

5-2011

Shifting parenting styles and the effect on juvenile delinquency.

Thomas J. Mowen
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.louisville.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Mowen, Thomas J., "Shifting parenting styles and the effect on juvenile delinquency." (2011). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1017.
<https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/1017>

This Master's Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

**SHIFTING PARENTING STYLES AND THE EFFECT ON JUVENILE
DELINQUENCY**

By

**Thomas J. Mowen
B.S., University of Louisville, 2010**

**A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of Louisville
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of**

Master of Arts

**College of Arts and Sciences
Department of Sociology
University of Louisville
Louisville, Kentucky**

May 2011

Copyright 2010 by Thomas J. Mowen

All rights reserved

SHIFTING PARENTING STYLES AND THE EFFECT ON JUVENILE
DELINQUENCY

By

Thomas J. Mowen

A Thesis Approved on

January 26, 2011

by the following Thesis Committee:

Thesis Director

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my wife, Christine Mowen,
my parents, Dr. Gregg Mowen and Dr. Carol Mowen, and
Dr. Clarence R. Talley, whose spirit continues to inspire.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my Thesis Chair, Dr. Ryan Schroeder, for his invaluable guidance and support. Dr. Schroeder has been the most supportive mentor and friend a person could want. I would also like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. George Higgins and Dr. D. Mark Austin for their assistance and supervision over this research project. I must also acknowledge Dr. Clarence Talley, a man who inspired and helped me find my passion in research, and also Dr. Jon H. Rieger, for his unwavering support, commitment, and mentorship. I would also like to thank my wife for her support and love.

ABSTRACT

SHIFTING PARENTING STYLES AND THE EFFECT ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Thomas J. Mowen

January 26, 2011

The importance of parenting styles on childhood development and early adolescent social and behavioral outcomes has been well documented within academic literature (Schaffer et al., 2009; Brand et al., 2009; Claes et al., 2005; Sirvanli-Ozen, 2005; Darling & Steinberg 1993; Lamborn et al., 1991) and the effects of parenting styles on juvenile delinquency have also been well researched (Hoeve, 2007; Pires & Jenkins, 2007; Claes et al., 2005; Duncan et al., 1998; Kandel, 1996; Simons & Robertson, 1989). While there have been a number of studies which show parenting practices evolve with the age of the child (Dix et al., 1986; Feldman et al., 1989; Smaller & Youniss, 1989), and parenting practices can change due to the effects of circumstances such as discrimination (Brody et al., 2008) and divorce (Simons et al., 1993), the literature on adolescent behavior and parenting styles has overlooked the impact of shifting parenting styles on delinquency. Using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, the current research examines 1) the extent and nature of parenting style changes during adolescence, and 2) the influence of such parenting style shifts on juvenile delinquency. Results indicate that shifts from authoritative to uninvolved or permissive parenting correlate with an increase in juvenile delinquency. Correspondingly, a shift from

uninvolved parenting to authoritative parenting is shown to correlate with a decrease in juvenile delinquency. A shift from permissive to authoritative parenting also corresponded with an increase in juvenile delinquency between waves. The contextual factors of parenting style shifts and the correlation with juvenile delinquency are assessed and discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Parenting Styles.....	1
II. PARENTING AND DELINQUENCY.....	7
Research History and Social Control.....	7
Direct Effects of Parenting and Attachment on Deviant Behavior.....	10
Intermediate Influences and the Impact of Parenting Styles on Delinquency.....	13
III. SHIFTING PARENTING STYLES.....	20
The Current Study.....	23
IV. METHODS.....	25
Data.....	25
Method of Analysis.....	31
V. ANALYSIS.....	34
Wave One Parenting and Wave One Delinquency.....	34
Wave One Parenting and Wave Three Delinquency.....	37
Wave One Parenting and Change in Delinquency.....	38

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Parenting styles have been a popular subject of inquiry for social scientists for the past half century (Parker & Benson, 2004), and research has consistently found that the family is among the most important agent of socialization for children and adolescents (Maccoby, 1992; Henricson & Roker, 2000; Brand et al., 2009; Schaffer et al., 2009). For most, parents serve a pivotal role in the process of socialization (Maccoby, 1992; Paulson & Sputa, 1996). Research has found that the parenting style is the primary avenue through which the child becomes acclimated to social life and interaction (Vandeleur et al., 2007). Parenting style has been defined as “the parents’ perceivable attitudes towards the child” (Darling & Stienberg, 1992:489). Through these attitudes, an emotional environment is created in which the parents’ expectations and behaviors to the child are expressed, and the child, in turn, interprets these behaviors and expectations. This interpretation creates the emotional environment through which all familial interaction occurs (Vandeleur et al., 2007). Parenting style, therefore, becomes the mediator for this emotional family environment (Darling and Steinberg, 1993).

Parenting Styles

Academic research has traditionally relied upon two variables when classifying parenting styles; those of parental demandingness (or control) and parental

responsiveness (or warmth) (Baumrind, 1966; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Paulson & Sputa, 1996; Schaffer et al., 2009). Demandingness refers to the boundaries and rules a parent places upon a child in order to integrate them into society (Baumrind, 1966). Demandingness also refers to the level of parental supervision over the child and direct confrontation between child and parent (Baumrind, 2005). Responsiveness refers to the amount the parent supports the child with warmth, consistency, reason, and rationale. Responsiveness also refers to the extent to which the child is allowed to grow individually by self-assertion (Baumrind, 2005). These two variables, originally employed by Baumrind (1966), have been used to identify the primary categories of parenting style by most researchers (Paulson & Sputa, 1996; Baumrind, 2005). At the time of Baumrind's (1966) initial study, three major parenting styles were categorized: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. Later, a fourth parenting style (indifferent/uninvolved) was added (Baumrind 1971).

Authoritative parenting is characterized by high demandingness and high responsiveness, while authoritarian parenting is characterized by high demandingness and low responsiveness. Permissive parenting is characterized by low demandingness and high responsiveness, while indifferent parenting is characterized by low demandingness and low responsiveness (Paulson & Sputa, 1996). A more in-depth analysis of these parenting styles is needed in order to explore the effects of each on juvenile behaviors.

Authoritarian Parenting

Authoritarian parenting is exemplified by total control of the child by the adult (Baumrind, 1966). Parents who are authoritative in their behaviors generally hold their

child to an absolute standard of behavior. This standard generally conforms to a higher authority, such as a religious standard or belief (Baumrind, 1966). Authoritarian parenting is also typified by punitive and forceful enforcement measures. This type of parenting style does not allow the child to exhibit much autonomy, nor is the child generally allowed to question parental rule and direction. Rules are viewed as concrete and parental authority is absolute.

Authoritarian parenting has been found to correlate with lower levels of self confidence and a lower ability to employ effective coping mechanisms among adolescents (Nijhof & Engels, 2007). Research has also found a correlation between the restrictive and hostile characteristics of authoritarian parenting and high levels of adolescent anxiety because the child often externalizes his/her problems (Nijhof & Engels, 2007). The restrictive nature of authoritarian parenting does not allow the child or adolescent to properly explore his/her own social interactions, which may result in higher levels of dependence on parental direction. This has been shown to inhibit the development of self confidence in the adolescent (Schaffer, 2000). Research has also found that children from authoritarian parents tend to have higher rates of some types of delinquency including vandalism (Duncan et al., 1998) and drug use (Pires & Jenkins, 2007). A negative parent-child relationship associated with high levels of parental restriction and demandingness, and low levels of responsiveness and support may increase the probability that a child will engage in deviant behavior (Wills et al., 1996). The high demandingness and low responsiveness of authoritarian parenting is in contrast to authoritative parenting.

Authoritative Parenting

Authoritative parenting style is characterized by rational discussion and reasoning. Baumrind (1966) describes the authoritative parent as one who, "...encourages verbal give and take, shares with the child the reasoning behind her policy..." (p. 891). The authoritative parenting style has also been described as autonomy-granting for the child because the child is able to object to the imposition of the parent. Because of this, the child can explore conformity on their own terms. The imposition of rule from the parent to the child occurs only when the child deviates from acceptable behavior. This results in the acknowledgement of the child's present self but also provides guidelines for future conduct and interaction. Therefore, authoritative parenting is rational, consistent, and warm.

Research has consistently found that authoritative parenting generally allows a child to develop into a healthy individual, both socially and psychologically (Nijhof & Engels, 2007). Research has also found that children from parents who are authoritative in their parenting style generally develop high levels of self-esteem, self reliance, and are able to employ effective coping strategies (Shaffer, 2000), and develop a positive image of self (Parker & Benson, 2004). A plethora of research has also concluded that authoritative parenting results in higher levels of academic achievement, and higher levels of maturity among adolescences (Paulson & Sputa, 1996; Mayseless et al., 2003). Research has also found that high levels of parental monitoring are associated with lower instances of some delinquent behavior, including involvement in peer groups (Simmons et al., 2001; Brown et al., 1993), alcohol abuse (Ary et al., 1999), and illicit drug use (Peterson et al., 1994).

Permissive Parenting

Permissive parenting is characterized by a lack of adult control over the child. Permissive parents allow a child or adolescent to self-regulate without concern for the effects of their actions (Baumrind, 1966). A parent who employs a permissive style works more as a counselor or advisor than as a figure of authority. A child may look to upon the parent as a resource, but not as an enforcer. This also transitions into other areas of life because a permissive parent does not appeal to the child to confirm to external standards (Baumrind, 1966). Studies have found that a lack of parental control may contribute to adolescent involvement in deviant peer groups and delinquency including vandalism and other deviant peer group activity (Ary et al., 1999).

Uninvolved Parenting

Uninvolved parenting is typified by low levels of control and low levels of warmth (Baumrind, 1966). An indifferent parent is not involved emotionally with the child beyond providing for basic needs and resources. This type of style is also characterized by a lack of control (Paulson & Sputa, 1996). Studies have found that children who perceive their parents as permissive and with low levels of support, are more likely to engage in illicit drug use (Wills et al., 1996) and alcohol abuse (Barnes et al. 1992).

A key difference between indifferent and permissive parenting is that the permissive parent is characterized by high levels of warmth (Paulson & Sputa, 1996). While neither type of parenting style is typified by the enforcement of rules, a permissive

parent may explain why there are rules (for the adolescents' safety or wellbeing) thus showing a certain level of warmth. Conversely, an indifferent parent will typically not outline rules (Baumrind, 1966).

Studies have shown both permissive and indifferent parenting styles to be correlated with negative psychological emotions in adolescents and children (Thurber & Sigman, 1998; Nijhof & Engels, 2007). Furthermore, children with permissive and indifferent parents are more likely to experience symptoms of depression than children whose parents are authoritative or authoritarian (Nijhof & Engels, 2007). Similarly, it has also been found that children whose parents are uninvolved often exhibit low signs of independence (Shaffer, 2000).

While differences in parenting behavior toward children had been documented previously (see also Sears et al., 1953; Spock, 1946), with the development of categorical positions of parenting style, stark differences in the development and behaviors of children whose parents exhibited characteristics of each parenting style began to be documented. The effects of different parenting styles on children outlined previously have been vastly observed. In a similar vein, the effects of parenting styles on juvenile delinquency have also been explored extensively within the criminological literature.

CHAPTER II

PARENTING AND DELIQUENCY

Research History and Social Control

A long history of research traces the importance of parenting on juvenile social and psychological development and delinquency (Glueck & Glueck 1950; McCord et al., 1961; Baumrind, 1996). Early studies of parenting and its effects on children and adolescents ultimately culminated in the criminological book *Causes of Delinquency*, (1969) by Travis Hirschi. Hirschi (1969) outlined the importance of social control theory and concluded that children with strong attachment to their parents, among other factors, were less likely to commit crime than children who lacked attachment to their parents. Hirschi argued that parents serve as the most important source of social control for children. An overview of social control theory will outline its applicability to juvenile delinquency and the important role parental attachment serves.

The most basic assumption of social control theory is that everyone is inclined to engage in deviant behavior (Hirschi, 1969). However, social control theory asserts that individuals choose not to be deviant because doing so would cause damage to their relationship with others (Hirschi, 1969). Social bonds shared with parents, friends and employers, for example, keep individuals invested with the rules of society and deter individuals from engaging in criminal behavior and delinquency. Conversely, an

individual with weak social bonds can more easily commit crime as they are not invested within the expectations and values of society. Hirschi outlined four important characteristics of social bonds: commitment, involvement, belief and attachment.

Commitment refers to the time and effort put forth into conventional activities, like pursuing an education, and valuing future goals. For example, after years of schooling, one may desire to receive a high paying job. To engage in criminal behavior would jeopardize this position. The hard work and commitment required to attain this position would deter an individual from engaging in illegal activity because a stake in conformity has been developed that requires commitment to conventional norms. For Hirschi, another important element of social bonds is *involvement*. Involvement is an important aspect of social control because engagement with conventional activities simply does not allow for idleness, which could lead to illegal activity and deviance. Spending time with parents, with peers or even reading a book serves as a buffer against the draw of criminality.

Belief is another component of Hirschi's theory of social control. Hirschi outlined that individuals within social groups shared common ideas on morality, values, and norms. This creates a mutual respect among all members for obeying the law. Individuals sharing common beliefs are more likely to feel kinship with one another, and are less likely to engage in activity that may violate that relationship. Belief in the legitimacy of society's rules serves as a deterrence to deviance. Through social bonds, an individual develops the belief that deviant behavior is morally wrong.

Of the four components of social control, Hirschi found that *attachment* is the most important. For Hirschi, attachment to conventional others, such as parents, serves

an important role in social control. Through attachment, one develops a moral cohesion to others which emphasizes the importance of positive reactions of those conventional others. More specifically, however, Hirschi believed parental attachment serves as the most important form of social control for children and adolescents. Hirschi (1969) observed that the development of respect for authority could not occur when a child lacked attachment to his/her parents. Without this basic necessity for social life, adolescents become unable to develop into healthy, law abiding citizens. Successful investment in society begins with the positive attachment to parents. For Hirschi, a lack of parent-child attachment results in higher levels of juvenile delinquent behavior.

Supporting Hirschi's hypothesis, research has found that delinquent youths exhibit lower levels of attachment to their parents (Hirschi, 1969; Stattin & Kerr, 2000). Research has also shown that a negative relationship between parent and child, as characterized by high levels of stress and hostility, create an environment where parent-child attachment is unlikely (Heaven, Newbury & Mak, 2004). It is possible that a shift from a positive parenting style to a negative parenting style may result in weakened social control due to lower levels of parent-child attachment. This may correlate with, or contribute to, an increase in juvenile delinquency and can be viewed through the framework of social control theory.

According to the social control theory, an individual can commit deviant acts when ties to conventional order have been broken (Wesley et al., 2009). When a youth lacks attachment with their parent, they risk being exposed to "criminogenic influences" (Hirschi, 1969: 85). Of the four primary parenting styles, authoritative parenting has been shown to create high levels of positive parent-child attachment, due to the high

levels of parental warmth and control, more than other types of parenting styles (Mason et al., 1996; Walker-Barnes & Mason, 2004). This creation of high levels of parent-child attachment results in high levels of social control (Agnew, 1993). When viewed through the social control theory, authoritative parenting, of the four primary categories of parenting, is the most effective form of social control because of the strong bonds created between parent and child. Conversely, authoritarian and indifferent parenting, which often exhibit parental rejection, have been shown to decrease parental attachment and increase the probability of adolescent involvement with deviant peer groups (Simons & Robertson, 1989). Similarly, a lack of control by the parent over the child, as characterized by permissive parenting, has been shown to correlate highly with delinquent behavior (Kandal, 1996).

Direct Effects of Parenting and Attachment on Deviant Behavior

A number of studies have identified particular parenting styles as risk factors for antisocial behavior in children and adolescences due to the lack of attachment developed between child and parent. Barnow et al. (2005) observed that low parental warmth, inconsistency and parental rejection can lead to antisocial behavior. Similarly, research has consistently found permissive parenting can also lead to antisocial behavior due to a lack of parental attention, boundaries, rules and enforcement (Beck & Shaw, 2005; Hawkins et al., 2000). Poor parental discipline, inadequate monitoring and parental inability to successfully problem solve have been found to correlate highly with adolescent antisocial and delinquent behavior (Kandel, 1996). Supporting this, Schaffer et al. (2009) found that indifferent parenting styles inhibit the development of empathy

within adolescents and therefore contribute to antisocial behavior. These findings support the notion that parental attachment, as mediated by parenting style, has important implications for the social and behavioral development of adolescents due to the effects of inadequate parenting behavior which fails to contribute to the development of parent-child bonds (Simons & Robertson, 1989).

Parental relationships which exhibit environments of hostility and conflict can put adolescence at an increased risk of deviance including vandalism and drug use (Pires & Jenkins, 2007; Duncan et al., 1998). Pires and Jenkins (2007) found that parenting styles and the quality of the parent-child relationship have a mediating effect on adolescent drug use. In their study, the researchers observed that drug users had significantly lower levels of satisfaction in the relationship with their parents than did adolescents who did not use drugs. Furthermore, a negative parent-child relationship and lack of attachment was also highly correlated with adolescent antisocial behavior (Pires & Jenkins, 2007). Along these lines, Wills et al. (1996) observed that children and adolescents who believed they had little support from their parents were especially vulnerable to use illicit drugs. Again, in both Wills et al. (1996) and Pires and Jenkins (2007), the adolescents who engaged in deviant behavior reported high levels of hostility and low levels of support from their parents. These findings further outline the importance of positive adult-child attachment.

In a sample of 699 adolescents and their families, Barnes et al. (1992) found that there existed a positive linear relationship between adolescents' rejection of drugs and alcohol and perceived parenting warmth and support. Additionally, the research revealed that both maternal and paternal support was negatively correlated with drinking, drug use, deviance and school misconduct. Adolescents perceiving higher levels of support were

much less likely to engage in these problematic behaviors. Interestingly enough, this correlation was found even in single parent households. The authors suggest that family structure may not play as important of a role as parenting style (Barnes et al, 1992). In looking at control, coercive parental control was shown to positively correlate with adolescent deviance and school misconduct. Additionally, the researchers found that adolescents who perceived that their parents set rules had significantly lower levels of deviant outcomes, and parental monitoring was the best predictor for low levels of all juvenile delinquent measures (Barnes et al., 1992).

In a similar conclusion, Vazsonyi and Klanjsek (2008) found that maternal and paternal closeness and support characteristics were key components in the successful process of positive socialization for children in their research. In fact, the researchers found that low levels of closeness (emotional attachment) served as a better predictor for delinquency than did other variables including monitoring and control. These findings support the notion that parental attachment serves to invest children into the conventional norms of society while serving to discourage juvenile delinquency and that attachment may be more important than control.

External factors and drug abuse problems have been shown to affect parenting quality and parenting style. Drug addicts, on average, spend less time with their child and tend to engage in poor parenting practices (Bauman & Levine, 1986). Social control theory, however, asserts that even attachment to a drug-using parent will serve to inhibit the child in engaging in deviant behavior. There is evidence to support this. Gainey et al. (2010) conducted research on children whose parents where heroin users. The researchers observed that older children with low levels of maternal attachment had

significantly higher levels of illegal drug use than those children who had high levels of maternal attachment. Higher levels of maternal attachment also served to mediate the affect of peer influence. Maternal attachment served as a buffer against involvement with deviant peers. Children who maintained a relationship with their mothers were much less likely to become involved in delinquent activities. Gainey et al. (2010) concluded that maternal attachment may serve as a protective factor against delinquency, even if the parent is a substance abuser.

Intermediate Influences and the Impact of Parenting Styles on Delinquency

According to the social control theory, when bonds and attachment with parents are weak, adolescents are at a higher risk for delinquent and antisocial behavior. To outline the importance of parenting as a form of social control, an exploration of deviant peer groups can be observed.

Walker-Barnes and Mason (2004) examined parental attachment and delinquency of gang members. The researchers investigated the level of parental attachment and parental control with levels of minor delinquency (skipping school, fighting, stealing items worth less than 50 dollars, and vandalism), substance use (marijuana and alcohol), and major delinquency (carrying a weapon, using a weapon in a fight, and stealing an item worth more than 50 dollars). The researchers found that high levels of parental control correlated with lower levels of both minor and major delinquency and substance use. Further outlining the importance of supportive parenting (in this case, high levels of behavioral control and parental warmth), parental attachment was found to reduce the impact of gang influence on the adolescent.

Positive parenting practices, namely parental support and warmth, can foster parent-child attachment and serve to mitigate the influence of even extreme forms of deviant peer groups (Mason et al., 1996; Walker-Barnes & Mason, 2004). Many additional studies have also shown that adolescents who have developed strong bonds and attachment with their parents are less likely to develop associations with deviant peers and engaged in delinquency (Agnew, 1993; Sankey & Huon, 1999). Simply put, the more involved the parent is in the life of the child, and the more attached the child is to the parent, the less likely the child is to engage in deviant behavior and be influenced by gangs (Walker-Barnes & Mason, 2004).

The role of peers on juvenile delinquency is an area in which social control theory can address, if not as the main point of the theory. As outlined by the social control theory, the development of respect for authority cannot occur when a child lacks attachment to their parents. In these cases, peers can serve to influence the behaviors of the child. Indeed, the criminological literature is full of research which concludes that both parents *and* peers are important influences in the use of drugs, both legal and illegal, by adolescents (Bauman et al., 1990). Researchers have also found that while parents and peers both influence adolescents, they do so in very different ways (Kandel, 1996). Parents serve as role models and influence adolescents by setting normative standards. Peers, on the other hand, influence adolescents through reciprocal role modeling. In this role, peers serve to shape normative standards which could be favorable to drug use.

The relationship between the influence of peers and the influence of parents is a highly intricate and contextual one. For instance, Simons et al. (1994) find that parents are more influential in the early stages of life, and that peers become increasingly

influential as the child moves into late adolescents; however, some research concludes that children moving into adolescence with high levels of parental supervision will be more likely to disassociate with deviant peer networks (Vitaro et al., 2005). What most research does find is that both parents and peers are of utmost importance in the process of socialization and likelihood of deviant acts in children and adolescents (Kandel, 1996), and that successful parental attachment is an important component for predicting criminogenic tendencies in children (Walker-Barnes & Mason 2004; Ary et al., 1999). [Emerging literature also finds that strong parental ties may serve as a buffer against crime in adult children (Schroeder et al., 2010).]

In a recent study on delinquent patterns of 13 year old students, Fergusson et al. (2007) observed that an increase in the delinquency of friends and peer networks in general was highly correlated with an increase in self-reported delinquency. When investigating potential mediators on delinquent behavior, Fergusson et al. (2007) observed that a negative family background and limited academic achievement increased the association with delinquent peers, whereas good academic achievement and a positive family background served to minimize self-reported delinquency. The research findings of Fergusson et al. (2007) mirror those of Burton et al. (1995), who concluded that adolescents with strong attachment to their parents were less likely to engage in deviant behavior, and less likely to associate with deviant peers. Other findings also show that positive family management practices are an important factor in reducing juvenile delinquency. Positive management has been shown to mitigate the use of illegal drugs, even in the presence of peers who use drugs (Peterson et al., 1994).

The role of parenting style and deviant peer networks has also been explored. A recent study by Bahr and Hoffman (2010) on 4,983 adolescents found that adolescents from parents who were authoritative were less likely to drink heavily than adolescents from parents who were authoritarian, indifferent or permissive. Furthermore, adolescents who had parents who were authoritative were also less likely to associate with peers who drank heavily. Bahr and Hoffman (2010) concluded that authoritative parents who express above-normal levels of support and monitoring may deter adolescents from alcohol use regardless of peer influence. Additionally, authoritative parenting may serve to moderate the child's choice of peer association.

Research has also found that authoritative parents tend to proactively manage their child's friends and peer networks (Simmons et al., 2001). Brown et al. (1993) found that authoritative parents generally encourage their child to join only certain peer groups. Other research has also found that authoritative parents also choose which school their child attends, and push their child to pursue extracurricular conventional activities such as sports or academic clubs (Ladd, Profilet & Hart, 1992). These types of strategies have been shown to mitigate the effects of deviant peers, and have also been shown to reduce the involvement with deviant peer networks because the probability of interaction with deviant peers drops dramatically (Simmons et al., 2001).

As one might expect, poor parenting styles may increase the chances of the child associating with deviant peer groups. Supporting this, Ary et al. (1999) found that lower levels of parental monitoring, and higher association with deviant peers served to predict engagement in delinquent behaviors. Other bodies of research have concluded that high levels of parental monitoring are associated with lower levels of delinquency (Pettit et al.,

2001). In a longitudinal study, Pettit et al. (2001) found that high levels of parental monitoring correspond to lower levels of juvenile delinquency, even in children who had previously reported high levels of delinquency. This finding highlights the importance of consistent parental monitoring and that the benefits of parental monitoring may be applicable even to delinquent children. Ineffective parenting styles may increase the probability of engagement in deviant peer networks.

Simons and Robertson (1989) found that parental rejection (which does not allow a healthy parent-child attachment to develop) increases the probability of adolescent involvement with deviant peer groups. Parental rejection was also found to correlate with the use of drugs and alcohol due, in part, to the influence of deviant peer networks. The researchers also found that parental rejection correlates with adolescent aggressive behavior. Interestingly, aggressive behavior served also as a predictor for involvement with deviant peer groups. Simons and Robertson (1989) observe that children suffering from parental rejection tend to be noncompliant and tend to associate with others who are also noncompliant. Along this line of thought, ineffective parenting styles can lead to aggressive behavior in adolescents which, in turn, can lead to rejection by nonaggressive peers. Consequently, aggressive youths then form friendships with other deviant youths (Simons & Robertson, 1989).

Alternative hypotheses have been suggested for this interaction which suggest that parental rejection is actually a result of adolescent aggression, but this alternative explanation is not widely supported (Simons & Robertson, 1989). While there is some research that finds that difficult children are not nurtured in as positive a manner as children who are not perceived as difficult (Bates, 1980), research overwhelmingly finds

parental rejection influences social and psychological adolescent development, and not the other way around (Simons & Robertson, 1989; Schaffer et al., 2009). Furthermore Simons et al. (1989) found that there is a highly causal flow from parental rejection to delinquent behavior, and that it is very unlikely that adolescent depression is causally related to parental rejection. Therefore, parental rejection is generally seen to correlate, if not necessarily lead to, involvement with deviant peers (Simons & Robertson, 1989).

The finding that parents are important buffers against deviant peer networks is also a conclusion that is consistent across different ethnicities in the United States. Baer (1999) found that maternal parental monitoring and strong parent-child attachment decreased the likelihood of juvenile delinquency across various ethnic groups (African-American, Euro-American and Mexican-American). Some research does find differences in the overall importance of parental involvement with ethnic minority groups. For instance, Bowman et al. (2006) found that African-American female children tend to benefit more from maternal involvement than other minority groups, although maternal involvement was correlated, at some level, with lower levels of delinquency for all ethnic minority groups under study.

Differences in the gendered effects of control and attachment have also been explored. Research finds that delinquency is highly correlated with a lack of parental bonding for girls (Barnes & Farrell, 1992; Hueber & Betts, 2002). Factors such as neglect, parent-child conflict, overtly harsh punishment and abuse have all been shown to predict increased levels of delinquency in girls (Heaven, Newbury & Mak, 2004). Parental attachment for girls, specifically, has been a prominent area of study in the delinquency of girls, and some research does find that the influence of peer networks is

greater for females (Kerpelman & Smith-Adcock, 2005). It must be noted that some differences in mediating affects have been found, most research finds that parental attachment is an important predictor for delinquency in both genders (Krohn & Massey, 1980; Kerpelman & Smith-Adcock, 2005).

These findings, along with previous research (Kandel, 1996; Fergusson et al., 2007) highlight the importance of parenting styles as among the highest correlative of deviant behavior. A positive family background and strong parent-child attachment led by positive parenting styles and practices can serve as a buffer against deviant behavior in adolescents and children (Simons et al., 1994; Kandel, 1996; Vitaro et al., 2005; Fergusson et al., 2007), and protect against deviant peer influence (Bahr & Hoffman 2010; Burton et al., 1995; Bauman, 1990). In addition to serving as a buffer against deviant peer networks, parenting styles can also have a direct impact on the level of delinquent engagement of their child.

CHAPTER III

SHIFTING PARENTING STYLES

One such area of research which has been minimally explored is the effect of shifting parental practices on children and adolescents. The literature acknowledges that parenting practices change with the age of the child (Dix et al., 1986; Feldman et al., 1989; Smaller & Youniss, 1989), but research has not explored the idea of shifts in parenting style and the effects on juvenile delinquency. Only certain “specialty” conditions where parenting styles may alter have been explored to date, including situations of discrimination (Brody et al., 2008) and divorce (Simons et al., 1993). The goal of prior research, however, was not to explore the effect of the change in parenting style on the child, but rather to explore the conditional affect of each situation on the parent. The current research aims to explore potential shifts in parenting styles and to examine potential effects on juvenile behavior.

Research has shown that environmental variables, like divorce, marital conflict, and parental depression, may affect parenting behaviors due to stress (Biglan, Hops & Sherman, 1988). Parental stress has been shown to increase the level of hostile interactions between the parent and child (Patterson & Forgatch, 1990; Webster-Stratton, 1990), which may result in lower levels of parent-child attachment. The impact on parenting style, however, appears to be minimally explored.

Some research has found that stress-related health issues like depression can negatively affect the parents' ability to engage in responsible childrearing practices (Brody et al., 2008). Brody et al. (2008) found that depression may lead to, and is often associated with, lower levels of supportive interaction between the parent and child. Within this study, the researchers found that perceived discrimination may serve to increase stress levels in the parents thereby increasing stress-related health issues and depression. In turn, these negative health outcomes may lead to lower levels of positive and healthy parenting practices (Brody et al., 2008). In this case, perceived discrimination may lead to a shift from healthy parenting (i.e. a communicative and supportive environment) to unhealthy parenting caused by stress (i.e. an environment of hostility and negativity).

Environmental causes related to a change in parenting styles are not the only times in which parenting practices may be altered. Developmental research has found that the parent-child relationship must often undergo changes as the child reaches adolescence (Sorkhabi, 2010). Research also suggests that this renegotiation of roles often leads to increased conflict between parent and child, and that some parents exhibit signs of difficulty in adjusting to the changing behaviors of their children (Claes et al., 2005). This may cause a parent to ineffectively supervise their child. Some research finds that this absence of control may lead the parent to adopt a permissive parenting style, which may result in a lack of boundaries placed upon the child (Claes et al., 2005). The lack of boundaries, or limitations and rules, has been found to correspond with juvenile delinquency and drug abuse (Lamborn et al., 1991; Loeber & Dishion, 1983). It is possible that a parent who once exemplified authoritarian parenting may become a

permissive parent due to the difficulty in adjusting to the change in the child, but this shift has not been explored.

A vast amount of academic research reports that divorce and remarriage can cause children and adolescents to exhibit higher levels of aggressiveness, defiance, and delinquent behavior (Amato et al., 1991; Demo et al., 1988) due to problems in family functioning and parental distress, in part because each member must assume a new role (Hetherington et al., 1989). In a longitudinal study, Klein et al. (1997) found that poor maternal communication and problem solving skills combined with the presence of divorce, maternal depressive mood, or high internal parental conflict was the strongest predictor of juvenile delinquent behavior. Research has, however, established that adolescent behavior among those living in single-parent homes continuously do not vary significantly in deviant activities than adolescences living in two-parent households (Keller et al., 2002). Very few bodies of research have investigated changes in parenting style caused by, or in conjunction with, divorce. At present, only Simons et al. (1993) have investigated the effects of divorce on parenting styles, though no comparison was done on parenting styles prior to divorce.

Simons et al. (1993) found that recently divorced mothers were at a high risk of depression and poor parenting. The researchers conclude that "...women who are depressed do not parent well" (p. 395). This is due, in part, to the exposure to negative life events, in this study divorce, and the lack of social support, especially among lower-income, newly divorced mothers. This process can lead to high levels of anxiety and stress. Furthermore, mothers with lower levels of education and higher levels of antisocial behavior were found to have less social support networks, lower interests in

finding a job, and less concern about financial obligations during the divorce process. These factors, combined, show that high levels of psychological distress may result in inept parenting practices. A shift from positive parenting styles to negative parenting styles could theoretically be observed in conjunction with divorce (Simons et al., 1993). An assessment of shifting parenting styles, however, is noticeably lacking the family and delinquency literature.

Interestingly, Simons et al. (2005) suggests that in communities with a high level of collective efficacy, uninvolved or permissive parents may be expected to adopt an authoritative parenting style. In areas where the community puts a lot of emphasis on conformity, parents may be expected to ensure that their child is no exception to the rule. In cases like this, it may be that pressure from neighbors, school teachers and other parents may result in a shift in parenting style. Again, empirical research on the outcomes of parenting style shifts is lacking in the current literature.

The Current Study

Based on the literature reviewed above, it is posited that parenting styles do shift across adolescence, and that such shifts will effect adolescent offending. A shift from a parenting style with high levels of demandingness (authoritative or authoritarian) to a parenting style with low levels of demandingness (permissive or uninvolved) may result in weakened social controls, which may allow for adolescent offending to occur. Similarly, a shift from a parenting style which exhibits high levels of supportiveness (authoritative or permissive) to a parenting style with low levels of parental supportiveness (authoritarian or uninvolved) may also result in weakened social controls,

which will allow for adolescent offending to occur. To assess shifts in parenting style, waves one and three from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth are analyzed to explore the extent and nature of shifting parenting styles and the potential effect on juvenile delinquency.

CHAPTER IV

METHODS

Data

The data used for this project are derived from wave one and wave three of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth. Data from wave one were collected in 1997, and data from wave three were collected in 1999. Wave one and wave three are utilized in the current study as the respondents were all under 18 years old in wave three, and a sufficient amount of time between waves allowed for a more comprehensive change in parenting style to be assessed. The total sample of the NLSY include 8,984 youths born between 1980 and 1984, between the ages of 12 and 16 at the first wave. The NLSY data were utilized for this research as the sample population closely resembles the national population and includes measures of parenting style (support and control), and specific measures of juvenile delinquency over the course of adolescence.

Although the sample size in the current study changes between waves due to both missing data and data collection methodology (the NLSY does not ask administer each survey question to every respondent in each wave), the total sample, overall, is still large (wave one n=8580; wave three n=4505). Age was the only predictor of attrition in wave three. However, children over age 18 were not surveyed on parenting style in wave three., which accounts for the inclusion of more younger adolescents in the wave three follow-up and therefore make the current study's findings more conservative. Overall,

the sample sizes represent the total number of adolescents who provided their perception of their mothers' parenting style in both wave one and wave three.

Dependent Variable: Juvenile Delinquency.

The NLSY includes five measures of delinquency in both wave one and wave three. Those measures include property crimes, physical assaults, stealing items worth more than fifty dollars (including an automobile or motorcycle), carrying a weapon, and selling hard drugs, and are measured as the number of times of occurrence in the previous year. Respondents were asked to report the number of times in the prior year they committed each offense. To be consistent with prior work on juvenile delinquency, the items were recoded into a seven category frequency response set (1=never, 7=more than once a day). Weights were then multiplied to these measures in order to better quantify the level of delinquent behavior of the respondents. The weighted score was then multiplied by the frequency of each offence. The weights applied were developed through the National Survey of Crime Severity (Wolfgang et al., 1985) and range in seriousness from property crimes (2.88) to selling hard drugs (8.53). The resulting juvenile delinquency index, therefore, represents both frequency and severity of each offense for each respondent. Through this weighted recode, each respondent was given a total score for delinquency at both wave one and wave three of the NLSY.

To account for the behavioral changes that occur alongside parenting style shifts across the two waves of data, difference scores for juvenile delinquency were included. To create this variable, the total weighted scored from wave one, as developed through the constructed delinquency, was subtracted from wave three. The descriptives are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Change in Delinquency between Wave One and Wave Three

Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
-1.452	16.294	-129.54	153.33

Parenting Style

The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth utilizes the traditional topology to assess parenting styles. These measures are consistent with other inventories used to measure parenting styles (see the Parenting Inventory II by Darling & Toyokawa, 1997). The NLSY measures parental support by asking the youth, "When you think about how s/he acts towards you, in general, would you say that s/he is very supportive, somewhat supportive or not very supportive?" Parental demandingness was measured through the response to, "In general, would you say that s/he is permissive or strict about making sure you did what you were suppose to do?" Supportiveness was measured through a three point scale (very supportive, somewhat supportive, or not very supportive) at both waves. Demandingness was measured on a two point scale (permissive, strict) at both waves.

Respondents indicating their parents as "not very supportive" or "somewhat supportive" were classified as nonsupportive (or non-responsive). Respondents indicating their parent was "very supportive" were considered supportive (or responsive). In terms of demandingness, youths classifying their parents' parenting style as permissive were coded as having nondemanding parents, while youths indicating their parents as demanding were considered demanding. This led to the creation of distinct and mutually-exclusive measures of the four primary types of parenting style. Authoritative, characterized by high support and high control; authoritarian, characterized by high

control and low support; permissive, characterized by low control and high support; and uninvolved, characterized by low control and low support. See Table 2.

Table 2: Parenting Style Classifications

	High Support	Low Support
High Control	Authoritative	Authoritarian
Low Control	Permissive	Uninvolved

The current study relies on child reports of parenting as prior research has indicated that children provide a more accurate assessment of parenting. For example, Noller and Callan (1986) found that on average, adolescents perceived other family members to have higher levels of general anxiety and exhibit lower levels of involvement with other family members. Parents, on the other hand, rated family members as much less anxious, and much more involved with the family, which suggests that there is often a disjuncture between parents and children in the perception of family interaction. While parents might view themselves as involved and supportive, adolescents may perceive their parents to be less involved and less supportive (Noller and Callan 1986). In a similar vein, Feldman et al., (1989) found that adolescents typically believe their family to be less cohesive than their parents do because of the need the parent has to justify their parenting efforts. These finding suggests that the measurement of parenting style through the perception of the child may be more valid than the parenting style as reported by the parent.

The current study relies on mother's parenting style. The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth breaks parenting style into two factors, the parenting style of the mother and the parenting style of the father. The current body of research employs the former, as prior inquiry suggests that the impact of maternal parenting is generally greater than

impact of paternal parenting with concern to juvenile delinquency (Gainey et al., 2010; Baer, 1999; Bowman et al., 2006; Klein et al., 1997). The parenting style of the mother was also utilized because there is not sufficient data on the father's parenting style to draw firm conclusions as many of the respondents indicated that their father was not present which resulted in a larger number of missing data (n=6421 for paternal parenting and n=8580 for maternal parenting in wave one. n=4505 for maternal parenting style in wave three and 2313 for paternal parenting in wave three). Table 3 outlines the proportion of maternal parenting styles for wave one (1997) and wave three (1999).

Table 3: Parenting Style By Waves

	Wave 1		Wave 3	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Uninvolved	890	10.4	772	17.1
Permissive	2999	35	1395	31
Authoritarian	1065	12.4	725	16.1
Authoritative	3626	42.2	1613	35.8
	8580	100	4505	100

Control Variables

Control variables were introduced in order to better isolate the correlation of parenting shifts on juvenile delinquency. As current literature suggests, delinquent peers, neighborhood disadvantage, prior offending, single and two parent households, and family environment all potentially influence juvenile delinquent behavior (Ary et al., 1999; Brody et al., 2008; Simons et al., 1993 Keller et al., 2002; Pires & Jenkins, 2007; Duncan et al., 1998). Additionally, race, gender, age, and family income were also used as control variables as they have also been found to contribute to juvenile delinquency

(Elliot, 1994; Hueber & Betts, 2002; Moore & Hagedorn 1999). Descriptives of the control variables are shown in Table 4.¹ The relationships between control variables were in the predicted direction. See Appendix A for bivariate correlations between control variables.

Table 4: Distribution of control variables

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Delinquent Peers	2.166	0.964	1	5
Income	46361.699	42143.504	-48100	246474
Neighborhood Disadvantage	135.822	142.714	0	700
Parental Relationship	3781.974	738.702	500	4800
Age	14.9896	1.397	13	17

The variable "Neighborhood disadvantage" was assessed using a scale to measure characteristics of the respondents home and neighborhood. The adolescent was asked, "In the past month, has your home usually had electricity and heat when you needed it?" and "In a typical week, how many days from 0 to 7 fo you hear gunshots in your neighborhood?" Additionally, the interviewer made notes on how well kept the building on the street where the youth residences in, how well kept the interior of the home is, and whether or not the interviewer was concerned for their safety in the neighborhood. These questions led the creation of the Neighborhood disadvantage variable with a score between 0 and 700.

To assess the level of household conflict, the relationship between the mother and father occupying the household was assessed as it was perceived by the adolescence. The questions asked were, " Does s/he scream at him/her when s/he is angry? Is s/he fair and

¹ All variables meet the criteria for normal distribution with the exception of income and age. Several data transformation techniques were utilized to adjust the kurtosis, but no transformation altered the substantive findings.

willing to compromise when they disagree? Does s/he express affection or love for him/her? Does s/he insult or criticize him/her or his/her ideas? Does s/he encourage or help him/her with things that are important to him/her? Does s/he blame him/her for her/his problems? The range is from 500 to 4800, with lower numbers representing lower levels of household conflict.

The variable delinquent peers was constructed through measuring the percent of peers who smoke, get drunk more than 1 time a month, belong to a gang, or who use an illegal drug. Respondents about the mean for each item were given a score of one, respondents below the mean were given a zero.

Method of Analysis

The present study first examines the relationship between wave one parenting and wave one delinquency to assess the cross-sectional relationship between maternal parenting and adolescent offending. Next, a regression is performed on wave one maternal parenting style and wave three juvenile delinquency to establish a baseline measure of the relationship between wave one maternal parenting style and juvenile delinquency over time. After these initial steps, the change in the juvenile delinquency score was determined between wave one and wave three as it corresponding to particular parenting style shifts, these results are shown in Table 6. This preliminary analysis allows for an understanding of the juvenile delinquency score change to be assessed as it relates to maternal parenting style shifts between waves.

The current study then utilizes change-score modeling to examine the relationship between shifts in parenting style and changes in adolescent offending between two waves

of NLSY data. Recent studies have utilized change score modeling, as it has been found that this type of modeling provides a more exact measure of the impact of family transitions on adolescent offending than other analytic models (Schroeder et al. 2010). In a comparison of statistical measures, Johnson (2005) concludes that change score modeling is superior to other forms of analysis when the research focuses on the effect of a transition and there exists a need to control for variables which may influence the outcome of the transition.² In the present body of research, prior levels of delinquency, influence of delinquent peers, neighborhood disadvantage, household conflict and family structure are controlled, but due to the complex nature of transitions in family, change score modeling allows for a more comprehensive and precise estimation of the effect of shifts in family on juvenile delinquency than other forms of modeling (Johnson, 2005).

First, any shift in parenting style is compared to stable parenting through ordinary least squares regression to assess the relationship between any type of maternal parenting shift (regardless of a negative to positive shift) and delinquency. Then, each parenting style shift is compared against the stable parenting style for authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and uninvolved to determine the particularities of maternal shifts and delinquency which will allow for a more comprehensive understanding of the effect of positive to negative shifts, such as authoritative to uninvolved, and negative to positive shifts, such as uninvolved to authoritative. Lastly, all parenting styles (including both shifts in parenting style and stable parenting styles) are regressed on stable authoritative parenting style. Stable authoritative parenting is used as the comparison because academic literature overwhelmingly suggests that authoritative parenting is the best

² The simple equation for change score modeling is $(Y_{i2} - Y_{i1}) = B_1 X_i + e'_i$. See Johnson (2005)

predictor of low levels of adolescent offending (Baumrind 1966; Brown et al., 1993; Peterson et al., 1994; Ary et al., 1999; Simmons et al., 2001).

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS

Wave One Parenting and Wave One Delinquency

In the first analysis, which explores the relationship between maternal parenting style and juvenile delinquency, an ordinary least squares regression is performed using the weighted juvenile delinquency score from wave one and the maternal parenting style from wave one. This analysis allows for a cross-sectional assessment of the relationship between parenting style and juvenile delinquency.

Table 5: Regression Comparing Wave One Parenting and Wave One Juvenile Delinquency

		Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Sociodemographic				
	Female	-.164***	-.174***	-.198***
	Black	-.010	-.007	-.049***
	Hispanic (White Contrast)	-.026*	-.026*	-.031**
	Other (White Contrast)	.011	.013	.010
	Income	-.057***	-.047***	-.004
	Age	.116***	.121***	-.004
Parenting Style_{w1}				
	Authoritative (Contrast)	-	-	-
	Permissive	-	.040***	.032**
	Uninvolved	-	.135***	.102***
	Authoritarian	-	.121***	.089***
Control Variables				
	Delinquent Peers Neighborhood Disadvantage	-	-	.269***
	Household Conflict	-	-	-.035**
	Single Parent	-	-	-.066***
	<i>F</i>	64.450***	69.353***	102.123***
	<i>R</i> ²	.043	.068	.134
	<i>N</i>	8575	8572	8567
<i>Note:</i> Standardized coefficients reported. + <i>p</i> < .10, * <i>p</i> < .05, ** <i>p</i> < .01, *** <i>p</i> < .001.				

The results shown in Table 5 first indicate that gender, income and age significantly impact adolescent offending in the predicted direction, as prior research has found females to be less delinquent than males (Kerpelman & Smith-Adock, 2005), changes in delinquency to occur with age (Kandel, 1996) and higher income to correspond negatively with offending (Simons et al. 1993). More important to the current study, the results also show that adolescents who perceived their mother as permissive, uninvolved and authoritarian have significantly higher levels of delinquent

behavior in wave one than adolescents who perceive their mother as authoritative³. This finding is consistent with prior research (Duncan et al., 1998; Pires & Jenkins, 2007; Wills et al., 1996).

Furthermore, Model 3 indicates that gender and race correlate strongly with juvenile delinquency, and adolescents who perceived their mother as permissive, uninvolved, and authoritarian continue to have significantly higher levels of delinquent behavior when controlling for delinquent peers, neighborhood disadvantage, household conflict and family structure than adolescents with authoritative mothers. Adolescents reporting their mother as uninvolved show the strongest association with juvenile delinquency. These findings coincide with other literature that finds that adolescents with uninvolved mothers generally have higher levels of delinquent behavior than adolescents whose mothers fall under one of the other forms of parenting style (Paulson & Sputa, 1996).

The analysis also reveals that maternal permissive parenting is less correlated with delinquent behavior than maternal authoritarian parenting, all else equal. This finding suggest that there may be a marked difference between high warmth and lack of control (permissive) and high control and lack of warmth (authoritarian) and the influence on adolescent offending, which has also been found in prior research. Vazonyi and Klanjsek (2008) conclude that maternal support and warmth is often more important than maternal control and restrictiveness in serving to reduce juvenile delinquent behavior. Additional analysis in this study may provide further information on the relationship between control and warmth and the impact on adolescent offending.

³ Multicollinearity was assessed and variance inflation factors were not an issue in this analysis

Wave One Parenting and Wave Three Delinquency

Having established a relationship between delinquency and maternal parenting style in wave one, an ordinary least squares regression was performed investigating the relationship between wave one maternal parenting style and wave three juvenile delinquency. This analysis establishes the relationship between wave one parenting styles and wave three delinquency. The results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Regression Comparing Wave One Parenting and Wave Three Juvenile Delinquency

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Sociodemographic			
Female	-.093***	-.095***	-.105***
Black	-.018	-.018	-.040**
Hispanic (White Contrast)	-.020+	-.020+	-.025*
Other (White Contrast)	.013	.013	.012
Income	-.011	-.009	.011
Age	-.039***	-.037***	-.067***
Wave 1 JD	.284***	.279***	.257***
Parenting Style_{w1}			
Authoritative (Contrast)			
Permissive	-	.001	-.001
Uninvolved	-	.017	.009
Authoritarian	-	.028**	.020+
Control Variables			
Delinquent Peers	-	-	.071***
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-	-	.041***
Household Conflict	-	-	-.012
Single Parent	-	-	-.032**
<i>F</i>	133.085***	94.084***	72.494***
<i>R</i> ²	.098	.099	.106
<i>N</i>	8574	8571	8567

Note: Standardized coefficients reported. +*p* < .10, **p* < .05, ***p* < .01, ****p* < .001.

Gender, age, wave one juvenile delinquency, family structure and delinquent peers all correlate highly with wave three juvenile delinquency. Authoritarian maternal

parenting correlates highly with wave three delinquency when controlling for the sociodemographic variables, but this relationship was reduced ($p < .10$) when the control variables were introduced. Uninvolved maternal parenting correlated with wave three juvenile delinquency when controlling for sociodemographic variables ($p < .10$), but this relationship was also reduced when the control variables were introduced. Adolescents who reported their mothers as permissive differed only slightly from adolescents who reported their mothers as authoritative in juvenile offending in wave three when all control variables were introduced (Model 3). The result of this ordinary least squares regression analysis outline that authoritarian maternal parenting style in wave one is the only parenting style associated with juvenile delinquency in wave three and that intermediate factors (delinquent peers, neighborhood disadvantage, and family structure) are more correlated with juvenile delinquency than specific parenting styles in this particular model. Overall, the findings suggest a strong cross-sectional relationship between maternal parenting style and delinquency but only authoritative parenting shows a marginal longitudinal effect. Another important aspect to analyze is the difference in adolescent offending between wave one and wave three and the relationship with maternal parenting style.

Wave One Parenting and Change in Delinquency

To assess the relationship between wave one maternal parenting and a change in delinquency between wave one and wave three, a new variable was created by subtracting wave one delinquency from wave three delinquency. The new variable represents the overall change in delinquency score between waves. This new variable

was regressed on maternal parenting from wave one and also the sociodemographic and control variables previously noted. The results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Parenting Style and Change in Delinquency between Wave One and Wave Three

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Sociodemographic			
Female	-.076***	-.078***	-.087***
Black	-.020*	-.021*	-.037***
Hispanic (White Contrast)	-.023*	-.024*	-.027**
Other Race (White Contrast)	.014	.014	.013
Income	-.008	-.007	.009
Age	-.034***	-.032***	-.056***
Wave 1 JD	-.554***	-.557***	-.576***
Parenting Style_{w1}			
Authoritative (Contrast)	-	-	-
Permissive	-	-.009	-.011
Uninvolved	-	.007	-.001
Authoritarian	-	.021*	.014
Control Variables			
Delinquent Peers	-	-	.063***
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-	-	.025*
Household Conflict	-	-	-.011
Single Parent	-	-	-.028**
<i>F</i>	536.111***	376.272***	274.605***
<i>R</i> ²	.304	.305	.310
<i>N</i>	8574	8571	8567
<i>Note:</i> Standardized coefficients reported. + <i>p</i> < .10, * <i>p</i> < .05, ** <i>p</i> < .01, *** <i>p</i> < .001.			

Adolescents who reported their mother as authoritarian showed a statistically significant increase between waves when compared to adolescents from a stable authoritative environment when controlling for the sociodemographic variables, but this relationship decreased when adding in the control variables. When controlling for delinquent peers and neighborhood disadvantage, adolescents who reported their mother

as either uninvolved or permissive showed slight decreases in offending between waves. These findings suggest that there may be an important difference between the hostile and restrictive environment created by authoritarian parenting (as those adolescents experienced an increase in delinquency) and the lack of restriction and hostility characterized by permissive or indifferent parenting (as those adolescents experienced a decrease in offending between waves).

Having established the relationship between maternal parenting style in wave one and the relationship with juvenile delinquency in wave one, wave three, and the change in delinquency between waves, the next step in the current project assesses shifting parenting styles and the relationship with juvenile delinquent behavior.

CHAPTER VI

SHIFTS IN PARENTING

The current study aims to explore the relationship between shifting parenting styles between waves and the change in juvenile delinquency. First, the prevalence of shifting parenting styles is explored.

Wave One to Wave Three Shifts

To assess the extent and nature of shifting maternal parenting style, wave one maternal parenting style and wave three maternal parenting style variables were recoded into a new variable which represent shifts from one parenting style to another between wave one and wave three.

An analysis of the new variables reveal substantial shifts in maternal parenting styles as reported by the youth between wave one and wave three as shown in Table 3. A total of 53.6 percent (n=2353) of adolescents surveyed reported shifts from one parenting style to another between wave one and wave three. A total of 49.7 percent (n=943) of all adolescents who reported their parents as authoritative in wave one of the NLSY reported a different parenting style in wave three. Similar patterns of shifting maternal parenting styles were found in each style and are shown in Table 8, with 62.9 percent (n=368) reported a shift from authoritarian to another form of parenting, 58.4 percent (n=277)

reported a shift from uninvolved to another form of parenting, 53.3 percent (n=764)

reported a shift away from permissive to another form of parenting.

Having established marked shifts in the perception of maternal parenting style by the adolescent between wave one and wave three, the potential impact of such shifts on juvenile delinquency was analyzed. To determine if there were any changes in juvenile offending between waves one and waves three, the change in delinquency for each parenting shift was computed. The result is shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Parental Shifts from Wave One to Wave Three by Juvenile Delinquency

Parenting Style	Shift To	Frequency	Percent	JDW1	JDW3	Δ JD
Authoritative			43.2			
	No Change	953	50.3	2.904	3.087	0.183
	Uninvolved	189	10	4.178	7.212	3.034
	Permissive	483	25.5	3.903	4.562	0.659
	Authoritarian	271	14.3	4.504	4.79	0.286
	Total	1896	100			
Authoritarian			13.3			
	No Change	217	37.1	7.667	6.772	-0.895
	Uninvolved	140	23.9	6.274	6.933	0.659
	Permissive	86	14.7	9.311	7.908	-1.403
	Authoritative	142	24.3	7.47	4.951	-2.519
	Total	585	100			
Uninvolved			10.8			
	No Change	197	41.6	9.551	7.33	-2.221
	Permissive	130	27.4	9.065	6.861	-2.204
	Authoritarian	80	16.9	5.374	3.992	-1.382
	Authoritative	67	14.1	7.175	3.23	-3.945
	Total	474	100			
Permissive			32.7			
	No Change	670	46.7	4.226	4.513	0.287
	Uninvolved	211	14.7	5.854	6.586	0.732
	Authoritarian	132	9.2	6.097	7.134	1.037
	Authoritative	421	29.4	4.509	2.812	-1.697
	Total	1434	100			
N=4389						

This preliminary analysis suggests that shifts from authoritative maternal parenting to any other form of parenting corresponds with an increase in juvenile offending, with the shift from authoritative to uninvolved having the highest increase in offending (mean increase=3.034). Similarly, a shift from uninvolved parenting to any other form of parenting corresponds with a decrease in offending between waves, with a shift from uninvolved to authoritative having the greatest reduction in offending (mean decrease=-3.945). Similar trends were found for the other forms of maternal parenting style. Adolescents reporting his/her mother as permissive in wave one show increases in offending at wave three, except for those adolescents reporting a shift from permissive to authoritative who had a decrease in offending. In line with the previous exploration of parenting style in the current study, adolescents who reported his/her mother as authoritarian had a decrease in overall delinquency for each parenting style shift, but the largest decrease was the shift from authoritarian to authoritative. Interestingly, and contrary to the hypothesis, authoritarian to uninvolved shifts also displayed a decrease in offending between waves.

The current findings suggest that shifting maternal parenting styles do impact adolescent offending. To further assess the relationship between shifts in maternal parenting and juvenile delinquent behavior, variables were created which represented each possible shift and an ordinary least squares regression was performed with control variables to further elucidate the strength of relationship between the variables.

Any Shift

Next, an investigation was performed using a new variable, *Any Shift*. The variable was created by combining any parenting style shift between wave one and wave

three. By investigating any shift in parenting style between wave one and wave three, the influence of a shift in parenting style and juvenile delinquency can be compared against stable parenting. The results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Regression Comparing Any Parenting Shift and Juvenile Delinquency

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Sociodemographic			
Female	-.083***	-.084***	-.092***
Black	-.024+	-.023+	-.048**
Hispanic (White Contrast)	-.025+	-.025+	-.032*
Other Race (White Contrast)	.007	.007	.005
Income	-.023+	-.022	.005
Age	-.008	-.008	-.025+
Wave 1 JD	-.499***	-.500***	-.522***
Parental Shift_{w1 to w3}			
Stable Parenting (Contrast)	-	-	-
Any Shift	-	.019	.017
Control Variables			
Delinquent Peers	-	-	.052***
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-	-	.055***
Household Conflict	-	-	-.012
Single Parent	-	-	-.035*
<i>F</i>	206.444***	180.963***	125.065***
<i>R</i> ²	.243	.244	.250
<i>N</i>	4499	4498	4494
<i>Note: Standardized coefficients reported. +p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.</i>			

The results show that adolescents who experience any shift in parenting between wave one and wave three also experience a slight increase in juvenile offending compared to adolescents who have stable parenting styles, although this relationship is not statically significant. To further examine the particularities of parenting style shifts on juvenile offending, each particular shift was analyzed using least squares regression.

Authoritative Shifts

An ordinary least squares regression was performed utilizing maternal authoritative parenting shifts and juvenile delinquency between wave one and wave three. The results are shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Regression Comparing Authoritative Shifts and Juvenile Delinquency

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Sociodemographic			
Female	-.090***	-.091***	-.095***
Black	-.012	-.006	-.025
Hispanic (White Contrast)	-.019	-.022	-.027
Other Race (White Contrast)	-.021	-.018	-.019
Age	-.016	-.019	-.025
Income	-.012	-.004	.014
Wave 1 JD	-.374***	-.379***	-.388***
Parental Shift_{w1 to w3}			
Stable Authoritative (Contrast)			
Authoritative to Uninvolved	-	.084***	.079***
Authoritative to Permissive	-	.036	.034
Authoritative to Authoritarian	-	.033	.031
Control Variables			
Delinquent Peers	-	-	.016
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-	-	.050*
Household Conflict	-	-	-.015
Single Parent	-	-	-.014
<i>F</i>	46.183***	31.898***	23.262***
<i>R</i> ²	.138	.145	.148
<i>N</i>	1896	1896	1896
<i>Note: Standardized coefficients reported. +p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.</i>			

First, the regression reveals that gender and wave one juvenile delinquency are strongly correlated with shifts in delinquency between waves. The regression also reveals that any shift from authoritative maternal parenting in wave one to permissive, authoritarian, or uninvolved parenting in wave three is associated with an increase in

adolescent offending. Important to note is that the shift from authoritative parenting to permissive or authoritarian parenting styles is not statistically significant. However, the shift from authoritative parenting to uninvolved maternal parenting is highly correlated with an increase in juvenile delinquency even in the presence of the control variables ($p < .001$). This finding coincides with the hypothesis that a shift from positive parenting (authoritative) to negative parenting (uninvolved) will correspond with a rise in delinquent activity.

Authoritarian Shifts

Next, a least squares regression was performed on maternal authoritarian shifts and juvenile delinquency. The results are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Regression Comparing Authoritarian Shifts and Juvenile Delinquency

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Sociodemographic			
Female	-.095**	-.094**	-.105*
Black	-.087*	-.082*	-.111**
Hispanic (White Contrast)	-.051	-.050	-.061
Other Race (White Contrast)	.098**	.097**	.088*
Income	-.014	-.012	.020
Age	-.019	-.023	-.054
Wave 1 Juvenile Delinquency	-.568***	-.566***	-.600***
Parental Shift_{w1 to w3}			
Stable Authoritarian (Contrast)	-	-	-
Authoritarian to Uninvolved	-	.046	.041
Authoritarian to Permissive	-	.017	.021
Authoritarian to Authoritative	-	.030	.031
Control Variables			
Delinquent Peers	-	-	.099**
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-	-	.042
Household Conflict	-	-	.020
Single Parent	-	-	-.061+
<i>F</i>	37.941***	26.377***	19.966***
<i>R</i> ²	.313	.315	.329
<i>N</i>	585	585	585
<i>Note:</i> Standardized coefficients reported. + <i>p</i> <.10, * <i>p</i> <.05, ** <i>p</i> <.01, *** <i>p</i> <.001.			

Although no shift in parenting style was a strong predictor of juvenile delinquency in wave three for the subject with an authoritarian mother at wave one, delinquent peers, gender, race, and wave one juvenile delinquency correlated strongly with delinquency in wave three for the subjects.

Permissive Shifts

A regression was then performed on maternal permissive parenting shifts and juvenile delinquency.

Table 12: Regression Comparing Permissive Shifts and Juvenile Delinquency

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Sociodemographic			
Female	-.088***	-.097***	-.102***
Black	-.021	-.019	-.037
Hispanic (White Contrast)	-.033	-.031	-.037
Other Race (White Contrast)	.009	.006	.005
Income	-.049*	-.044+	-.025
Age	.014	.016	.007
Wave 1 JD	-.541***	-.547***	-.561***
Parental Shift_{w1 to w3}			
Stable Permissive (Contrast)	-	-	-
Permissive to Uninvolved	-	.045+	.041+
Permissive to Authoritarian	-	.049*	.046*
Permissive to Authoritative	-	-.052*	-.050*
Control Variables			
Delinquent Peers	-	-	.040
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-	-	.044+
Household Conflict	-	-	-.005
Single Parent	-	-	-.020
<i>F</i>	80.273***	58.515***	42.461***
<i>R</i> ²	.283	.291	.295
<i>N</i>	1428	1425	1421
<i>Note:</i> Standardized coefficients reported. + <i>p</i> <.10, * <i>p</i> <.05, ** <i>p</i> <.01, *** <i>p</i> <.001.			

Table 12 reveals that permissive shifts to uninvolved and authoritarian parenting correspond with an increase in juvenile delinquency, while a shift from permissive to authoritative corresponds with a decrease in juvenile delinquency ($p < .05$) when controlling for age, income, gender, and wave one juvenile delinquency (Model 2). Model 3 reveals that the relationship between each permissive shift and wave three juvenile delinquency remains statistically significant even in the presence of control variables.

The finding that the shift from permissive to authoritarian parenting between wave one and wave three correlates with an increase in juvenile delinquency ($p < .05$)

coincides with the previous finding in the current project that a shift from authoritarian maternal parenting to permissive maternal parenting correlates with a decrease in juvenile delinquency and further reaffirms that there may exist an important difference in the predictive ability of high support (permissive) over high restrictiveness (authoritarian).

Uninvolved Shifts

A regression was then performed on maternal uninvolved parenting shifts from wave one to wave three.

Table 13: Regression Comparing Uninvolved Shifts and Juvenile Delinquency

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Sociodemographic			
Female	-.036	-.038	-.058
Black	-.040	-.042	-.054
Hispanic (White Contrast)	-.006	-.006	.003
Other Race (White Contrast)	.060	.058	.052
Income	.026	.028	.061
Age	-.027	-.039	-.074
Wave 1 JD	-.601***	-.606***	-.646***
Parental Shift_{w1 to w3}			
Stable Uninvolved (Contrast)	-	-	-
Uninvolved to Authoritative	-	-.077+	-.075+
Uninvolved to Permissive	-	-.010	-.016
Uninvolved to Authoritarian	-	-.046	-.040
Control Variables			
Delinquent Peers	-	-	.105*
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-	-	.033
Household Conflict	-	-	.035
Single Parent	-	-	-.055
<i>F</i>	36.838***	26.294***	19.658***
<i>R</i> ²	.356	.362	.375
<i>N</i>	468	465	461

Note: Standardized coefficients reported. +*p* < .10, **p* < .05, ***p* < .01, ****p* < .001.

Table 13 reveals a decrease in juvenile delinquency between wave one and wave three for adolescents who reported their mother as uninvolved. The only significant

sociodemographic variable was wave one delinquency ($p < .001$) and the only significant control variable was delinquent peers ($p < .005$). Although the uninvolvement to authoritative shift was the only maternal parenting shift that was moderately significant ($p < .10$), each shift away from uninvolvement correlated with a decrease in juvenile delinquency between waves.

All Parenting Styles

The final least squares regression compares juvenile delinquency and all parenting styles (both stable and shifting) against stable authoritative. This analysis was performed as the present research finds that stable parenting is the best predictor of low levels of juvenile delinquency and prior research has found that authoritative parenting is the best predictor of low levels of juvenile delinquency. Therefore, it is hypothesized that stable authoritative maternal parenting will correlate with the lowest level of juvenile delinquent behavior than any other. The result of this regression is shown in Table 14.

Table 14: All Parenting Styles Against Stable Authoritative by Juvenile Delinquency

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Sociodemographic			
Female	-.083***	-.087***	-.095***
Black	-.024+	-.022	-.046**
Hispanic (White Contrast)	-.025+	-.025+	-.031*
Other Race (White Contrast)	.007	.007	.005
Income	-.023+	-.018	.007
Age	-.008	-.011	-.026+
Wave 1 JD	-.499***	-.504***	-.523***
Parental Shift w1 to w3			
Uninvolved (Stable)	-	.020	.015
Shift to Permissive	-	.013	.009
Shift to Authoritarian	-	-.002	-.003
Shift to Authoritative	-	-.016	-.017
Permissive (Stable)	-	.008	.009
Shift to Authoritarian	-	.031*	.029*
Shift to Authoritative	-	-.028+	-.026+
Shift to Uninvolved	-	.030*	.027*
Authoritarian (Stable)	-	.001	.001
Shift to Authoritative	-	.018	.016
Shift to Uninvolved	-	.028*	.023+
Shift to Permissive	-	.013	.013
Authoritative (Stable)	-	-	-
Shift to Authoritarian	-	.013	.014
Shift to Permissive	-	.012	.013
Shift to Uninvolved	-	.042**	.039**
Control Variables			
Delinquent	-	-	.050**
Neighborhood Disadvantage	-	-	.053***
Household Conflict	-	-	-.006
Single Parent	-	-	-.032*
<i>F</i>	206.444***	67.514***	58.902***
<i>R</i> ²	.243	.249	.255
<i>N</i>	4499	4484	4480
<i>Note: Standardized coefficients reported. +p < .10, *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.</i>			

Sex, race, age, and wave one juvenile delinquency were all strongly correlated with wave three juvenile delinquency. Additionally, delinquent peers, neighborhood disadvantage and family structure all correlated with juvenile delinquency in wave three. Adolescents with permissive maternal parenting in wave one which shifted to uninvolved parenting in wave three experience a statistically significant increase (when compared to stable authoritative) in juvenile delinquency between waves ($p < .10$). Similarly, adolescents with permissive maternal parenting in wave one which shifted to authoritarian parenting in wave three also experienced an increase in juvenile delinquency between waves ($p < .10$). Adolescents with permissive maternal parenting in wave one which shifted to authoritative parenting in wave three experienced a statistically significant decrease in juvenile delinquency between waves ($p < .01$). Also significant was the shift from authoritative maternal parenting in wave one to uninvolved maternal parenting in wave three. This shift corresponded with an increase in juvenile delinquency ($p < .01$).

Overall, this analysis reveals an important and complex relationship between shifting maternal parenting styles and the influence on juvenile delinquent behaviors. Negative maternal parenting which shifted to a more positive maternal parenting style between waves corresponded to a decrease in juvenile delinquency. Similarly, the shifts from a positive parenting style to a more negative parenting style corresponded with a rise in delinquent behavior.

CHAPTER VII

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The current project examines the effect of shifting parenting practices and juvenile delinquent behaviors. While prior research has found that parenting styles can change due a change in the age of a child (Dix et al., 1986; Feldman et al., 1989; Smaller & Youniss, 1989), divorce (Simons et al., 1993), environmental causes like discrimination (Brody et al., 2008) and community expectation (Simons et al., 2005), no project has investigated the impact of parenting style shifts and the effect on juvenile delinquency prior to this investigation.

Research has clearly established that delinquent youths exhibit lower levels of attachment to their parents than non delinquent youths (Hirschi, 1969; Stattin & Kerr, 2000). Prior research has also found that authoritative parenting generally creates stronger parent-child bonds, due to high levels of warmth and control, than any other form of parenting (Mason et al., 1996; Walker-Barnes & Mason, 2004) and that the creation of high levels of parent-child attachment result in high levels of social control (Agnew, 1993).

Relying on the framework of social control theory and past literature showing a significant relationship between parenting styles and juvenile delinquency, it was hypothesized that adolescents shifting from situations of authoritative parenting to more

negative forms of parenting would coincide with an increase in delinquency due to lower levels of parental attachment and support. As previous literature suggests, the current study found that adolescents whose mother was authoritative in wave one show lower levels of juvenile delinquency than any other parenting style during the same wave (authoritarian, permissive, uninvolved). Additionally, the data reveal that adolescents whose mother was authoritative in wave one also had lower levels of offending in wave three than adolescents whose mother was authoritarian or uninvolved, and offending levels equal to adolescents whose mother was permissive when controlling for the effects of delinquent peers and neighborhood disadvantage, as shown in Table 5.

Second, the data show that any shift in parenting style from wave one to wave three correlated with a slight increase in juvenile delinquency. As noted previously, this relationship was not statistically significant in the multivariate analysis; rather, the data do show that particular shifts are associated with significant increases in juvenile offending. While a general shift in parenting was not associated with a statistically significant change in delinquency, some specific shifts in parenting style between waves were found to predict adolescent offending.

The data show that adolescents who reported their mother's parenting style as authoritative in wave one and reported their mother's parenting style as uninvolved in wave three experienced significant increases in juvenile offending between waves. Adolescents who reported their mother's parenting style as permissive in wave one and authoritarian in wave three also reported a significant increase in offending. A shift from permissive parenting in wave one to uninvolved parenting in wave three also resulted in an increase in juvenile offending. While the multivariate data show that other shifts from

positive parenting styles to negative parenting styles are not statistically significant, the results do show that overall, shifts from positive parenting to negative parenting styles are related to an increase in offending.

Coinciding with the finding that positive to negative shifts correlated with an increase in delinquency, it was found that shifts from negative parenting styles to positive parenting styles correlated with a decrease in juvenile offending. The multivariate data reveal that a shift from permissive parenting in wave one to authoritative parenting in wave three significantly correlate with a decrease in juvenile delinquency between waves. Similarly, a shift from uninvolved parenting in wave one to authoritative parenting in wave three also correlated with a decrease in delinquency. While this analysis does not find a significant relationship between all negative to positive shifts, the data does reveal that negative parenting styles in wave one that shift to positive parenting styles in wave three do, overall, contribute to a decrease in adolescent offending.⁴

This project provides strong evidence that some parenting style shifts have a strong impact on adolescent offending. This finding supports the hypothesis that positive parenting practices serve as the best form of social control, and when the parenting style shifts from a positive style (authoritative) to a negative style (uninvolved), or from a negative style (permissive) to a more negative style (uninvolved), the bonds to the parents are weakened which result in low levels of social control and allow for juvenile delinquency to occur. Coinciding with this finding, the current project also finds that shifts from negative parenting to positive parenting may reestablish parental attachment and decrease adolescent offending. A shift from negative parenting (permissive or

⁴ The notable exception is the non-statistically significant shift from authoritarian (wave one) to authoritative (wave three), which correlated with a slight increase in offending.

uninvolved) to positive parenting (authoritative) significantly correlated with a decrease in adolescent offending. In these shifts, adolescents who were previously less attached to their mother due to a permissive or uninvolved maternal parenting style generally experienced a decrease in juvenile offending coinciding with a shift in parenting style. The current finding supports the hypothesis that a shift from negative parenting style to positive parenting styles will result in higher levels of social control and juvenile delinquency will decrease.

While past research has classified parenting styles as static (Baumrind, 1966; Baumrind, 2005; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Paulson & Sputa, 1996; Schaffer et al., 2009), this body of research suggests that parenting styles are not static; but rather, are dynamic processes subject to change that have important implications for adolescents.

There are some notable limitations to the current study. In particular, this project is limited by the data available from the NLSY concerning divorce, cohabitation and remarriage between waves, which has been found to impact juvenile offending (Rebellon, 2002; Amato et al., 1991; Demo et al., 1988). Additionally, current research suggests that a transition from a single-parent-household to a two-parent-household through marriage or cohabitation may be associated with an increase in juvenile delinquent behavior (Schroeder et al., 2010). It is also outside of the scope of the current project to investigate why parenting styles may shift, but past research suggests that parenting styles may change due to community expectation (Brody et al., 2008) and discrimination (Simons et al., 2005).

Future research needs to investigate confounding variables which may contribute to shifts in parenting style, including parental cohabitation and parental perception of

discrimination. A more complete investigation should also include paternal parenting consideration and the effect on delinquency. Overall, an investigation into the contextual nature of parenting style shifts may provide more insight into the process by which changes in parenting style effect juvenile delinquency.

REFERENCES

- Agnew, R. (1993). Why do they do it? An examination of the intervening mechanisms between social control variables and delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 20, 245-266.
- Ary D.V., Duncan T.E., Duncan S.C., Hops, H. (1999). Adolescent problem behavior: The influence of parents and peers. *Behavioral Research and Therapy*, 37, 217-230.
- Amato, P.R. & Keith, B. (1991). Parental Divorce and the Well-being of Children: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110, 26-46.
- Baer, J. (1999). Family Relationships, Parenting Behavior, and Adolescent Deviance in Three Ethnic Groups. *Families in Society*, 80, 279-285.
- Bahr, S. J. & Hoffmann, J.P. (2010). Parenting Style, Religiosity, Peers, and Adolescent Heavy Drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 71, 539-543.
- Barnes, G. M., & Farrell, M.P. (1992). Parental Support and Control as Predictors of Adolescent Drinking, Delinquency, and Related Problem Behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 763-776.
- Barnow, S., Lucht, M., & Freyberger, H. J. (2005). Correlates of aggressive and delinquent conduct problems in adolescence. *Aggressive Behavior*, 31, 24-39.
- Bauman, K.E., Foshee V.A., Linzer, M.A., & Koch, G.G. (1990). Effect of parental smoking classification on the association between parental and adolescent smoking. *Addictive Behaviors*, 15, 413-422.
- Bauman, P., & Levine, S.A. (1986). The Development of Children of Drug Addicts. *The International Journal of the Addictions*, 21, 849-863.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behavior. *Child Development*, 37, 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1996). The Discipline Controversy Revisited. *Family Relations*, 45, 405-414.

- Baumrind, D. (2005). Patterns of Parental Authority and Adolescent Autonomy. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 108, 61.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current Patterns of Parental Authority. *Developmental Psychology Monograph*: 1, Pt. 2, 1-103.
- Bates, J. (1980). The concept of a difficult child. *Merrill Palmer Quarterly*, 26, 299-319.
- Beck, J. E., & Shaw, D. S. (2005). The influence of perinatal complications and environmental adversity on boys' antisocial behavior. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46, 35-46.
- Biglan, A., Hopes, H., & Sherman, L. (1988). Coercive family process and maternal depression. In R.D. Peters and R.J. McMahon (Eds.), *Social learning and systems approaches to marriage and the family* (pp. 72-103). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Bowman, M. A., Prelow, H.M., & Weaver, S.R. (2007). Parenting Behaviors, Association with Deviant Peers, and Delinquency in African American Adolescents: A Mediated-Moderation Model. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36, 517-527.
- Brand, S., Hatzinger, M., Beck, J., & Holsboer-Trachsler, E. (2009). Perceived Parenting Styles, Personality Traits and Sleep Patterns in Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32, 1189-1207
- Brody, G.H., Chen Y.F., Kogan, S.M., Murry, V.M., Logan, P., & Luo, Z. (2008). Linking Perceived Discrimination to Longitudinal Changes in African American Mothers' Parenting Practices. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70, 319-331.
- Brown, B., Mounts, N., Lamborn, S., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting practices and group affiliation in adolescence. *Child Development*, 64, 467-482
- Burton, V., Cullen, F., Evand, T. D., Dunaway, R.R., Kethineni, S., & Payne, G. (1995). The impact of parental controls on delinquency. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23, 111-126.
- Claes, M., Lacourse, E., Ercolani, A.P., Pierro, A., Leone, L., & Presaghi, F. (2005). Parenting, Peer Orientation, Drug use, and Antisocial Behavior in Late Adolescence: A Cross-National Study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 35, 401-411.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 487-496.
- Darling, N., & Toyokawa, T. (1997). Construction and validation of the Parenting Style Inventory II. *The Pennsylvania State University: Internal publication*.

- Demo, D.H., & Acock, A.C. (1988). The Impact of Divorce on Children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 50, 619–648.
- Duncan, S. C., Duncan, T. E., Biglan, A., & Ary, D. (1998). Contribution of the social context to the development of adolescent substance use: A multivariate latent growth modeling approach. *Drug Alcohol Dependence*, 50, 57–71.
- Elliott, D. S. (1994). 'Serious Violent Offenders: Onset, Development Course, and Termination. *Criminology*, 32, 1–21.
- Feldman, S. S., Wentzel, K.R., & Gehring, T.M. (1989). A Comparison of the Views of Mothers, Fathers, and Pre-Adolescents about Family Cohesion and Power." *Journal of Family Psychology*, 3, 39-60.
- Fergusson, D. M., Vitaro, F., Wanner, B., & Brendgen, M. (2007). Protective and Compensatory Factors Mitigating the Influence of Deviant Friends on Delinquent Behaviours during Early Adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 30, 33-50.
- Gainey, R. R., Catalano, R.F., Haggerty, K.P., & Hoppe, M.J. (1997). Deviance among the Children of Heroin Addicts in Treatment: Impact of Parents and Peers. *Deviant Behavior*, 18, 143-159.
- Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1950). *Unraveling juvenile delinquency*. New York; Goramonwealth Fund.
- Hawkins, J. D., Herrenkohl, T. I., Farrington, D. P., Brewer, D., Catalano, R. F., & Harachi, T. W. (2000). *Predictors of youth violence*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Heaven, P.C., Newbury, K., & Mak, A. (2004). The impact of adolescent and parental characteristics on adolescent levels of delinquency and depression. *Personality & Individual Difference*, 36, 173-185.
- Hetherington, E.M., Stanley-Hagan, Anderson, E.R. (1989). Marital Transitions: A Child's Perspective. *American Psychology*, 44, 303–312.
- Hetherington, E.M., Bridges, M., Insabella, G.M. (1998). What Matters? What Does Not? Five Perspectives on the Association Between Marital Transitions and Children's Adjustment. *American Psychology*, 53, 167–184.
- Henricson, C., & Roker, D. (2000). Support for the parents of adolescents: A review. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 763-783.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Johnson, D. (2005). Two-Wave Panel Analysis: Comparing Statistical Methods for Studying the Effects of Transitions. *Journal of Marriage the Family*, 67, 1061–1075.
- Kandel, D. B. (1996). The parental and peer contexts of adolescent deviance: an algebra of interpersonal influences. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 26, 289-315.
- 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. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 28, 399-427.
- Kerpelman, J.L., & Smith-Adcock, S. (2005). Female Adolescents' Delinquent Activity: The Intersection of Bonds to Parents and Reputation Enhancement. *Youth & Society* 37, 176-200.
- Klein, K., Forehand, R., Armistead, L., & Long, P. (1997). Delinquency during the Transition to Early Adulthood: Family and Parenting Predictors from Early Adolescence. *Adolescence*, 32, 61-80.
- Krohn, M., & Massey, J.L. (1980). Social Control and Delinquent Behavior: An Examination of the Elements of the Social Bond. *Sociological Quarterly*, 25, 529-43.
- Ladd, G., Profilet, S., & Hart, C. (1992). *Parents' management of children's peer relationships: Facilitating and supervising children's acuities in peer culture*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lamborn, S., Mounts, N., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. (1991). Patterns of Competence and Adjustment among Adolescents from Authoritative, Authoritarian, Indulgent, and Neglectful Families. *Child Development*, 62, 1049.
- Loeber, R., & Dishion, T. J. (1983). Early predictor of male delinquency: a review. *Psychology Bulletin*, 94, 68–99.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the Context of the Family: Parent- Child Interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (ed.) and P. H. Mussen (series ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology*, 4, *Socialization, Personality, and Social Development*. New York: Wiley.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1992). The role of parents in the socialization of children: An historical overview. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 1006-1017.
- Mason, C. A., Gonzales, N., Cauce, A.M., & Hiraga, Y. (1996). Neither too sweet nor too sour: Problem peers, maternal control, and problem behavior in African American adolescents. *Child Development*, 67, 2115–2130.

- Mayseless, O., Scharf, M., & Sholt, M. (2003). From Authoritative Parenting Practices to an Authoritarian Context: Exploring the Person-Environment Fit. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 13, 427-456.
- McGord, W., McGord, J., & Howard, A. (1961). Familial correlates of aggression in nondelinquent male children. *Abnormal Social Psychology*, 62, 79-93.
- Moore, J.W., & Hagedorn, J.M. (1999.) 'What Happens to Girls in the Gang?' Pp. 177–186 in *Female Gangs in America: Essays on Girls, Gangs, and Gender*, edited by Hagedorn, J.M. Chicago, IL: Lake View Press.
- Noller, P., & Callan, V. J. (1986). Perceptions of Communicative Relationships in Families with Adolescents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 813-820.
- Nijhof, K. S., Rutgere C., & Engels, M.E. (2007). Parenting Styles, Coping Strategies, and the Expression of Homesickness. *Journal of Adolescence*, 30, 709-720.
- Parker, J. S., & Benson, M.J. (2004). Parent-Adolescent Relations and Adolescent Functioning: Self-Esteem, Substance Abuse, and Delinquency. *Adolescence*, 39, 519-530.
- Patterson, G.R. & Forgatch, M.S. (1990). Initiation and maintenance of process disrupting single-mother families. In G.R. Patterson (Ed.) *Depression and aggression in family interaction* (pp. 209-245). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Paulson, S. E., & Sputa, C.L. (1996). Patterns of Parenting during Adolescence: Perceptions of Adolescents and Parents. *Adolescence*, 31, 369-381.
- Peterson, P. L, Hawkins, D.J., Abbott, R.D., & Catalano, R.F. (1994). Disentangling the Effects of Parental Drinking, Family Management, and Parental Alcohol Norms on Current Drinking by Black and White Adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 4, 203- 227.
- Pettit, G.S., Laird, R.D., Dodge, K.A., Bates, J.E., & Criss, M.M. (2001). Antecedents and behavior-problem outcomes of parental monitoring and psychological control in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 72, 583-598.
- Pires, P., & Jenkins, J.M. (2007). A Growth Curve Analysis of the Joint Influences of Parenting Affect, Child Characteristics and Deviant Peers on Adolescent Illicit Drug use. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36, 169-183
- Rebellon, C. J.(2002). Reconsidering the Broken Homes/Delinquency Relationship and Exploring Its Mediating Mechanism(s). *Criminology*, 40, 103–36.
- Sankey, M., & Huon, G. F. (1999). Investigating the role of alienation in a multi-component-model of juvenile delinquency. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22, 95-107.

- Shaffer, D. R. (2000). *Social and personality development*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Schaffer, M., Clark, S., & Jeglic, E.L. (2009). The Role of Empathy and Parenting Style in the Development of Antisocial Behaviors. *Crime & Delinquency*, 55, 586-599.
- Schroeder, R., Giordano, P., & Cernovick, S. (2010). Adult child-parent bonds and life course criminality. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 562-572.
- Schroeder, R. D., Osgood, A. K., & Oghia, M. J. (2010). Family transitions and juvenile delinquency. *Sociological Inquiry*, 80, 579-604.
- Sears, R. R., Whiting, J. W. M., Nowlis, V., & Sears, P. S. (1953). Some child rearing antecedents of aggression and dependency in young children. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 47, 135-234.
- Simons, R.L., Simons, L.G., Burt, C.H., Brody, G.H., & Cutrona, S. (2005). Collective Efficacy, Authoritative Parenting and Delinquency: A Longitudinal Test of a Model Integrating Community-and Family-Level Processes. *Criminology*, 43, 989-1029.
- Simons, R. L., Chao, W., Conger, R.D., & Elder, G.H. (2001). Quality of Parenting as Mediator of the Effect of Childhood Defiance on Adolescent Friendship Choices and Delinquency: A Growth Curve Analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63, 63-79.
- Sorkhabi, N. (2010). Sources of Parent-Adolescent Conflict: Content and Form of Parenting. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38, 761-782.
- Simons, R.L., & Robertson, J.F. (1989). The Impact of Parenting Factors, Deviant Peers, and Coping Style upon Adolescent Drug use. *Family Relations*, 38, 273-281.
- Simons, R. L., Beaman, J., Conger, J.D., & Chao, W. (1993). Stress, Support, and Antisocial Behavior Trait as Determinants of Emotional Well-being and Parenting Practices among Single Mothers. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 385-398.
- Simons, R.L., Wu, C., Conger, R.D., & Lorenz, F.O. (1994). Two routes to delinquency: Differences between early and late starters in the impact of parenting and deviant peers. *Criminology*, 32, 247-276.
- Spoek, B. M. (1946). *The common sense book of baby and child care*. New York: Duell, Sloan, & Pearee.
- Stattin, H. & Kerr M. (2000). Parental monitoring: A reinterpretation. *Child Development*, 71, 1072-185.

- Thurber, C. A., & Sigman, M. D. (1998). Preliminary models of risk and protective factors for childhood homesickness: Review and empirical synthesis. *Child Development, 69*, 903–934.
- Vandeleur, C. L., Perrez, M., & Schoebi, D. (2007). Associations between measures of emotion and familial dynamics in normative families with adolescents. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 66*, 5-16.
- Vazsonyi, A.T., & Klanjsek, R. (2008). A Test of Self-Control Theory Across Different Socioeconomic Strata. *Justice Quarterly, 25*, 101-131.
- Vitaro, F., Brendgen, M., & Wanner, B. (2005). Patterns of Affiliation with Delinquent Friends During Late Childhood and Early Adolescence: Correlates and Consequences. *Social Development, 14*, 82-108.
- Webster-Stratton, C. (1990). Stress: A potential disrupter of parent perceptions and family interactions. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 19*, 302-312.
- Wesley, C. T., Wharton, T., & Taylor, J.K. (2009). An examination of differential associated and social control theory: Family systems and Delinquency. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 7*, 3-15.
- Wills, T. A., Mariani, J., & Filler, M. (1996). The role of family and peer relationships in adolescent substance use. In Pierce, G. R., Sarason, B. R., and Sarason, I. G. (eds.), *Handbook of the Social Support and the Family*. Plenum Press, New York, pp. 495– 549.
- Wolfgang, M.E., Figlio, R.M., Tracy, P.E., & Singer, S.E. (1985). National Survey of Crime Severity. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Bivariate correlations between control variables

		Female	Black	Hispanic	Other Race	Income	Neighbor Disadvn	Home Con.	Age	Sngle Prnt	W1 Del	Del Peer
Female	Correlation	1	.013	-.002	.006	-.013	-.005	-.052	.009	-.028	-.165	.094
	Sig.		.206	.842	.583	.292	.714	.003	.420	.008	.000	.000
Black	Correlation	.013	1	-.307	-.057	-.226	.286	-.027	.019	-.271	.003	.091
	Sig.	.206		.000	.000	.000	.000	.132	.078	.000	.801	.000
Hispanic	Correlation	-.002	-.307	1	-.050	-.179	.068	.011	-.007	.042	-.009	-.001
	Sig.	.842	.000		.000	.000	.000	.547	.479	.000	.402	.915
Other Race	Correlation	.006	-.057	-.050	1	.020	-.012	.017	-.001	-.008	.008	.003
	Sig.	.583	.000	.000		.110	.415	.331	.928	.427	.423	.778
Income	Correlation	-.013	-.226	-.179	.020	1	-.381	.043	.023	.322	-.055	-.109
	Sig.	.292	.000	.000	.110		.000	.037	.060	.000	.000	.000
Neighbor Disadvn	Correlation	-.005	.286	.068	-.012	-.381	1	-.107	-.015	-.249	.118	.141
	Sig.	.714	.000	.000	.415	.000		.000	.311	.000	.000	.000
Home Con.	Correlation	-.052	-.027	.011	.017	.043	-.107	1	-.103	.050	-.156	-.169
	Sig.	.003	.132	.547	.331	.037	.000		.000	.005	.000	.000
Age	Correlation	.009	.019	-.007	-.001	.023	-.015	-.103	1	-.037	.113	.459
	Sig.	.420	.078	.479	.928	.060	.311	.000		.000	.000	.000
Sngle Prnt	Correlation	-.028	-.271	.042	-.008	.322	-.249	.050	-.037	1	-.112	-.164
	Sig.	.008	.000	.000	.427	.000	.000	.005	.000		.000	.000
W1 Del	Correlation	-.165	.003	-.009	.008	-.055	.118	-.156	.113	-.112	1	.277
	Sig.	.000	.801	.402	.423	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
Del Peer	Correlation	.094	.091	-.001	.003	-.109	.141	-.169	.459	-.164	.277	1
	Sig.	.000	.000	.915	.778	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

CURRICULUM VITAE

Thomas J. Mowen

Office	Home
Office 115, Lutz Hall Department of Sociology University of Louisville Louisville, KY 40292 (502) 852-8045	511 South 5 th Street Apartment 706 Louisville, KY 40202 (502) 689-9945 tjmowe01@louisville.edu

EDUCATION

- M.A. Sociology, University of Louisville, 2011. 4.0 GPA
Thesis: "Shifting Parenting Styles and the Effect on
Juvenile Delinquency." Advisor: Ryan D. Schroeder
- B.S. Sociology, University of Louisville, 2010. *Summa Cum Laude*

PEER-REVIEWED ARTICLES

- Mowen, Thomas and Ryan Schroeder. 2011. "Not in My Name: An Investigation of
Victims' Family Clemency Movements and Court Appointed Closure."
Forthcoming in *Western Criminology Review*.

MANUSCRIPTS UNDER REVIEW

- Schroeder, Ryan, George Higgins, and Thomas Mowen. 2011. "Maternal Attachment
Trajectories and Adult Criminal Offending." Currently under review at the
Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency.

PAPERS IN PROGRESS

- Schroeder, Ryan and Thomas Mowen. "The Sociological Dimensions of Celiac
Disease." A study of the social stigma of Celiac Disease and exploration of
secondary deviance resulting from label internalization.
- Mowen, Thomas. "Shifting Parenting Styles and Juvenile Delinquency."
A study on the effects of shifting parenting styles on juvenile delinquent behavior.

PAPERS PRESENTED AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

Mowen, Thomas. "Parental Transitions and Juvenile Delinquency." Will present at the 2011 North Central Sociological Association session in Criminology. Cleveland, Ohio. (March 31-April 2, 2011).

Mowen, Thomas. "Victims' Clemency and Media." Presented at the 2010 Anthropologists and Sociologists of Kentucky Annual Conference at Lindsey Wilson College (October 1-2, 2010)

Mowen, Thomas. "An Introspective Look at Victims' Family Clemency Movements and the Myth of Court Appointed Closure." Presented at the 2010 SouthEastern Sociology Symposium at Emory University (February 19-20, 2010). Awarded First Place for Excellence in Undergraduate Research at SEUSS.

Mowen, Thomas. "Electrical Energy Use Behavioral Patterns." University of Louisville. A study of energy use behavioral patterns within the College of Arts and Sciences. Paper presented at the Campus-Community Partnerships for Sustainability Conference in Lexington, Kentucky (April 16-18, 2009).

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Instructor, *University of Louisville*, Spring 2011. Taught Sociology 323: Diversity and Inequality. (N=45 students) Designed and prepared the entire course. Presented all lectures, activities, exams, and assignments each class meeting to a class of 46 students.

Graduate Teaching Assistant, *University of Louisville*, Fall 2010-Spring 2011. Worked as a fully-funded graduate teaching assistant for Sociology 210: Race and Ethnicity. Prepared and presented lectures to 120 students. Coordinated and directed two recitation seminars each week (N=31 students in each section). Graded exams, quizzes, and in-class assignments.

Graduate Teaching Assistant, *University of Louisville*, Summer 2010. Volunteered as a teaching assistant for Dr. Ryan Schroeder for SOC 201: Intro to Sociology. Wrote and presented lectures each week (N=40 students). Responsible for grading all paper/class assignments, creating PowerPoints, assignments, and handouts.

Undergraduate Teaching Assistant, *University of Louisville*, Fall 2009-Spring 2010. Served as an undergraduate teaching assistant for Sociology 210: Race and Ethnicity. Prepared and presented lectures on selected topics (N=115 students). Assisted with recitation discussion.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Managing Editor, *Kentuck Journal of Anthropology and Sociology*, Spring 2011-Present. Edited, formatted, and reviewed manuscripts. Compiled all documents, indices, and editorial notes for publication

Editorial Assistant, *Kentucky Journal of Anthropology and Sociology*, Summer 2010-Spring 2011. Received and distributed manuscripts for review. Edited and prepared articles for publication. Contacted sociology and anthropology programs in the region for submissions.

Manuscript Reviewer, *Journal of Social Service Research*, 2010.

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

Graduate Student Union, *Sociology Department Representative* (Fall 2010-Spring 2011). Served on behalf of the sociology department for the College of Arts and Sciences on the GSU.

Tau Sigma Honor Society, *Faculty Advisor* (Fall 2010-Spring 2011), *Secretary* (Fall 2009-Spring 2010), and *Committee Member* (Fall 2008-Spring 2009), University of Louisville.

Graduate Student Teaching Academy, *CoPresenter*, University of Louisville, (Fall 2010). Prepared and presented on critical thinking tools and classroom applicability for incoming GTAs.

Forecastle Sustainability Project, *Chairperson of Collection*. (Spring 2010-Fall 2010). Directed a campus-wide volunteer project aimed at raising awareness about green and sustainable practices throughout the campus and surrounding community of Louisville, KY.

Sociology Student Association, *President* (Fall 2009-Spring 2010), and *Vice President* (Fall 2008-Spring 2009). Conducted organization meetings. Planned and directed organizational community service projects.

President's Honor Roll for Community Engagement, *Student Representative* (Fall 2009-Spring 2010). Represented the student body while implementing new requirements for campus-community volunteer work and community service milestone projects.

Ideas to Action Quality Enhancement Initiative, *Student Representative* (Summer 2009-Spring 2010), *Curriculum Awareness Subcommittee Member* (Fall 2009-Spring 2010), *Search Committee Member* (Spring 2010). Represented the undergraduate student body on the faculty task group for the Curriculum and Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) and worked to raise student awareness of the curriculum reform initiative.

HONORS

- Awarded First Place for Excellence in Undergraduate Research at the 2010 SouthEastern Undergraduate Sociology Symposium (SEUSS) at Emory University.
- Named Graduate Student of the Month by the School of Interdisciplinary and Graduate Students, University of Louisville, November, 2010.
- Inducted into the University of Louisville Woodcock Society, the highest honors awarded by the College of Arts and Sciences
- Recipient of the 2010 James E. DeBurger Award for Outstanding Research in Sociology by the University of Louisville
- Recipient of the 2010 Charles H. Parrish Award for Outstanding Service to Promote Human Welfare by the University of Louisville
- Phi Kappa Phi National Honor Society Member (Spring, 2010)
- Alpha Kappa Delta Sociology Honors Society Member (Fall, 2009)
- Golden Key International Honor Society Member (Fall, 2009)
- National Collegiate Scholars Society Member (Spring, 2006)
- Appointed to the Dean's List, 4.0 GPA (5 semesters)
- Appointed to the Dean's Scholars List, 3.75 GPA or greater (3 semesters)
- Received Full Scholarship, Montana State University (2005-2006)
- Received Tuition Scholarship, University of Louisville (2009-2010)
- University of Louisville Honors Program (2008-2010)

MEMBERSHIPS

North Central Sociological Association, Member

VOLUNTEER SERVICE

Summer School Coordinator (Summer 2009) and ***Volunteer*** (Fall 2008-Present), Brooklawn Childcare and Family Services, Louisville, KY. Coordinated summer school activities for boys grades 4-8. Instructed English, mathematics, history and art class. Coached middle school softball and t-ball teams. Conducted team-building exercises with at-risk youths.

Classroom Volunteer (Summer 2008-Fall 2010), Fort Knox Elementary School. Served as a tutor for basic English writing and as a chaperone for field trips.

Volunteer Piano Instructor, Music 102 (Fall 2007), Montana State University. Worked with students on piano skills and performance technique.

Crowd Management and Clean-up Volunteer (Fall 2005-Spring 2006), Montana State University. Worked as a sideline assistant/crowd manager and ticket taker for football and basketball games.

WORK EXPERIENCE

Manager of Receiving/Stocking and Delivery, Lowe's Home Improvement, Bozeman, MT. (December 2006-July 2007). Supervised 35 people. Responsible for two-million-dollars of inventory. Coordinated training and implementation of federal stocking and reporting regulations. Instituted and oversaw OSHA customer property and safety standards.