

Spring 2013

The Impact Of Maturity And Parenting Style In Delinquent Behaviors

Nichole Lind

Fort Hays State University, nichole.lind@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/theses>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lind, Nichole, "The Impact Of Maturity And Parenting Style In Delinquent Behaviors" (2013). *Master's Theses*. 89.
<https://scholars.fhsu.edu/theses/89>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository.

THE IMPACT OF MATURITY AND PARENTING
STYLE ON DELINQUENT BEHAVIORS

being

A Field Study Presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the Fort Hays State University in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Education Specialist

by

Nichole Lind

M.S., Fort Hays State University

Date _____

Approved _____
Major Professor

Approved _____
Chair, Graduate Council

ABSTRACT

Most of the previous research about juvenile delinquency has focused on why some adolescents become delinquent. Elliott and Voss (1974) theorized that delinquent behavior occurs due to the aspiration opportunity disjunction, or goals that are beyond one's means. Moffitt (1993) shifted the focus of research as to why most adolescents quit their delinquent behavior and others persist towards a lifetime of criminal activities. Mounts (2002) found that parents who had higher levels of parenting management practices had adolescents with lower levels of drug use and drug using friends. Moffitt (1993) proposed that it is a perceptual shift or an exit from the maturity gap that ends illegal behavior for most adolescents. The current study focused on the impact of maturity and parenting style on delinquent behaviors. Through the examination of self-reported delinquent behaviors, psychosocial maturity, and the type of parenting style for mid-western college students, ages 18 to 20-years of age, utilizing linear regressions, this study found that the actual supervision conducted by parents is a better predictor and deterrent than parental involvement. Psychosocial maturity was also able to predict delinquent behavior, as those who score higher in psychosocial maturity had lower levels of delinquent behaviors.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of my thesis was made possible through the advice, guidance, patience, and support of my committee members, advisor, and family. I would like to express my highest gratitude to Dr. Janett Naylor, my advisor, who patiently guided me through the process. Her knowledge, support, accessibility, and guidance, have been invaluable. I offer my regards and appreciation to the members of my graduate committee, Dr. Leo Herrman, Dr. Kathryn McGonigal, and Mrs. Betsy Leeds, for your support and consideration.

I owe everything I have accomplished to my husband, Mike, my sons, Evan, Cade, Grady, and Holden, for always encouraging me to finish the race. There are no words to express my appreciation of your unending love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
LIST OF APPENDIXES.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Delinquency.....	3
Parents.....	12
Psychosocial Maturity.....	19
Present Study and Hypotheses.....	24
METHOD	
Participants.....	30
Measures.....	30
<i>Parenting Style Index</i>	30
<i>Psychosocial Maturity Inventory</i>	32
<i>Social Misconduct Checklist</i>	33
<i>Demographics Questionnaire</i>	35
Procedure.....	35
RESULTS.....	36
DISCUSSION.....	47

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	A Model of Psychosocial Maturity.....	23
2	Variables and their Method of Assessment.....	29
3	Parenting Style and Categorizing Variables.....	32
4	Results of Linear Regression to Predict Psychosocial Maturity.....	38
5	Results of Linear Regression to Predict Social Misconduct from Parenting Style.....	42
6	Results of Linear Regression to Predict Social Misconduct from Psychosocial Maturity.....	44
7	Results of <i>t</i> -test Comparing Gender.....	45
8	Results of <i>t</i> -test Comparing Socio-Economic Status.....	46
9	Results of Linear Regression to Predict Parental Education from Parenting Style.....	47

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix	Page
A Informed Consent Form.....	58
B Parent Style Index.....	61
C Social Misconducts Checklist.....	64
D Psychosocial Maturity Inventory.....	68
E Demographics.....	73
F Debriefing Statement.....	76

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquency is often considered a sign of the times, or a symptom of what is wrong with society rather than an affliction of the individual. Juvenile delinquency has prevailed across centuries and has continued to be viewed as a societal problem. The term “juvenile delinquency” however, did not exist until the turn of the nineteenth century. Prior to that time, society relied on a family-based system of discipline as Colonial law required parents to punish their children so that intervention by court officials was unnecessary (Mennel, 1983). As work left the home for the factory, and villages became cities, the children of poor families were often displaced and juvenile delinquency emerged.

Emile Durkheim (1951) explained that when society is disturbed by crisis or benefit, the transition to adapt and regulate causes an imbalance. “The state of deregulation or anomy is thus further heightened by passions being less disciplined, precisely when they need more disciplining” (Durkheim, 1951, location 4815). While the Industrial Revolution may have led to the displacement of poor children, which acted as a catalyst for juvenile delinquency at the societal level, juvenile delinquency has perpetuated despite more stable times.

The 2008 Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Report estimated that over two million arrests of persons younger than the age of 18 were made in the United States (OJJDP, 2009). Of all arrests in the year 2008, juveniles accounted for 16% of all violent crime arrests and 26% of all property crime arrests. It is evident that

juvenile offenders are in every community and school, as they have been for many generations.

As juvenile delinquency has continued to impact society and as society's views have evolved from punishing youth with death for pick pocketing to the current complex juvenile justice system, much research has been done to further understand juvenile delinquents (Shore, 2000). There have been vast amounts of research dedicated to the causes of delinquency over the years and many factors have been identified in the development of delinquent behavior. The shift in recent research of delinquency is not directed toward why one does it, but why most quit while others persist towards a lifetime of criminal activities (Moffitt, 1993). As it is becoming more accepted that *most* youth have dabbled in delinquency, the causes become less important than the ways in which to facilitate an end to the troublesome delinquent behaviors.

Terrie E. Moffitt (1993) proposed that adolescent-limited delinquent activity is due to a growing maturity gap created by modernization. The post modernization era has delayed the achievement of social maturity for adolescents and expedited the achievement of biological maturity. This disparity creates a personal anomaly, which is compounded by strained parental relationships. The composition of families has also changed drastically since the Industrial Revolution. This study purports that the familial relationship and the achievement of social maturity are significant in facilitating an end to delinquent behaviors.

Delinquency

Delbert S. Elliott and Harwin L. Voss published *Delinquency and Dropout* in 1974, which attempted to synthesize strain, social-learning theory and social control theories (Elliott & Voss, 1974). Elliott and Voss (1974) expanded the definition of delinquency by stating that, “delinquent behavior is learned and positively reinforced as an alternative means to achieve cultural goals” (Elliott & Voss, 1974, p. 9). This theory views delinquency as purposive behavior that is an alternative to further failure. It focuses on the discrepancy between youths’ aspired goals and their perceived opportunity to achieve those goals. It also addresses how the inability to achieve these goals leads to an alienation from society, which permits deviation from societies rules. The social learning component is essential, as individuals must have the opportunity to observe illegal behavior and find reinforcements for such behavior.

Elliott and Voss’s (1974) theory differs from many of their era as they do not limit delinquency to only lower socioeconomic statuses. This theory notes that middle class youth often have aspirations that exceed their opportunities as their goals are set higher than those of lower socioeconomic status. The discrepancy between aspirations and opportunities is referred to as the *aspiration opportunity disjunction* or goals that are beyond one’s means. Durkheim (1951) suggested that “to pursue a goal which is by definition unattainable is to condemn oneself to a state of perpetual unhappiness” (location 4724). Elliott and Voss (1974) theorized that the aspiration and the element that cause the failure are not important to this theory, only the expectation of failure that the youth perceives. It was found, however, in their four-year longitudinal study that a causal connection existed between failure and delinquency pertaining only to academic

achievement and parental acceptance (Elliott & Voss, 1974). Not all youth anticipating failure will become delinquents; rather they introduced a developmental model that outlines a path toward delinquency.

The second component as described by Elliott and Voss (1974) is *external attribution of blame*. While they describe the trajectory of external blame as being different from internal blame, they failed to define external blame. They believe that external blame will eventually lead to delinquency, whereas internal blame will lead to social isolation and dropping out of school, but not delinquency. This contradicts Travis Hirschi (1969) who stated, “it does not matter whether the boy blames himself or the social system for potential failure; ascription of blame is essentially unrelated to the commission of delinquent acts” (Hirschi, 1969, p. 184). At the end of their longitudinal study, Elliott and Voss (1974) found little support for this component as delinquents and dropouts were not consistent in blaming themselves or anyone else for their failures.

The third component in the Elliott and Voss model is essential to understanding delinquency and is founded upon Durkheim’s theory of anomie (Durkheim, 1951; Elliott & Voss, 1974). It is *normlessness or alienation* that acts as the permitter allowing youth to abandon their beliefs and abidance of society’s rules and commit delinquent behavior. There are many reasons for youth to feel alienated from their parents, schools or peers. Academic achievement is a primary stressor in the lives of many youth. This stress caused the stomachaches of Vicki Abele’s 12-year-old daughter that inspired her to make the film *Race to Nowhere*. This film depicts the achievement culture of today’s middle-class, as the résumé building of children begins before they can even read (Gabriel, 2010). For children with learning disabilities or one who does not perform well in school

for a variety of other reasons, school may leave them feeling alienated. Post dropout surveys reported that students felt alienated within the classroom (Jimerson, Anderson, & Whipple, 2002). Many researchers, who view dropping out of school as a developmental process similar to that of delinquency, note that dropping out may be due to prolonged experience of school failure and alienation (Tuck, 1989).

The failure one experiences in school may serve as the *aspiration-opportunity disjunction*, as well as the *alienation* components of the Elliott and Voss model. Lynam, Moffitt, and Stouthamer-Loeber (1993) found that delinquent youth scored eight IQ points lower on the Wechsler Intelligence Scales for Children-Revised (WISC-R) than non-delinquent youth. This longitudinal study was able to determine by early and repeated testing that delinquent behaviors did not cause a decrease in IQ. The prevailing question left unanswered by this study was what other factors could account for the discrepancy between intelligence in delinquent and non-delinquent youth?

Elliott and Voss (1974) stated that a change in youths' reference group may be the link between failure and delinquency. This changing of friends is the final element of this delinquency model, *access and exposure to delinquent peers*. Elliott and Voss (1974) explain this component as the learned interaction with other persons who exhibit and support delinquent behavior patterns. In recent years, it is expected that today's youth have ample exposure to delinquent behavior due to youth having unlimited access to the internet and television. Therefore, the access and exposure to the delinquent peers' component is fulfilled very early on in life.

Mark Warr (1993b) asserts that the majority of American adolescents have at least some delinquent friends. Warr found that it is the level of parental attachment and time

spent with parents, which affirms the influence of these delinquent peers. Data from the National Youth Survey of 1976 showed that “weekend family time may have the greatest preventative effect on delinquency” (Warr, 1993b, p. 259). Consequently, if youth are spending their weekends with their family access and time spent with a delinquent peer group is limited. Warr also determined that the level of parental attachment is significant in avoiding delinquent friends, but it is not significant in reducing delinquency once those delinquent friendships have been established (Warr, 1993b).

In 1969, Hirschi referred to parental influence in delinquent peer relationships as being “psychologically present” (p. 88). Psychological presence refers to the indirect control that parents have over their children. While parents may not be physically present when the temptation to commit a crime occurs, a psychological presence refers to whether or not youth give thought to their parent’s reaction to their behavior. As adolescents begin spending more time at school and in afterschool activities with friends, parental influence becomes more of an indirect effect. Haynie and Osgood (2005) found that adolescents who spent a great deal of *unstructured* time with non-delinquent or pro-social friends exhibited more delinquent behaviors than those who had organized structured activities, such as school clubs or school sponsored sports (Haynie & Osgood, 2005). Haynie and Osgood (2005) add support to the theories of Warr (1993a), Elliott, and Voss (1974) with their finding that adolescents will engage in even more delinquency if they have delinquent friends.

The effect of parents on the development of delinquency is strongly associated in nearly every study and cannot be ignored as a powerful and influential factor. Researchers disagree, however, on whether or not the effect of parents is direct and

causal or more of an indirect influence. Much of the research discussed thus far refers to the indirect influence that parenting has on delinquency. Parents may influence the amount of unstructured time that their children have to spend with friends. Parents may affect the type of friends that are made available to their children, based on the schools attended and the activities that their children participate thereby exposing them to peers that are more deviant and increasing the level of delinquency (Haynie & Osgood, 2005; Elliott & Voss, 1974; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch & Darling, 1992; Warr, 1993a). The effectiveness of parental monitoring and consequences may also have a substantial impact on the age of first offense, which may have lasting implications (Patterson & Yoerger, 1993; Moffitt, 1993).

While Elliott and Voss (1974) focused much of their theory on peers, a theory predicated by Patterson & Yoerger (1993) postulates that the social skills taught to children by their parents have a direct effect on children's development into delinquency. It is then the social skills that distinguish between early onset delinquency, by the age of fourteen, and late onset, which occurs in middle adolescence. Simons, Wu, Conger, and Lorenz (1994) describe the distinction between the two groups. The late starters are acting out in rebellion under the encouragement and support of their peers. Late starters possess adequate social skills, but may have had a decline in parenting quality due to divorce or the common discord between adolescents and parents. Early starters, however, are described as aggressive and defiant and as having serious deficits in social skills due to inept parenting practices.

Patterson and Yoerger (1993) state that both peer rejection and academic failure have powerful consequences for antisocial boys, as each failure is a negative experience

and decreases future positive reinforcements. The early starters are typically rejected by conventional peers and must form friendships with other deviant peers. Peer rejection may be synonymous with the *alienation* component of Elliott and Voss (1974), and the academic failure may fulfill the *aspiration-opportunity disjunction*. The early onset group is at risk of becoming chronic or lifelong offenders.

The description of early versus late onset delinquents is similar to Crick and Dodge's (1994) description of socially adjusted and maladjusted children. As children develop social self-perceptions based on their peers' response to them, the self-perceptions have a reciprocal relationship with their social adjustment. As children perceive themselves as misfits, the alienation component of Elliott and Voss' (1974) delinquent development model takes effect and permits children to partake in delinquent behavior, as encouraged by their delinquent peer group.

What may be missing from the Elliott and Voss (1974) model however, is the influence that children may have on their own environments, or perhaps why the disjunction exists in the first place. Patterson and Yoerger (1993) found that parents of antisocial children use less positive reinforcers for prosocial behaviors than that of a control group of normal children. While social skills deficits are expected to occur due to the failure of parents to teach adequate social skills, the blame may not all befall the parents. Difficult children affect their own environment as, "their noncompliance and explosive temper make it difficult for parents, siblings, teachers, or peers to teach them anything" (Patterson & Yoerger, 1993, p. 148).

Terrie E. Moffitt (1993) offers some explanation as to why some children are seemingly more difficult and resistant to social norms. Moffitt (1993) proposed a

comprehensive taxonomy of two types of juvenile offenders that during adolescence are often indistinguishable; *life-course persistent* and *adolescent-limited*. The life-course-persistent individual is similar to Patterson and Yoerger's (1993) early onset offender. Moffitt (1993) describes life-course persistent offenders as people who display antisocial behavior at a very early age due to neurological issues.

The neurological issues present in life-course persistent offenders may be very subtle due to poor prenatal care, prematurity, exposure to toxins, a troubled birth or a variety of other complications, but may result in a difficult infant. Usually by toddlerhood, children with a neurological issue may be described as "clumsy, awkward, overactive, inattentive, irritable, impulsive, hard to keep on schedule, delayed in reaching developmental milestones, poor at verbal comprehension, deficient at expressing themselves, or slow at learning new things" (Moffitt, 1993, p. 681). Difficult children likely have a profound impact on the parent's ability to effectively parent and use appropriate discipline.

Moffitt (1993) notes that strong evidence exists that those children who become antisocial also suffer from neuropsychological deficits. Verbal and executive function neuropsychological deficits are empirically associated with antisocial behavior (Moffitt, 1993). These deficits are independent of social class, race, test motivation, and academic attainment (Moffitt, 1990). A primary difference between the life-course persistent offender and the adolescent limited offender is the presence or absence of neuropsychological deficits (Barnes, Beaver & Piquero, 2011). The adolescent limited offenders are typically free of neuropsychological deficits and their life outcomes are better than the life-course persistent offender.

Socioeconomic status, single parenting, lack of resources, and a high parent frustration level often compound these neurological issues. Moffitt (1993) points out that biology is not deterministic. These person-environment interactions are subject to the snowball effect of circumstance, as lower socioeconomic status also puts children at risk to observe more deviant behavior, which exacerbates already present neurological issues and lack of effective parenting and fulfills the Elliott and Voss (1974) access and exposure to delinquent peers component. By school age, children could likely be diagnosed with conduct disorder and are often rejected by peers due to an over aggressiveness and lack of self-control. Peer rejection results in missed socialization opportunities. The exhibition of behavior problems results in missed class time and missed opportunities to attain basic academic skills. The missed social and academic opportunities exacerbate already poor verbal abilities and perpetuate the life-course (Moffitt, 1993).

Interestingly by adolescence, Moffitt (1993) proffers that the children who were once rejected by their peers now become role models of sorts and otherwise normal adolescents attempt to emulate the antisocial behavior of the life-course-persistent antisocial adolescents. In Moffitt's theory, the adolescent-limited antisocial behavior individuals abruptly develop from this emulation and the *maturity gap*. Moffitt (1993) defined the maturity gap as the gap between biological maturity and social maturity. Moffitt (1993) notes that due to improved nutrition and health care, biological maturity is occurring at an earlier age, while due to modernization, entrance into the workforce is delayed. This creates a vacuum where biologically mature individuals do not have the

responsibilities or benefits of adulthood. The *maturity gap* may last five to ten years and can result in frustration and the proverbial teenage angst.

Barnes, Beaver, and Piquero (2011) found that the *maturity gap* was a “significant predictor of absentention from delinquency after controlling for self-control, age, and race” (p. 702). Beaver et al. (2011) determined that if the level of biological maturity is equal with the level of social maturity the less chance of delinquent activity. The life-course-persistent antisocial individuals, however, are not subjected to the maturity gap as they have already acquired a piece of adult life as their parents are often disengaged or disregarded. “As evidence that they have social consequence in the adult world, they have personal attorneys, social workers, and probation officers; they operate small businesses in the underground economy; and they have fathered children” (Moffitt, 1993, p. 687). This creates envious circumstances and emulation results at a staggering rate. Moffitt (1993) cites an Elliott and Menard (1996) finding that 78% of 11-year-olds reported no or minimal delinquency among their friends, but 66% of 17-year-olds reported substantial delinquency among their friends.

Moffitt’s (1993) review of the 1980 Federal Bureau of Investigation index of offenses shows a sharp increase at 11 years of age, a peak at 17 years of age and a gradual decrease in the early twenties. Moffitt proffers that the decrease in offenses is evidence that the adolescent-limited antisocial behavior group desists in offending. Moffitt (1993) offers possible reasons as to why the gradual reduction in antisocial behavior occurs; exit from the maturity gap, or the consequences of illegal behavior undergo a perceptual shift from enviable to punishment. This theoretical perceptual shift or loss of motivation only occurs in the adolescent-limited group. The life-course

persistent individuals are by definition, to continue with antisocial behavior. Moffitt (1993) theorizes that with this perceptual shift the life-course-persistent individuals again become rejected by their peers, thereby rejected by society.

Parents

Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, and Dornbusch (1994) found that the type of parenting, as defined by Diana Baumrind's (1966) framework, which consisted of three types of parenting styles; permissive, authoritarian and authoritative. Baumrind described permissive parents as those who do not punish and are accepting of their children's impulses, desires and actions. Permissive parents make few demands or place few rules upon their children, allowing them to regulate themselves. Baumrind described authoritarian parents as those who attempt to shape and control their children's behavior, as they value obedience and favor punishment. Punishment for authoritarian parents is often a forceful measure and many household responsibilities may be placed upon these children. Baumrind (1966, p. 891) stated, "The authoritarian parent was stern because she cared. Her discipline was strict, consistent and loving." In contrast, Baumrind describes authoritative parents as those who attempt to direct their children in a rational, issue oriented manner. Authoritative parents encourage their children to discuss rules and their objections to rules as self-will and conformity are both valuable to the authoritative parent. They encourage their children but continue to set expectations for future conduct (Baumrind, 1966).

Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg and Dornbusch (1991) expanded this framework to further discern two types of permissive parenting styles. They distinguished neglectful and indulgent, as two separate permissive parenting styles, as the intent of the parent is

very different. The distinction between these two types of permissive parents as postulated by Lamborn et al. (1991) is made between the level of involvement and acceptance. Indulgent parents are not strict with their children because they believe in trust and democracy in parenting. They are however, responsive to their children's emotional needs and demonstrate warmth and acceptance toward their children. This is similar to the spirit of the permissive parents as described by Baumrind (1966). Neglectful parents however, are not strict and are unresponsive due to general disengagement rather than an ideological parenting style. These parents were not included in Baumrind's framework in any way and may reflect a cultural shift that occurred somewhere between 1966 and 1991.

Lamborn et al. (1991) conducted a study to measure and compare the psychosocial development, school achievement, internalized distress, and problem behavior of children from each of the four parenting styles. Children of indulgent homes were found to be high in self-reliance, social competence and delinquency. The indulged youth were found to be more peer oriented than that of other parenting styles (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). Children of the neglectful parenting style have lower levels of self-esteem than that of indulged children, but they have similar amounts of problem behavior and delinquency. Children of authoritarian homes were similar to children of neglectful parenting in their levels of self-esteem.

Authoritarian parents were described by Lamborn et al. (1991) as firm, directive, but less supportive than authoritative parents. Children of authoritarian parents are found to have few behavioral problems but are often less competent, with lower self-esteem and are less prosocial than children of authoritative homes (Lamborn et al., 1991). The

distinction between authoritative and authoritarian parents is in the level of involvement and acceptance. While both are firm and demanding, the authoritative parents are responsive to children and show warmth or acceptance. Lamborn et al. described authoritative parents as firm, supportive and democratic (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). These parents are both responsive and demanding with a high degree of warmth or acceptance, a high degree of psychological autonomy or democracy, and a high degree of behavioral control (Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989). The Lamborn et al. (1991) study found the children of authoritative parents to be competent, prosocial, low in internalizing problems, low in drug use and high in autonomy.

It is clear through the description of these parenting styles and their associated outcomes for children that the authoritative parenting style is typically the most revered, within American culture. Steinberg (2001) discusses further, how authoritative parenting has such an overwhelming benefit to adolescents. Steinberg stated that the nurturance and involvement factors of authoritative parenting make children more receptive to parental influence. The support and structure of authoritative parenting facilitates the development of self-regulatory skills. The verbal give-and-take engages children promoting cognitive and social competence, which strengthens children's functioning outside of the family (Steinberg, 2001).

School is usually where children and adolescents spend most of their time without their families and their social competence is scrutinized. Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch and Darling (1992) found through a large longitudinal study that an authoritative parenting style had a significant impact on school performance and engagement during the high school years. Steinberg et al. (1992) found that parental encouragement alone

did not enhance school achievement or engagement. In fact, the longitudinal analysis from this study, while only correlational, found that parental involvement could lead to academic success. Parental involvement was measured by five elements: helping with homework when asked, attending school programs, watching students in sports or other extracurricular activities, helping students select courses, and knowing how students are doing in school. If parental involvement is a key component in academic success, one could deduce that less parental involvement could incur an increase in school failure.

As adolescents begin spending more time at school and in afterschool activities with friends, parental influence becomes more of an *indirect* effect as suggested by Haynie and Osgood (2005). As parental involvement is important in academic success, Mounts (2002) found parental involvement to be an important influence on the friends that the youth chooses as well. Mounts conducted a longitudinal study involving 300 ninth grade students who completed questionnaires regarding their perceptions of their parent's parenting style, parenting management practices, parental involvement, their own drug use and the drug use of their three best friends. This study described parent management practices as consisting of *monitoring, guiding, neutrality, prohibiting, and supporting*. Parenting styles were defined as authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and uninvolved. The uninvolved parenting style is similar to the neglectful style as described by Lamborn et al. (1991). Mounts (2002) found that levels of *monitoring* were higher in the authoritative parenting styles than in any other parenting style as reported by the adolescents. *Neutrality*, which Mounts (2002) defined as when parents do not interfere with their children's peer relationships, was found to be highest in authoritative and indulgent parenting styles as compared to the authoritarian style. The level of

supportiveness was found to be higher in authoritative and indulgent families than in authoritarian and uninvolved families.

Mounts (2002) then compared parenting management practices to the adolescents' reported drug use and that of their friends. It was found that when parents had higher levels of *guiding*, these adolescents' associated with friends who had lower levels of drug use. Mounts (2002) defined *guiding* as when the parents discuss the consequences of being friends with particular people. Parents who practiced a higher level of *supporting*, which was defined as when parents encourage and facilitate friendships, had adolescents' lower in first time drug use. Interestingly parents who practiced high levels of *prohibiting* had children with higher levels of first time drug use. As expected, Mounts (2002) found that youth with higher levels of first time drug use associated with friends with higher levels of drug use.

The Mounts (2002) study is key in understanding how parenting styles and practices influence adolescents' choice in friends, as well as their own behavior. The practice of *guiding* relates to Hirschi's (1969) referral to parental influence in delinquent peer relationships as being "psychologically present" (p. 88). The transition from childhood into adolescence is marked by the decreasing amount of time that the youth spends with parents, therefore parental involvement and presence may take a more *indirect* effect. During the earlier years of childhood, parents arrange play dates. Later parents choose where their children will attend school thereby indirectly influencing the selection of friends available. However, in later adolescence as more independence is demanded, adolescents may expand their friendship circle and the influence of the parents is reduced to what they have taught their children.

Adolescence is a time of change for both adolescents and parents alike; however these changes effect each individual very differently. Steinberg (2001) notes that while adolescents benefit from the authoritative parenting style, parents often do not benefit from their children entering adolescence. Many parents whose children are entering into adolescence suffer from lowered self-esteem, diminished life satisfaction, increased anxiety, depression, and more apprehension about growing older (Steinberg & Steinberg, 1994). Adolescence is defined as the process of growing to maturity (Adolescence, 2011). It is only logical that this process will affect the entire family. The parent-child relationship is undergoing a great deal of restructuring as adolescents begin to assert autonomy and negotiate new parental supervision rules, perhaps in an effort to fulfill the *maturity gap* as described by Moffitt (1993). While the traditional model of the storm and stress parent-adolescent conflict period has been displaced in the majority of the current literature, the changes this relationship endures throughout adolescence cannot be ignored.

McGue, Elkins, Walden & Iacono (2005) conducted a three year longitudinal study involving over 1,300 individual twins that evidenced the perception of the downfall of the parent-child relationship. This study utilized questionnaires of 11 year olds regarding their relationship with their parents and repeated the measure at 14 years of age. A significant result in the perceived quality of the parent-child relationship was found, as it was lower at the follow-up questionnaire than it was at the intake assessment. While most of the youth felt their parental relationship had remained stable during those three years, a statistically significant amount felt that their relationship had deteriorated compared to those that saw an improvement in the parent-child relationship (McGue,

Elkins, Walden, & Iacono, 2005). These results however should be tempered with the information that was obtained came only from the self-reports of the adolescents and according to Steinberg (2001), adolescents seem less affected from their conflict with their parents than their parents do.

The changing nature of the adolescent-parent relationship is significant because while the technical parenting style may or may not change during adolescence, active parenting may be essential in preventing or tempering delinquent behavior. Dishion, Nelson, and Bullock (2004) found that there was a significant decrease in the family management practices of early to mid-adolescence antisocial boys' families compared to that of well-adjusted boys' families. Dishion et al. (2004) also found that an inverse relationship existed between lower levels of family management and higher levels of antisocial behavior, while higher or stable levels of family management were associated with lower levels of antisocial behavior at 18 years of age.

While one could argue with Dishion et al.'s comparison of antisocial and well-adjusted boy's family management as Moffitt (1993), Patterson, and Yoerger (1993) have thoroughly described the developmental trajectory of early onset antisocial behavior and by mid-adolescence, it does not appear that family management practices will have a substantial impact. Dishion et al. (2004) contends that this parental disengagement facilitates youths' access to deviant friends and furthers the family deterioration, in fulfillment of Elliott and Voss's (1974) final component of delinquent exposure. Dishion et al. (2004) coins this phenomenon as *premature autonomy*. Premature autonomy is a variation on Moffitt's (1993) *maturity gap*, as it refers to the youth's desire to be autonomous and the parental role in gradually enabling that autonomy.

Psychosocial Maturity

Moffitt (1993) proposed that a perceptual shift or an exit from the maturity gap ends illegal behavior in the adolescent-limited group. Maturity is a vital component to understanding the cessation of delinquent behavior in the adolescent-limited group. Barnes, Beaver, and Piquero (2011) found in their study that males with a low maturity gap, or equal levels of social maturity and biological maturity were less likely to commit delinquent acts. Barnes et al. (2011) measured social maturity with just seven questions regarding the level of autonomy granted to them by their parents.

Greenberger and Sorenson (1974) outline three basic types of maturity; biological, sociological and psychological those are all needed to achieve a societal 'ideal' of growth, development and socialization. The biological maturity concept refers to the ability to both survive and reproduce in an average environment. Biologically mature individuals are primarily only concerned with the physical needs to survive and continue their genes. Greenberger and Sorenson (1974) point out that adaptability to the physical environment is of decreasing importance in advanced societies due to the advancement of technology. Therefore, the ability to reproduce does little to guarantee the survival of the species.

Sociological maturity refers to individuals who are fully socialized and have the information and skills that enable them to perform the kinds of work engaged in by members of the society (Greenberger & Sorenson, 1974). Socially mature individuals also have the ability to pass on the societal language, values and work skills to future generations. Of particular importance, later socialization with peers *should* act to reinforce early social learning, but deficits usually perpetuate (Greenberger & Sorenson,

1974). The goal of the socialization of individuals serves the purposes of society, as it attempts to create the type of people needed to help society run smoothly and efficiently.

Psychological maturity is a term that may be interchangeable with mental health and social adjustment. Psychologically mature individuals must reach their mature state by successfully accomplishing a sequence in developmental milestones. Mature individuals would exhibit impulse control and have quality interpersonal relationships and sublimations (Greenberger & Sorenson, 1974). The goal of psychological development is the growth of constructive attitudes toward the self, others and their chosen social group.

Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr and Knerr (1975) define psychosocial maturity as a concept that is concerned with both the survival of both the person and the society. As the development of psychosocial maturity involves the integration of individual attributes that help a society to function smoothly. The Greenberger et al. (1975) model outlines three general demands made by all societies on individuals: (1) the capacity to function effectively on one's own, or *individual adequacy*; (2) the capacity to interact adequately with others, or *interpersonal adequacy*; and (3) the capacity to contribute to social cohesion, or *social adequacy* (Greenberger, Josselson, Knerr, & Knerr, 1975).

Greenberger et al. (1975) developed a measure, the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory, which includes the three aforementioned demands and further itemizes specific attributes within each demand. Such as *individual adequacy* involving constructs of self reliance, identity and work orientation; *interpersonal adequacy* involving communication skills, enlightened trust and knowledge of major roles; and *social adequacy* involving the constructs of social commitment, openness to sociopolitical

change and tolerance of individual and cultural differences. Table I is adapted from Greenberger and Sorenson (1974, p. 333) and highlights the organization of the societal demands and their constructs. These constructs, by description, seem to have a possible relation to the Elliott and Voss (1974) model of the development of a delinquent. The third component of Elliott and Voss in particular, *normlessness or alienation* seems to relate to *social adequacy* (Elliott & Voss, 1974).

Monahan, Steinberg, Cauffman and Mulvey (2009) conducted a study to determine the factors that lead to the cessation of adolescent antisocial activity. Monahan et al. (2009) postulated that psychosocial maturity leads to the eventual cessation of antisocial activity for most of the adolescents as very few continue to a career in crime. Monahan et al. (2009) studied 1,170 males who were adjudicated as juvenile offenders for serious crimes. The males were between the ages of 14 and 17 and were repeatedly interviewed for five years, for a total of eight interviews.

The participants were separated into five groups using a variety of offending scores averaged over the five-year period; low antisocial behavior trajectory group; moderate antisocial behavior trajectory; mid-adolescent peak trajectory; steadily desisting trajectory; and the persisting trajectory group. Monahan et al. (2009) found that the antisocial persisting group evidenced a diminished impulse control level at the age of 18 and declines in impulse control over time. The persisting group also evidenced a decline in the suppression of aggression and was the lowest in consideration of others, personal responsibility and orientation towards the future. However, they did exhibit a rapid increase and by the age of 22 was nearly equal to the other groups in their level of consideration for others (Monahan et al., 2009).

The mid-adolescent peak group also had slower growth rates in responsibility than that of the comparison groups and was very low in future orientation. These similarities as shared with the persistent offending group may be seen as an affirmation to Moffitt's (1993) theory that the mid-adolescent peak group has failed to have the perceptual shift that would view the consequences of antisocial behavior as enviable rather than punishment.

Table 1

*A Model of Psychosocial Maturity*Individual adequacy

Self-reliance

- Absence of excessive need for social validation
- Sense of control
- Initiative

Identity

- Clarity of self-concept
- Consideration of life goals
- Self-esteem
- Internalized values

Work orientation

- Standards of competence
- Pleasure in work
- General work skills

Interpersonal adequacy

Communication skills

- Ability to encode messages
- Ability to decode messages
- Empathy

Knowledge of major roles

- Role-appropriate behavior
- Management of role conflict

Social adequacy

Social commitment

- Feelings of community
- Willingness to work for social goals
- Readiness to form alliances
- Interest in long-term social goals

Openness to sociopolitical change

- General openness to change
- Recognition of costs of status quo
- Recognition of costs of change

Tolerance of individual and cultural differences

- Willingness to interact with people who differ from the norm
- Sensitivity to rights of people who differ from the norm
- Awareness of costs and benefits of tolerance

Present Study and Hypotheses

The purpose of the current study was to investigate how parenting affects youth's psychosocial maturity and their subsequent delinquent behaviors. The vast amount of literature studying juvenile delinquency has supported that parents and peers significantly affect delinquent behavior. This study was focused on the indirect influence of parents, as the participant population, being late adolescents, were primarily living out of the home for the first time. The participant sample were recent graduates from the maturity gap and were still newly experiencing indirect parenting effects. The attention of this study was focused more on the effect of parenting than peers on an outcome of delinquent behavior in relation to psychosocial maturity. While this study does not discount the vital role of peers, it has been thoroughly researched and its inclusion was beyond the scope and purpose of this study.

The first variable of this study was psychosocial maturity, which was measured by the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (PSM). The PSM summarized scores from the subtests of social adequacy and individual adequacy. Social adequacy involved the constructs of social commitment, openness to sociopolitical change and tolerance of individual and cultural differences. Individual adequacy involved the constructs of self reliance, identity and work orientation.

The second variable was parental style, which was measured by the Parenting Style Index (PSI). The PSI classified the parenting styles of the participants' parents as involved, psychological autonomy granting or strict. This index was based off the participant's perception of their parents parenting style and facilitated the classification of parents as authoritative, authoritarian, negligent or indulgent.

The third variable was illegal behavior, which was measured by the Social Misconduct Checklist (IBC). This self-report checklist divided the type of crimes reported into status offences, property crimes, drug crimes, violent crimes and a criminality category. This study further divided this checklist by the age at the time of the illegal behavior in order to ascertain early or late on-set or continuing illegal behavior. Participants were asked whether each noted behavior occurred before the age of 14, from the ages of 14-18 or after the age of 18. They were asked to assess their frequency of this behavior; never, 1-3 times, 3-5 times or more than 5 times, this was used to assess a range of delinquent behavior.

Participants were asked for their demographic information, such as their gender, ethnicity, academic classification, education level of parents and socioeconomic status. Participants were also asked which country they were raised, as the concepts in this study relate to a western, individualistic society and are not likely to apply to other cultures.

Hypotheses Set One

The first set of hypotheses pertained to the two variables of psychosocial maturity (PSM), social adequacy and individual adequacy. The first hypothesis was a main effect between psychosocial maturity and parenting style. Parenting style served as the independent variable and psychosocial maturity as the dependent variable. Participants whose parents scored high in acceptance/involvement and strictness/supervision, or are classified as authoritative parenting style, were expected to show higher levels of psychosocial maturity scores, particularly in individual adequacy and autonomy. This was because the nature of the authoritative parenting style allows, encourages and guides

adolescents to think for themselves and make their own decisions; this type of practice should foster adequacy and autonomy.

On the contrary, those with authoritarian parents were expected to score low in individual and social adequacy as they have always been told what to do rather than benefit and grow from being guided through experiences as those with authoritative parents have. People with authoritarian parents would show variability within individual adequacy as they would show a high degree of work orientation but a low degree of developed identity. The children of authoritarian parents have been told what to do, how to do it and the questioning of authority was not allowed, nor encouraged.

Those with indulgent parents would also score low in individual and social adequacy but may show variability within the social adequacy subtests. The indulged youth may be open to sociopolitical change, but lack a high degree of social commitment. The children of indulgent parents have not learned accountability or responsibility due to the lack of rules they grew up with and will therefore lack the motivation to be committed to a social cause. Those of indulgent parents may support sociopolitical change however as they were raised with their parents support in a democratic environment.

The participants with negligent parents would be low in individual and social adequacy with a higher score within the individual adequacy subtest of self-reliance. The children of negligent parents must learn to take care of themselves or to find other ways to meet their needs due to their parents' unresponsiveness; therefore, it is plausible that their self-reliance score will be elevated. Those of negligent parents however would be low in individual and social adequacy, as they too have not learned accountability or responsibility due to the lack of rules provided by their parents.

Hypothesis Set Two

The second set of hypotheses pertained to parenting style and illegal behavior as the dependent variable. People with authoritative or authoritarian parents would have a lesser level of delinquent behaviors than those with negligent or indulgent parents due to the strictness and supervision level with which they were raised. Authoritative and authoritarian parents provide much more strictness and supervision thereby instilling accountability and responsibility that may act as a deterrent in committing illegal behaviors. People with authoritative parents would have the lowest early onset illegal behavior scores and most of their illegal behavior will be status offenses. It is expected that there be very few early onset offenders within the sample, but if there are any, it is expected that they will have either indulgent or negligent parents as those youth lacked the guidance of strict rules.

Hypothesis Set Three

The third set of hypotheses pertained to psychosocial maturity (PSM) and illegal behavior as the dependent variable. People who score overall higher in psychosocial maturity would have fewer delinquent behaviors than those who scored lower in psychosocial maturity. As it is expected that maturity increase over time, any delinquent behaviors by participants scoring high on the PSM scale, most likely would not have occurred recently. Those who score highest in social adequacy would have the fewest illegal behaviors as they exhibit the most social cohesion and social responsibility. Those who have committed the most violent illegal behaviors will have the lowest interpersonal adequacy as they lack the capacity to interact with others in an adequate manner.

Hypothesis Set Four

The fourth set of hypotheses pertained to demographic variables and illegal behavior as the dependent variable. As research has consistently shown, males would have more illegal behaviors than females. Those lower in SES would have a higher number of illegal behaviors, starting at an earlier age.

Hypothesis Set Five

The fifth set of hypotheses pertained to demographic variables and parenting style as the independent variable. Parents with higher levels of academic achievement would be classified as having an authoritative parenting style, as those with more education are more likely to value teaching their children to think for themselves and guiding through high levels of supervision and high levels of involvement. Those who have authoritative parents would be less likely to report a lower SES status than any of the other style of parenting.

Table 2

Variables and their Method of Assessment with Applicable Subscales

Variable	Method of Assessment
Psychosocial Maturity Social Adequacy Social Commitment Openness to Sociopolitical Change Tolerance of Individual & Cultural Individual Adequacy Self-Reliance Identity Work Orientation	Psychosocial Maturity Inventory
Parenting Style Involvement Psychological Autonomy-Granting Strictness Authoritativeness	Parent Style Index
Social Misconduct Status Offenses Property Crimes Violent Crimes Drug Offenses Criminality Under 14 years of age Between 14 and 18 years of age 18 years of age or older	Social Misconduct Checklist
Gender Ethnicity Age Academic Classification Mother's Level of Education Father's Level of Education Pell Grant Qualification	Demographics Questionnaire

METHOD

Participants

The data from this study originates from a self-report questionnaire administered to approximately 400 participants. Many of these volunteers were excluded due to living with their parents and/or not being within the targeted age range. After deleting incomplete records, 197 participants remained. Of the 197 remaining participants, 50% were 18-years of age, 33% were 19-years of age, 14% were 20-years of age, and 2% were 21-years of age. The participants were recruited from entry-level college courses at Fort Hays State University and Colby Community College. These colleges are located in western Kansas and contain a limited amount of ethnic diversity, 86% of the participants were Caucasian, 6% were Hispanic, 4% were African American, and 2% were Asian. Approximately 38% of the participants were male and 62% were female.

Measures

Four measures were used in addressing the research questions, including the Parent Style Index (modified from Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts and Dornbusch, 1994), the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory (Greenberger et al., 1975), the Social Misconduct Measure (modified from McCoy, Fremouw, Tyner, Clegg, Johanasson-Love and Strunk, 2006 and Hirschi, 1969) and a demographic questionnaire. Table 2 shows all four measures and the corresponding variables.

Parenting Style Index. The Parenting Style Index was designed by Steinberg et al. (1992) and Steinberg et al. (1994) to measure and classify parents of adolescents as authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families based on Baumrind's theory (Baumrind, 1966). The index consists of two sections, titled "My Parents" and

“My Free Time.” The items then contributed to scores for two scales; acceptance/involvement and strictness/supervision. The acceptance/involvement scale measures the adolescents perception of the extent of their parent’s as loving, responsive and involved (Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). An example of a question in the “My Parents” section, loading on the acceptance/involvement scale is, “My parents helped me with my school work if there was something I didn’t understand.” The strictness/supervision scale measures the level of parental monitoring and supervision as reported by adolescents. The “My Free Time” section loads on the supervision/strictness scale with questions like, “How much did your parents TRY to know about what you did with your free time in high school?” The full modified PSI may be viewed in Appendix C.

In 1994, Steinberg et al. defined the four parenting categories by trichotomizing their sample on acceptance and on strictness. As shown in Table 3, authoritative families scored highest on acceptance/ involvement and strictness/supervision. Authoritarian families were in the lowest tertile for involvement but were in the highest tertile for strictness. Neglectful families’ scores placed them in the lowest tertiles for both variables. Indulgent families were in the highest tertile for involvement and in the lowest for strictness. Steinberg et al. (1994) excluded families whose scores placed them within the middle tertile to ensure that the four groups were representative of distinct categories.

Table 3

Parenting Styles and Categorizing Variables

Parenting Style	Categorizing Variables	
	<u>Acceptance/Involvement</u>	<u>Strictness/Supervision</u>
Authoritative	High	High
Authoritarian	Low	High
Neglectful	Low	Low
Indulgent	High	Low

Psychosocial Maturity Inventory. The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory was developed by Ellen Greenberger (1984) to measure the general demands made by society on individuals, as previously discussed; individual adequacy, interpersonal adequacy and social adequacy. Individual adequacy involves the constructs of self-reliance, identity and work orientation. Interpersonal adequacy involves the constructs of communications skills, enlightened trust and knowledge of major roles. Social adequacy involves the constructs of social commitment, openness to sociopolitical change and tolerance of individual and cultural differences. The societal demands and their corresponding constructs may be viewed in Table 1.

The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory consists of 93-items to be rated by the participant on a four point likert scale (1= agree strongly- 4= disagree strongly). Questions such as “If you can trust a person in one way, you know you can trust him or her in all ways” and “There are more good people than bad people” load on the enlightened trust scale (Greenberger, 1984). The items are then scored to determine the nine subscale scores and two summary scores. Summary scores are only obtained for

Individual Adequacy and Social Adequacy by summing the subscales, but Interpersonal Adequacy does not factorially cohere to the remaining subscales. The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory- Form D may be viewed in its entirety in Appendix D.

The Greenberger et al. (1975) psychosocial maturity measure has been validated with third grade through college students. A rise in maturity, as one would expect, was seen with age. Intellectual ability may moderate the psychosocial maturity scores, but the measure has been found to reliably test more than intelligence. Greenberger et al. (1975) reliability and validity studies did find however, that verbal achievement scores are highly correlated with psychosocial maturity scores. Josselson, Greenberger and McConochie (1975) found that the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory constructs of self-reliance, work orientation, identity and openness to change were significantly related to the Rosenberg self esteem scale. The constructs of self-reliance, work orientation, identity and communication skills were also significantly related to the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Josselson, Greenberger, & McConochie, 1975).

Social Misconduct Checklist. The Social Misconduct Checklist was designed for this study utilizing the Illegal Behavior Checklist by McCoy et al. (2006) based on the Loeber Youth Questionnaire, the Attendance and Discipline questionnaire developed by Travis Hirschi (1969) and the adapted checklist consists of 23-item, self-report measure of illegal activity. The questions are categorized as *status offenses*, which are crimes only if committed by a person under the age of majority; *drug crimes*, which are crimes involving drugs; *property crimes*, which are crimes involving property; *violent crimes* which are crimes against people and a *miscellaneous section* which addresses arrests and thoughts about criminality.

Thornberry and Krohn (2000) contend that self-report measures are the most accurate form of delinquency measurement aside from observing the delinquent behavior first-hand. Self-report measures eliminate the possible bias from law enforcement and judicial practices. It is expected that illegal behavior occurs more often than arrests and convictions would indicate. Junger-Tas and Marshall (1999) found that police statistics are not as reflective of reality as self-report surveys, especially in regards to substance abuse crimes. Hirschi (1969) noted that as the number of delinquent acts may change overtime, it is important to ask *when* these acts occurred. As this is a key element to this study, questions regarding *when* were worked into the survey.

Questions were adapted from the Illegal Behavior Checklist and the Attendance and Discipline questionnaire to fit the expected sample population. Questions regarding gang affiliation were removed and questions regarding marijuana use were modified, as it is no longer illegal in all states and municipalities. The question format was also modified to acquire information regarding the age of the participant at the time the crime was committed, as well as the frequency of the occurrence. Participants were asked, "Have you ever skipped school?" They classified their answer regarding their age; before the age of 14, between ages 14-18, and after the age of 18. They then quantified their answer; never, 1-3 times, 3-5 times, or more than 5 times. The age at the time of offense was added, as it is relative and necessary to determine the role of parental style and psychosocial maturity in illegal behavior. The frequency of offense was added in order to obtain a range of delinquency level. The Social Misconduct Checklist may be viewed in its entirety in Appendix E.

Demographics Questionnaire. The participants would be asked to share information regarding their gender, age, ethnicity, academic classification, parent's educational attainment and whether or not they still reside with their parents, and if they received financial assistance in the form of grants to ascertain their socio-economic status, as grants are dispersed on a financial needs basis.

Participants would also be asked where they were primarily raised. The data from participants who were raised outside of the United States may be excluded from the study, as the theories associated with this study typically apply to middle-class American Caucasians. While a diverse sample would be of interest, it is not expected that this study will produce enough of a diverse sample to be capable of any significant statistical findings.

Procedure

Participants were recruited from classes on the Fort Hays State University campus. An email was also sent to area community colleges requesting their participation, as well. Colby Community College psychology students participated in the study, but no other college responded to the recruitment email. It should be noted however, that as the survey was online and anonymous, it is unknown whether or not other schools participated. Participants were referred to the online survey address. Participants read the informed consent and chose whether or not to participate. The demographic questionnaire was administered last to avoid the well-documented priming effect that may occur when participants report personal information before the completion of the requested tasks. After participants completed all four measures, the

debriefing form appeared on their screen. Participants were then instructed to print the debriefing form in order to obtain any extra credit offered by their instructors.

RESULTS

The findings from the ANOVA analyzing the main effects between psychosocial maturity and parenting style, lead to grossly uneven groups and reduced the sample size significantly. The ANOVA calculations excluded nearly half of the participants, reducing N to 90 instead of the 197 original participants. Due to these issues, linear regressions were a better fit for the necessary analyses as they were more inclusive of participants, therefore ANOVA was not used in any of the analyses.

The regression models used two separate variables, Involvement and Actual Supervision, to represent group membership for parenting style. Actual Supervision consisted of asking participants “how much do/did your parents REALLY know?” This question then had six levels to ascertain what their parents knew about how their time was spent. The Parental Involvement subscale contained questions such as; “I can count on my parents to help me out, if I have some kind of problem; My parents keep pushing me to do my best in whatever I do.” The PSM utilized two general scales; Individual Adequacy and Social Adequacy, each involve three constructs. Individual Adequacy was constructed from identity, self-reliance, and work orientation subscales. Social Adequacy was constructed from social commitment, openness to change, and tolerance.

A linear regression was computed to predict Individual Adequacy from Actual Supervision and Involvement (see Table 4 for details). The overall regression was statistically significant and predicted about 16% of the variance in Individual Adequacy. Involvement significantly, negatively predicted Individual Adequacy when the variable

Actual Supervision was statistically controlled. Actual Supervision also significantly predicted Individual Adequacy when the variable Involvement was statistically controlled, but was positive. For every increase in Actual Supervision + Involvement, Individual Adequacy increases by .21 and decreases by -.25. Therefore, the more involved the parents are, the lower the Individual Adequacy, and the more supervision achieved, the higher the Individual Adequacy.

A linear regression was computed to predict Social Adequacy from Actual Supervision and Involvement (see Table 4 for details). The overall regression was statistically significant and predicted about 6% of the variance in Involvement. Involvement did not significantly predict Social Adequacy when the variable Actual Supervision was statistically controlled. Actual Supervision significantly predicted Social Adequacy when the variable Involvement was statistically controlled. For every increase in Actual Supervision, Social Adequacy increases by .20. Therefore, the more supervision achieved, the higher the Individual Adequacy.

Table 4

Results of Linear Regression to Predict Psychosocial Maturity

	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i> ² _{adj}	<i>β</i>	<i>t</i>
Predicting Individual Adequacy	18.08**	.15		
Involvement			-.25	-3.23**
Actual Supervision			.21	2.66**
Predicting Social Adequacy	6.83**	.06		
Involvement			-.09	-1.09
Actual Supervision			.20	2.46*

p*<.05, *p*<.01, *df*(2,193)

The second set of hypotheses pertained to parenting style and illegal behaviors. Variables were computed using data from the Social Misconduct Checklist and the Parenting Style Index. Again, the parenting variables used were Involvement and Actual Supervision. From the Social Misconduct Checklist, seven variables were predicted from the linear regression analysis: (1) Status Offenses are the sum from those who committed status offenses for all age groups; (2) Property Offenses are the sum from all age groups who reported committing a property crime; (3) Drug offenses are the sum from all age groups who reported committing a drug crime; (4) Criminality are the sum from all age groups who reported that they had friends who had been arrested, considered themselves as criminals, or they reported that they had personally been arrested; (5) Violent Offenses are the sum from all age groups who reported committing a violent crime; (6) Total Social Misconduct is the sum from all age groups of those who committed status

offenses, property crimes, violent crimes, drug crimes and Criminality; and (7) Age of Onset Under 14 is the sum of all the aforementioned categories, but only those who committed said crimes while under the age of 14.

Separate linear regressions were computed each to predict Status Offenses, Property Offenses, Drug Offenses, Criminality, Violent Offenses, Total Social Misconduct, and Crimes Occurring Before 14-years of Age, from the parenting style variables of Involvement and Actual Supervision. As indicated by Table 5, all illegal behaviors were significantly predicted when Involvement and Actual Supervision entered into the full model. Status Offenses, Property Offenses, Drug Offenses, and Criminality were all predicted by Actual Supervision when controlling for Involvement. However, Involvement when controlling for Actual Supervision was not statistically significant, in most cases, except for in the Total Social Misconduct model.

A linear regression was computed to predict Total Social Misconduct from Actual Supervision and Involvement (see Table 5 for details). The overall regression was statistically significant and predicted about 16% of the variance in Total Social Misconduct. Involvement significantly predicted Total Social Misconduct when the variable Actual Supervision was statistically controlled. Actual Supervision was negatively, significantly predicted of Total Social Misconduct when the variable Involvement was statistically controlled, but was negative. For every increase in Actual Supervision + Involvement, Total Social Misconduct increases by .16 and decreases by -.28. Therefore, the more involved parents are, the higher the Total Social Misconduct and the more supervision achieved, the less Total Social Misconduct.

Separate linear regressions were computed to predict Status Offenses, Property Offenses, and Criminality from Actual Supervision and Involvement (see Table 5 for details). The overall regressions were statistically significant and predicted about 9% of the variance in Status Offenses, about 8% of the variance in Property Offenses, and 12% of the variance in Criminality. Involvement did not significantly predict either Status Offenses, Property Offenses, or Criminality when the variable Actual Supervision was statistically controlled. Actual Supervision significantly predicted Status Offenses, Property Offenses, and Criminality when the variable Involvement was statistically controlled, but was negative. For every increase in Actual Supervision, Status Offenses decreases by $-.21$. For every increase in Actual Supervision, Property Offenses decreases by $-.22$. For every increase in Actual Supervision, Criminality decreases by $-.25$. Therefore, the more the supervision, the lower the Status Offenses, Property Offenses, and Criminality.

Separate linear regressions were computed to predict Drug Offenses, Violent Offenses, and Onset Under 14-years of age from Actual Supervision and Involvement (see Table 5 for details). Neither Involvement nor Actual Supervision predicted Drug Offenses, Violent Offenses, and Onset Under 14-years of age. The complete model of each of these offenses was statistically significant but the individual slopes were not, indicating that both Involvement and Actual Supervision jointly but not uniquely predict Drug Offenses, Violent Offenses, and Onset Under 14-years of age.

The third set of hypotheses pertained to psychosocial maturity (PSM) as the predictors and Social Misconduct behaviors as the dependent variables. Linear regressions were computed to predict Total Social Misconduct, Violent Offenses, Drug

Offenses, Status Offenses, Crimes Occurring Before 14-years of Age, Crimes Committed Between the Ages of 14-years and 18-years, and Crimes Committed Over the Age of 18 years from the PSM variables Individual Adequacy and Social Adequacy.

As indicated in Table 6, Social Adequacy significantly predicted Total Social Misconduct and Violent Crimes. The overall regressions were statically significant but negative, and predicted about 10% of the variance in Total Social Misconduct, and about 10% of the variance in Violent Crimes. For every increase in Social Adequacy, Total Social Misconduct decreased by -.26. For every increase in Social Adequacy, Violent Crimes decreased by -.21. Therefore, the less Social Adequacy, the less Total Social Misconduct, and Violent Crimes.

Table 5

Results of Linear Regression to Predict Social Misconducts from Parenting Style.

	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i> ² _{adj}	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>
Predicting Status Offenses	9.66**	.08		
Involvement			.14	1.71
Actual Supervision			-.21	-2.58*
Predicting Property Offenses	8.3**	.07		
Involvement			.09	1.17
Actual Supervision			-.22	-2.74**
Predicting Drug Offenses	15.96**	.13		
Involvement			.14	1.85
Actual Supervision			-.28	-3.61**
Predicting Criminality	13.39**	.11		
Involvement			.15	1.92
Actual Supervision			-.25	-3.11*
Predicting Violent Offenses	3.92*	.03		
Involvement			.10	1.24
Actual Supervision			-.12	-1.50
Predicting Total Social Misconduct	17.83**	.15		
Involvement			.16	2.13*
Actual Supervision			-.28	-3.67**
Predicting Age of Onset Under 14	7.78**	.07		
Involvement			.16	1.91
Actual Supervision			-.16	-1.96

p*<.05, *p*<.01, *df*(2, 193)

Individual Adequacy significantly predicted Status Offenses, Drug Offenses, and the age of the offender in all three categories. The overall regressions were statically significant, and predicted about 6% of the variance in Status Offense, about 6% of the variance in Drug Offenses, about 6% of the variance in Under 14-years of age, about 9%

of the variance in 14 to 18-years of age, and about 8% of the variance in Over 18-years of age. For every increase in Individual Adequacy, Status Offenses decreased by -.20. For every increase in Individual Adequacy, Drug Offenses decreased by -.25. For every increase in Individual Adequacy, Under 14-years of age decreased by -.20. For every increase in Individual Adequacy, Crimes Occurring 14- 18 years of age decreased by -.30. For every increase in Individual Adequacy, Over 18-years of age decreased by -.17. Therefore, the less Individual Adequacy, the fewer Status Offenses and illegal behaviors at all age groups.

Table 6

Results of Linear Regression to Predict Social Misconducts from Psychosocial Maturity Variables.

	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>R</i> ² _{adj}	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>
Predicting Total Social Misconduct	10.96**	(2,193)	.09		
Social Adequacy				-.26	-3.29**
Individual Adequacy				-.09	-1.09
Predicting Total Violent	10.16**	(2,193)	.09		
Social Adequacy				-.21	-2.55*
Individual Adequacy				-.15	-1.81
Predicting Drug Offenses	6.80**	(2,193)	.06		
Social Adequacy				-.01	-.09
Individual Adequacy				-.25	-3.08**
Predicting Status Offenses	6.18**	(2,193)	.05		
Social Adequacy				-.08	-.94
Individual Adequacy				-.20	-2.38**
Predicting Under 14- Years	6.05**	(2,193)	.05		
Social Adequacy				-.07	-.90
Individual Adequacy				-.20	-2.38*
Predicting 14 to 18- Years	9.64**	(2,193)	.08		
Social Adequacy				-.01	-.15
Individual Adequacy				-.30	-3.65**
Predicting Over 18- Years	8.25**	(2,192)	.07		
Social Adequacy				-.15	-1.85
Individual Adequacy				-.17	-2.10*

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

The fourth set of hypotheses pertained to demographic variables and Social Misconduct as the dependent variable. It was expected that males would have a higher number of illegal behaviors compared to females. T-tests were computed to compare the means of males and females, the results of these analyses appear in Table 7. As indicated

in Table 7, males do have higher number of Social Misconduct behaviors than females across each type of measured crime; however, there is no statistical significance between their reported criminality. These analyses did result in multiple violations of the homogenous of variance as indicated in Table 7, but with a large sample size, the *t*-test is robust.

Table 7

Results of t-test Comparing Gender.

	Male <i>M</i>	(<i>SD</i>)	Female <i>M</i>	(<i>SD</i>)	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>
Total Social Misconduct ^a	18.97	(3.93)	17.55	(2.48)	2.78**	108.66
Status Offenses ^a	3.85	(1.01)	3.50	(.62)	2.71**	107.08
Property Offenses ^a	3.56	(.79)	3.27	(.46)	2.95**	102.72
Violent Crimes ^a	3.47	(.86)	3.07	(.28)	3.87**	82.68
Drug Offenses	4.34	(1.10)	4.26	(1.03)	.79	194.00
Criminality	3.69	(1.10)	3.45	(.75)	1.78	194.00
Under Age 14 ^a	5.61	(1.17)	5.27	(.71)	2.23*	106.34
Between 14 & 18 Years ^a	6.74	(1.61)	6.20	(1.29)	2.48*	129.00
Over 18 Years ^a	6.61	(1.51)	6.14	(1.01)	2.41*	113.37

a = violation of equal variance

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

It was also expected that those lower in Socio-Economic Status (SES) would have a higher number of illegal behaviors and would start offending at an earlier age than those of higher SES. Participants were asked whether or not they qualified for a Pell Grant to indicate SES. It was expected that those who received a Pell Grant and thereby had a lower Socio-Economic Status, would have committed more offenses and have a higher degree of criminality than those who did not qualify for the Pell Grant. T-tests were computed and as indicated in Table 8, low SES had a higher mean for Total Social Misconduct, Status Offenses, Violent Crimes, Drug Offenses, Under 14-years of age and

between 14 to 18-years of age. As indicated in Table 8, these analyses again resulted in multiple violations of the homogenous of variance, but with a large sample size the *t*-test is robust.

Table 8

Results of t-test comparing Socio-Economic Status.

	Low SES <i>M</i>	(<i>SD</i>)	High SES <i>M</i>	(<i>SD</i>)	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>
Total Social Misconduct ^a	18.85	(3.74)	17.51	(2.55)	2.82**	138.66
Status Offenses	3.82	(.85)	3.50	(.76)	2.85**	193.00
Property Offenses ^a	3.47	(.73)	3.31	(.53)	1.72	144.82
Violent Crimes ^a	3.37	(.77)	3.11	(.41)	2.80**	118.70
Drug Offenses ^a	4.51	(1.16)	4.16	(.95)	2.27*	158.29
Criminality	3.70	(1.13)	3.44	(.69)	1.82	193.00
Under Age 14 ^a	5.60	(1.27)	5.25	(.49)	2.40*	101.72
Between 14 & 18 Years ^a	6.78	(1.75)	6.12	(1.08)	3.00**	129.52
Over 18 Years	6.47	(1.31)	6.19	(1.18)	1.57	192.00

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, a = violation of equal variance

The fifth and final hypothesis pertains to demographic variables and parenting style as the independent variable. It was hypothesized that parents with higher levels of academic achievement would be classified as having an authoritative parenting style, as indicated by high Involvement and high Actual Supervision. A linear regression was computed to predict Parental Education from Involvement and Actual Supervision. The overall regression was not statistically significant (see Table 9 for details). It should be noted that the 64% of the participants reported that their parents had not graduated from college.

Table 9

Results of Linear Regression to Predict Parental Education from Parenting Style.

	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	R^2_{adj}	<i>B</i>	<i>t</i>
Predicting Mother's Education	1.36	(2,186)	.00		
Involvement				-.13	.12
Actual Supervision				-.03	.73
Predicting Father's Education	1.86	(2,187)	.01		
Involvement				-.16	-1.92
Actual Supervision				.10	-1.14

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to determine the effects of parenting style and psychosocial maturity on delinquent behaviors. This study is developed upon previous research (Moffitt, 1993; Steinberg et al., 1994; Monahan et al., 2009; Lamborn et al., 1991; Elliott & Voss, 1974; Baumrind, 1966) suggesting that delinquency is a developmental process that is largely effected by parenting style, and the maturity of the individual. This study however, was conducted on 18 to 20-year olds who were exiting the proposed maturity gap and were relatively new to life outside of the structure of their parent's home.

In an effort to examine the relationship between psychosocial maturity and parenting style on delinquent behaviors, five hypotheses were developed. The first hypotheses developed stated that those with authoritative parents would have a higher degree of psychosocial maturity. The analyses of this hypothesis led to interesting and

unexpected results. Parents high in supervision resulted in adolescents higher in individual adequacy, contrary to the null hypothesis and the current literature.

This result may have been influenced by the measure of parental involvement that was used, as it was a four-point Likert scale that asked participants to rate statements such as, “I can count on my parents to help me out, if I have some kind of problem; My parents say that you shouldn't argue with adults; My parents helped me with my schoolwork if there is something I didn't understand.” As the participants in this study were no longer residing with their parents, these statements may have been perceived as a description of intrusive parents rather than the intended, involved parents. For college age adolescents, the measure of parental involvement may be viewed as condescending to their adulthood. Moving away from home is a decisive step toward achieving social consequence and intrusive or overly involved parents may demean this achievement.

The second hypotheses developed stated that those with authoritative or authoritarian parents will have a lesser level of delinquent behaviors than those with negligent or indulgent parents due to the strictness and supervision level with which they were raised. As indicated by the results of this study, Actual Supervision is a better predictor and a deterrent of Status Offenses, Property Offenses, Criminality, and Total Social Misconduct, than Involvement. Actual Supervision is negatively related with the occurrence of these crimes, meaning that as the supervision increases the incidence of these crimes decreases.

According to Baumrind's (1966) parenting styles, parents high in supervision and low in involvement would be authoritarian parents and authoritative parents would be both high in involvement and supervision. It was expected that both involvement and

supervision would be a deterrent to crime however, only Actual Supervision was found as a significant deterrent. This may again be due to the measure of involvement used for this study. Actual Supervision was measured through questions of what parents *actually* knew/know about where you go at night while in high school and now. This measure is essentially a measure of parental awareness of the activities of adolescents. It is likely that those participants who are involved in illegal activities do not inform their parents of such, while those participants who do, have nothing to hide. It is also possible that questions as to where you are going and where you have been are better tolerated as a means of safety and respect for parents, than parents asserting their assistance, as that intrudes on the adult abilities of adolescents.

The third hypotheses developed stated that those who score higher in psychosocial maturity would have fewer delinquent behaviors than those who scored lower in psychosocial maturity. Overall, it was found that higher levels of psychosocial maturity resulted in fewer delinquent behaviors, as was expected. Social Adequacy was able to predict Total Illegal Behavior, and Total Violent Behavior, while Individual Adequacy was able to predict Status Offenses, Drug Offenses and illegal behaviors in all age groups. This finding offers support to the original hypotheses that the achievement of social maturity would be significant in facilitating an end to delinquent behaviors.

The different crimes associated with the different psychosocial adequacies offers additional support, as those who are higher in Social Adequacy, or higher in their social commitment, and tolerance of individual and cultural differences, were less likely to commit violent acts and their overall illegal behavior was less. While the crimes

associated with Individual Adequacy could be perceived as more, self-destructive or rebellious type offenses.

The fourth hypotheses developed addressed the demographic variables that are commonly associated with delinquency. These hypotheses stated that males would have more illegal behaviors than females, and those lower in socioeconomic status will have a higher number of illegal behaviors, starting at an earlier age. The results supported these hypotheses in regards to both gender and socioeconomic status. Criminality was the only non-significant delinquent behavior between the males and females. Criminality was measured by asking participants if they had friends who had been arrested, considered themselves as criminals, or they reported that they had personally been arrested. This may be due to, as Moffitt (1993) and Warr (1993b) have also found, that most adolescents have at least some delinquent friends.

As Moffitt (1993) found that the neurological issues, which may precipitate delinquent behavior, are often due to poor prenatal care, prematurity, exposure to toxins, which are issue more commonly faced by those in lower socioeconomic status. A lower socioeconomic status also puts children at risk to observe more deviant behavior, which exacerbates already present neurological issues. The lower socioeconomic participants were more likely to have committed Status Offenses, Drug Offenses, Violent Offenses, and crimes within the two younger age groups.

The fifth and final set of hypotheses developed addressed the demographic variables that are commonly associated with parenting style. It was expected that parents with higher levels of academic achievement will be classified as having an authoritative parenting style, as those with more education are more likely to value teaching their

children to think for themselves and guiding through high levels of supervision and high levels of involvement. Those who have authoritative parents will be less likely to report a lower socioeconomic status than any of the other style of parenting. This study found that parenting style was unable to predict the education level of either parent. As most of the participant sample reported that their parents had not graduated from college, this sample may not have provided enough diversity to properly measure these variables.

Limitations

As mentioned above, the participant sample lacked diversity. The participants were all from a mid-western university with limited ethnic, socioeconomic and parental education diversity. Generalization from this study should be guarded as a result. A second limitation from this study is likely due to the involvement measure, as it seems to have limited the findings of this study. A measure that better addresses the specific circumstances for the late adolescent age group may have yielded very different results.

An additional limitation or weakness of this study is due to the data being derived entirely from self-report measures. While this methodology has been found to be acceptable by many other researchers in similar studies, it should be considered that the data collected was not verified with criminal records or parental accounts of parenting style. Therefore, the data is only representative of the perceptions of the adolescents participating in this study.

Possible Implications and Future Research

Future research is needed to verify the current studies results and continue exploring the effects of parenting and psychosocial maturity on delinquency. Generalization across a more diverse participant sample should be explored. Future

research should refine the measurement of parental involvement to be used with the upper adolescent age group. This age group offers an interesting phase in Moffitt's (1993) maturity gap and warrants further investigation. This study offered some insight into how the role of parenting changes for this age group. While the engagement of parents in the lives of adolescents is necessary and warranted, it must adapt as the maturity level of the adolescents change. If the parents fail to make the necessary adjustments, the adolescents may rebel. This study confirmed that parents can make a difference in adolescent delinquency.

References

- Adolescence. (2011). In *Dictionary.com Unabridged*. Retrieved from <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/adolescenc>
- Baumrind, D. (1966, December). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development, 37* (4), 887-907.
- Cauffman, E., & Steinberg, L. (2000). (Im)matruity of judgment in adolescence: Why adolescents may be less culpable than adults. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 18*, 741-760.
- Cosby, B., & Poussaint, A. F. (1986). *Fatherhood*. New York: Berkley Publishing Group.
- Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1994). A review and reformulation of social information processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*(1), 74-101.
- Dishion, T. J., Nelson, S. E., & Bullock, B. M. (2004). Premature adolescent autonomy: Parent disengagement and deviant peer process in the amplification of problem behaviour. *Journal of Adolescence, 27*, 515-530. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2004.06.005
- Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide a study in sociology*. [Kindle version]. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com/Suicide-ebook/dp>
- Elliott, D. S. (1962). Delinquency and perceived opportunity. *Sociological Inquiry, 32*, 216-227.
- Elliott, D. S., Ageton, S. S., & Canter, R. J. (1979). An integrated theoretical perspective on delinquent behavior. *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 16*, 3-27.

- Elliott, D. S., & Voss, H. L. (1974). *Delinquency and dropout*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Gabriel, T. (2010, December 9). Parents embrace documentary on pressures of school. *The New York Times*, p. A23. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/09/education/09nowhere.html?r=1&pagewanted=2>
- Greenberger, E. (1984). *Psychosocial maturity inventory*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Greenberger, E., Josselson, R., Knerr, C., & Knerr, B. (1975). The measurement and structure of psychosocial maturity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 4, 127-143.
- Greenberger, E., & Sorenson, A. B. (1974). Toward a concept of psychosocial maturity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 3, 329-357.
- Haynie, D. L., & Osgood, D. W. (2005). Reconsidering peers and delinquency: How do peers matter? *Social Forces*, 84(2), 1109-1130.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jimerson, S. R., Anderson, G. E., & Whipple, A. (2002). Winning the battle and losing the war: Examining the relation between grade retention and dropping out of school. *Psychology in the Schools*, 39(4), 441-457.
- Josselson, R., Greenberger, E., & McConochie, D. (1975). *On the validity of the psychosocial maturity inventory: Relationship to measures of well-being* (Center for Social Organization of Schools Report No. 186). Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD: Center for Social Organization of Schools.
- Junger-Tas, J. & Marshall, I.H. (1999). The self-report methodology in crime research. *Crime & Justice*, 25, 291-367

- Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, indulgent and neglectful families. *Child Development, 62*(5), 1049-1065.
- Lynam, D., Moffitt, T., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1993). Explaining the relation between IQ and delinquency: Class, race, test, motivation, school failure, or self control? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102*(2), 187-196.
- McCoy, K., Fremouw, W., Tyner, E., Clegg, C., Johanasson-Love, J., & Strunk, J. (2006). Criminal-thinking styles and illegal behavior among college students: validation of the PICTS. *Journal of Forensic Science, 51*, 1174-1177. doi: 10.1111/j.1556-4029.2006.00216.x
- McGue, M., Elkins, I., Walden, B., & Iacono, W. G. (2005). Perceptions of the parent-adolescent relationship: A longitudinal investigation. *Developmental Psychology, 41*(6), 971-984. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.41.6.971
- Mennel, R.M. (1983). Attitudes and policies toward juvenile delinquency in the united states: A historiographical review. *Crime and Justice, 4*, 191-224.
- Moffitt, T.E. (1990). The neuropsychology of delinquency: A critical review of theory and research. *Crime and justice, 12*, 99-169.
- Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review, 100*, 674-701.
- Monahan, K. C., Steinberg, L., Cauffman, E., & Mulvey, E. P. (2009). Trajectories of antisocial behavior and psychosocial maturity from adolescence to young adulthood. *Developmental Psychology, 45*(6), 1654-1668.

- Mounts, N. S. (2002). Parental management of adolescent peer relationships in context: The role of parenting style. *Journal of Family Psychology, 16*(1), 58-69. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.16.1.58
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2009). *Juvenile Arrests 2008* (Juvenile Justice Bulletin). Retrieved from OJJDP: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/228479.pdf>
- Patterson, G. R., & Yoerger, K. (1993). Developmental models for delinquent behavior. In S. Hodgins, *Mental disorder and crime* (p. 140-172). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Shore, H. (2000). The idea of juvenile crime in 19th century England. *History Today, 50*(6), Retrieved from <http://www.historytoday.com/heather-shore/idea-juvenile-crime-19th-century-england>
- 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, 33*(2), 247-276.
- Steinberg, L. (2001). We know some things: Parent- adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 11*, 1-19.
- Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (1996). Maturity of judgment in adolescence: Psychosocial factors in adolescent decision making. *Law and Human Behavior, 20*, 249-272.
- Steinberg, L., Elmen, J. D., & Mounts, N. S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychosocial maturity, and academic success among adolescents. *Child Development, 60*(6), 1424-1436.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Darling, N., Mounts, N. S., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1994).

Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development, 65*(3), 754-770.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development, 63*(5), 1266-1281.

Steinberg, L., & Steinberg, W. (1994). *Crossing paths: How your child's adolescence triggers your own crisis*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Thornberry, T.P. & Krohn, M.D. (2000). The self-report method for measuring delinquency and crime. *Criminal Justice, 4*, 33-83. Retrieved from: https://www.ncjrs.gov/criminal_justice2000/vol_4/04b.pdf

Tuck, K. (1989). *A study of students who left: D.C. public school dropouts*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Warr, M. (1993). Age, peers and delinquency. *Criminology, 31*(1), 17-40.

Warr, M. (1993). Parents, peers and delinquency. *Social Forces, 72*, 247-264.

Appendix A
Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent

You are being asked to participate in a research study. It is your choice whether or not to participate. Your decision whether or not to participate will have no effects on your benefits of the research or your academic standing to which you are otherwise entitled.

What is the purpose of this study?

The purpose of this study is to explore how participant's attitudes and their parents have affected their past illegal behaviors and the frequency of those behaviors.

What does this study involve?

The study involves filling out four surveys. If you decide to participate you will be directed to the questionnaires with adequate instructions. The survey will take 30-40 minutes to complete. It includes questions about your attitudes regarding a variety of topics as well as current and past behaviors. Questions will address the level of supervision from your parents while you lived at home. You will also be asked for some demographic information (e.g., age, education level). If you have any questions, feel free to contact the researcher.

Are there any benefits from participating in this study?

Your participation will help us learn more about how people's attitudes and parents affect their possible illegal behaviors. It is important to understand how one's attitudes impact their behavior. In participating in this study you are contributing to this understanding.

Will you be paid or receive anything from participating in this study?

Yes, compensation is offered in the form of extra credit, if the professor of one of your classes allows extra credit for participation.

What are the risks from participating in this study?

It is unlikely that participation in this project will result in any harm. However, sometimes thinking about some of these topics may cause people to become upset. Therefore, there is a small psychological risk. You do not have to respond to any question that you feel uncomfortable responding to, and you may stop participating at any time. If you feel distressed or become upset by participating, you may stop your participation at any time. If you do feel distressed or become upset by participating, you may seek help at the Kelly Center on campus, which provides support for students. They are located on the bottom floor of Picken Hall and their number is (785) 628-4401.

How will your confidentiality and privacy be protected?

Your responses will be kept completely anonymous. We will NOT know your IP address when you respond to the Internet survey.

Data is collected only for research purposes. Your data will be identified by an ID number, not name, and will be kept in password-protected computer files. Access to all data will be limited to the researcher and project adviser. All of the data will be destroyed

after five years by shredding files or deleting computer files. The information collected for this study will be used only for the purposes of conducting this study. The findings from this study may be presented at meetings or published in papers, but your name will never be used in presentations or papers.

Withdrawal from the study:

You may choose to stop your participation in this study at any time. Your decision to stop your participation will have no effect on your academic standing or possible compensation.

Who should you call with questions regarding this study?

Questions about this study may be directed to the researcher: Nichole Lind at nllind@scatcat.fhsu.edu or (785) 822-2640. You may also contact Dr. Janett Naylor at jmnaylor@fhsu.edu. If you have any questions, concerns, or suggestions about human research at FHSU, you may call the Office of Scholarship and Sponsored Projects at FHSU (785) 628-4349 during business hours.

Appendix B
Parenting Style Index

MY PARENTS

Please answer the next set of questions about the parent(s) (or guardians) that you lived with. If you spent time in more than one home, answer the questions about the parent(s) (or guardians) who had the most say over your daily life.

If you **STRONGLY AGREE** with the statement, put a 4 on the line next to it.

If you **AGREE SOMEWHAT** with the statement, put a 3 on the line next to it.

If you **DISAGREE SOMEWHAT** with the statement, put a 2 on the line next to it.

If you **STRONGLY DISAGREE** with the statement, put a 1 on the line next to it.

- ____ 1. I can count on my parents to help me out, if I have some kind of problem.
- ____ 2. My parents say that you shouldn't argue with adults.
- ____ 3. My parents keep pushing me to do my best in whatever I do.
- ____ 4. My parents say that you should give in on arguments rather than make people angry.
- ____ 5. My parents keep pushing me to think independently.
- ____ 6. When I get/got a poor grade in school, my parents make my life miserable.
- ____ 7. My parents helped me with my schoolwork if there is something I didn't understand.
- ____ 8. My parents tell me that their ideas are correct and that I should not question them.
- ____ 9. When my parents want me to do something, they explain why.
- ____ 10. Whenever I argue with my parents, they say things like, "You'll know better when you grow up."
- ____ 11. When I get/got a poor grade in school, my parents encourage me to try harder.
- ____ 12. My parents let me make my own plans for things I want to do.
- ____ 13. My parents knew who my friends were.
- ____ 14. My parents act cold and unfriendly if I do something they don't like.
- ____ 15. My parents spend time just talking with me.
- ____ 16. When I get/got a poor grade in school, my parents make me feel guilty.
- ____ 17. My family does things for fun together.
- ____ 18. My parents won't let me do things with them when I do something they don't like.

MY FREE TIME

Please answer the following questions as to what it was like while living with your parent(s) or guardians.

1. In a typical week, what is the latest you can stay out on SCHOOL NIGHTS (Monday-Thursday)?

I was not allowed out ____
 before 8:00 ____
 8:00 to 8:59 ____
 9:00 to 9:59 ____
 10:00 to 10:59 ____
 11:00 or later ____
 as late as I wanted ____

2. In a typical week, what is the latest you can stay out on FRIDAY OR SATURDAY NIGHT?

I was not allowed out ____
 before 8:00 ____
 8:00 to 8:59 ____
 9:00 to 9:59 ____
 10:00 to 10:59 ____
 11:00 or later ____
 as late as I wanted ____

3. How much do/did your parents TRY to know...

Didn't try to know anything
 Try to know a little
 Try to know a lot

Where you go at night now? ____
 Where you went at night while in high school? ____
 What you do with your free time now? ____
 What you did with your free time in high school? ____
 Where you were most afternoons after school while in high school? ____
 Where you spend most of your time now? ____

4. How much do/did your parents REALLY know...

Didn't know
 Knew very little
 Knew some
 Knew a lot

Where you go at night now? ____
 Where you went at night in high school? ____
 What you do with your free time now? ____
 What you did in your free time while in high school? ____
 Where you are most afternoons after school while in high school? ____
 Where you spend most of your time now? ____

Appendix C

Social Misconduct Checklist

1. Have you ever been suspended from school?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
2. Have you ever skipped school?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
3. Have you ever taken something (worth less than \$2) that did not belong to you?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
4. Have you ever liked about your age to buy alcohol or tobacco?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
5. Have you ever taken a car ride without the owner's permission?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
6. Have you ever broken into someone's house?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
7. Have you ever trespassed?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
8. Have you ever sexually assaulted someone?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

9. Have you ever ILLEGALLY used marijuana?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
10. Have you ever broken into a car that did not belong to you?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
11. Have any of your friends ever been arrested?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
12. Have you ever ran away from home?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
13. Have you ever consumed alcohol under the age of 21?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
14. Have you ever used a prescription medication in a way that it was not intended?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
15. Have you ever beaten up or hurt anyone on purpose? (Other than your siblings)
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
16. Have you ever thought of yourself as a delinquent or a criminal?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

17. Have you ever been arrested or “picked up by the police”?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
18. Have you ever taken something (worth more than \$50) that did not belong to you?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
19. Have you ever started a fight? (Other than with siblings)
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
20. Have you ever used cocaine, methamphetamine, heroin, LSD or ecstasy?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
21. Have you ever threatened someone with a weapon?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
22. Have you ever sold drugs?
- | | Never | 1-3 times | 3-5 times | More than 5 times |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Before 14 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Between 14- 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Older than 18 years of age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Appendix D
Psychosocial Maturity Index

1 = AGREE STRONGLY
2 = AGREE A LITTLE
3 = DISAGREE A LITTLE
4 = DISAGREE STRONGLY

1. When a job turns out to be much harder than I was told it would be, I don't feel I have to do it perfectly.
2. If a friend whose ideas about God are very different from mine gave me a religious magazine to read, I wouldn't read it.
3. It's not very practical to try to decide what kind of job you want because that depends so much on other people.
4. A man shouldn't cook dinner for his wife and children unless the wife is sick.
5. I can't really say what my interests are.
6. I would rather use my free time to enjoy myself than to help raise money for a neighborhood project.
7. I find it hard to stick to anything that takes a long time to do.
8. You should avoid spending too much time with people who are not approved of, even though you think they are really all right.
9. In a group I prefer to let other people make the decisions.
10. We should limit the number of women who can train for jobs usually held by men, such as pilot or engineer.
11. I never seem to feel the same about myself from one week to the next.
12. Why work for something that others will enjoy if you won't be alive to enjoy it too?
13. I hate to admit it, but I give up on my work when things go wrong.
14. I would not mind being friends with a person whose father or mother was in trouble with the law.
15. You can't be expected to make a success of yourself if you had a bad childhood.
16. Women who decide not to be mothers are not doing what they should.
17. Most people are better liked than I am.
18. I would only give a large sum of money to medical research on cancer if I knew they would find a cure in my lifetime.

- 1 = AGREE STRONGLY**
2 = AGREE A LITTLE
3 = DISAGREE A LITTLE
4 = DISAGREE STRONGLY

19. I seldom get behind in my work.
20. I don't think I could be close friends with a disabled person.
21. Luck decides most things that happen to me.
22. Women should not be elected to top government positions.
23. My life is pretty empty.
24. If I felt strongly about something, like race relations or better medical care for the poor, I would only work for it if there was a chance things could be changed quickly.
25. I tend to go from one thing to another before finishing any one of them.
26. Gay people should not move into neighborhoods where there are mostly older people and young children.
27. The main reason I'm not more successful is that I have bad luck.
28. Schools should not let new methods of teaching, like TV and internet, take up too much time in school.
29. I can't seem to keep people as friends for very long.
30. It's not really my problem if my neighbors are in trouble and need help.
31. I often don't finish work I start.
32. It would bother me to work for a person whose skin color is different from mine.
33. Someone often has to tell me what to do.
34. I would like to talk to other students all over the world by way of computers (e.g., e-mail).
35. I'm acting like something I'm not a lot of the time.
36. Time you spend helping others get what they want would be better spent trying to get what you want.
37. I often leave my homework unfinished if there are a lot of good TV shows on that evening.

1 = AGREE STRONGLY
2 = AGREE A LITTLE
3= DISAGREE A LITTLE
4= DISAGREE STRONGLY

38. I would not make friends with a person who had very different manners from mine.
39. When things go well for me, it is usually not because of anything I myself actually did.
40. Men should not be able to train themselves for jobs usually held by women, such as elementary school teacher, nurse, and telephone operator.
41. I never know what I'm going to do next.
42. It is much more satisfying to work for your own good than to work for the good of a group you belong to.
43. I believe in working only as hard as I have to.
44. I would rather not live in a neighborhood where there are people of different races or skin colors.
45. I feel very uncomfortable if I disagree with what my friends think.
46. Children cannot be happy staying in day care centers while their mothers are at work.
47. I change the way I feel and act so often that I sometimes wonder who the "real" me is.
48. I would not like it if they used some of my tax money to keep up a park that I never use.
49. It's more important for a job to pay well than for a job to be very interesting.
50. I would not mind working closely on a job with a person whose skin color is different from mine.
51. It is best to agree with others, rather than say what you really think, if it will keep the peace.
52. I wouldn't like it if a lot of girls my age become lawyers, engineers and business executives.
53. Nobody knows what I'm really like.
54. If there is only one copy of a book everyone wants to read, the person who gets it first should be able to keep it as long as he or she wants.
55. Very often I forget work I am supposed to do.

- 1 = AGREE STRONGLY**
- 2 = AGREE A LITTLE**
- 3 = DISAGREE A LITTLE**
- 4 = DISAGREE STRONGLY**

- 56. I wouldn't like to spend the weekend in the home of a friend whose parents don't speak English.
- 57. I don't know whether I like a new outfit until I find out what my friends think of it.
- 58. If we limit the amount of money people can earn, we take away some of their freedom.
- 59. I am not really accepted and liked.
- 60. If a sign in a park says "Do not pick the flowers – They are here for all to enjoy," you can pick a few if you have a good personal reason.
- 61. If I had a choice, I would prefer a blood transfusion from a person of the same skin color as mine.
- 62. If we don't encourage women to work, we are seriously reducing what the country could accomplish.
- 63. A person is responsible only for the happiness of his family, relatives, and close friends.

Appendix E
Demographic Information

1. What is your age?
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - Other _____

2. What country did you primarily grow up in?
 - China
 - Great Britain
 - Japan
 - Mexico
 - Spain
 - United States
 - Other _____

3. What is your gender?
 - Male
 - Female

4. What is your academic classification?
 - Freshman
 - Sophomore
 - Junior
 - Senior
 - Graduate
 - Other _____

5. What ethnicity best describes you?
 - White
 - African American
 - Asian
 - Hispanic
 - Pacific Islander
 - American Indian
 - Other _____

6. What is the highest level of education completed by your mother?
- Some High School
 - High School Diploma
 - Some College
 - Associates Degree
 - Bachelors Degree
 - Freshman
 - Graduate Degree
 - Other _____
7. What is the highest level of education completed by your father?
- Some High School
 - High School Diploma
 - Some College
 - Associates Degree
 - Bachelors Degree
 - Freshman
 - Graduate Degree
 - Other _____
8. Did you qualify for a Pell grant?
- Yes
 - No

Appendix F
Debriefing Statement

Study Debriefing

This study is concerned with how maturity and parenting style affect illegal or delinquent behaviors. Previous studies have found that parents and peers significantly impact delinquent behavior. Some researchers have proposed that a temporary maturity gap may also play a role in delinquent behavior.

How was this tested?

In this study, you were asked to complete four sections of the survey involving the parenting style of your parents, your past illegal behaviors, your maturity and demographic information. All participants completed the same survey and the levels and rates of each section will be based on the average answers.

Hypotheses and main questions:

We expect to find that participants with higher levels of maturity will no longer be performing illegal behaviors. We also expect that those participants with parents, who are/were involved and accepting of them, will have the lowest rates of illegal behaviors. Likewise, we expect that participants whose parents are accepting and involved will also achieve higher levels of maturity.

Why is this important to study?

The reasons why people act illegally is important for our society to understand but it may be even more important to understand why people stop their own illegal behaviors. It is also important to understand how parenting style affects maturity and illegal behaviors.

We thank you for your participation in this study. If you know of any friends or acquaintances that are eligible to participate in this study, we request that you not discuss it with them until after they have had the opportunity to participate. Prior knowledge of the nature of this study could invalidate the results

If you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to email the researcher, Nichole Lind (nllind@scatcat.fhsu.edu) or Dr. Naylor (jmnaylor@fhsu.edu).

In the event that you feel psychologically distressed by participation in this study, we encourage you to seek help at the Kelly Center on campus, which provides support for students. They are located on the bottom floor of Picken Hall and their number is (785) 628-4401.

Thank you again for your participation.