AN EXAMINATION OF THE IMPACT OF PARENTAL DRUG USE, FAMILY

STRUCTURE, AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS ON ADOLESCENTS'

SELF-REPORTED DRUG USE, SERIOUS DELINQUENCY,

AND DEVIANT BEHAVIORS


A THESIS IN
Criminal Justice and Criminology


Presented to the Faculty of the University
of Missouri – Kansas City in partial fulfillment of
the requirement for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE


by
ASHEKA N. JACKSON


B.A., University of Missouri-Kansas City in Kansas City, Missouri, 2010


Kansas City, Missouri
2012

AN EXAMINATION OF THE IMPACT OF PARENTAL DRUG USE, FAMILY

STRUCTURE, AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS ON ADOLESCENTS'

SELF-REPORTED DRUG USE, SERIOUS DELINQUENCY,

AND DEVIANT BEHAVIORS

Asheka N Jackson, Candidate for the Master of Science Degree

University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2012

## ABSTRACT

Research has shown that youths reared in homes with parental drug use have a high risk of exhibiting maladaptive social behaviors encompassing delinquency, deviance, and criminality (Keller, Catalano, Haggerty, & Fleming, 2002; Denton & Kampe, 1994; Gross &McCaul, 1991; Hoffman & Johnson, 1998). Additionally, family transitions such as changes in the configuration of one's family structure (i.e. single parent households due to divorce or separation) have shown to have a negative impact on the behavioral development of adolescents (Hoffman & Johnson, 1998).

Nonetheless, while micro-level predictors are vital in illuminating the linkage of the home environment on outcomes of serious delinquency, drug use, and deviance, the impact of the broader social environment also warrants concern as structural conditions of one's neighborhood has significances for the manifestation of anti-social behaviors.

The current study will explore the impact of parental drug use, family structure (i.e. habitation with a biological or stepparent), and environmental conditions on youths' self-reported drug use, serious delinquency, and deviance (i.e. risky sexual behaviors and poor educational performance). The results of the study demonstrated that drug use, deviance, and serious

delinquency are impacted by both environmental and home conditions. However, the type of predictor variable mattered for the type of outcome behavior reported. For example, micro variables are stronger predictors of drug use and risky sexual behaviors while macro variables are stronger predictors of delinquency and poor educational performance.

APPROVAL PAGE

The faculty listed below, appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences have

examined a thesis titled "An Examination of the Impact of Parental Drug Use, Family Transition,

and Environmental Conditions on Adolescents' Self-Reported Drug Use, Delinquency, and

Deviant Behaviors" presented by Asheka N. Jackson, candidate for the Master of Science degree,

and certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Supervisory Committees

Toya Like-Haislip, Committee Chair, PhD
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

Kristi Holsinger, PhD
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

Wayne Lucas, PhD
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology

CONTENTS

TABLES

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

I dedicate this study in memory of my father Joseph Samuel Jackson who taught me the value of education and hard work. I love you. This research is also dedicated to members of the criminal justice field in various areas, be it the academia, professionals, students, and policy makers. It is with hope that this research will function as an appendage to the existing literature, provide a guide for future research on this phenomenon, and offer practical measures needed to address the issue of serious delinquency, drug use, and deviance among adolescents and young adults.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Theories salient to the analysis of adolescents' drug use, deviance, and serious

delinquency encompass *Social Control theories* (Hirschi, 1969; Shaw& McKay, 1942; Bursik &

Grasmick 1993), *Social Learning theories* (Sutherland, 1947; Burgess & Akers, 1966), Anderson

(1999) *Code of the Street* perspective, and  Shaw and McKay's (1942) *Social Disorganization*

*theory*. Even though *Code of the Street* is largely categorized as a subcultural theory, it can be

partly classified as a Social Learning theory as it provides rich details on how the social

environment creates subcultures and shapes behaviors through a process of social learning.

Therefore, this provides the rationale for incorporating this theory under the social learning

umbrella.

The basic premise of *Social Control theories* is that humans are inclined to commit crimes

but desist from doing so due to the social control exerted over us by others in society and pro

social institutions. Theories of *Social Learning* postulate that criminality is engendered through

the learning of criminal behaviors by association with other lawbreakers. Anderson (1999)

elucidates that violence is a cultural norm among the urban underclass and that violence is elicited

as a result of the protocols derived from the code of the street that dictates the use of physical

aggression in the resolution of conflicts. The social disorganization perspective posits that

delinquency is a natural ecological response to disorganized conditions in a community and that

conditions of poverty, residential mobility, and racial heterogeneity reduce collective efficacy

and increase the probability of crime and deviance. The applicability of the aforementioned

theoretical perspectives to the purpose of the study will be fully explored in the literature review.

The present research seeks to investigate the effect of parental drug use, family structure

(i.e. habitation with a biological parent or stepparent), and environmental conditions on adolescents' self-reported drug use, serious delinquency, and deviant behaviors. The independent variables of my study are parental drug use; these include parents' use of alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, crack/cocaine, and other illegal drugs. Family structure is measured as habitation with biological or step parent during junior years; environmental conditions include neighborhood disorder and racial discrimination. The dependent variable of interests are self-reported drug use (i.e. cigarettes, marijuana, alcohol, powder cocaine, crack cocaine, amphetamines or stimulants, analgesics, tranquilizers, inhalants, heroin, sedatives or barbiturates, and hallucinogens), and delinquency,— measured by respondents' engagement in crimes punishable by law and gang involvement. Deviance, the final dependent variable, is measured as poor educational performance and risky sexual behaviors. The control variables are race, age, and gender of respondents.

Drug use, deviance, and delinquent behaviors among adolescents are of grave concern to educators, parents, criminal justice officials, and policy makers, as teenagers' participation in self-destructive activities may culminate in a host of behavioral and social adjustment problems that affects competency at school—resulting in poor academic performance, truancy, or dropout rates (Swaim, Beauvais, Chavez, & Oetting, 1997; Cairns, Cairns, & Neckerman, 1989), in the home—resulting in strained family relationships (Keller, Catalano, Haggerty, & Fleming, 2002), and in the broader public sphere. Maladaptive acts and behaviors attenuate possibilities of social mobility and perpetuate a cycle of drug abuse and criminality (Hagan, 1985; Crane, 1991).

Albeit evidence that both macro and micro variables play a crucial role in explicating the phenomenon of drug use, deviance, and delinquency, there is still ambiguity as to the exact mechanism and impact of these variables (measured separately and simultaneously) in producing

deviant and delinquent behaviors. Therefore, the purpose of the study is to examine whether parental drug use, family structure, and environmental factors correlate with adolescents' self-reported drug use, deviance, and serious delinquent behaviors and what type of variables (macro or micro) are stronger predictors of the outcome behaviors. The study is worthy of investigation as it expands on the extant literature by analyzing both individual and macro-level correlates of drug use, deviance, and delinquent behaviors among adolescents. Moreover, the study demonstrates whether micro and macro level variables work in conjunction in effecting the aforesaid resulting behaviors or have separate and distinct effects on the measured outcome. An investigation of both individual and structural predictors are now being used in ways it was not done in the past, and as such, this study particularly functions as an appendage to the existing literature and provides a comprehensive understanding of the different variables that impact the outcome behaviors of drug use, deviance, and serious delinquency.

Furthermore, it is hypothesize that adolescents who have experienced a reconfiguration in their family structure, witnessed parental drug use in the home, or grew up in a socially disorganized neighborhood will self-report high rates of drug use, serious delinquency, and deviant behaviors. Additionally, it is hypothesize that micro level variables (i.e. family structure and parental drug use) will have a greater effect in predicting outcome behaviors than macro level measurements of neighborhood characteristics as adolescents are more likely to be directly influenced by behaviors of others closest to them, such as parents and siblings, than broader social conditions. Being that the home environment plays a primary role in molding the behaviors of youths, it is expected that the micro influences will be greater predictors of the dependent variables than neighborhood effects.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

*Micro Theories of Social Learning and Social Control*

Numerous theoretical perspectives have been raised to explain juveniles' involvement in serious delinquency, deviance, and drug use. These theoretical paradigms encompass Social Control theories, such as Hirschi's Social Bond theory, Social learning theories, such as Sutherland's Differential Association theory, and Burgess and Akers' theory of Differential Reinforcement. The central premise of Social Control theories lies in the notion that people are inhibited from crime commission due to processes of social control that institutions and others in society exert over individuals' behaviors.

Precisely, Hirschi (1969) postulates that an individual's bond to society serves to protect one from engagement in crime, but when this bond is broken or enfeebled delinquency will manifest. The chief elements of social bonds include: Attachment, Commitment, Involvement, and Belief. Attachment refers to the emotional ties of persons to others and institutions in a conventional society; it is through attachment that one internalizes the norms and values of society. Commitment denotes the idea that people's investment in conventional activities, such as employment and education works to avert delinquency due to fear of losing reputation, prospects, and goods they acquired from school and work.

The notion of Involvement proposes that one's gross engagement in conventional activities permits a marginal amount of time for engagement in delinquency. The premise of Belief rests on the notion that by virtue of adhering to the value system of society, individuals have a reduced probability of engaging in anti-social acts. Though a weaker belief in the conventional system amplifies the probability of deviance, this is not to insinuate that delinquents

do not believe in a conventional value system, but rather, their beliefs are contingent on other elements of the aforesaid social bonds (Hirschi, 1969). While Hirschi's (1969) theory provides a plausible explanation as to the process of desistance from crime, the theory fails to account for gender disparities in delinquency and the mechanisms through which these behaviors are practiced (Booth, Farrell, &Varano, 2008). For example, Hirschi's data was limited to male offenders, and as such, there is much ambiguity as to whether the processes of social bonds unfold in a similar manner for females as they do for males—being that males are more formally controlled whilst females are more informally controlled (Booth et al., 2008). Moreover, Booth et al. (2008) noted that involvement in pro social activities, such as sports, have shown to have the unintended consequence of exacerbating delinquency for males. A tenuous explanation is that sport activities elevate the risk of delinquency by intensifying aggression in males.

As mentioned, Social Control theories emphasize bonds as protective factors of delinquency, and while Social Learning theories highlight a similar process, the premise is reversed— meaning that ties to others in society through a process of social learning facilitates delinquency. Sutherland (1947), a prominent advocate of the social learning perspective, posits that criminal behavior is a result of a person's abilities and inclinations to commit crime. He outlined nine propositions that illustrate the mechanisms through which criminal behavior is learned. Sutherland (1947) notes that (1) criminal behavior is largely due to a process of social learning, (2) criminal behavior is learned through interaction and communication with others, (3) criminal behavior is learned in intimate groups, (4) learning of criminal behaviors encompasses techniques, drives, motives, rationales, and attitudes for committing crime, (5) the direction of these motives and drives result from learning of the definitions of legal codes as favorable or unfavorable, (6) when there is an excess of favorable definitions to violating the law over

unfavorable definitions, delinquency occurs, (7) Differential Association differs in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity, (8) criminal behavior by association with criminal others involves the same mechanism implied in any other forms of learning, and (9), criminal behavior is an expression of the needs and values as non-criminal behaviors (Sutherland, 1947).

Burgess and Akers (1966), in a reformulation of Sutherland's (1947) theory, elucidate that criminal behavior functions through a mechanism of operant conditioning in a process of interaction based on contingencies of reinforcement. They suggest that deviant behaviors are learned in both social and non-social settings that are reinforcing or discriminative for criminal behavior. The authors note that criminal behavior is learned in intimate groups where persons provide reinforcement for anti-social acts. Additionally, the process of learning criminal behavior, including the techniques and attitudes of such actions, are reliant on existing reinforcement contingencies and those who reinforce the behavior. For these theorists, the learning of crime involves direct and indirect interactions with primary and distant reference groups, as well as normative association with others. Individuals exposed to differential association are provided with an availability of models to imitate that offers differential reinforcement (anticipated or actual rewards and punishment of behavior) which determines future engagement in crimes. The frequency, amount, and probability of the reinforcement will engender the greatest effect on criminality (Burgess & Akers, 1966). Social Learning paradigms are crucial attempts at explicating the elements, functions, and mechanisms of juveniles' engagement in drug use, deviant behaviors, and serious delinquency.  However, Social Learning Theories cannot fully account for all the dimensions of criminality and deviance spanning from the home environments and neighborhoods As such, an ecological perspective of criminality is needed to unearth further association between one's community and its impact on crime and anti-social acts.

*Macro Theories of Social Learning and Social Control*

Shaw and McKay's (1942) Social Disorganization theory, Bursick and Grasmick's (1993) expansion of Shaw and McKay's theory and Anderson's (1999) Code of the Street perspective have been most profound in explicating the crime and delinquency relationship at the neighborhood level. These scholars highlight the importance of understanding macro level structural conditions and the mechanisms through which structural predictors impact delinquency, drug use, and an array of deviant behaviors.

Shaw and McKay's (1942) theory of Social Disorganization postulate that delinquency is a natural ecological response to disorganized conditions in neighborhoods. The theorists hypothesize that environmental conditions, such as poverty (represented by low rentals and public relief), residential transience (measured by high population turnover) and ethnic heterogeneity (marked by the influx of immigrants) result in the breakdown of social institutions that facilitates control of community members. The deterioration of social control, in turn, enables the emergence of social disorganization that engenders criminality (Shaw & McKay, 1942).

The work of Shaw and McKay (1942) was influenced by Burgess (1923), who suggested that the transition from rural to industrial areas altered the social structure of the city creating specific zones inhabited by specific persons. Borrowing from this idea, Shaw and McKay (1942) postulated that the growth and modification in the structure of cities, such as Chicago, led to the development of zones marked by clearly defined characteristics. For example, Zone 1 encompassed the central business and industrial district; Zone 2 is marked by transition and characterized by manufacturing jobs; Zone 3 is inhabited by workers in industries who lived at a distance from the area of transition; Zone 4 encompassed residential areas characterized by luxurious apartment complexes and single dwellings, and Zone 5 is the commuters zone—which

7

is the suburban area about half an hour from the central business district. The area in transition (zone 2) has the highest rates of delinquency due to an influx of immigrants, concentrated poverty, residential transience, and a constellation of social ills.

In areas of high delinquency, conflicting moral values due to heterogenic diversity makes it difficult to sustain uniformity in values and goals. This in turn produces legitimate and illegitimate value systems that are in discord. The presence of both proper and improper modes of behavior impede the family's ability to maintain common values and social control of its members, in the sense that, the family itself may not be criminal but may be benefitting from family members' criminal enterprises, and as such, it would be difficult for a family to advise against crime (Shaw & McKay, 1942). While Shaw and McKay briefly implied the importance of voluntary organizations and institutions in preventing delinquency, they failed to unravel the mechanisms through which these institutions work to avert delinquency.

Bursik and Grasmick (1988) addressed this deficiency by expanding on Shaw and McKay's (1942) work, suggesting that social control is achieved through private, parochial, and public ties in the neighborhood and that the strength of these ties serve to increase social control that facilitates the reduction of disorder and crime. Private ties refer to informal and intimate relations among residents and friends, parochial connections refer to more formal ties among members, and public ties denote the community's ability to secure and allocate resources from external political and social agencies. Social control is achieved through the supervision and integration of local institutions into the community that provide social support for its members. These institutions reduce crime indirectly through the threat of withdrawal of social support from members who violate the norms of the neighborhood. Therefore, individuals who violate the community's social network system would be barred from access to the community's social

8

institutions, and it is this threat of social withdrawal that serves to avert engagement in crime.

Additionally, Bellair (1997) postulated that community networks reduce crime because of the interrelationships of kin and friendship networks that provides formal and informal ties. In neighborhoods where persons are familiar with each other, they are more likely to mobilize the community's resources toward a common goal and watch over their neighbors' possession. However, in communities where ties are distant or less informal, individuals may be more reluctant to work together toward collective efficacy (Bellair, 1997; Slocum, Taylor, Brick, & Esbensen, 2010).

While it is assumed by Patterson (1991) that transient communities generally have weaker levels of social control and higher rates of crime due to racial heterogeneity (that facilitates a diverse mixture of ethnic values that impedes collective efficacy and engender cultural conflict), collective efficacy may not be the main factor that differentiates high crime areas from low crime areas. For example, Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush, (2001) found that areas with low collective efficacy had similar crime rates to those high in collective efficacy and that collective efficacy only has an appreciably impact of reducing crime in black neighborhoods (Morenoff, Sampson, & Raudenbush, 2001).

Another integral theoretical explanation of crime and delinquency is Anderson's (1999) Code of the Street Perspective. This theory explicates the formation of the underclass subculture. Even though it is largely a subcultural theory, social learning is inherent in the foundation of the theory as the formation of inner-city street orientations is largely achieved through a process of social learning. The author elucidates that macro structural correlates of crime, such as poverty, joblessness, and racial discrimination alienate inner city residents from mainstream society from achieving conventional goals. As a result, the code of the street develops as a cultural response to

9

alienation from mainstream society. The code of the street is used to govern interpersonal public behaviors, provide a rationale for violence, and is used to negotiate respect. According to Anderson (1999), respect is a means of earning social capital in the inner city as other conventional avenues of earning respect has been precluded, and as such, violence becomes a conduit for gaining prestige and respect.

In the inner city, two types of families coexist in a single neighborhood; the decent families and street families. Decent families raise their children with mainstream values and emphasize the significance of education; these families are also more likely to ally themselves with pro social institutions, and are less likely to engage in crime. On the other hand, street families are overwhelmingly affected by poverty and other social ills that prompt frustrations and poor parenting techniques. While these families may love their children, they experience greater difficulties in providing physical and emotional support to their children and often orient their children toward deviant lifestyles at an early age. At the early age of six or seven, children begin to conceptualize fighting as a virtue and humility as a weakness through observation of older persons in their homes and communities. During the period of adolescence, social pressures to adapt to a street-orientation are exacerbated by peer influence whereby adolescents are expected to adhere to a particular cultural system. As such, both decent and street teenagers, out of fear of being taunted as a square, adjust to a street-orientation lifestyle. Violence in the inner-city is learned through a process of behavioral emulation and reinforced through rewards conferred on aggressive individuals. Therefore, children begin to learn that being violent and aggressive have protective functions, as well as providing hierarchal statuses (Anderson, 1999).

10

*Adolescents' Drug Use*

Over the past four decades, drug use has fluctuated among adolescents in the United States with more than half of American youths self-reporting experimentation with at least one form of illicit drugs. In the mid 1970s to the early 1980s, there was an increase in illicit drug use among high school teenagers, following a subsequent decline in 1992, a further increase of more than 50 percent in 1991, and a major decline in 2008 (Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman, & Schulenburg, 2008). The investigation of teenagers' drug use is relevant to the discourse of deviance and delinquency because early onset of drug use is predictive of later substance use, delinquency, and an array of anti-social acts (Windle, 1990).

Alcohol and marijuana comprise the chief drugs used among high school youths (Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman, & Schulenburg, 2008). More than 50 percent of 12th graders and approximately 40 percent of 8th graders reported the use of alcohol. Marijuana, being the second most frequently used drug was self-reported by over 50 percent of high school youths in 1979 (Johnston et al., 2008). Accessibility and perceived benefits of these drugs parallel the extent and frequency of its use. For example, the larger proportion of students who use marijuana, in comparison to cocaine, is explained by the data which illustrates that 84 percent of 12th graders self-reported relative ease in accessing marijuana in comparison to 42 percent of 12th graders who self-reported similar access to cocaine (Johnson et al., 2008). Additionally, psycho therapeutic drugs such as sedatives and amphetamines are widely used by adolescents primarily because its medicinal purposes has been legitimized by the media and consequences of its use has been diminished. The decreased stigma associated with psycho therapeutic drugs infers a tacit acceptance of these drugs among adolescents (Johnson et al., 2008). Hansen (1985) notes that even though the media is notorious for propagating antidrug campaigns, it can also have the

counterproductive effect of sensationalizing adolescents' drug use.

The overall decline in drug use was most substantial for methamphetamine among 8th grade students. The decline in the use of drugs, such as cocaine, crack, amphetamine, ritalin, and tobacco is due to the perceived risks associated with these drugs at specific epochs. For example, in the 1960s, there was an upsurge in the use of LSD and methamphetamines. However, media reports of persons dying from drug poisoning and overdose may have instilled fear in teenagers about the potentially deadly consequences of using these drugs. The death of Len Bias, for example, who presumably died from an overdose of crack cocaine heralded rapid declines in crack cocaine among adults and adolescents in the 1980s. Hence, when fears of consequences associated with drugs are widespread, drug use decreases. However, if the perceived risks are expected to be low, drug use among adolescents increases (Johnston et al., 2008).

Studies examining the nature and extent of the drug problem among U.S. teenagers fail to differentiate between individuals who are primary drug users and those who are one time users. This "one category fits all" approach results in discrepancies that distort the accuracy of the drug phenomenon. Therefore, in order to develop a concrete understanding of the drug problem, efforts must be made to specify drug users based on a typology of Non-users, Tasters, and Habitual users (Adler & Loctecka, 1973). Non-users refer to persons who have never used any form of drug. Tasters include individuals who have used one or more types of drugs but not on a weekly or daily basis and Habitual users are persons who have used one or more substances on a weekly basis. Adolescents who are habitual users have the highest risks of engaging in prolong substance use, deviance, and delinquency. Furthermore, these individuals generally perceive their homes as a negative, boring, and threatening place in which they feel alienated. A possible rationale for habitual drug users' negative perception of their home stems from the supposition that such

12

adolescents are more likely to self-report their parents' involvement in drug use and defer to their parents in providing them with information on drugs. The drug-taking behavior of the parents incapacitates effective parenting practices that may engender abuse, maltreatment, and parental non-responsiveness toward the child. Additionally, adolescents who use drugs are generally from drug-abusing households and modeling of their parents' drug behaviors subliminally or directly influence the onset and involvement in later substance use (Adler & Loctecka, 1973).

While much of the extant literature has focused on individual and environmental factors that influence the initiation of adolescents' drug use, no study to date has (and possibly cannot) account for all the risk factors that influence adolescents' drug use (Newcomb, Maddahian, Skager, & Bentler, 1987) However, what is clear is that adolescents with several risk factors, such as emotional distress (Newcomb, Maddahian, Skager, & Bentler, 1987), peer substance use (Adler &Loctecka, 1973) poor educational attainment ( Fan & Chen, 2001; Frome & Eccles, 1998; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling,1992; Cairns, Cairns, & Neckerman, 1989; Swaim, Beauvais, Chavez, & Oetting, 1997) and poor family structure ( Keller, Catalano, Haggerty, & Fleming, 2002; Hoffman & Johnson,1998; Cernkovich & Giordano, 1987; Gove & Crutchfield, 1982; Flewelling & Bauman, 1990; Cherlin, Furstenberg, Chase-Linsdale, Kiernan, Robins, Morrison, & Teitler, 1991; Denton & Kampfe, 1994) are at an elevated risk of substance initiation and misuse.

*Parental Drug Use*

Studies indicate that teenagers' involvement in drugs correlates with family members' drug use (Nurco, Blatchley, Hanlon, & Grady, 1999; Stranger, Higgins, Bickel, Elk, Grabowski, Schmitz, Amass, Kirby, & Seracini, 1999; Keller, Catalano, Haggerty, & Fleming, 2002; Newcomb & Bentler, 1988; Bauman & Dougherty, 1983). However, this correlation appears to be

13

contingent on the gender of the family member (Gfroerer, 1987). For example, one study found

the impact of fathers' drug use to be less significant on children's subsequent involvement in

drugs in comparison to the effects of the mothers' and siblings' drug use (Gfroerer, 1987).

Adolescents raised in homes of drug dependent parents have an elevated risk of

developing maladaptive behaviors encompassing deviance and criminality, cognitive and

behavioral problems, and an array of psychiatric illnesses (Adler & Loctecka, 1973; Keller et al.,

2002). These individuals are more likely to be subjected to family instability, poverty,

unemployment, family violence, and a host of criminogenic conditions that exacerbate drug use

and delinquency (Keller et al., 2002). Drug dependent parents are more likely to have psychiatric

illnesses and mood disorders that incapacitate their ability to exhibit proper childrearing

techniques and be receptive to the needs of their children, and as such, the behavior of the parent

can engender mood disorders and behavioral problems for the child (Nurco, Blatchley, Hanlon, &

Grady, 1999; Stranger, Higgins, Bickel, Elk, Grabowski, Schmitz, Amass, Kirby, & Seracini,

1999).

Bauman and Dougherty (1983) notes that drug addicted mothers exhibit less socially

adaptive and poorer childrearing techniques than their non-addicted counterparts and that these

behaviors are subconsciously transmitted to their children. It is assumed that temporal or

permanent personality characteristics and attitudes of the drug addicted parents have an adverse

effect on the development of their children (Nurco et al., 1999) and that these behaviors

contributes to family disruption and other social ailments that impact adolescent deviant and

criminal behaviors (Stranger et al., 1999).

The effect of living in a drug abusing household creates behavioral and emotional

problems that spans academic failures, cognitive and social developmental problems, and social

isolation of adolescents (Stranger, Higgins, Bickel, Elk, Grabowski, Schmitz, Amass, Kirby, & Seracini, 1999; Bauman & Dougherty, 1983). The impact of the environment on substance use has shown to have a more robust effect than the impact of genes, as portrayed through the biological transmission of familial alcoholism. Much of the influence of genes on substance use is confounded by the fact that a large proportion of adolescents with a positive history of familial alcoholism reported coming from broken homes marked by divorce, parental separation, and family discord. Therefore, genetic influences on adolescent substance are moderated through environmental effects (Gross &McCaul, 1991).

The parallels between parents' drug involvement and adolescents' subsequent drug use is profoundly illustrated by Bauman and Dougherty (1983) in their study on mothers receiving methadone treatment. The authors found that mothers on methadone maintenance exhibited lower behavioral and cognitive abilities, and were least effective in child rearing styles, self-control, and socialization skills than their non-addicted counterparts. Subsequently, children of methadone mothers scored higher on aversive behaviors and had earlier and more frequent experiences with drugs than children of non-addicted mothers (Bauman & Dougherty, 1983). For these adolescents, chemical dependency is an emulation of parental behaviors. Adolescents in drug abusing households view their parents' drug use as a means of coping with life stressors and the child begins to mimic the behavior of the drug dependent parent by initiating drug experimentation, which subsequently leads to an intergenerational cycle of drug abuse (Nurco et al., 1999).

Children reared in homes of parental drug use are either left to their own human agency without many repercussions to their behaviors or they are not given ample autonomy to make independent decisions. It is no surprise, therefore, that children reared in these households report having little emotional and social connection to their parents (laissez faire homes) or report their

parents being overly controlling, intrusive, and harsh in discipline (authoritarian homes). It is

conjectured that the lack of autonomy may cause adolescents to turn to drugs in order to cope with

life's problems and the lack of parental control serves to provide children with avenues to engage

in deviance, drug use, and serious forms of delinquency (Denton & Kampfe, 1994).

*Siblings' Influence on Drug Use*

It is clear by virtue of the extant literature that parental drug use and family structure have

an appreciable impact on adolescents' drug use and delinquency (Gfroerer, 1987; Adler &

Loctecka, 1973; Keller, Catalano, Haggerty, & Fleming, 2002; Bauman &Dougherty 1983;

Stranger, Higgins, Bickel, Elk, Grabowski, Schmitz, Amass, Kirby, & Seracini, 1999; Nurco,

Blatchley, Hanlon, & Grady 1999). However, other scholars have argued that the effect of

siblings' drug use net of parental influence has a stronger association on adolescents' involvement

in drugs (Denton & Kampfe, 1994). Despite the presumed relationship of adolescent involvement

in drug use and their siblings' prior involvement in illicit substances, the sibling-delinquency

relationship has not received much empirical investigation (Lauritsen, 1993). However, what is

unquestionable is that the impact of siblings' delinquency on drug use, net of other family

variables, has been reported in several studies, with some researchers positing a fairly stable

correlation over a five year period (Lauritsen, 1993). Older siblings have been shown to function

as role models for younger ones, often providing emotional and social support and setting

behavior protocols on dating and sexual relationships. The effect of older siblings on younger

siblings' behaviors is transmitted through a process of behavioral modeling. For example, older

siblings who smoke are more likely to have younger siblings who smoke and younger siblings are

more likely to use illicit substances if older siblings have done so in the past (Needle, McCubbin,

Wilson, Reineck, Lazar, & Mederer, 1986).

16

It is suggested that the imitation of deviant behaviors is portrayed through a social learning process whereby younger siblings emulate the behavior of older siblings through observation, replication, and reinforcement of behaviors. The closer the relationship between siblings, the stronger the correlation of adolescents and siblings' drug use. In fact, the relationship is so robust that parental drug use becomes diminished when siblings' drug use is taken into account and simultaneously measured (Lauritsen, 1993).

The extent and frequency of older siblings' substance use increase the likelihood of prolonged adolescents' substance use, and likewise, adolescent drug use decreases when siblings are disapproving of drugs or do not initiate drug experimentation (Needle, McCubbin, Wilson, Reineck, Lazar & Mederer, 1986). While there is much consensus on the effects of sibling relationship on drugs and delinquency, scholars have questioned whether the birth order of the siblings alters this relationship (see Sletto, 1934). Wilkenson, Stitt, and Erickson (1982) found that the birth order and gender of the sibling matters in influencing delinquency among adolescents. For example, middle born boys in siblings of all boy pairs or mixed gender pairs reported the highest rates of delinquency. Middle born girls with an older male sibling reported the lowest levels of delinquency while middle born girls with an older female sibling reported highest levels of delinquency. It is conjectured that girls with an older sister engage in delinquent acts due to the perceived inability to compete with her elder sister, and as a result, resorts to defying behaviors for attention. However, for males with older siblings, the pressure to aspire to norms of societal masculinity functions as the central force behind male delinquency (Needle, McCubbin, Wilson, Reineck, Lazar, Mederer, 1986).

*Peer Influence on Drug Use*

The most significant predictor of drug use among adolescent is the association with a

17

deviant peer group. Associating with drug using friends amplifies the probability of drug use due to the likelihood of being involved in social situations that would induce deviance. The behaviors of drug using friends perpetuate a stronger tendency toward drug use regardless of the attitudes of the drug using peer (whether the peer group has a favorable outlook toward drug use).This indicates that teenagers' drug use is a social behavior carried out in the presence of an accepting peer group rather than the normative behavior of all teenagers (Johnson, Marcos, & Bahr, 1987). It is presumed that as youths enter the adolescence stage, the influences of parents are diminished (Mounts & Steinberg, 1995; Johnson, Marcos & Bahr, 1987) and the influence of peers becomes paramount. As adolescents begin to spend an increasing amount of unsupervised time with their peer group, the peer group begins to function as a resource for providing short term goals and social protocol concerning adolescents' behavior (Mount & Steinberg, 1995), as well as social pressure to engage in deviance (Johnson, Marcos, & Bahr, 1987).  While adolescents' drug use is amplified by deviant peer association, in the sense that increased drug using friends corresponded to an increase in drug using behaviors, teenagers with authoritative parenting regardless of drug using friends, are less likely to use drugs than youths raised under other forms of parenting styles (Johnson, Marcos, & Bahr, 1987).

*Family Structure*

Approximately 50 percent of children in the United States will experience living in a single parent household at least some point in their lives (Cherlin, Furstenberg, Chase-Linsdale, Kiernan, Robins, Morrison, & Teitler, 1991). Living in a single parent household due to family transition has the concomitant effect of increasing drug use and delinquency. These delinquent behaviors encompass theft, graffitti, vandalism, the sale and distribution of drugs, among other things. While the empirical literature demonstrates that children from two parent households

18

experience less drug use and delinquency than children from other types of households (Hoffman &Johnson, 1998), there is still a lack of consensus as to the role of family structure on adolescents' drug use and delinquency (Hoffman & Johnson, 1998; Grove & Crutchfield, 1982). Some scholars have postulated that marital disruption and single parent households are correlates of delinquency (Hoffman & Johnson, 1998), while others have found negligible effects of family structure on delinquency (Cernkovich & Giordano, 1987; Gove & Crutchfield, 1982).

Flewelling and Bauman (1990) noted that the failed or negligible association between family structure and delinquency is due to the failure to measure intervening variables that would unearth associations between the two variables. For example, Keller, Haggerty, and Fleming (2002) reported that children from single parent families and two parent intact homes self-reported equal amounts of drug use. Even more astounding is that children in two parent families reported slightly higher drug use than children in single parent families (Keller et al., 2002). It has been shown that it is the atmosphere and stability of the family environment rather than the absence or presence of a two-parent household that impacts delinquency and drug use (Denton & Kampfe, 1994).

Poor family environment plays a crucial role in the manifestation of drug use among adolescents because family disruptions, such as divorce and remarriage affect the capacity of children to adapt to  changes in family circumstances and reintegrate successfully into the family. However, while family transition and residential mobility effect drug use among adolescents, it is crucial to note that the type of drug differs between intact and non-intact homes. For example, adolescents who have experienced changes in their family structure are more likely to abuse marijuana than youths who did not experience a reconfiguration of their family structure. However, youths from intact families have a higher probability of abusing hallucinogens (Denton

19

& Kampfe, 1994). Family disruption may cause severe stress for adolescents, decreases the capacity to function normally, and amplifies the risk of drug use, aggression, and a host of behavioral problems (Keller, Catalano, Haggerty, & Fleming, 2002). If family transitions are exacerbated by stressors such as change in residence, school, income, or parenting style, this further increases the probability of delinquency (Keller, Catalano, Haggerty & Fleming, 2002). Residential mobility, therefore, affects the developmental outcome of the children by severing previous personal and social ties and engenders much difficulty in sustaining old ties or forming new bonds (Hoffman &Johnson, 1998).

Furthermore, families who experience a transition are likely to have lower incomes than intact families; such economic burden places great pressure on parents to monitor and supervise their children's activities and cater to their developmental needs. This deficiency in parental support reduces adolescents' motivation to succeed in school and in other areas of their life (Hoffman & Johnson, 1998). The more parent transitions a child experiences, the more socio-behavioral problems the child will encounter, which will increase the probability of drug use, deviance, and serious delinquency. For example, experiencing two events of parent transitions double the probability of delinquency, while experiencing four parent transitions heighten the probability of delinquency six times (Keller, Catalano, Haggerty & Fleming, 2002).

Racial differences among adolescents from non-intact homes illustrate that African American adolescents reported lower levels of drug use and deviance than their white counterparts and are more likely to view their homes as a positive environment than their white peers. A plausible explanation is that African American adolescents are more likely to be raised in single parent households, and as a result, experiences less stigmatization and subsequent psychosis from the structure of their home environment. Because this phenomenon is not the same

for whites, when white adolescents experience a family transition, the subsequent effects of drug and delinquency are more profound (Nurco & Blatchley, 1999).

*Family's Influence on Premarital Sex*

As the aforementioned literature indicates, adolescents' drug use and delinquency is impacted by family variables, such as parents' drug use, siblings influence, and family structure. Other deviant behaviors stemming from drug use include teenagers' engagement in premarital sex (Weinstein & Thornton, 1989). Involvement in substance use correlates with early onset of sexual intercourse as the effects of drugs inhibit self-control and rationality and increase the likelihood of sexual intercourse (Capaldi, Crossby, & Stool Miller, 1996).

The family context provides opportunities for discourse on the sexual behaviors of adolescents. A distant relationship, particularly between mother and child, fosters a discrepancy between the mother's attitudes and expectations of the adolescent's sexual behaviors (Weinstein & Thorton, 1989). Changes in family configurations can have devastating effects on the development of teenagers that may serve to increase the chances of deviance (i.e. early sexual intercourse). A change in school, neighborhood, or residence may extenuate adolescents' stress and create a strained parent-child relationship, which in turn, impedes the efficacy of parents as agents of social control (Wu & Thomson, 2001; Bahr, Maughan, &Marcos, 1998). However, effective communication between mother and child facilitates a transmittal of values that prohibits premarital coitus. Nonetheless, sexual abstinence is contingent on the parenting style of the mother (Weinstein &Thorton, 1989). For example, youths with permissive mothers are more likely to report early sexual involvement than adolescents of non-permissive mothers (Weinstein & Thorton, 1989).

Single mothers' dating relationships, sometimes with multiple partners, expose teenaged

girls to precocious sexual impressions and behaviors that directly or indirectly affect youths'

attitudes toward premarital sex (Capaldi, Crosby, & StoolMiller, 1996). Adolescents reared in

single parent families, who are cognizant of the sexual behavior of their parents, are more likely

to engage in sexual behaviors and believe that such behaviors are acceptable. In single parent

families, social control of adolescents' sexual behavior is diminished due to mediocre resources in

these households to adequately supervise adolescents' actions. Nonetheless, a close parent-child

relationship enables adherence of parental standards and expectations, making the supervision of

youths' behavior easier to manage (Wu & Thomson, 2001).

*Education*

A voluminous body of literature indicates that parental involvement in their children's

education correlates with ensuing academic success. Parental involvement is a multifaceted

concept that may range from communicative behaviors, participation in school activities, and

aspirations for their children. Parental engrossment in their children's education, and aspirations

for their children, has a positive effect on children's educational performance across subject areas

and cumulative GPA (Fan & Chen, 2001).  The academic performance of a youth is somewhat

dependent on the parents' perception of the child's ability to succeed in school. Youths are so

pervious to the perception of their parent's evaluation of their ability to perform a task that if the

parent feels the child is inept at a certain task, this perception will be reflected in the actual

performance of the child. Gender roles and expectations become even more relevant in parent's

perception of their children's ability in Math and English. For example, daughters whose mothers

are more likely to perceive them as incompetent in math self-reported lower grades in the subject

than daughters whose parents perceived them as competent in the subject. Similarly, boys whose

mothers perceived them as proficient in a subject area outperform their same gendered peers

(Frome & Eccles, 1998).

The type of childrearing technique has a direct impact on students' academic performance. There are four main types of parenting styles; these include (1) Authoritative, (2) Authoritarian, (3) Neglectful, and (4) Indulgent/Laissez Faire. Authoritative parenting encompasses high levels of responsiveness and demandingness. These parents are generally warm and supportive toward their children and grant their children autonomy and supervise their children's activities. Authoritarian parents place great emphasis on obedience to authority and conformity to rules and standards. They are high in demand but lack parental responsiveness of warmth and support toward their children. Continued reliance on external reinforcement undermines their children's perception of self-reliance and internal motivation. Neglectful parents are not responsive to their children's needs and they do not set or demand any standards for their children. They do not support their children's endeavors and they are uninvolved in their children's activities. Finally, Indulgent/Laissez Faire parents are low in demand but high in responsiveness. They are general more likely to tolerate their children's misbehavior without any form of correction and are least likely to create guidelines for proper conduct. While these children score high on social competence, they conversely score low on work orientation and perception of academic abilities (Glasglow, Dornbusch, Troyer, Steinberg, & Ritter, 1997).

Authoritative parenting styles have been shown to have the strongest effect on children's motivation to perform in school. These parents are more likely to be involved in their children's school and activities and provide encouragement and resources for their children's success. Due to the premise that authoritative parents participate in their children's education, children from these home environments are more likely to academically outperform their counterparts (Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992). The relationship of education on delinquency

23

is crucial to investigate as adolescents with low educational attainment are more likely to drop out of school, affiliate with delinquent peers, and become delinquent (Cairns, Cairns, & Neckerman, 1989).

Dropout rates across the United States have historically been disproportionate among racial and ethnic minorities. For instance, one in four black youths and one in three Hispanic youths as opposed to one in five white youths, between the ages of 18 and 21, have an elevated risk of ending high school prematurely. Males, especially black males, youths raised in single parent families, and individuals of low SES backgrounds are more likely to drop out of school due to the perceived inability to perform in school and the need to work in order to support their family. Youths who are at risk of dropping out of school also have the disadvantage of being raised under a non-authoritative parenting style that does not provide them with emotional or material support for social advancement (Rumberger, 1993). Additionally, these youths are also raised in impoverished neighborhoods where there is a greater risk of unwed pregnancies. The ramification of this event results in an untimely termination of high school that perpetuates poverty through confinement to marginal labor statuses (Hagan, 1993; Crane, 1991).

*Poverty and Low Socioeconomic Status (SES)*

Sociological explanations of delinquency have been attributed to structural conditions such as low SES among the inner city working class. Discrepancies between theory and research on the effect of SES on delinquency have produced confounding effects. While many theoretical explanations have attributed SES to delinquency by means of a deprivation model (Entner Wright, Caspi, Miech, & Silva, 1999; Simcha-Fagan & Schwartz, 1986; Patterson, 1991; Braithwaite, 1981) research has found no relationship or a negligible effect of social class on delinquency (Johnson, 1980), presumably because SES is faultily measured by father's occupational status

(Winship, 1992). A plausible explanation for the non-significant relationship is that the effect of SES on delinquency is indirect and operates through causal mediators. For example, those of high SES backgrounds reported greater educational and employment opportunities but also reported fewer conventional values and a greater taste for risk taking activities; the unintended consequences of engagement in risk taking activities engenders delinquency. Thus, it is assumed that the positive (education/employment) and negative (risk-taking) effects of SES eliminates the correlation between delinquency and social class which explains the mixed findings of numerous studies (Entner Wright et al., 1999).

Additionally, Braithwaite (1981) posited that a negligible correlation between SES and delinquency may be due to inadequacy of self-report data that often excludes seriousness of offenses and fails to discern class differences (Braithwaite, 1981). Though the literature is equivocal as to the relationship between delinquency and social class, a closer examination of the literature suggests that the type of delinquent act differed based on social classes. For example, running away was frequently committed by upper class middle girls and car theft and truancy frequently committed by lower class youth (Nye, Short, & Olson (1958).

*SES and RACE*

The impact of poverty on delinquency has been raised by numerous scholars (Simcha-Fagan, Schwartz, 1986; Patterson, 1991; Enter Wright, Caspi, Miech, Silva, 1999; Braithwaite, 1981; Johnson, 1980) and even though there is not a consensus as to the impact of SES on delinquency, a certain outcome is that families at lower income brackets are more susceptible to a host of social ailments that manifest in crime and deviance than those in the higher income brackets. In the 1980s, 8 percent of whites were living below the poverty line in comparison to 28.9 percent of blacks and 23.2 percent of Hispanics. The highest rates of poverty have been

25

steadily pronounced among minority groups despite fluctuations in the poverty levels for all races. Black children comprise 42 percent of all children living below poverty levels in 1980s, and Hispanic children followed suit at 33 percent while white children were at a distant 13.4 percent. Statistically, more white females live below the poverty level than white males. However, despite this gender disparity in income within the white race, Black and Hispanic males and females are twice as likely to live below the poverty line as white females (US Census Bureau, 2012).

The income level of families in the United States demonstrates that almost three times the number of black families as compared to white families earn fewer than 10,000 dollars per year, 8.5 percent of whites were earning middle class income in comparison to 7.9 percent of black families and 8.2 percent of Hispanic families. However, a wider gap in income is illustrated by those earning in the top five percent quartile ($250,000 and above). For this category, whites comprise 2.8 percent, Hispanics comprises 1 percent and blacks make up less than 1 percent of those earning in the top 5 percent quartile (US Census Bureau, 2012). It is clear that the gap in income and poverty rates is widest between those in the top 5 percent and bottom 5 percent quartile of the income distribution. The concentration of poverty among black working class youth has devastating consequences for delinquency, drug use, and crime.

Disadvantaged communities produce more opportunities for children to model and engage in non-criminal behaviors. Due to the fact that African American communities are more likely to have higher poverty rates, they are also more likely to have higher property and violent crime rates. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Crime Victimization Survey (2005), from 1993-2003, juveniles between the ages of 12-17 were the primary victims of violent crime. Older adolescents, males, and black teenagers have a greater risk of victimization than their respective counterparts. Juveniles were perceived to be either victims or offenders in 38% of all

violent crimes, and offenders were identified as juveniles in a quarter of all nonfatal violent victimization (NCVS, 2005, p7).

Most crimes perpetrated by juveniles were committed against other juveniles and three out of four violent crimes were committed by male juveniles, which is three and half times higher than crimes committed by female juveniles. Between the periods of 1993-2003, victimization rates for juveniles decreased for all nonfatal crimes, such as sexual assault, rape, simple assault, robbery, and aggravated assault. Though much of the decline is attributable to younger adolescents' desistance from crime (65 percent decline), older adolescents' decreased involvement in crime have also had an appreciable impact on the overall reduction of adolescents' victimization rates.

*Racial Discrimination*

Research on racial differences in victimization suggests that African American youths are disproportionately represented in violent crime and are also more likely to die by homicide than their white counterparts (Stewart, Simons, & Conger, 2002). In fact, black adolescents are five times more likely to be victims of homicide than their white counterparts and are seven times more likely to be homicide offenders than their white counterparts (Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCVS, 2005).

Drug arrest rates for black adults between the periods of 1985-1989 more than doubled the arrest rates for whites despite that blacks only comprise 15 percent of the nation's drug users and whites comprises 77 percent of drug users. Black juveniles are also arrested for drug crimes at a rate five times greater than white juveniles. It is posited that drug laws and subsequent disparity in arrest rates is an attempt to control minority populations (Mosher, 2001). Therefore, the focus on drugs in inner city environments perpetuates the myth that minorities are archetype users,

traffickers, sellers, and purchasers of drugs (Tonry, 1995).

It is important to note that poverty rates and its subsequent effects are not exclusive to inner city black communities as the exact effects of poverty have shown to replicate in poor white neighborhoods. Racial differences in violent victimizations are attributable to criminogenic environmental conditions and differences in ecological contexts (Bellair & McNulty, 2005). The lower rates of violent crime in white neighborhoods is explained by the premise that these communities are closer to middle class white neighborhoods, and as such, the institutional benefits of these communities may spill over in disadvantaged white neighborhoods. But, unlike black neighborhoods, middle class black communities are more segregated from impoverished ones, and as such, impoverished black communities do not benefit from the institutional privileges of middle class black communities (Krivo & Peterson, 1996).

Residential segregation after the migration period produced high rates of poverty, unemployment, family and community disruption that led to higher levels of victimization rates in black neighborhoods. Additionally, the exodus of the black middle class from the inner city increased the growth of poor residents and single parent families in disadvantaged neighborhoods (Sampson & Wilson, 2006). Single parent families are seven times more likely to be poor than two parent families and live in poverty for a longer period of time. The effects of poverty reduce chances of marriage and increase chances of out of wedlock childbearing events; these life events then functions to reduce opportunities for young people and alienate them from mainstream society (Musick & Mare, 2006).

Racial discriminatory practices in employment lead to a concentration of minority youths in secondary and mediocre labor markets. These employment statuses further preclude inner city youths from social advancement and provide no incentive for continued participation in the labor

28

force. Youths in the inner city are barred from certain aspects of social mobility as most individuals lack the qualification to secure employment in the primary labor market. But, most importantly, discriminatory practices in the workplace serve to confine minority groups to secondary labor. Additionally, because secondary jobs rarely provide opportunities for professional development, individuals who are working in the secondary labor market often become discontented and detached from the work arena and may resort to criminal behavior for alternative means of earning capital (Crutchfield, Masueda, & Drakulich, 2006).

*Neighborhood Disorder*

Conditions of neighborhood disorder may encompass perceptible social maladies such as physical decay, drunkenness, vandalism, panhandling, loitering youths in street gangs, widespread drug abuse, street prostitution, among other social nuisances. Concerns about the disorder are dependent on the concern level of community members. Some conditions of neighborhood disorder may be ranked as more important than others. For example, loitering youths in corner gangs is rated as a problem of high concern in disorganized communities. However, physical decay is viewed as less disconcerting. These groups of youth may range from small groups engaging in meaningless casual conversations to organized fighting groups. These groups pose a threat to the normative order of the community by virtue of the activities that they engage in (i.e. drug use, harassment, and intimidation of neighborhood residents) and their establishment of territorial dominance.

Harassment and intimidation may come in the forms of sexual innuendos and verbal catcalls made to women, as well as physical harassment. Intimidation may be in the expression of verbal threats or menacing actions and facial expressions. Territorial dominance implies the ownership of a block or a street that is precluded from certain gangs or ethnic groups.

29

Drug use is also widespread in communities marred by social disorder and high levels of poverty. In these neighborhoods, drug sellers and users are often on the street corner at bus stations, bars, and pool halls—wherever activity is high and busy. Most drug sellers and users coexist in the same areas and often engage in an array of other illegal enterprises. However, in some cities "certain drug-dealing blocks operate like fast-food restaurants—drive-through customers (some apparently from the suburbs) get curb-side service, while the whole operation is guarded by young look-outs at each end of the block" ( Skogan, p.30,1990). Youths are involved in the drug industry for the financial benefits that are derived from these sales, especially youths who are unemployed or believe that the drug business is more lucrative than regular employment. Older men encourage and recruit younger youths into drug enterprises, sell drugs to them, and use them as pushers in the neighborhood.

Prostitution is rampant in disorganized neighborhoods. In some places, commercial sex is evident in topless bars, burlesque parlors, live sex shows, and street side prostitution. It is important to bear in mind that some sex enterprises are legitimate business, such as massage parlors and pornographic movie theaters. This reality makes it harder for residents to eliminate these operations in their communities even if they view them as a disorderly nuisance.

Vandalism is the most highly rated disorder in most disorganized neighborhoods. Vandals generally engage in destroying and defacing public properties such as schools, street signs, and business places. These youths may also engage in spray painting walls and writing graffiti. Vandals are generally a part of a delinquent group. They may also perform poorly in school, are generally unsupervised, and encroach upon the law. Vandalism may be tactical in origin, meaning that the vandals mark their territory such as using gang graffiti, or it could be vindictive in nature, such as individuals defacing an apartment building due to unaffordable rent prices.

Neighborhood disorder causes anger and demoralization of citizens in these communities, in the sense that regular citizens are uneasy when they traverse parks, shopping areas, and their home streets. Many residents are also under the impression that no one cares about the condition of their community and they become impotent in deriving proactive measures to solve the problems of disorder. Fear is a resultant consequence of disorder due to the premise that persons who engage in disorderly conduct are threatening and unpredictable and that most groups who inflict acts of chaos usually engage in violent intra group conflict. Therefore, social disorder reduces a community's capacity to exercise social control over its residents, inhibits cooperation and mutual trust among its members, and severs social collectivity among community residents.

In areas where disorder is high, persons are less likely to protect each other's property and form collective and public cooperative actions. Disorder is positively related to property crimes (i.e. robberies), as areas with high rates of neighborhood disorder tend to have high rates of robbery. Disorderly conditions also affect the urban ecology of one's neighborhood, in the sense that social derangement increase residential transience by plummeting an individual's desire to move into certain communities. Middle class, highly educated, intact families are often dissatisfied with conditions of disorganized neighborhoods, and as such, are likely to transit out of these areas, rendering poor black unmarried adults destitute in these communities. Racial discrimination occurs in disorderly neighborhoods as white middle class residents tend to segregate themselves from poorer blacks and access to housing becomes inequitable or financially unattainable to poorer ethnic minorities. Poor minorities are then confined to these disorganized communities where a culmination of persons with similar background and educational statuses engender further disorder (Skogan, 1990).

As aforementioned, the goal of the research is to examine whether parental drug use,

family structure, (measured as habitation with a biological parent and/or a step parent), and environmental conditions are predictive of adolescents' self-reported involvement in drug use, deviance, (measured as risky sexual behaviors and poor educational performance) and serious delinquency. These variables will be measured using collective and separate models. The hypothesis predicts that individual and structural characteristics will be significant predictors of the outcome behaviors. Additionally, it is predicted that individual characteristics will have a stronger impact on engendering the outcome behaviors than macro structural influences.

CHAPTER 3

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The current research examines whether psycho social risk factors of parental drug use, family structure, and environmental influences are predictive of youths' self-reported drug use, deviance, and serious delinquent behaviors. Past and current research suggests that the aforementioned variables have been shown to have a significant impact on youths' initiation and involvement in a wide array of aberrant behaviors. However, what remains unclear is whether these variables (micro and macro) have an equal impact on the outcome behaviors or whether the impact is changed significantly when measured collectively or separately.

The existing data for the study is derived from a two wave longitudinal panel study. Even though the study design is longitudinal in nature, data will only be employed from wave 1 as the goal is not to assess the effects of the aforesaid psycho social variables on adolescents' self-reported drug use, deviance, and delinquent behaviors in a longitudinal or temporal order but rather to determine whether these variables are predictive of such behaviors. Moreover, all identifiers have been removed from the participants' responses, making it impossible to associate individuals' responses from time one to time two. Therefore, employing data from both waves would be impossible.

*Data*

The two wave panel study was retrieved from the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research database (ICPSR) and employed survey interviews from a sample of non-institutionalized young adults between the ages of 19 and 23 who were former students in Miami Dade Public School in South Florida. The sample is comprised of former students who were previously selected for the South Florida Youth Development study when they were in the 6th or

7th grade in Miami Dade Public Schools. From that cohort, a representative sample was generated that will be used for the present project. The first survey interview was gathered January 1998 through June 2000 and the second wave of survey interviews conducted between January 2000 and April 2002. The population for both waves was 1803 and the sample was composed of all 410 females from the South Florida Youth Development Study and 1,273 randomly drawn males from the same project. There was an overall participation rate of 75.6 percent males and 80.5 percent females.

A stratification of the sample by sex, race, and ethnicity was performed with an equal proportion of males and females, African Americans, Cuban Americans, non-Cuban Hispanics, and non-Hispanic whites to the general population. Weights were developed to compensate for bias in the supplementary female sample and post stratification weights were used to adjust fractions in the sample to match the county and age cohort of the 1990 United States Census. The data was collected via computer-assisted personal interviews (CAPI) and face to face interviews using a combination of both methods. A structured interview was conducted to measure drug use and psychiatric disorders noted in the DSM-IV. The Diagnostic Interview Schedule (DIS) was used to assess post-traumatic stress disorder, anti-social personality disorder, and AD/HD. Additionally, the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale was employed to assess sub-clinical depression (see Turner (2002) for more information on the scale). Other measures were obtained on recent and lifetime stress exposure, anxiety, depression, and other post-traumatic stress disorders. However, for this study's purpose, only risk factors measured in the study concerning drug use, deviance, and delinquent behaviors in the data are included in the present study. I eliminated the psychosis measures as the objective of the current study is not concerned with testing or measuring post-traumatic stress disorders or psychosis of respondents

on the outcome behaviors.

*Independent Variable*

The independent variables of interest in the study consist of parental drug use, family structure (measured as habitation with a biological or stepparent), and structural conditions of the community. Parental drug use is an individual level predictor and is dichotomize as those who reported parental drug use being coded as 1 and those who did not report drug use being coded as 0. Questions concerning parental drug use asked whether respondents' parents have ever used mind-altering substances, such as alcohol, marijuana, tobacco, cocaine, crack cocaine, and other forms of illegal drugs. Family structure is measured as an individual predictor and includes questions that ask respondents about their family configuration, such as whether the respondent lived with their mother only, father only, or step parents during junior or middle years. The variables were dichotomized (No=0 and Yes=1). Structural conditions of the community are measured using variables capturing neighborhood disorder and racial discrimination. Questions concerning neighborhood disorder asked respondents about the conditions of their neighborhood, indicating the extent to which they felt that they must travel carefully through some places in their neighborhood, the extent to which they deem some places to be unsafe, how often they hear gunshots in the neighborhood, and the extent of gang violence and drug use problems in their community. These conditions were measured as (not true=0 and true =1). Each item is measured with a 2 point scale with higher values indicating severe neighborhood conditions. Racial discrimination variables are measured as structural predictors and include indicators of unfairness in employment, difficult neighbors, insult received from others, access to housing, and opinion of the frequency of negative treatment received by others (No=0 and Yes=1).

Additionally, poverty and low SES variables are measured as individual level predictors

and include indicators of employment, whether respondents are employed and whether the respondent has ever been on welfare (No=0 and Yes=1).

*Dependent Variable*

The dependent variables for this study include adolescents' self-reported drug use, serious delinquency, and deviant behaviors (i.e. risky sexual behaviors and poor educational performance). Adolescents' drug use was measured by asking whether respondent have ever tried a wide range of illicit substances, such as cigarettes, marijuana, powder cocaine, crack cocaine, amphetamines or stimulants, analgesics, tranquilizers, inhalants, heroin, sedatives or barbiturates, hallucinogens, and alcohol (No=0 and Yes=1). Delinquency was measured by asking respondents about gang involvement and gang activities and whether respondent have ever been arrested or partaken in an offense punishable by law. These variables were also dichotomized (No=0 and Yes=1). Finally, deviant outcomes were assessed by measuring whether the respondent was involved in risky sexual behaviors and attained low educational performance. Risky sexual behaviors were measured by asking whether respondents used alcohol or drugs during sexual activities, whether respondent used a condom during sex, whether respondent ever contracted an STD, such as herpes, Chlamydia, and HIV/AIDs (No=0 and Yes=1). Low academic achievement was measured by asking whether respondent ever failed a grade in high school (No=0 and Yes=1).

*Control Variables*

Being that race, age, and gender are prominent correlates of the measured outcome behaviors; these variables will be controlled in the relevant analyses. Race is defined as African Americans (Yes=1, No=0), white, defined as non-Hispanic white (Yes=1, No=0), Hispanics collapsed as Hispanic black and Hispanic white (Yes=1, No=0) and those who identify

themselves from another racial or ethnic group (Yes=1, No=0). Age is a continuous variable ranging from 19 to 23, and gender is dichotomize (male=1 and female=0).

*Analytical Strategy*

Logistic Regression Analyses will be employed as it is the most suitable means to test the ability of several independent variables in predicting the likelihood of a dichotomize outcome variable occurring. This statistical tool is an "extension of multiple regressions in situations where the DV is not a continuous or quantitative variable [and has as few as two outcome variables]" (Mertler & Vannatta, 2002 p.313). The study's goals are to determine whether the independent variables of parental drug use, family structure, and environmental conditions are predictive of adolescents' self-reported drug use, serious delinquency, and deviant behaviors. Because the dependent variables are binary coded, logistic regression is the most appropriate statistical tool in accurately predicting adolescents' engagement in the measured outcome behaviors. Logistic Regression is advantageous in the sense that no assumptions need to be made about the distributions of the independent variables, and the predictor variables do not need to be distributed normally, linearly related, or have equal within group variances (Mertler & Vannatta, 2002).

Four separate analyses, with a total of twelve analytical models, will be conducted to determine whether the independent variables are predictive of the outcome behaviors. The first analysis will assess drug use considering micro-level conditions only (Model 1), then macro-level conditions (Model 2), and lastly a combined model including both (Model 3). The second analysis will measure serious forms of delinquency using the same strategy. The third and final set of analyses will assess deviant measures of risky sexual behaviors and deviant measures of poor educational performance using the same strategy. Even though risky sexual behaviors and poor

educational performance measures are assessing deviance, they are computed in separate analysis because they are distinct forms of deviance and did not load well together on the varimax rotation. Computing individual and structural predictors separately will allow for an examination of each type of variable on the outcome behavior. Additionally, running a combined analysis of both micro and macro level variables will allow for a stronger analysis of the impact of these variables in predicting the likelihood of the dependent variable occurring. This procedure will also help to statistically determine what form of variables (micro or macro) are more significant predictors of the outcome behaviors.

## Table 1. Descriptive statistics of micro predictor variables

| Variable | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Individual Characteristics** | | | | |
| **Parents drug use** | | | | |
| *Alcohol* | | | | 82.8 |
| *Tobacco* | | | | 56 |
| *Marijuana* | | | | 29 |
| *Crack/Cocaine* | | | | 10.7 |
| *Other drug* | | | | 6.2 |
| **Family Structure** | | | | |
| *Lived w/mother infancy years* | | | | 6.2** |
| *Lived w/ father infancy years* | | | | 4.2** |
| *Lived w/ step dad infancy years* | | | | .4** |
| *Lived w/ stepmom infancy years* | | | | .2** |
| *Lived w/ mother elementary years* | | | | 6.0** |
| *Lived w/father elementary years* | | | | 2.7** |
| *Lived w/ step dad elementary years* | | | | 1.4** |
| *Lived w/ step mom elementary years* | | | | .4** |
| *Lived w/ mother junior years* | | | | 92.1 |
| *Lived w/ father junior years* | | | | 59.4 |
| *Lived w/ stepdad junior years* | | | | 10.9 |
| *Lived w/ step mom junior years* | | | | 2.0 |
| **Poverty and SES** | | | | |
| *Employed* | | | | 67.5 |
| *Welfare dependency* | | | | 2.8 |

*Source:* Drug Use Trajectories: Ethnic/Racial Comparisons, 1998-2002 (ICPRS 30862)
The descriptive statistics are based on the unweighted sample of parents' drug use for alcohol (n=1493), tobacco (n=1009), marijuana (n=522), crack/cocaine (n=193), other illegal drugs (n=112).
Family structure is indicated as years with mother, father, stepfather, and stepmother during ages 1-6, elementary, and junior years.
Ages 1-6 with mother (n=132), ages 1-6 with father (n=75), ages 1-6 with stepmother (n=3), ages 1-6 with stepfather (n=8).
Ages 7-12 with mother (n=108), ages 7-12 with father (n=49), ages 7-12 with stepmother (n=8), ages 7-12 with stepfather (n=25).
Ages 13-18 with mother (n=1661), ages 13-18 with father (n=1071), ages 13-18 with stepmother (n=36), ages 13-18 with stepfather (196).
** indicates too many missing values, and as such, are excluded from the final analysis.
Variables of current employment are (n=1217), and welfare (n=51).

# Table 2. Descriptive statistics of macro predictor variables

| Variable | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Structural Characteristics** | | | | |
| **Neighborhood Disorder** | | | | |
| *Conditions unsafe* | 1.30 | 1.00 | .630 | |
| *Gunshots* | 1.21 | 1.00 | .525 | |
| *Gang violence* | 1.17 | 1.00 | .476 | |
| *Drug use/sale* | 1.41 | 1.00 | .702 | |
| *Travel carefully* | 1.13 | 1.00 | 10.1 | |
| **Discrimination** | | | | |
| *Fired/denied promotion* | | | | |
| *Not been hired* | | | | 19.1 |
| *Realtor/landlord refuse housing* | | | | 19.9 |
| *Difficult neighbors* | | | | 14.4 |
| *People insult* | | | | 3.4 |
| *Bad service at public places* | | | | 15.1 |
| *People act as they are better than r* | | | | 20.9 |
| | | | | 51.9 |
| *People act as they are afraid of r* | | | | 32.2 |
| *People deem r dishonest* | | | | 18 |

*Source:* Drug Use Trajectories: Ethnic/Racial Comparisons, 1998-2002 (ICPRS 30862)
The descriptive statistics are based on the unweighted sample of neighborhood conditions: unsafe (n=379), gunshots (n=282), gang violence (n=225), drug problems (n=513), and travel (n=182).
Racial discrimination measures are Fired/denied promotion (n=345), not hired (n=359), realtors refuse housing (n=61), difficult neighbors (n=260). Other measures of racial discrimination include respondents' experiences of negative treatment by others: negative service at public restaurants (n=376), people afraid of respondent (n=580), people believe respondent is dishonest (n=325), people act as if they are better than respondent (n=935), and people insult respondent (n=272).

# Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the dependent variable on drug use

| Variable | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation | Maximum | Minimum | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcome behaviors** | | | | | | |
| **Drug use** | | | | | | |
| *Cigarettes* | | | | | | 23.5 |
| *Sedatives/barbiturates* | | | | 1 | 0 | 11.6 |
| *Amphetamine/Stimulant* | | | | 1 | 0 | 11.3 |
| *Analgesics* | | | | 1 | 0 | 36.2 |
| *Tranquilizers* | | | | 1 | 0 | 22.2 |
| *Inhalants* | | | | 1 | 0 | 11.8 |
| *Marijuana* | | | | 1 | 0 | 56.1 |
| *Hallucinogen* | | | | 1 | 0 | 22.7 |
| *Alcohol* | | | | 1 | 0 | 86.7 |
| *Powder cocaine* | | | | 1 | 0 | 15.9 |
| *Crack cocaine* | | | | 1 | 0 | 2.7 |
| *Heroin* | | | | 1 | 0 | 1.4 |

*Source:* Drug Use Trajectories: Ethnic/Racial Comparisons, 1998-2002 (ICPRS 30862)

The descriptive statistics are based on the unweighted sample of adolescents' self-reported drug use: cigarettes (n=423), sedatives or barbiturates (n=209), amphetamines or stimulant (n=204), analgesics (n=652), tranquilizers (n=400), inhalants (n=213), marijuana (n=1012), powder cocaine (286), crack cocaine (n=48), hallucinogens (n=409), heroin (26), alcohol (n=1563).

# Table 4. Descriptive statistics of the dependent variable on serious delinquency

| Variable | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation | Maximum | Minimum | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcome behaviors** | | | | | | |
| **Serious delinquency** | | | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | 0 | 4.1 |
| *Gang involvement* | | | | 1 | 0 | 1.4 |
| *Gang colors* | | | | 1 | 0 | 4.5 |
| *Gang signs* | | | | 1 | 0 | 12.8 |
| *Drugs w/gang* | | | | 1 | 0 | 23.6 |
| *Leisure w/gang* | | | | 1 | 0 | 3.5 |
| *Vandalism* | | | | 1 | 0 | 1.7 |
| *Car theft* | | | | 1 | 0 | 5.3 |
| *Handgun* | | | | 1 | 0 | 17.1 |
| *Arrested/Juvenile hall* | | | | | | |

*Source:* Drug Use Trajectories: Ethnic/Racial Comparisons, 1998-2002 (ICPRS 30862)

The descriptive statistics are based on the unweighted sample of adolescents' involvement in serious delinquency. Current or previous gang membership (n=74), display gang colors (n=26), display gang signs (n=81), drugs or alcohol with gang (n=231), leisure with gang (n=426), vandalism (n=63), car theft (n=31), hang gun possession (95), arrested or stayed in jail or juvenile hall (n=308).

# Table 5. Descriptive statistics of the dependent variable on deviance

| Variable | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation | Maximum | Minimum | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcome behaviors** | | | | | | |
| **Deviance** | | | | 1 | 0 | 41.4 |
| *Condom* | | | | 1 | 0 | 9.8 |
| *Alcohol w/sex* | | | | 1 | 0 | 9.8 |
| *Drugs w/sex* | | | | 1 | 0 | .7 |
| *Herpes* | | | | 1 | 0 | 3.3 |
| *Chlamydia* | | | | 1 | 0 | .1 |
| *HIV/AIDS* | | | | 1 | 0 | .7 |
| *Other STD* | | | | 1 | 0 | 23.5 |
| *Fail grade* | | | | | | |

*Source:* Drug Use Trajectories: Ethnic/Racial Comparisons, 1998-2002 (ICPRS 30862)

The descriptive statistics are based on the unweighted sample of self-reported risky sexual behaviors of respondents: condom (n=747), alcohol w/sex (n=176), drugs w/sex (n=89), chyalmidia (n=59), HIV/AIDS (n=2), herpes (n=12), other std (n=12). For the deviance measure of weak educational performance, respondents indicated if they have failed a grade in school (n=423).

**Table 6. Descriptive statistics of control variables**

| Variables | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Age* | *20.01* | *20.00* | .943 | |
| *White (reference group)* | | | | |
| *Hispanic* | | | | 47.1 |
| *African Americans* | | | | 24.1 |
| *Other* | | | | 3.2 |
| *Male* | | | | 53 |
| *Female* | | | | 47 |

*Source:* Drug Use Trajectories: Ethnic/Racial Comparisons, 1998-2002 (ICPRS 30862)

For the control variables, the weighted sample of adolescents' self-reported demographic characteristics are non-Hispanic white (n=460), Hispanics (n=850), blacks (n=434), and other (n=57). Gender is male (n=955) and female (n=848). Respondents indicated their age to be 18 (n=28), 19 (n=547), 20 (n=748), 21 (n=361), 22 (n=98), 23 (n=21). The racial grouping of Hispanic includes categories of Hispanic non-white and Hispanic black.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this research is to determine whether variables of parental drug use, family structure, and neighborhood conditions are predictive of adolescents' self-reported drug use, deviance, and serious delinquent behaviors. Additionally, the research aims to determine whether micro-level variables of parental drug use and family structure or macro-level variables of neighborhood characteristics are stronger predictors of the outcome behaviors. It is hypothesize that micro-level variables will be more significant predictors of the outcome behaviors as conditions of the home environment are likely to have stronger impact on the behaviors of impressionable adolescents. The frequency of contact and closeness amongst family members may generate a higher possibility of negative behavioral emulation than structural conditions of one's neighborhood. Due to the premise that conditions of the environment have a more indirect or secondary effect on individuals' behaviors, it is believed that conditions of the home (i.e. micro level variables) will be stronger predictors of the outcome behaviors than conditions of one's neighborhood.

By analyzing the differences in micro and macro-level predictor variables on the outcome behaviors, the research will provide a broader understanding of the factors and dimensions that impact adolescents' involvement and engagement in an array of deviance, drug use, and serious delinquency, as well as the correlates that are stronger predictors of these actions. In order to address the research goals, Logistic Regression models will be conducted on the variables to determine predictive effects and strength of the predictor variables on the outcome behaviors. As such, twelve analytical models will be computed for this section.

*Preliminary Analyses*

Due to the diverse nature of questions aimed at measuring factors of drug use, deviance, and serious delinquency, preliminary analyses were done to determine correlation, significant relationships, and commonality among variables. Bivariate correlations of all the variables employed in the analysis were computed to determine the significant relationships and correlation among items. Additionally, Reliability Analysis using the Cronbach's Alpha (.05 or above) was used to estimate the extent of covariance among items. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for the outcome measure of drug use is .820. The reliability coefficient for delinquency is .566, and the Cronbach Alpha for the deviant measure of risky sexual behaviors is .073. Being that there was only one item assessing poor educational performance, reliability analysis could not be computed for this variable.

These analyses served as a basis for performing a series of factor analysis which permitted a more substantive assessment of the extent of commonality among variables and allowed for more parsimonious analyses by combining those variables that are correlated.

Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation was performed to examine the extent of commonality in survey items measuring parental drug use, family structure, and neighborhood conditions. The Factor Analysis revealed two components measuring parents' drug use. Items measuring alcohol and tobacco were reduced into one factor based on commonality among these items and are labeled *Parents' legal drug use*. Similarly, items assessing marijuana, crack/cocaine, and other drugs are labeled *Parents illegal drug use*.

Variables measuring family structure were reduced into two components labeled as *Biological parent*, this measures the child's habitation during junior years with his or her father and mother, and *Step parent*, this variable measures the child's junior year's tenancy with step

mother or stepfather. Items assessing neighborhood conditions measure the safeness of the

neighborhood, whether respondents indicated that they have to travel through certain parts of their

neighborhoods carefully, and whether there have been incidences of gunshots, gang violence, and

drug use/sale problems in the respondent's community. Due to the high commonality among these

items, they were reduced in one factor labeled *neighborhood disorder*.

Variables measuring poverty and low SES did not load well together on the Factor

Analysis, and as such, are included in the final analyses. Additionally, measures of racial

discrimination were collapsed into three components labeled *job discrimination* which includes

items measuring unfair disparate treatment respondents experienced in being fired and denied

promotion, and unfair treatment received in not being hired for a job. Items assessing housing

discrimination and insult received from others shared a high commonality and were reduced into

one component labeled *residential discrimination*. The item assessing difficult neighbors did not

share a commonality with any of the other variables, and as such, it is computed separately using

Logistic Regression. Moreover, one component was computed for items measuring discriminatory

treatment received from others. These include variables of "bad service at public places", "people

acts as if they are afraid of respondent", "people deem respondent to be dishonest", and "people

act as if they are better than respondent". These items share a single commonality and are labeled

*discriminatory treatment.*

In regard to the outcome variables, adolescents' self-reported drug use (cigarettes, sedatives

or barbiturates, amphetamine or stimulant, analgesics, tranquilizers, inhalants, marijuana or

hashish, hallucinogen, alcohol, powder cocaine, crack cocaine, and heroin) were computed into

four components. Component one is labeled *Teen common drug use* and includes items measuring

marijuana and alcohol use. Component two is categorized as *teen illicit drug use*, and includes

items measuring cigarettes, sedative, amphetamine, tranquilizers and inhalants. Component three includes items assessing hallucinogen and analgesics use and is labeled *other teen drug* and component four assesses crack and heroin use and is labeled *teen uncommon drug use,* as crack and heroin have been shown by the literature to be the least likely drugs used by adolescents.

Adolescents' self-reported serious delinquency measures were compressed into five components. Indicators assessing "gang colors" and "gang signs" were reduced into one component and are labeled *gang commitment*. Similarly, items assessing "drugs" and "leisure" with gang are reduced into one factor labeled *gang behavior*. Moreover, items measuring "vandalism", "car theft", and "handgun possession" were labeled *property offenses* as one component. Items that measure whether respondent have "ever been a member of a gang" and have ever been "arrested or placed in juvenile hall" share a high commonality and are labeled *gang involvement and arrest*. The variable assessing car theft did not share a commonality with any of the other items, and as such, is measure separately using Logistic Regression.

On a similar note, items assessing adolescents' risky sexual behaviors were computed into three factors. Factor one include items that assess adolescents' use of alcohol and drugs before or during sexual intercourse, labeled as *alcohol and drug use in coitus*. Factor two includes items that measures sexual transmitted diseases, such as HIV and herpes, labeled as *STDs incurable*. Factor three includes items such as chlamydia and condom use during sex labeled *STD and condom*. Variables that indicated whether respondent had contracted "other STDS" not mentioned in the survey, did not share commonality with any of the other items, and is measured separately using Logistic Regression.

Finally, poor educational attainment measures were obtained by assessing whether the respondent ever failed a grade during high school. Due to the singularity of this variable, it cannot

be computed using the Principal Component Analysis and is assessed separately in the final analytic models.

In order to prevent running multiple analyses for the outcome variables, scaling of the outcome variables was done to collapse multiple components into one item of the outcome behaviors. For example, *teen common drug use, teen illicit drug use, other teen drug use, and teen uncommon drug use* was collapsed into one scale measuring the outcome behavior of drug use. Similarly, the five factorial components of delinquency were computed into one scale measuring the outcome behavior of delinquency and the components of risky sexual behavior were also reduced into one scale.

*Final Analyses*

The tables below illustrate the results for the twelve analytical models assessing micro and macro variables collectively and separately on the respective outcome behaviors of drug use, deviance, and serious delinquency. In addition to these variables, controls for age, race, and gender are also included in the models.

*Models Predicting Drug Use*

Table 7 presents the results of the BLR model predicting drug use. Out of all the variables in the model, only three revealed statistically significant relationships. For the individual predictors, parents' legal drug use was statistically significant and for the structural predictors, discriminatory treatment and job discrimination were significant predictors of respondents' drug use after controlling for age, race, and gender. The coefficient of all predictors are positive, parents' legal drug use (b =.430), discriminatory treatment (b =.291), and job discrimination (b=.279), indicating that respondents who reported parents' legal drug use, discriminatory treatment and job discrimination also self-reported personal drug use. When the variables were

measured in a combined model, interesting differences emerged. For the individual predictors of drug use, parents' legal drug use (b=.418) remained significant after controlling for age, race, and gender. However, for the structural predictors, only discriminatory treatment (b =.279) remained significant, as job discrimination was no longer a significant predictor of drug use. For the remaining significant variables, the relationship between the predictors and the outcome variable is positive, indicating that respondents who reported parents' legal drug use and discriminatory treatment also reported personal drug use. The Cox & Snell and Nagelkerke pseudo $R^2$ for the micro model predicting drug use explains between 4.9 and 11 percent of the variation in the likelihood the dependent variable will occur, while the Cox & Snell and Nagelkerke pseudo $R^2$ for the macro model explains between 3.9 and 8.6 percent of the variation in the likelihood the outcome behavior will occur. Thus, based on these statistics, it is clear that individual level predictors have a stronger effect on the outcome behavior of self-reported drug use than structural predictors.

## Table 7. Logistic regression models predicting drug use

| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE |
| **Variables** | | | | | | |
| **Individual Characteristics** | | | | | | |
| Age | .140 | .095 | | | .135 | .096 |
| Gender | .452* | .182 | | | .357 | .188 |
| White **(reference group)** | | | | | | |
| Hispanics | -.560 | .289 | | | -.535 | .291 |
| Blacks | -1.173*** | .302 | | | -1.248*** | .310 |
| Other race | -.220 | .654 | | | 1.00 | .773 |
| Biological parent | .019 | .095 | | | .050 | .096 |
| Stepparent | .173 | .125 | | | .161 | .126 |
| Parents' illegal drug use | .210 | .129 | | | .191 | .132 |
| Parents' legal drug use | .430*** | .085 | | | .418*** | .087 |
| Welfare | .792 | .630 | | | .725 | .636 |
| Current income | .157 | .194 | | | .195 | .196 |
| **Structural Characteristics** | | | | | | |
| **Neighborhood disorder** | | | -.059 | .082 | -.118 | .089 |
| **Discriminatory Treatment** | | | .291** | .106 | .279* | .115 |
| **Job Discrimination** | | | .279** | .104 | .179 | .106 |
| **Residential Discrimination** | | | -.046 | .092 | .027 | .106 |
| **Difficult neighbors** | | | .048 | .267 | .131 | .306 |
| | | | | | | |
| **Cox & Snell $R^2$** | .049 | | .039 | | .058 | |
| **Nagelkerke $R^2$** | .110 | | .086 | | .131 | |

† $p<.10$. *$p<.05$. **$p<.01$. ***$p<.001$

*Models Predicting Delinquency*

Items predicting delinquency are shown in Table 8. For the individual predictor variables, habitation with a biological parent during the junior years (b=-.167), parents illegal drug use (b=.209), and welfare (b=.791) were significant predictors of delinquency. In regard to structural characteristics, neighborhood disorder (b=.355), discriminatory treatment (b=.320), and job discrimination (b=.284) were significant predictors of the outcome behaviors after controlling for age, race, and gender. Except for the variable measuring family structure (i.e. habitation with a biological parent), all the significant variables have a positive relationship with the outcome behavior of delinquency, indicating that respondents who reported parents' illegal drug use, welfare, neighborhood disorder, discriminatory treatment, and job discrimination, also self-reported involvement in delinquency. Habitation with a biological parent during their junior years was conversely related with outcomes of delinquency.

When the variables were computed in a combined model, parents' illegal drug use (b=.167) and habitation with biological parent (b=-.129) remained significant predictors of delinquency. However, the variable welfare was no longer a significant predictor of the outcome behavior. For the structural predictors, all the previously significant variables (i.e. neighborhood disorder (b=.331), discriminatory treatment (b=.328), and job discrimination (b=.247)), remained significant after controlling for age, race, and gender. The relationship between the significant predictors and the outcome behavior, with the exception of the family structure variable, was positive indicating that respondents who reported parents' use of illegal drugs, neighborhood disorder, discriminatory treatment, and job discrimination also self-reported involvement in delinquency. However, habitation with a biological parent had a negative effect on self-reported delinquency. The Cox & Snell and Nagelkerke pseudo $R^2$ for the micro model predicting

delinquency explains between 8.8 and 12 percent of the likelihood in the variation the dependent variable will occur and the Cox & Snell and Nagelkerke pseudo $R^2$ for the macro model explains between 12.7 and 17.3 percent of the likelihood in the variation that the event will occur. This demonstrates the stronger significance of structural characteristics in predicting delinquency.

**Table 8. Logistic regression models predicting delinquency**

| | Model 1 | | Model 2 | | Model 3 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | b | SE | b | SE | b | SE |
| **Variables** | | | | | | |
| **Individual Characteristics** | | | | | | |
| Age | .062 | .058 | | | .075 | .061 |
| Gender | 1.202*** | .113 | | | 1.084*** | .118 |
| White **(reference group)** | | | | | | |
| Hispanics | .345* | .137 | | | .337* | .142 |
| Blacks | -.049 | .165 | | | -.510** | .179 |
| Other race | .358 | .312 | | | .275 | .330 |
| Biological parent | -.167** | .059 | | | -.129* | .062 |
| Stepparent | .025 | .055 | | | .047 | .057 |
| Parents' illegal drug use | .209*** | .057 | | | .167** | .060 |
| Parents' legal drug use | .083 | .057 | | | .036 | .059 |
| Welfare | .791* | .328 | | | .586 | .342 |
| Current income | -.038 | .119 | | | .015 | .124 |
| **Structural Characteristics** | | | | | | |
| **Neighborhood disorder** | | | .355*** | .057 | .331*** | .060 |
| **Discriminatory Treatment** | | | .320*** | .061 | .328*** | .063 |
| **Job Discrimination** | | | .284*** | .056 | .247*** | .059 |
| **Residential Discrimination** | | | -.074 | .059 | -.065 | .061 |
| **Difficult neighbors** | | | .003 | .159 | -.013 | .167 |
| | | | | | | |
| **Cox & Snell $R^2$** | .088 | | .127 | | .144 | |
| **Nagelkerke $R^2$** | .120 | | .173 | | .195 | |

† $p<.10$. *$p<.05$. **$p<.01$. ***$p<.001$

*Models Predicting Risky Sexual Behaviors*

Items assessing deviance were measured separately as risky sexual behavior and poor educational performance. The results for risky sexual behaviors are presented in table 9. The significant variables in the model predicting risky sexual behaviors encompass habitation with a step parent during their junior years (-.188), welfare (b=-.950) and neighborhood disorder (b=.118). The coefficient for neighborhood disorder is positive suggesting that respondents who indicated high levels of neighborhood disorder also self-reported high levels of risky sexual behaviors. However, habitation with a step parent and being a welfare recipient had a negative relationship with the outcome variable of risky sexual behaviors, suggesting that respondents who reported being a welfare recipient and lived with a step parent during their junior years were less likely to self-report risky sexual behaviors.

When the variables are measured in a combined model, all variables (i.e. habitation with a stepparent (b=.168), welfare (b=-.948), and neighborhood disorder (b=.125) remained significant with no significant variables emerging. The Cox & Snell and Nagelkerke pseudo $R^2$ for the micro model predicting risky sexual behaviors explains between 6.6 and 8.9 percent of the likelihood in the variation the dependent variable will occur and the Cox & Snell and Nagelkerke pseudo $R^2$ for the macro model explains between 5.8 and 7.8 percent of the likelihood in the variation that the event will occur. Thus, based on the logistic regression models, micro variables are stronger predictors of risky sexual behaviors.

## Table 9. Logistic regression models predicting risky sexual behavior

| Variables | Model 1 b | Model 1 SE | Model 2 b | Model 2 SE | Model 3 b | Model 3 SE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Individual Characteristics** | | | | | | |
| Age | -.100 | .060 | | | -.103 | .060 |
| Gender | .616*** | .113 | | | .618*** | .117 |
| White **(reference group)** | | | | | | |
| Hispanics | -.492*** | .142 | | | -.487*** | .143 |
| Blacks | .149 | .174 | | | .108 | .180 |
| Other race | .063 | .358 | | | .187 | .367 |
| Biological parent | -.060 | .063 | | | -.061 | .064 |
| Stepparent | -.188*** | .057 | | | -.168** | .057 |
| Parents' illegal drug use | .082 | .058 | | | .083 | .059 |
| Parents' legal drug use | -.061 | .061 | | | -.061 | .061 |
| Welfare | -.950** | .349 | | | -.948** | .352 |
| Current income | .024 | .125 | | | .028 | .125 |
| **Structural Characteristics** | | | | | | |
| **Neighborhood disorder** | | | .118* | .057 | .125* | .061 |
| **Discriminatory Treatment** | | | -.009 | .061 | .019 | .064 |
| **Job Discrimination** | | | -.046 | .056 | -.068 | .058 |
| **Residential Discrimination** | | | -.039 | .056 | -.035 | .058 |
| **Difficult neighbors** | | | -.058 | .156 | -.059 | .162 |
| | | | | | | |
| **Cox & Snell $R^2$** | .066 | | .058 | | .070 | |
| **Nagelkerke $R^2$** | .089 | | .078 | | .094 | |

† $p<.10$. *$p<.05$. **$p<.01$. ***$p<.001$

*Models Predicting Poor Educational Performance*

Table 10 shows the predictor variables that are significant for the outcome of poor educational performance. These include habitation with a biological parent (b=-.139), neighborhood disorder (b=.126), job discrimination (b=.186), and residential discrimination (b=.140). With the exception of habitation with a biological parent, the relationship between the predictors and outcome variables are positive, indicating that respondents who self-reported neighborhood disorder and job and residential discrimination also self-reported poor educational performance. However, individuals who reported habitation with a biological parent self-reported minimal or lower levels of poor educational achievement. In other words, respondents who lived with a biological parent are less likely to perform poorly in school.

When both individual and structural predictors were computed in a combined model, living with a biological parent (b=-.103) and neighborhood disorder (b=.116) were no longer significant. However, job (b=.196) and residential (b=.147) discrimination remained significant. This proposition buffers previous arguments made by Crutchfield, Masueda, & Drakulich (2006) that minority youths who are more likely to perform poorly in school are generally raised in environments that are racially segregated. Interestingly, it may be that these environmental conditions (i.e. racial discrimination and racial segregation) force youths out of school, resulting in weak academic attainment.

The Cox & Snell and Nagelkerke pseudo $R^2$ for the combined model suggests that macro variables are stronger predictors of poor educational performance. The macro model explains between 10.4 and 15.7 percent of the variation in the likelihood the dependent variable will occur, while the Cox & Snell and Nagelkerke pseudo $R^2$ for the micro model explains between 8.9 and 13.5 percent of the variation in the likelihood the dependent variable will occur.

## Table 10. Logistic regression models predicting poor educational performance

| Variables | Model 1 b | Model 1 SE | Model 2 b | Model 2 SE | Model 3 b | Model 3 SE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Individual Characteristics** | | | | | | |
| Age | .578*** | .064 | | | .578*** | .066 |
| Gender | .310* | .126 | | | .239 | .131 |
| White **(reference group)** | | | | | | |
| Hispanics | 1.030*** | .178 | | | 1.038*** | .182 |
| Blacks | .840*** | .205 | | | .686*** | .215 |
| Other race | .311 | .407 | | | .242 | .410 |
| Biological parent | -.139* | .064 | | | -.103 | .065 |
| Stepparent | .071 | .060 | | | .087 | .060 |
| Parents' illegal drug use | -.005 | .065 | | | -.032 | .066 |
| Parents' legal drug use | .047 | .064 | | | .016 | .065 |
| Welfare | .317 | .338 | | | .139 | .342 |
| Current income | -.211 | .135 | | | -.183 | .136 |
| **Structural Characteristics** | | | | | | |
| **Neighborhood disorder** | | | .126* | .060 | .116 | .064 |
| **Discriminatory Treatment** | | | .093 | .066 | .057 | .069 |
| **Job Discrimination** | | | .186** | .060 | .196** | .062 |
| **Residential Discrimination** | | | .140* | .057 | .147* | .059 |
| **Difficult neighbors** | | | -.031 | .174 | .007 | .181 |
| **Cox & Snell $R^2$** | .089 | | .104 | | .105 | |
| **Nagelkerke $R^2$** | .135 | | .157 | | .159 | |

† $p<.10$. *$p<.05$. **$p<.01$. ***$p<.001$

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

As stated earlier, adolescents' engagement in drug use, deviance, and serious forms of delinquency has been attributed to family structure, parental drug use, and structural conditions of the environment. The impact of these variables may engender a host of social and behavioral problems that suppress adolescents' success in various areas of life, such as school, home, and employment. Failure to perform in these areas may culminate in psychosis and anti-social acts that perpetuate an intergenerational cycle of drug use, deviance, and serious delinquency. The hypothesis predicted that adolescents who are raised in homes of drug dependent parents, have experienced a reconfiguration of family structure (i.e. step families) and live in a disorganized neighborhood, will self-report the aforementioned behaviors of drug use, deviance, and serious delinquency. Additionally, it is predicted that micro-level variables will have a stronger effect on engendering the outcome behaviors than macro level predictors. Based on the results of the study, the first hypothesis was confirmed. However, the second hypothesis was partially supported as structural characteristics were shown to have a greater predictive effect on serious forms of delinquency and deviance (i.e. poor educational attainment) than micro influences. Micro influences, on the other hand, were shown to have a stronger predictive effect on drug use and deviant measures of risky sexual behaviors.

In summarizing the results of the study for the twelve analytical models, tables 7-10 demonstrate that parents' legal drug use, discriminatory treatment, and job discrimination has a positive and significant relationship with self-reported drug use. When the variables were assessed in a combined model, job discrimination became non-significant.

Interestingly, these findings buffer the extant literature that teenagers' involvement in

58

drugs correspond with parents' drug use. Although the literature did not differentiate between legal and illicit drug use and whether differences in the status of the drug mattered for emulation of drug taking behavior, what is clear is that drug taking behaviors in the home may serve to arouse adolescents' interests and involvement in drugs (Nurco, Blatchley, Hanlon, & Grady, 1999; Stranger, Higgins, Bickel, Elk, Grabowski, Schmitz, Amass, Kirby, & Seracini, 1999; Keller, Catalano, Haggerty, & Fleming, 2002; Newcomb & Bentler, 1988). Nonetheless, based on the present study, it can be surmised that differences in the legal status of a drug are important for predicting particular outcome behaviors. For example, parents' legal drug use predicted respondents' self-reported drug use but not delinquency. Similarly, parents' illegal drug use predicted respondents' self-reported delinquency but not drug use. The correlation of parents' legal drug use with adolescents' self-reported personal drug use is understandable being that legal drugs, such as alcohol and tobacco are widely available at stores, making adolescents' drug taking behaviors more feasible. The ease in access to these drugs may explain their significant predictive effect on adolescents' drug use. In other words, drugs that are legal and available for purchase over the counter are more likely to be used by young persons.

Additionally, structural conditions of the environment are crucial predictors of adolescents' drug use as persons in neighborhoods marked by high levels of social disorder and poverty tend to experience high levels of discriminatory practices and treatment. It is assumed that these conditions produce criminogenic behaviors, encompassing drug use (Skogan, 1990). The mechanism through which discrimination leads to drug use remains ambiguous. However, one proposition may be that some other intervening variables, such as peer influence, may be involved. For example, it could be that adolescents raised in socially disorganized neighborhoods have encountered discrimination and that these individuals tend to associate with

drug using peers and the frequency of this association amplifies the risk of drug involvement.

Similarly, those who experienced job discrimination are often confined to the same neighborhoods with similar conditions and the availability of drugs in these neighborhoods as well as the association with other drug users lends itself to personal drug use. Thus, discrimination in and of itself, may have an indirect influence on the outcome behavior. Conditions of the home may be stronger predictors of drug use due to the frequency of contact amongst family members and relatives that use drugs in the home. The association with drug using family members increases the propensity for emulation of parents' drug taking behavior.

In regard to serious delinquency, the significant predictors encompass habitation with a biological parent, parents' illegal drug use, being a welfare recipient, neighborhood disorder, and experiencing job discrimination and discriminatory treatment. With the exception of habitation with a biological parent, all significant variables in the models had a positive association with serious delinquency. Additionally, when all the variables were computed in a combined model, only the welfare measure became non-significant. These findings are expected given that measures of discrimination, neighborhood disorder and parents' illegal drug use has been shown to correlate with adolescents' engagement in delinquency (Bauman & Dougherty, 1983; Keller, Catalano, Haggerty & Fleming, 2002; Simons & Burt, 2011; Skogan, 1990). The fact that parents' illegal drug use is a significant predictor of delinquency could largely mean that adolescents who witness their parents using illegal drugs are more likely to have fewer rules, supervision, and guidance that would circumvent engagement in anti-social acts and criminal behavior. The use of powder cocaine, marijuana, or crack cocaine by a parent figure may instill the notion that drug involvement is acceptable, and as such, adolescents may move beyond the personal use of drugs to the sale and distribution of  drugs—which in and of itself is a serious delinquent behavior.

60

Moreover, living with a biological parent has a negative effect on delinquency as it is expected that a parental figure would provide the resources, guidance, and structure needed to curb adolescents' engagement in anti-social behaviors. According to Hirschi (1969) attachments or bonds to others in society (i.e. parents and friends) help one internalize the norms of that society. It is believed that these bonds foster pro social behaviors and curb involvement in delinquency. Therefore, it is expected that adolescents who live with their biological parents are less likely to be involved in delinquency due to the bond between parent and child and the social expectations of that child's behavior would determine the child's pro social conduct. In regard to neighborhood disorder, neighborhoods that are disorganized in structure produce a sense of demoralization in persons and gives the impression that no one cares about the condition of the neighborhood, permitting lawless behavior to go unnoticed and often times unpunished. Because social disorder reduces the capacity of a community to exercise social control over its residents, delinquency and other criminal behaviors become common and acceptable standards of behavior (Skogan, 1990).

In regard to deviant measures of risky sexual behaviors, habitation with a stepparent and being a welfare recipient was negatively associated with engagement in risky sexual behaviors. However, neighborhood disorder was positively associated with the outcome variable. When the variables were measured in a combined model, all variables remained significant predictors of the outcome behavior. The present study's finding of the family structure variable is unexpected given the literature's exposition of the influence of family structure on adolescents' sexual behaviors. The literature suggests that a modification in family configurations through separation or divorce may create negative implications for adolescents' sexual behaviors. For example, living with a step parent may increase the initiation of early sexual activities, premarital coitus,

61

teenaged and unwed pregnancies, and the use of drugs and alcohol during intercourse (Weinstein & Thornton 1989, Capaldi, Crossby, & StoolMiller, 1996; Wu &Thomson, 2001; Bahr, Maughan, & Marcos, 1998). A single mother's habitation with a partner may have negative consequences for an adolescents' sexuality as the parent's engagement in coitus may subliminally suggest an acceptance of precocious sexual behaviors that would increase adolescents' engagement in early and risky sexual behaviors; therefore, the results of this study that suggest that living with a stepparent decrease risky sexual behaviors is quite an unexpected finding. Perhaps the gender of the step parent and the child matters. For example, single mother's engagement in non-marital relationships may have negative consequences for her daughter's sexual activities, but not for her son. Similarly, a single father's non-marital sexual relationship may serve to delay his daughter's sexual activities but increases his son's risky sexual activities. The scope of this study does not allow for verification of this assumption. Therefore, it is incumbent on future researchers to verify this postulation.

The direction of neighborhood disorder on the outcome variables is not surprising given that these conditions have been consistently linked to adolescents' engagement in deviance and that adolescents raised in disorganized neighborhoods are more likely to engage in crime and an array of deviant activities (i.e. Skogan, 1990; NCVS, 2005). Additionally, the relationship between the welfare predictor variable and self-reported risky sexual behavior is anticipated, given that welfare benefits serve to augment income or standard of living among the poorer class. In other words, individuals who receive assistance from the government in supporting their living conditions are probably less prone to engage in deviant behaviors (i.e. risky sexual activities) due to an increase in income that somehow serves to offer better living conditions, which in turn produces positive role models and better behaviors.

In regard to the last measure of deviance (i.e. poor educational performance), habitation with a biological parent, neighborhood disorder, job discrimination, and residential discrimination predicted poor educational attainment. All of the variables showed a positive direction with the outcome behavior with the exception of habitation with a biological parent. Nonetheless, consequent to the variables being measured in a combined model, habitation with a biological parent was no longer significant. This finding also implies that parental influence in adolescents' educational performance may become diminished or nullified when conditions of the environment are taken into account. This is an interesting finding given that the literature accentuates the impact of parents on their offspring's educational performance. For example, children of parents who are vested in their education tend to perform well in school and outperform their peers; conversely children whose parents neglect their education perform at mediocre levels (Fan & Chen, 2001). In fact the influence of the parent on the child's education can be so monumental to the extent that the parents' perception of their child's ability to perform in school may equate to the actual performance of that child (Frome & Eccles, 1998). Nonetheless, the present study's findings did not substantiate the empirical literature.

A possible explanation for the stronger impact of structural conditions over individual predictor variables in predicting poor educational performance is that individuals who experience job and residential discrimination may not see much value in educational pursuits in order to take their education seriously. Additionally, it could be that the educational systems in some communities are so poor that it no longer provides any motivation or incentive to succeed in school. Therefore, the consequences of discrimination at the structural level engenders residential segregation practices that results in poor school systems and blockage of resources. Furthermore, the lack of foreseeable fruitful employment prospects due to job discrimination and low

63

qualifications creates a nonchalant outlook toward school and related academia that diminishes one's aspirations for high academic attainment.

The fact that discrimination measures were significant predictors of almost all of the outcome variables is a cause for concern and warrants further consideration. It is important to further investigate the extent to which discrimination at both the individual and structural levels functions to engender drug use, serious delinquency, and deviance among youth. It should be noted that this variable is especially relevant for the outcome behaviors of minority youths as they are most likely to experience elements of discrimination and are also more likely to self-report involvement in anti-social acts.

It is vital to reiterate that when the predictor variables were assessed in a combined model, job discrimination was no longer significant for drug use, welfare was no longer significant for delinquency, and habitation with a biological parent was no longer significant for poor educational performance. A possible explanation of these findings could be that experiencing discriminatory treatment renders job discrimination redundant as both variables are measures of similar conditions. Or, it could be that some respondents were not employed at the time of the survey or have experienced marginal employment throughout their lives in order to adequately self-report job discrimination.

The non-significance of the welfare variable impact on delinquency assumes that individual poverty levels and/or low SES status per se, do not lead one onto a delinquent trajectory, but rather external social conditions of one's neighborhood (i.e. disorder and discrimination) are stronger factors that will cause youths to deviate. In other words, individuals' poverty status, in and of itself, does not predict delinquency when the broader ecological conditions are taken into account. Similarly, structural conditions are more influential in

determining academic success than parental influences. Direction for future research should include measurements of sibling and peer influence in the models to determine if these variables will also render parental influences non-significant; if parental influence becomes nullified when siblings and peer variables are taken into account, then the empirical literature has overemphasized the role of parents in shaping their children's behavior. Either way, the results of the study suggests that one's broader social environment plays a key role in determining individual's behavior, and as such, these conditions should be further investigated and promptly addressed.

*Implications*

The present study suggests that family therapy is a plausible implication to address deviant and delinquent behaviors stemming from the home environment. Family-based therapy is imperative as the present study and the extant literature demonstrate that drug-taking behaviors of the parent indirectly and directly impact adolescents' drug use. Examples of therapy that would be suited to address such dysfunctional behaviors include Functional Family Therapy. Functional Family therapy is a preventive and intervention family based program that provides support, counseling, and structure to families of at-risk and delinquent youths. It is multi-systemic in nature as it focuses on conditions of both the home and broader social environments. It is based on a clinical model supported by the empirical literature and is used widely in juvenile facilities as a means to help curb recidivism rates (Sexton & Alexander, 2000).

Therapy, based on this approach, will provide counseling sessions for child and the parent so that the parent can be made aware of the impact of his or her drug use on the subsequent drug-taking behaviors of the adolescent. For example, if parents recognize the influence of their

drug-taking behaviors on their children's drug use, then this will allow for a discussion of measures to eradicate parents' drug use. Additionally, therapy may also serve to simultaneously improve the relationship between parent and child. Moreover, drug courts can play a crucial role in providing mandatory drug counseling for the juvenile delinquent who has been referred into the court system. The drug court may serve a dual purpose whereby the court provides mandatory drug treatment to the adolescent and simultaneously sanctions delinquent behavior involving drug offenses, such as the sale and distribution of narcotics; this approach may aid in circumventing further use and sale of drugs.

Based on the present study, it is clear that social maladies in one's neighborhood are positively related to outcome behaviors of delinquency, risky sexual behaviors, and poor educational performance. Measures that can be taken to address neighborhood disorder include routine police patrol and neighborhood watch programs in disorganized communities riddled by high rates of crime. This measure should be taken with caution as minority communities generally have negative relationships with law enforcement officers. Therefore, routine police patrol is recommended at the minimal level and preferable with a combination of neighborhood patrol and watch groups. These measures would function to reduce the proliferation of youth gangs and respective illegal activities. Additionally, removing graffiti, demolishing old and unusable buildings, and constructing recreation and community centers would serve to reduce the presence of physical and social decay and foster collective efficacy and beautification of these disorganized communities.

Measures of discrimination, especially job discrimination, surfaced recurrently in a positive direction with outcome behaviors of delinquency, drug use, and poor educational performance. Even though it is understandable that to argue for a reconstruction of the structural

environment is improbable, feasible measures that can still be taken into account to address

criminogenic behaviors stemming from the environment includes the provision of better quality

schools in these communities with resources adequate to facilitate the academic success of

students. Moreover, ensuring that employers adhere to equal opportunity employment practices

is one means of curtailing discriminatory practices. Additionally, vocational training is

consequential in providing job experience and moral training to youths so that individuals can

be better equipped with the necessary qualifications to secure employment. Finally, programs

should be implemented to provide inner city families with access to a host of social services (i.e.

free childcare services, lunch programs in schools, generous welfare benefits, free parenting

classes, access to better and more affordable health care, among other services) that would serve

to ameliorate some of the adverse conditions and social pressures experienced by inner city

families. Due to the fact that these measures, if implemented adequately, would reduce some

of the financial burdens of inner city families, parents would be able to cater more

appropriately to the developmental needs of their children and to monitor and supervise their

children's activities. Social services in these communities are compulsory in order to connect

youths to pro social institutions (such as school, family, and community) that would buffer

engagement against serious delinquency, drug use, and deviance.

*Limitations and Conclusions*

The major limitation of this study is that I only employed one wave of the data from a two

wave longitudinal study. I employed this option due to identifiers being removed from the data

making it impossible to match responses from time one to time two. Because I employed one

wave of the survey data, I am unable to draw temporal inferences or identify measured

differences in the self-reported outcome behaviors that would provide a more comprehensive

understanding of the phenomenon. Another limitation of my study is the weak measure of educational performance. The item measuring educational performance asked respondents if they "ever failed a grade in high school". Even though failing a grade is indicative of poor academic success, it is not predictive of long term academic attainment. In other words, failing seventh grade, for example, indicates failure only in seventh grade but not eighth, ninth, or tenth grade. Therefore, a respondent may have failed a grade, but significantly improved his success in the latter grades. Because "ever failed a grade in high school" measure cannot be assumed to purport to overall poor academic performance, the study's finding for this measure should be taken with caution. Additionally, the results of this study cannot be generalized as the sample only employed youths/young adults from Miami Dade Public school. Moreover, the sample employed a high proportion of minority youths in comparison to white youths. Therefore, if a more diverse sample was used, it is expected that the outcome of the study would have been slightly different for the measured dependent variables, especially those variables assessing conditions of the environment and family structure as white youths are significantly less likely to be affected by disorganized neighborhood conditions and experience reconfiguration of their family structure than minority youths.

In summary, the goal of this research was to assess whether parental drug use, family structure, and environmental conditions impact adolescents' self-reported drug use, serious delinquency, and deviant behaviors. Based on the results of the study, parents' drug use impacts self-reported personal drug use and delinquency. However, whether the drug is legal or illegal has different consequences for the type of outcome behavior. Living with a biological parent reduces serious delinquency and living with a stepparent reduces risky sexual behaviors. Additionally, the conditions of one's environment play a chief role in predicting self-reported

drug use, deviance, and serious delinquency. It is clear that family structure is important in impacting some forms of deviant behaviors and drug use. Therefore, some sort of family therapy such as, Family Functional Therapy becomes a crucial conduit to address anti-social behaviors stemming from the home environment. Moreover, measures to address conditions of the neighborhood is warranted as macro influences have been shown to be stronger predictors of delinquency and poor educational performance than individual predictors, and as such, neighborhood watch programs (to detect and prevent criminal activities), building of recreational facilities in disorganized communities, and improving the school's systems are needed in order to reduce criminogenic influences that lead one onto a trajectory of criminality and deviance. Addressing these conditions is of immediate concern as it is only through an effort of contemporaneously addressing conditions of the home as well as the broader social environment that we will attain significant reductions in the aforementioned behaviors of drug use, deviance, and serious delinquency while improving relationships in these domains.

REFERENCES

Adler, P.T., & Loctecka, L. (1973). Drug use among high school students: Patterns and correlates. *The International Journal of the Addictions, 8* (3), 537-548.

Amey, C.H., Albrecht, S.L., & Miller, M.K. (1996). Racial differences in adolescent drug use: The impact of religion. *Substance Use and Misuse 31* (10), 1311-1332.

Anderson, E. (1999). *Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Bahr, S.J., Maughan, S.L., Marcos, A.C., & Li, B. (1998). Family, religiosity, and the risk of adolescent drug use. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 60* (4), 979-992.

Baum, K. (2005). *Juvenile victimization and offending, 1993-2003.* Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, National Crime Victimization Survey. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office

Bauman, P.S. Dougherty, F.E. (1983). Drug-addicted mothers' parenting and their children's development. *The International Journal of the Addictions, 18* (3), 291-302.

Bellair, P.E. (1997). Social interaction and community crime: Examining the importance of neighborhood networks. *Criminology, 35* (4), 677-703.

Bellair, P.E., McNulty, T.L. (2005). Beyond the bell curve: Community disadvantage and the explanation of black-white differences in adolescent violence. *Criminology, 43* (4), 1135-1168.

Booth, J.A., Farrell, A., & Varano, S.P. (2008). Social control, serious delinquency, and risky behavior: A gendered analysis. *Crime and Delinquency, 54* (3), 423-456.

Braithwaite, J. (1981). The myth of social class and criminality reconsidered. *American Sociological Review 46* (1), 36-57.

Burgess, E.W. (1923). *The* growth of the city: An introduction to a research project. In R. Park & E. Burgess (Eds.), *The city* (pp.47-62). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burgess, R.L., & Akers, R.L. (1966). A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. *Social Problems, 14*, 128-147.

Bursik, R.J., Jr. (1986). Ecological stability and the dynamics of delinquency. *Crime and Justice 8,* 35-66.

Bursik, R.J, Jr., & Grasmick, H.G. (1993). *Neighborhoods and crime: The dimensions of effective community control.* Lanham, MA: Lexington Books.

Braithwaite, J. (1981). The myth of social class and criminality reconsidered. *American Sociological Review, 46* (1), 36-57.

Cairns, R. B., Cairns, B.D., & Neckerman, H.J. (1989). Early school dropout: Configurations and determinants. *Child Development, 60* (6), 1437-1452.

Capaldi, D.M., Crosby, L., & Stoolmiller, M. (1996). Predicting the timing of first sexual Intercourse for at risk adolescent males. *Child Development, 67* (2), 344-359.

Cernkovich, S.A., & Giordano, P.C. (1987). Family relationships and delinquency. *Criminology, 25* (2), 295-319. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.1987.tb00799.x

Cherlin, A.J., Furstenberg, F.F, Jr., Chase-Lindsdale, D.L., Kiernan, K.E., Robins, P.K.,Morrison, D.R., & Teitler, J.O. (1991). Longitudinal studies of effects of divorce on children in Great Britain and the United States. *Science, 252* (5011), 1386-1389.

Chou, L., Ho, C., Chen, C., & Chen, W. (2006). *Addictive Behaviors 31*, 149-154.

Crane, J. (1991). Effects of neighborhoods on dropping out of school and teenage child bearing. In C. Jencks & P. Peterson (Eds.), *The urban underclass* (pp. 299-320). Washington: The Brookings Institution.

Cruchfield, R.D., Masueda, R.L., & Drakulich, K. (2006). *Race, labor markets, and neighborhood violence*. In R. Peterson, L. Krivo & J. Hagan (Eds.), The many colors of crime: Inequalities of race, ethnicity, and crime in America (pp.199-220). New York: New York University Press.

Denton, R.E., & Kampfe, C.M. (1994). The relationship between family variables and adolescent substance abuse: A literature review. *Adolescence, 29* (114), 475-494.

Elliot, D.S. (1966). School attendance and drop out. *Social Problems 13* (3), 307-314.

Entner Wright, B.R., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T.E., Miech, R.A., & Silva, P.A. (1999). Reconsidering the relationship between SES and delinquency: Causation but not correlation. *Criminology, 37* (1), 175-194. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.1999.tb00483.x

Fan, X., & Chen, M. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Education Psychology Review 13* (1), 1-22.

Flewelling, R.L, & Bauman, K.E. (1990). Family structure as a predictor of initial substance use  and sexual intercourse in early adolescence. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 52* (1), 171-181.

Frome, P.M., & Eccles, J.S. (1998). Parents' influence on children's achievement-related perceptions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74* (2), 435-452.

71

Gfroerer, J. (1987). Correlation between drug use by teenagers and drug use by older family members. *The American Journal of Drug Alcohol Abuse, 13* (1&2), 95-108.

Glasglow, K.L., Dornbusch, S.M., Troyer, L., Steinberg, L., & Ritter, P.L. (1997). Parenting styles, adolescents' attributions, and educational outcomes in nine heterogeneous high schools. *Child Development, 68 (3),* 507-529.

Grove, W.R., & Crutchfield, R.D. (1982). The family and juvenile delinquency. *The Sociological Quarterly, 23* (3), 301-319.

Gross, J., & McCaul, M.E. (1991). A comparison of drug use and adjustment in urban adolescent children of substance abusers. *The International Journal of the Addictions, 25* (4A), 495-511.

Hagan, J. (1993). The social embeddedness of crime and unemployment. *Criminology, 31* (4) 465-491. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.1993.tb01138.x

Hansen, A. (1985). Will the government mass media campaigns on drugs work? *British Medical Journal, 290* (6), 1054-1055

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

Hoffmann, J.P., & Cerbone, F.G. (1999). Stressful life events and delinquency escalation in early adolescence. *Criminology, 37* (2), 343-373.

Hoffmann, J.P., & Johnson, R.A. (1998). A national portrait of family structure and adolescent drug use. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 60* (3), 633-645.

Johnson, R.E. (1980). Social class and delinquent behavior: A new test. *Criminology, 18* (1), 86-93.

Johnson, R.E., Marcos, A.C., & Bahr, S.J. (1987). The role of peers in the complex etiology of adolescent drug use. *Criminology 25* (2) 323-340.

Johnston, L.D., O'Malley, P.M., Bachman, J.G. & Schulenberg, J.E. (2008). *Monitoring the future national results on adolescent drug use: Overview of key findings, 2008* (NIH Publication No.09-7401) Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse

Keller, T.E., Catalano, R.F., Haggerty, K.P., & Fleming, C.B. (2002). Parent figure transitions and delinquency and drug use among early adolescent children of substance abusers. *American Journal of Drug Alcohol Abuse, 28* (3), 399-427.

Krivo, L.J., & Peterson, R.D. (1996). Extremely disadvantaged neighborhoods and urban crime. *Social Forces, 75* (2), 619-650.

Lauritsen, J.L. (1993). Sibling resemblance in juvenile delinquency: Findings from the national youth survey. *Criminology 31* (3), 387-409.

Mertler, C.A., & Vannatta, R. (2002). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Miller, L., Davies, M., & Greenwald, S. (2000). Religiosity and substance use and abuse among adolescents in the national comorbidity survey. *American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 39* (9) 1190-1197.

Morenoff, J.D., Sampson, R.J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2001). Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology 39* (3), 517-559.

Mosher, C. (2001). Predicting drug arrest rates: Conflict and social disorganization perspectives. *Crime and Delinquency 47* (1), 84-104.

Mounts, N.S., & Steinberg, L. (1995). An ecological analysis of peer influence on adolescent grade point average and drug use. *Development Psychology 31* (6), 915- 922.

Musick, K., & Mare, R.D. (2006). Recent trends in the inheritance of poverty and family structure. *Social Science Research, 35* (4), 471-499. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2004.11.006

Needle, R., McCubbin, H., Wilson, M., Reineck, R., Lazar, A., & Mederer, H. (1986). Interpersonal influences in adolescent drug use— the role of older siblings, parents, and peers. *The International Journal of Addictions, 21* (7), 739-766.

Newcomb, M.D., Maddahian, E., Skager, R., & Bentler, P.M. (1987). Substance abuse and psychosocial risk factors among teenagers: association with sex, age, ethnicity, and type of school. *The American Journal of Drug Alcohol Abuse, 13* (4), 413-433.

Newcomb, M.D., & Bentler, P.M. (1988). The impact of family context, deviant attitudes, and emotional distress on adolescent drug use: Longitudinal latent-variable analyses of mothers and their children. *Journal of Research in Personality 22*, 154-176.

Nurco, D.N., Blatchley, R.J., Hanlon, T.E., & O'Grady, K.E. (1999). Early deviance and related risk factors in the children of narcotic addicts. *American Journal of Drug Alcohol Abuse, 25* (1), 25-45

Nye, F.I., Short, J.F., & Olson, V.J. (1958). Socioeconomic status and delinquent behavior. *American Journal of Sociology 63* (4), 381-389.

Patchin, J.W., Huebner, B.M., McCluskey, J.D., Varano, S.P., & Bynum, T.S. (2006). Exposure to community violence and childhood delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency 52* (2), 307-331.

Patterson, E.B. (1991). Poverty, income inequality, and community crime rates. *Criminology, 29*(4) 755-775.

Rumberger, R.W. (1983). Dropping out of high school: The influence of race, sex, and family background. *American Educational Research Journal, 20* (2), 199-220. doi: 10.3102/00028312020002199

Shaw, C.R., & McKay, H.D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas* (1st ed). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sexton, T.L., & Alexander, J.F. (2000). *Functional Family therapy*. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Simcha-Fagan, O., & Schwartz, J.E. (1986). Neighborhood and delinquency: An assessment of contextual effects. *Criminology, 24* (4), 667-702. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.1986.tb01507.x

Simons, R.L., & Burt, C.H. (2011). Learning to be bad: Adverse social conditions, social schemas, and crime. *Criminology 49* (2), 553-598.

Slocum, L., Taylor, T.J., Brick, B.T., & Esbensen, F. (2010). Neighborhood structural characteristics, individual-level attitudes, and youths' crime reporting intentions. *Criminology, 48* (4), 1063-1100.

Stanger, C., Higgins, S.T., Bickel, W.K., Elk, R., Grabowski, J., Schmitz, J., Amass, L., Kirby,K.C., & Seracini, A.M. (1999). Behavioral and emotional problems among children of cocaine and opiate-dependent parents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescence Psychiatry, 38* (4), 421-428.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S.D., Dornbusch, S.M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development, 63*, 1266-1281.

Stewart, E.A., Simons, R.L., & Conger, R.D. (2002). Assessing neighborhood and social psychological influences on childhood violence in an African American sample. *Criminology 40* (4), 801-829.

Swaim, R.C., Beauvais, F., Chavez, E.L., & Oetting, E. R. (1997). The effect of school dropout rates on estimates of adolescent substance use among three racial/ethnic groups. *American Journal of Public Health, 87*(1), 51-55.

Sutherland, E. (1947). *Principles in criminology* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Rowe Publishers, Incorporation.

Thornton, A., & Camburn, D. (1989). Religious participation and adolescent sexual behavior and attitudes. *Journal of Marriage and Family 51* (3), 641-653.

Tonry, M. (1995). Race and the war on drugs. In M. Tonry (Ed,). *Malign neglect—Race, Crime, and punishment in America*. (pp. 81-116). New York: Oxford University Press, Inc,

US Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States. (2012*). Income, expenditures, poverty and wealth: Family income* (131st Edition). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Willie, C.V. (1967). The relative contribution of family status and economic status to juvenile delinquency. *Social Problems, 14* (3), 326-335.

Wilkinson, K., Stitt, B.G., & Erickson, M.L. (1982). Siblings and delinquent behavior: An exploratory study of a neglected family variable. *Criminology 20* (2), 223-239.

Weinstein, M., & Thornton, A. (1989). Mother-child relations and adolescent sexual attitudes and behavior. *Demography, 26* (4), 563-577.

Wu, L.L., & Thomson, E. (2001). Race differences in family experience and early sexual initiation: Dynamic models of family structure and family change. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63* (3), 682-696.

Windle, M. (1990). A longitudinal study of antisocial behaviors in early adolescence as predictors of late adolescent substance use: Gender and ethnic group differences. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 99* (1), 86-91.

Winship, C. 91992). Race, poverty, and the American occupational structure [Review of the book: *The American occupational structure*] *Contemporary Sociology, 21* (5), 639-643. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/2075545.

VITA

Asheka Jackson was born in Saint Catherine, Jamaica on January 30th, 1989. She was raised by her father, Joseph Samuel Jackson during most of her childhood years. After high school, she migrated to the United States of America where she studied Criminal Justice and Criminology at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. After graduating with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Criminal Justice and Criminology, she pursued her Masters' of Science degree in the same field at the aforesaid university.

She works as a Graduate Teaching Assistant in the Criminal Justice Department where she assists students with their respective CJC courses. Outside of academia, Asheka volunteers her time at the Adhoc Group Against Crime agency and other non-profit organizations in Kansas City, Missouri. She plans to pursue a PhD in Criminology at Simon Fraser University.