397.

Rankin, Joseph H. and Edward L. Wells. 1990. "The Effect of Parental Attachments and Direct Controls on Delinquency". *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency.* vol. 27:2. 140-165.

Reese, L.E., E.M. Vera, K. Thompson, and R. Reyes. 2001. "A Qualitative Investigation of Perceptions of Violent Risk Factors in Low-Income African American Children". *Journal of Clinical and Child Psychology.* vol. 30. 161-171.

Rhodes, A. Lewis and Albert J. Reiss. 1969. "Apathy, Truancy, and Delinquency as Adaptations to School Failure". *Social Forces,* vol 48:1. 12-22.

Richards, Maryse H., Bobbi Viegas Miller, Philip C. O'Donnell, Michelle S. Wasserman, and Craig Colder. 2004. "Parental Monitoring Mediates the Effects of Age and Sex on Problem Behaviors Among African American Urban Young Adolescents". *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. vol. 33:3. 221-234.

Richters, John E. and Pedro Martinez. 1993. "The NIMH Community Violence Project: I. Children as Victims of and Witnesses to Violence". *Psychiatry.* vol. 56:1. 7-21.

Rose, Clark C., Brian A. Glaser, Georgia B. Calhoun and Jeffrey M. Bates. 2004. "Assessing the Parents of Juvenile Offenders: A Preliminary Validation Study of the Juvenile Offender and Parent Questionnaire". *Child & Family Behavior Therapy*. vol. 26. 25-43.

Rosenberg, M.L., P. O'Carroll, and K. Powell. 1992. "Let's be Clear: Violence is a Public Health Problem". *Journal of the American Medical Association.* vol. 267. 3071-3072.

Ross, Catherine E., John Mirowsky, and Shana Pribesh. 2001. "Powelessness and the Amplification of Threat: Neighborhood Disadvantage, Disorder, and Mistrust". *American Sociological Review.* vol. 66. 568-591.

Sampson, Robert J. and John H. Laub. 1993. Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sanders, Jr., Johnny and Rubye C. Sanders. 1998. "Anti-Dropout Interventions". *Teaching for Excellence.* vol. 18. 33-34.

Scales, P.C., P.L. Benson, N. Leffert, and D.A. Blyth. 2000. "Contribution of Developmental Assests to the Prediction of Thriving among Adolescents". *Applied Developmental Science.* vol. 4:1. 27-46.

Scholte, Evert M. 1999. "Factors Predicting Continued Violence into Young Adulthood". *Journal of Adolescence.* vol. 22. 3-20.

Secret, Philip E. & James B. Johnson. 1996. "Specialized juvenile courts: Do they make a difference in judicial decision making?" *Journal of Crime and Justice*, XIX:2. 159-180.

Shafinar, Ariana, Nathan A. Fox, and Lewis A. Leavitt. 2000. "Preschool Children's Exposure to Violence: Relation of Behavior Problems to Parent and Child Reports". *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry.* vol. 70:1. 115-125.

Sheldon, S.B. and J.L. Epstein. 2005. "Involvement Counts: Family and Community Partnerships and Math Achievement." *The Journal of Educational Research,* vol. 98: 196-206.

Shepherd, Jr. Robert E. 1999. "The juvenile court at 100 years: A look back". *Juvenile Justice*, VI :2. 1-12, www.ncjrs.gov/html/ojjdp/jjjournal1299/2.html.

Shuntich, R.J., D. Loh, and D. Katz. 1998. "Some Relationships Among Affection, Aggression and Alcohol Use in the Family Setting". *Perceptions and Motor Skills.* vol. 86:3. 1051-1060.

Simons, Ronald L., Christine Johnson, Rand D. Conger, and Glen Elder, Jr. 1998. "A Test of Latent Trait versus Life-Course Perspectives on the Stability of Adolescent Antisocial Behavior". *Criminology.* vol. 36:2. 217-244.

Simons, Ronald L., Leslie Gordon Simons, Yi-Fu Chen, Gene Brody and Kuei-Hsiu Lin. 2007. "Identifying the Psychological Factors that Mediate the Association Between Parenting Practices and Delinquency". *Criminology.* vol. 45:3. 481-517.

Simons, Ronald L., Kuei-Hsiu Lin, Leslie C. Gordon, Gene Brody, and Rand D. Conger. 2002. "Community Differences in the Association Between Parenting Practices and Child Conduct Problems". *Journal of Marriage and Family.* vol. 64. 331-345.

Snyder, Howard N. and Melissa Sickmund. 2006. "Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2006 National Report. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Sprott, Jane B., Jennifer M. Jenkins, and Anthony N. Doob. 2005. "The Importance of School: Protecting At-Risk Youth From Early Offending". *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*. vol. 3:1. 59-77.

Stewart, Eric A., Ronald L. Simons, Rand D. Conger, and Laura V. Scaramella. 2002. "Beyond the Interactional Relationship Between Delinquency and Parenting Practices: The Contribution of Legal Sanctions". *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. vol. 39: 1. 36-59.

Swahn, Monica H. and John E. Donovan. 2005. "Predictors of fighting attributed to alcohol use among adolescent drinkers." *Addictive Behaviors*. vol 30. 1317-1334.

Thompson, Martie P., Nadine Kaslow, and J.B. Kingree. 2002. "Risk Factors for Suicide Attempts Among African American Women Experiencing Recent Intimate Partner Violence". *Violence and Victims.* vol. 17:3. 283-295.

Unnever, James D., Francis T. Cullen, and Robert Agnew. 2006. "Why is 'Bad' Parenting Criminogenic?". *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*. vol. 4:1. 3-33.

van der Vorst, Haske, Rutger C. M. E. Engels, Wim Meeus, Maja Dekovic, and Ad Vermulst. "Parental Attachment, Parental Control, and Early Development of Alcohol Use: A Longitudinal Study". *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. vol. 20:2. 107-116.

Voelkl, Kristine E., John Welte, and William Wieczorek. 1999. "Schooling and Delinquency Among White and African American Adolescents." *Urban Education,* vol. 34:1. 69-88.

Walker, S. 1971. "The Lawyer-Child Relationship: A Statistical Analysis". *Duquesne Law Review.* vol. 9. 627-650.

Wallace, Lisa Hutchinson and David C. May. 2005. "The Impact of Parental Attachment and Feelings of Isolation on Adolescent Fear of Crime at School". *Adolescence*. vol. 40. 457-474.

Ward, David A. and Charles Tittle. 1994. "IQ and Delinquency: A Test of Two Competing Explanations." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology,* vol. 10:3. 189-212.

Warr, Mark. 2005. "Making Delinquent Friends: Adult Supervision and Children's Affiliations". *Criminology.* vol. 43:1. 77-105.

Watkins, Jr. John C. 1999. Selected cases on juvenile justice in the twentieth century. The Edwin Mellen Press.

Weitzer, Ronald and Steven A. Tuch. 1999. "Race, Class, and Perceptions of Discrimination by the Police". *Crime & Delinquency.* vol. 45:4. 494-507.

Wells, L. Edward and Joseph H. Rankin. 1986. "Direct Parental Controls and Delinquency." *Criminology.* vol. 26. 263-285.

Wright, John Paul and Francis T. Cullen. 2001. "Parental Efficacy and Delinquent Behavior: Do Control and Support Matter?". *Criminology*. vol. 39. 677-705.

Wright, John Paul. May 16, 2007. Personal Communication.

Appendices

Appendix A
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PARENTAL COMPETENCIES STUDY

Purpose of Project:	I understand that the purpose of this study is to provide my feelings, thoughts, and attitudes about my relationship with my child as it relates to my child's court involvement.
Procedures:	The survey is given to me, the parent or legal guardian of a juvenile on probation in Henrico County. The survey includes questions about my feelings, thoughts, and attitudes about parenting, and some general information about me and my family. It will take about 30 minutes to complete and I may refuse to answer any questions. My responses will not be shared with anyone outside the research study team. At no point will my child be approached or asked any questions. However, the research team will collect information from the court system regarding his/her progress on probation through court records.
Confidentiality:	The answers I give will be available to the researchers. I will be given a code in place of my name and all information collected will be stored in locked file cabinet or in secured computerized files that only the researchers will have access to. Response will not be made available to anyone outside the research team (including the court) and my individual responses will NOT impact my child's status on probation in any way.
Risk:	There is minimal risk involved in participating in this study. In answering the survey questions, I may provide information or opinions that are critical to understanding the relationship between parental thoughts, attitudes, and feelings and juvenile compliance with court orders. I understand that research staff will implement procedures to reduce these risks, as outlined in the confidentiality section of this form. There is a chance that survey questions may cause some distress if I am particularly anxious about sensitive issues. I understand that I can refuse to answer any questions and may stop completing the survey at any time during administration. No other risks are anticipated.
Benefits and freedom to withdraw:	The results to this survey could lead to the improvement of services to both future parents and children on probation. I may elect not to participate in the survey without any impact on my child's standing with the courts. I understand I may ask questions about the survey at any time by calling Amy Cook at (804) 387-0043 or Dr. Jill Gordon at (804) 827-0901.
Contact Information of Principal Investigator:	Jill A. Gordon, Ph.D. Associate Professor VCU - 923 W. Franklin Street, Rm 317 Richmond, VA 23284 (804) 827- 0901
Contact information for questions about your rights as a participant in this study	Office for Research Subjects Protection, Virginia Commonwealth University 800 E. Leigh Street, Suite 111 P.O. Box 980568 Richmond, VA 23298 (804) 828 – 0868

Completion of the survey indicates your consent to participate in this study.

APPROVED
8/23/07 CAHLSR

APPENDIX B

Parent Questionnaire

Youth

Study ID_____

Date completed_____

Section I: There are four possible answers for each statement:

Completely False = 1, Mostly False = 2, Mostly True = 3, and Completely True = 4.

For each item that describes a set of thoughts or feelings that you may have toward your child on probation, please circle the number to the right of the question. For example, if a statement is **Completely True**, as applied to you, circle the **4** to the right of the question**.** Try to respond to every statement. This only applies to the child currently on probation in Henrico County, not any of your other children.

	Completely False	Mostly False	Mostly True	Completely True
1. I have "had it" with my child.	1	2	3	4
2. The violence in our community has been a bad influence on my child.	1	2	3	4
3. The court system is against my child.	1	2	3	4

	Completely False	Mostly False	Mostly True	Completely True
4. The future looks bad for my child.	1	2	3	4
5. My anger with my child is interfering with my relationship with him/her.	1	2	3	4
6. My child physically threatens me.	1	2	3	4
7. I feel like giving up on my child.	1	2	3	4
8. My child would not hurt me.	1	2	3	4
9. I get angry when I think of the bad things that my child has done.	1	2	3	4
10. The court system treats my child poorly because of who he/she is.	1	2	3	4
11. My child listens to me.	1	2	3	4
12. I lose my temper with my child.	1	2	3	4

	Completely False	Mostly False	Mostly True	Completely True
13. It bothers me that I can't trust my own child.	1	2	3	4
14. The police are out to get my child.	1	2	3	4
15. I find it stressful to raise a child with all the violence in our community.	1	2	3	4
16. The court is out to get my child.	1	2	3	4
17. When it comes to my child, I feel hopeless.	1	2	3	4
18. In spite of my child getting in trouble I know that I've been a good parent.	1	2	3	4
19. I'm afraid to turn my back on my child when he/she is angry.	1	2	3	4
20. Sometimes I wonder if my child should live some place else.	1	2	3	4
21. My child will mess up again.	1	2	3	4

	Completely False	Mostly False	Mostly True	Completely True
22. The court wants to help my child.	1	2	3	4
23. Sometimes I feel like a horrible person for not raising my child better.	1	2	3	4
24. The court misunderstands what it is like for my child.	1	2	3	4
25. I am angry with my child.	1	2	3	4
26. I am the one to blame when it comes to my child.	1	2	3	4
27. I know if my child comes home late.	1	2	3	4
28. I understand my child.	1	2	3	4
29. I am tired of him/her getting into trouble.	1	2	3	4
30. My child keeps me informed about where he/she is going.	1	2	3	4

	Completely False	Mostly False	Mostly True	Completely True
31. If the police will leave us alone, then things will turn out okay for my child.	1	2	3	4
32. I think my child could seriously hurt me.	1	2	3	4
33. My child plays for the New York Yankees.	1	2	3	4
34. My child lets me know when he/she will be home from school.	1	2	3	4
35. I get so angry with my child that I can't deal with him/her.	1	2	3	4
36. I stay on top of how my child is doing in school.	1	2	3	4
37. I think they are making too big a deal out of what my child has been accused of.	1	2	3	4
38. Sometimes I am afraid of my child.	1	2	3	4
39. My child's lip (backtalk) makes me very angry.	1	2	3	4

	Completely False	Mostly False	Mostly True	Completely True
40. I have heated arguments with my child.	1	2	3	4
41. I should have spent more time with my child.	1	2	3	4
42. My child threatens or bullies me to get what he/she wants.	1	2	3	4
43. Sometimes I feel like a prisoner in my own home because of my child.	1	2	3	4
44. I have raised my child the best way that I know how.	1	2	3	4
45. I never know what my child is doing from day to day.	1	2	3	4
46. It's my fault my child is in trouble.	1	2	3	4
47. My child just doesn't know the difference between right and wrong, and that's why he/she is in trouble.	1	2	3	4
48. Sometimes I think my child does things to make me angry.	1	2	3	4

	Completely False	Mostly False	Mostly True	Completely True
49. Sometimes I get the feeling that people in the court see everyone as guilty.	1	2	3	4
50. I know the types of television shows that my child watches.	1	2	3	4
51. I will know if my child has gotten into a fight.	1	2	3	4
52. I am the inventor of the Ford automobile.	1	2	3	4
53. My child is being unfairly accused.	1	2	3	4
54. The police don't treat people like us very well.	1	2	3	4
55. Sometimes my child explodes with anger and it scares me.	1	2	3	4
56. I worry about the influence of gangs on my child.	1	2	3	4
57. I feel all alone in raising this child.	1	2	3	4
58. If I make my child tell me where he is going we would fight all the time.	1	2	3	4

	Completely False	Mostly False	Mostly True	Completely True
59. My child has an attitude.	1	2	3	4
60. The probation officer cares about my child.	1	2	3	4
61. Others who know me think I am a good parent.	1	2	3	4
62. I fear that my child will physically hurt me.	1	2	3	4
63. I know how to help my child deal with his/her problems.	1	2	3	4
64. My child irritates me when he/she misbehaves.	1	2	3	4
65. The people in the court system treat my child with respect.	1	2	3	4
66. I know the names of the kids who my child hangs out with.	1	2	3	4
67. My child has hit me within the past year.	1	2	3	4

Section II: Please circle the one response that best describes your thoughts and feelings about your relationship with your child.

Never = 1, Hardly ever = 2, Sometimes= 3, and Most of the time = 4.

For each item that describes a set of thoughts or feelings that you may have toward your child on probation, please circle the number to the right of the question. Please try to respond to every statement. This only applies to the child currently on probation in Henrico County, not any of your other children.

How often do you or have you…	Never	Hardly Ever	Sometimes	Most of the time
68. expect that your child make his/her bed?	1	2	3	4
69. expect your child to clean their room?	1	2	3	4
70. expect your child to help with household maintenance?	1	2	3	4
71. expect your child to do routine chores?	1	2	3	4
72. expect your child to manage their time wisely?	1	2	3	4
73. monitor what your child watches on television?	1	2	3	4
74. know where your child is when he/she is away from home?	1	2	3	4

How often do you or have you…	Never	Hardly Ever	Sometimes	Most of the time
75. helped your child with their schoolwork?	1	2	3	4
76. discussed with your child who he/she dates?	1	2	3	4
77. miss your child's important events? (for example, a sports game)	1	2	3	4
78. miss your child's activities? (for example, sports practice)	1	2	3	4
79. encourage your child to have a hobby?	1	2	3	4
80. provide your child with a special lesson or activity?	1	2	3	4
81. praised your child?	1	2	3	4
82. show affection towards your child?	1	2	3	4
83. compliment your child?	1	2	3	4

How often do you or have you…	Never	Hardly Ever	Sometimes	Most of the time
84. sit down together for a family dinner?	1	2	3	4
85. taken your child out to dinner in the past month?	1	2	3	4
86. taken your child to the movies in the past month?	1	2	3	4
87. taken your child shopping for something special for him/her in the past month?	1	2	3	4
88. taken your child on an outing in the past month?	1	2	3	4
89. taken your child to church in the past month?	1	2	3	4
90. done things together with your child in the past month?	1	2	3	4
91. worked on his/her schoolwork together in the past month?	1	2	3	4
92. play a game or a sport with him/her in the past month?	1	2	3	4

How often do you or have you…	Never	Hardly Ever	Sometimes	Most of the time
93. know where your child is?	1	2	3	4

Directions: Please check the appropriate response.

94. How close do you feel to your child?
_____Not at all close
_____ Sometimes close
_____ Close
_____ Very close

95. How many of your child's close friends do you know well?
_____ All of them
_____ Most of them
_____ A few of them
_____ None of them

Section III: This information is regarding household information and information about you. Please place an "X" next to the appropriate response, unless otherwise indicated.

96. I am the_____.
_____ Mother
_____ Father
_____ Legal guardian
_____ Maternal Grandmother
_____ Maternal Grandfather
_____ Paternal Grandmother
_____ Paternal Grandfather
_____ Other, Please specify_____

97. What is your gender?
_____ Female
_____ Male

98. What is your age? Please select only one category.
_____ 30 and under
_____ 31-40
_____ 41-50
_____ 51-60
_____ 61-70
_____ 71 and over

99. What is your race/ethnicity?
____Black or African-American
____White or Caucasian
____ Asian
____ Hispanic
____ Other, please specify_____

100. Please indicate your highest level of education **completed**.
_____ Did not graduate from high school
_____ High school graduate
_____ GED
_____ Some college
_____ Associate degree
_____ Bachelor degree
_____ Graduate degree

101. Marital status:
____ Married
____ Separated
____ Divorced
____ Never married

102. Who regularly resides in your home? Please check all that apply.
_____ Mother (or equivalent)
_____ Father (or equivalent)
_____ Grandmother
_____ Grandfather
_____ Aunt
_____ Uncle
_____ Cousin(s), #_____
_____ Adult friend
_____ Youth friend
_____ Sibling(s), #_____

103. What is your current employment status?
_____ Employed full-time
_____ Employed part-time
_____ Unemployed, looking for work
_____ Unemployed, disabled
_____ Unemployed, volunteer
_____ Unemployed, retired
_____ Other

104. Below is a list of possible sources of money that you may have received in the past 30 days. Please remember that the information you give is strictly confidential and your responses will not affect any services or money that you receive. Please identify your sources of income in the past 30 days.

In the past 30 days, did you receive……	**No**	**Yes**	**Don't Know**	***If Yes,* How much?**
a. Wages or money from paid employment. This includes any wages or money received from legal <u>AND</u> "under the table" employment.	0	1	3	$ __ __ __ __ __ .
b. SSI, SSDI, or Disability	0	1	3	$ __ __ __ __ __ .
c. Social Security Income (SSA)	0	1	3	$ __ __ __ __ __ .
d. Food Stamps	0	1	3	$ __ __ __ __ __ .
e. Public assistance or other benefits, such as welfare, general assistance, or TANF *(Temporary Assistance to Needy Families)*	0	1	3	$ __ __ __ __ __ .
f. Veteran's benefits	0	1	3	$ __ __ __ __ __ .
g. Unemployment on Worker's Compensation	0	1	3	$ __ __ __ __ __ .
h. Child support or alimony	0	1	3	$ __ __ __ __ __ .
i. Income from a spouse or partner's wages or other money	0	1	3	$ __ __ __ __ __ .
j. Money from family members or friends to buy food, pay rent, get medical care or anything else	0	1	3	$ __ __ __ __ __ .
k. Retirement	0	1	3	$ __ __ __ __ __ .

105. Have you been diagnosed with any mental health problems?

_____ No

_____ Yes, If yes, please check all that apply:

_____ Learning disability

_____ Depression

_____ Bi-polar

_____ Mental Retardation

_____ Anxiety disorders

_____ Other, please specify_____

106. Please describe your physical health.

_____ Healthy

_____ Fair

_____ Poor

107. How many times have you been arrested? ____ ____

108.Do you have a problem with alcohol?

_____ No

_____ Yes

109. Do you have a problem with legal or illegal drugs?

_____ No

_____ Yes

110. Please indicate all family members who have been arrested.

_____ Mother

_____ Father

_____ Sibling

_____ Grandparent

_____ Aunt

_____ Uncle

_____ Cousin(s)

_____ Other, please specify_____

Thank you for your participation in this study!

APPENDIX C

Juvenile Data Collection Form Baseline

Youth Study Identification Number_____

Date form completed_____

Directions: Please complete this form in reference to the juvenile named on the face sheet. Please remove the front face sheet from this instrument. The youth ID number is for the research purpose only. Please place an "X" in the appropriate response.

1. Race:
   _____ Black or African-American
   _____ White or Caucasian
   _____ Asian
   _____ Hispanic
   _____ Other, please specify_____

2. Age:_____

3. Gender:
   _____ Female
   _____ Male

4. Please complete the chart below for each offense in the juvenile's probation file, including the current charge. Please use the following categories where applicable.

*Status/Disposition Codes:

1= Placed on probation
2= Suspended sentence
3= Detention sentence
4= Community sanction (community service, restitution, STOP, CAP, any VJCCCA program)
5= Matter taken under advisement/ Pending disposition (continued to later date)
6= Remain on probation

Offense Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Offense VCC Code (LAR-2359-F9)	Status/Disposition (see above categories)

Home Involvement

Directions: Please circle or check the appropriate response.

5. Describe the current relationship between the parent/guardian and the juvenile.

   Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Very good Excellent

6. Parent/guardian imposes discipline at home…. Never Sometimes Always

7. Juvenile obeys his parent/guardian……Never Sometimes Always

8. Parent/guardian reports "negative" home Behaviors……Never Sometimes Always

9. Juvenile keeps curfew…….Never Sometimes Always

10. The juvenile lives with parent/guardian.
    _____ No
    _____ Yes

11. Has the family discussed conflict in the home that is **not** related to the primary parent/guardian?
_____ No
_____ Yes, if yes, the conflict exists between (check all that apply)
_____ Other parent/guardian, identify relationship_____
_____ Siblings
_____ Other family member residing in the home
_____ Unrelated person in the home, identify relationship_____

12. Has the juvenile has been diagnosed with a psychiatric disorder?
_____ No
_____ Yes, if yes, please check all that apply:
_____ ADHD
_____ ADD
_____ Learning disability
_____ Conduct disorder
_____ Depression
_____ Bi-polar
_____ Mental Retardation
_____ Anxiety disorders
_____ Other, please specify_____

School Involvement

Please circle the most appropriate response.

13. Current grade level_____.

14. Juvenile is currently enrolled in school or equivalent.	No	Yes	Unknown
15. Juvenile is maintaining passing grades.	No	Yes	Unknown
16. Juvenile has been suspended from school.	No	Yes	Unknown
17. Juvenile has been expelled from school.	No	Yes	Unknown
18. The juvenile regularly attends school.	No	Yes	Unknown
19. Does the juvenile experience peer conflict at school?	No	Yes	Unknown

Community Involvement

Please place an "X" in the appropriate response.

20. Is the juvenile currently employed? No Yes Unknown

21. Are there reports or indications of substance abuse?

_____ No

_____ Yes, check all of the sources that were used to confirm the juvenile's involvement in substance use.

_____ Urinalysis
_____ Self-Report of juvenile
_____ Parent (biological or step)
_____ Legal guardian (other than parent)
_____ Friend
_____ Probation Officer
_____ Counselor/ Clinician
_____ Police Officer
_____ Substance abuse related charges
_____ Other, please specify_____

Delinquent Involvement

Please complete the following information.

22. Has the juvenile been arrested since he/she was placed on probation?

_____ No

_____ Yes, if yes, complete the following chart and use the codes given below.

*Status/Disposition Codes:

1= Placed on probation
2= Suspended sentence
3= Detention sentence
4= Community sanction (community service, restitution, STOP, CAP, any VJCCCA program)
5= Matter taken under advisement/ Pending disposition (continued to later date)
6= Remain on probation

Offense Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Offense VCC Code (LAR-2359-F9)	Status/Disposition (see above categories)

Please place the survey in the envelope provided, seal it, and return it to Amy Cook as soon as possible. Thank you for completing the data collection form.

APPENDIX D

Juvenile Data Collection Form Follow-Up (6 and 12 months)

Youth Study Identification Number_____

Date form completed_____

Directions: Please complete this form in reference to the juvenile named on the face sheet. Please remove the front face sheet from this instrument. The youth ID number is for the research purpose only. Please place an "X" in the appropriate response as it pertains to the past 6 months.

Home Involvement

Directions: Please circle or check the appropriate response.

1. Describe the current relationship between the parent/guardian and the juvenile.

   Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Very good Excellent

6. Parent/guardian imposes discipline at home…. Never Sometimes Always

7. Juvenile obeys his parent/guardian……Never Sometimes Always

8. Parent/guardian reports "negative" home Behaviors……Never Sometimes Always

9. Juvenile keeps curfew…….Never Sometimes Always

10. The juvenile lives with parent/guardian.
    _____ No
    _____ Yes

11. Has the family discussed conflict in the home that is **not** related to the primary parent/guardian?
    _____ No
    _____ Yes, If yes, the conflict exists between (check all that apply)
    _____ Other parent/guardian, identify relationship_____
    _____ Siblings
    _____ Other family member residing in the home
    _____ Unrelated person in the home, identify relationship_____

12. Has the juvenile has been diagnosed with a psychiatric disorder?
_____ No
_____ Yes, If yes, please check all that apply:
_____ ADHD
_____ ADD
_____ Learning disability
_____ Conduct disorder
_____ Depression
_____ Bi-polar
_____ Mental Retardation
_____ Anxiety disorders
_____ Other, please specify_____

School Involvement

Please circle the most appropriate response.

13. Current grade level_____.

14. Juvenile is currently enrolled in school or equivalent.	No	Yes	Unknown
15. Juvenile is maintaining passing grades.	No	Yes	Unknown
16. Juvenile has been suspended from school.	No	Yes	Unknown
17. Juvenile has been expelled from school.	No	Yes	Unknown
18. The juvenile regularly attends school.	No	Yes	Unknown
19. Does the juvenile experience peer conflict at school?	No	Yes	Unknown

Community Involvement

Please place an "X" in the appropriate response.

20. Is the juvenile currently employed?	No	Yes	Unknown

21. Are there reports or indications of substance abuse?

_____ No

_____ Yes, check all of the sources that were used to confirm the juvenile's involvement in substance use.

_____ Urinalysis
_____ Self-Report of juvenile
_____ Parent (biological or step)
_____ Legal guardian (other than parent)
_____ Friend
_____ Probation Officer
_____ Counselor/ Clinician
_____ Police Officer
_____ Substance abuse related charges
_____ Other, please specify_____

Delinquent Involvement

Please complete the following information.

22. Has the juvenile been arrested since he/she was placed on probation?

_____ No

_____ Yes, if yes, complete the following chart and use the codes given below.

*Status/Disposition Codes:

1= Placed on probation
2= Suspended sentence
3= Detention sentence
4= Community sanction (community service, restitution, STOP, CAP, any VJCCCA program)
5= Matter taken under advisement/ Pending disposition (continued to later date)
6= Remain on probation

Offense Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Offense VCC Code (LAR-2359-F9)	Status/Disposition (see above categories)

Please place the survey in the envelope provided, seal it, and return it to Amy Cook as soon as possible. Thank you for completing the data collection form.

APPENDIX E

Face Sheet For Survey/Data Collection Instrument

Research Investigator: Please remove this sheet from the survey PRIOR to presentation of the information to the parent or guardian.

Probation Officer: Please remove this sheet from the data collection instrument upon completion of the baseline or follow-up data collection forms PRIOR to returning the form to the research team.

Please DESTROY this face sheet.

Name:_____

JTS Number_____

Probation Officer _____

VITA

Amy Cook

October 21, 1971
Danville, Virginia, USA

Education	Ph. D. in Public Policy and Public Administration, with a concentration in criminal/juvenile justice, Virginia Commonwealth University, anticipated graduation May, 2009. Dissertation title: "Parental Competencies of Juvenile Probationers and Compliance with Court Sanctions and Recidivism Rates." Dr. Jill Gordon, Advisor. Master of Liberal Arts, University of Richmond, 2005. B.S. in Criminal Justice, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1997.
Teaching Experience	***Adjunct Faculty Member, Virginia Commonwealth University*** • Teach Introduction to Corrections (Fall 2007-present), Senior Seminar course (Fall 2008), and Introduction to Policing (Spring 2009). • Develop course lectures, materials, exams, and assignments for students. • Evaluate and objectively grade student work. • Mentor students and monitor student progress. • Advise and counsel students as needed to ensure successful completion of coursework. ***Graduate Teaching Assistant, Virginia Commonwealth University*** • Taught undergraduate criminal justice courses such as Justice Systems Survey and Research Methods. • Developed course lectures, materials, and assignments for students taking both classroom and on-line courses. • Evaluated and objectively graded student work. • Mentored students and monitored student progress. • Advised and counseled students as needed to ensure successful completion of coursework.

Research Experience	Dissertation Title: "Parental Competencies of Juvenile Probationers and Compliance with Court Sanctions and Recidivism Rates." This project has allowed me the opportunity to design, develop, and execute primary research to determine key findings in order to develop recommendations for juvenile justice professionals. The data is currently being analyzed and interpreted in order to produce a publishable manuscript. Henrico County, Virginia.	*Fall 2007-Spring 2009*
	Program evaluation of the "Today's Boys, Tomorrow's Men" Program with A.V. Norrell Elementary School and Richmond Behavioral Health Authority. Responsibilities included conducting a needs assessment and process evaluation through the use of group observations, focus groups, and interviews with various stakeholders. Richmond, Virginia.	*Spring 2007*
	Research Assistant to Dr. Robyn Lacks. Program evaluation: "Road Dawgs Camp: Don't Associate With Gangs". Responsibilities included meeting with stakeholders, visiting program sites, and survey construction for campers, parents of campers, camp facilitators and administrators. Data analysis included the use of descriptive statistics and qualitative feedback. Fairfax County, Virginia.	*Summer 2006-Spring 2007*
	Research Assistant to Dr. Nicolle Parsons-Pollard. "Truancy Programs". Responsibilities included a national search of existing truancy programs in order to determine the most effective components of truancy programs and the resources needed in order for Richmond Public Schools to lower truancy rates. Richmond, Virginia.	*Fall 2005*

Presentations	Amy Cook. "Parental Competencies of Juvenile Probationers." Virginia Commonwealth University, Criminal Justice Student Research Conference presentation. Richmond, Virginia, February 18, 2009. Amy Cook and Jill Gordon. "Parental Competencies of Juvenile Probationers and Compliance with Court Sanctions and Recidivism Rates." Research proposal presented to the Henrico County Juvenile Court Service Unit administrators, Judges, County Manager's Office, and Commonwealth Attorney's Office. Henrico County, Virginia, June 2007. Robyn Lacks and Amy Cook. "Building Resiliency and Positive Decision Making in Youth to Break the Cycle of Gang Recruitment." Invited conference presentation to the Governor's Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, Prevention Comes First Conference. Richmond, Virginia, December 2006.
Work Experience	Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice, Probation Officer, 1997-Present • Extensive knowledge of juvenile and domestic relations court processes. • Works closely with local police departments to address public safety concerns and community problems in a proactive manner. • Prepares excellent oral and written reports for the Court in a timely, effective manner. • Participates on multidisciplinary teams and interagency committees. • Employs outstanding management skills in supervising over 170 cases and concurrent relationships with external clients. • Knowledgeably links victims and clients to services available in their communities. • Served on the Board of Directors for the Henrico County Coalition Against Domestic Violence and as Co-Chair of the Henrico County Fatality Review Team.
Professional Development	Attended Exploratory Factor Analysis Workshop sponsored by the Center for the Advancement of Research Methods Analysis (CARMA), Fall 2007. Attended teaching workshops, incorporating the use of technology in the classroom, sponsored by Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), VCU Fall 2005 and Spring 2006. Attended "Discussion Board Workshop" sponsored by Center for Teaching Excellence, VCU Fall 2005.
Awards	2008 Outstanding Criminal Justice Graduate Student Award, L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs, VCU.
Professional Memberships	Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Pi Alpha Alpha, The National Honor Society for Public Affairs and Administration