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Abstract

Purpose
The goal of this research is to examine the influence of authoritarian parenting, a traditional socialization practice among African American parents, on a representative sample of adolescent males at risk for delinquency and violence and contrast this with authoritative parenting a style found efficacious for White adolescents. Authoritarian parenting is hypothesized to differentially deter high risk African American adolescents from delinquency and violence when compared to high risk White adolescents.

Methods
Data from the Rochester Youth Development Study (RYDS), a longitudinal investigation of the development of antisocial behavior in an urban sample of 1000 youths followed from ages 13 to adulthood are used. The original sample includes 69% African American males; 17% Hispanic American males and 14% White males. This study included 134 White males and 464 African American males. Measures include a summated risk index inclusive of adolescents’ experiences with negative life events, single parent households, residences in communities with high percentages of poverty and arrest rates, and low parental education. Authoritative parenting measures include dimensions reflecting parental responsiveness and monitoring; authoritarian parenting added restrictive parental control derived from adolescent responses about parental intrusiveness, non-democratic decision making and severity of discipline. Hierarchical linear regression was used to assess the main effect of authoritative parenting and its interaction with cumulative risk
in explaining delinquency and violence. In the second step, the main effect of restrictive parental control and its interaction with cumulative risk was added to assess an increase in explanatory power.

Findings

Results indicated that authoritarian parenting is not an efficacious childrearing style for African American or White high risk adolescents. Authoritative parenting, however, was found to be a racially invariant in its effects because it reduced delinquent outcomes in both African American and White adolescents. A significant negative relationship between authoritative parenting and violence was found exclusively in the African American sample. These findings suggest that prevention and intervention strategies ought to include parent training to enhance responsiveness and monitoring and reduce ineffective parenting in communities at risk for delinquency and violence.
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I. Introduction and Relevance of the Research

A. Problem Statement

The plight of urban poor African American male adolescents and their disproportionately high risks for delinquency and violence has been well documented (Glazer, N., and Moynihan, D.P., 1963; Kunjufu, 1985; Ogbo, 1988; Myers, H., Taylor, S., Alvy, K. Arrington, A. and Richardson, M., 1992; Friedman, A., Grasnick, S., Bransfield, S., and Kriesher, C., 1995; McNulty and Bellair, 2003). The experiences of African American male youth in inner cities are likely to be characterized by substandard housing, underachieving schools, poor health care and disproportionate barriers to economic opportunities (Krause, N., 1988; Taylor, A., 1991; Myers and colleagues, 1992; Nettles, S. and Pleck, J., 1996). Consequently, the social and economic conditions in inner city neighborhoods generate chronic levels of stress for African American youth as reflected in low levels of self-efficacy and tendencies towards delinquent and violent behavior (Grier and Cobbs, 1992; Sayfer, 1994; Wilson, 1996; Anderson, 1999; Leary, Brennan and Briggs, 2005). This ecological reality is qualitatively different than that of white adolescents who do not share the same race classification, ethnic heritage or consequences of minority status designation (Gibbs, 1989; Baldwin,A., Baldwin, C., Kasser, T., and Zax, M., 1993). Many studies of delinquency, particularly those based on official data, support findings that urban African American youth are at higher risk for delinquency and violent offending (Wolfgang, Figlio, Sellin, 1972; Farrington, Loeber and Stouthamer–Loeber, 1999; McNulty and Bellair, 2003). Indeed, a subculture of violence has even been postulated (Wolfgang and Ferracutti, 1981). Classic subculture theories such as Cohen’s (1955) “Delinquent Boys”
and Cloward and Ohlin’s (1960) notion of access to illegitimate opportunities also reveal evidence of subcultures. Explanations that account for the ethnic and racial demographics of delinquency and violence can also be found in many other delinquency theories. Sutherland’s (1947) theory of Differential Association suggested law-abiding or law-violating definitions of behavior are learned in association with those around us. Learning theorists have posited that behavior is learned from positive and negative stimuli including the media and other sources within the environment (Akers, 1991). Moreover, Hirshi’s (1969) social control theory asserts that a lack of social controls stem from nonexistent or weakened essential bonding elements that include attachment, commitment, involvement and belief in conventional activities.

Racial and ethnic minorities, particularly urban African Americans, also experience a unique and very different socialization process (Billingsley, 1968; Peters, 1988a, 1988b; Wilson, 1987, 1996; Anderson, 1999; Leary and colleagues, 2005). Socialization processes for African Americans include internalization of political, social, psychological, economic and community disadvantage that becomes increasingly apparent as youth develop through the life cycle (DeAnda, 1984). Theoretical, empirical and ethnographic research also indicates that the socialization processes responsible for the development of personal, group and cultural identities for African American adolescents are very different than for white adolescents (Lazarus, 1979; Peters, 1988a; 1988b; Harrison, 1988; Phinney, 1992; Ross, 1992; Boykins and Toms, 1994; Wilson, 1987, 1996; Anderson, 1999).

There is considerable research that describes the mainstream socialization process but relatively few studies of racial and ethnic variation in socialization that focuses
exclusively on African Americans. Some of the available research, however, does note the important differences in primary socialization such as family management practices (Patterson and Stouthamer–Loeber, 1984; Smith, 1990; Smith and Krohn, 1992), childrearing styles (Baumrind, 1972; Wilson, 1974; Baldwin, 1990) and the salience and practice of religious beliefs (Lincoln and Mamiya, 1990; Johnson, 2000; McCree, Diclemente, Wingood, Davies, and Harrington, 2003).

A major issue surrounding the socialization of urban African American adolescents is the effect of internalizing subordinate social class status (Barbarin, 1993; Safyer, 1994), the reaction to racism, alienation and the perceived contempt from mainstream society (Wilson, 1987, 1996; Anderson, 1999). In addition, there is also concern that African American adolescent socialization includes daily experiences with joblessness and persistent poverty that weakens the family and community social structure and lead to social isolation within the confines of black communities.

Consequently, urban African American adolescents are without important role models, social resources or occupational contacts (Wilson, 1996). The result is an adaptation to the systemic blockage of opportunities in the form of ghetto-related traits, attitudes, styles, habits and behaviors that are antithetical to mainstream cultural values.

In this oppositional street culture, urban African American adolescents adopt codes of the street characterized by adverse and oppositional social identities “where what is good for the community is that which opposes conventional society” (Anderson, 1999:308). Thus, African American adolescents react to the perceived contempt they feel from mainstream society by rejecting and displaying contempt for mainstream values. To this end, they invest their considerable mental resources in an oppositional culture where
value is placed on toughness, getting respect, and getting “props” (proper deference) (Anderson, 1999; Leary and colleagues, 2005).

As urban African Americans adolescents increasingly immerse themselves into this oppositional culture, they lose interest in gaining acceptance or respect from the mainstream culture. It is in this ecological context that African American parents face the tasks of adopting a childrearing style that guides their children away from despair, anger and the lure of the oppositional culture towards hope and positive personal and ethnic identities. Most importantly, these parents must develop an inner belief that their children can overcome disadvantages to live law abiding lives (Hale, 1991; Miller, 1999; Anderson, 1999). Decades ago, Billingsley (1968:28) noted the challenge to black families:

For the Negro family, socialization is doubly challenging, for the family must teach its young members not only how to be human, but how to be black in a white society. The requirements are not the same. Negro families must teach their children very early in life, sometimes as early as two years of age, the meaning of being black.

Reconciling the challenge of living in a race-conscious society that threatens adolescent psychosocial development has been accomplished, historically, by responsive African American parents who have employed restrictive parenting regimens as a racial socialization strategy to overcome disadvantage. Race socialization strategies include a diversity of culturally influenced materials, traditions, rituals, discussions, childrearing styles and socialization processes designed to neutralize the destructive effects of racism within the identity development process of African Americans adolescents (Stevenson, 1994a).
This study tests the hypothesis that authoritarian parenting operates as a race socialization protective factor that prevents high-risk African American adolescents from engaging in delinquency and violence. The hypothesis is based on the notion that responsive African American parents proactively use authoritarian childrearing as a race socialization strategy to produce a resilient effect in the presence of high-risk pressures. Authoritarian childrearing involves retaining restrictive control over adolescents, autocratic decision-making and strict discipline. However, critical to the hypothesis of authoritarian parenting as a protective factor is the notion that these childrearing practices are employed as a response to high-risk dangerous ecological environments. In African American high-risk families, authoritarian parenting is employed by responsive parents who explain that disadvantage is overcome by accepting personal responsibility and developing a tenacious commitment to competent behavior in the face of unfair odds. In summary, authoritarian childrearing by African American parents is hypothesized to create a race socialization protective effect that differentially alters predictions of delinquency and violence in high-risk African American adolescents relative to their White adolescent counterparts.

There are significant prevention implications if the hypothesis is supported. First, if studies that report urban African American male adolescents as the most chronic and prevalent offenders are accurate, perhaps a culturally significant childrearing style should be adopted in prevention policy. A targeted prevention policy that focuses exclusively on African American adolescents could conceivably address findings of disproportionate chronic and violent offending within this high-risk group. Secondly, a policy emphasizing prevention could identify and utilize community cultural resources to
illuminate key elements necessary for a restrictive parenting regimen to work in environments most at risk for delinquency and violence. Thirdly, the expenditure of scarce resources on a specific protective factor would be cost effective because it would be based on what we know works. Finally, if the hypothesis is supported, the major challenge will be to understand variations in risk contexts that successfully engage this restrictive parenting style.

**B. Racial Socialization**

The notion of racial socialization references specific proactive socialization strategies designed to neutralize the adverse effects of racism through communication that certain competencies to navigate a hostile environment will have to be developed (Stevenson, 1994a; Brown and Gary, 1991; Miller, 1999). Race socialization strategies help children understand the meaning of their race within the larger sociopolitical structure. Moreover, race socialization emphasizes the importance of overcoming disadvantage through hard work and discipline primarily through the development of race and cultural pride (Stevenson, 1994a; 1994b; Hughes and Chen, 1997; Miller, 1999). Most importantly, it is a proactive socialization process designed to build self confidence, self-esteem, and a strong cultural identity capable of combating the ecological risks of racism, alienation, and social policies that disproportionately burden African Americans. Some of the ecological risks urban African Americans endure include concentrated poverty, rampant joblessness, underserved neighborhoods absent cultural institutions or social organizations, large number of female-headed households, delinquency, exorbitant school dropout rates, teenage pregnancy, social isolation and institutionalized barriers to

C. Race Socialization and Authoritarian Parenting

Baumrind’s (1971) seminal study of childrearing typologies nearly 35 years ago provides the paradigm for study of parenting styles. Baumrind’s (1966) initial findings of parenting typologies included parenting behavior and attitude dimensions characterized as authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and disengaged. Significantly, since her initial research, Baumrind (1996) and other investigators have found authoritative parenting the most favorable parenting style because positive development outcomes were found in middle class and mainstream European American children (Baumrind, 1971, 1991; Maccoby and Martin, 1983; Fletcher et al., 1995; Grey and Steinberg, 1999; Pittman and Chase-Lansdale, 2001; Kaplan, 2003). Although authoritative parenting has been found to predict positive developmental outcomes in White adolescents, among other ethnic groups and cultures, research findings have produced mixed results (Baumrind, 1966; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, and Fraleigh, 1987; Baldwin, a., Baldwin, C., and Cole, R., 1990; Lin and Fu, 1990; Chao, 1994; Walker-Barnes and Mason, 2001).

There is both theoretical and empirical evidence that authoritarian parenting is an effective race socialization strategy for African American adolescents in high-risk urban environments where negative developmental outcomes are likely (Baumrind, 1972, 1996; Wilson, 1974; Lassiter, 1987; Peters, 1988a, 1988b; Baldwin, 1990). Essentially, authoritarian childrearing, hypothesized as a race socialization strategy, is proposed as a
parent-child relationship characterized by responsiveness, monitoring, consistent discipline and restrictive parental control (Baumrind, 1972; Baldwin and colleagues, 1990).

Authoritative childrearing, a related parenting style, is characterized as a more democratic, less restrictive and punitive parenting style of responsive parents who monitor their children and use consistent discipline. A variety of investigators have found authoritative patterns of childrearing to include favorable attitudes towards the use of parental suggestions, positive incentives and democratic decision-making about childrearing (Rickel, A. and Biasatti, 1982; Kochanska, G. L. Kuczynski and Radde-Yarrow (1989); Kochanska, G. 1990; Dekovic, M.J. Janseens and J. Gerris, 1991; Kaufmann D., Gesten E., Lucia M., Salcedo, O. and Gobioff, R., 2000)

This study focuses on the viable use of authoritarian parenting as a race socializing protective factor that differentially produces positive developmental outcomes in high-risk African American adolescents by uniquely buffering the risk factors for delinquency and violence. One of the core premises of the study is that the common negative conceptualization of authoritarian parenting does not necessarily generalize across all ethnic and cultural groups (Baumrind, 1966; Baldwin and colleagues, 1990; Lin and Fu, 1990; Chao, 1994).

Lin and Fu (1990) found empirical support to establish the premise of cultural variations in conceptualizations of authoritarian parenting. They surveyed parents of Chinese, immigrant Chinese and European American parents on four factors of childrearing including parental control, open expression of affection, encouragement of independence and emphasis on achievement. Both groups of Chinese parents were
found to have higher ratings than European American parents on parental control and achievement and unexpectedly, on encouragement of independence. They concluded that the relationship between childrearing, achievement and independence warranted more culturally sensitive investigations from a multicultural perspective.

Chao (1994) found support for the notion that the Chinese cultural concept of *chiaoshun* (training children in the appropriate behaviors) influenced authoritarian childrearing in Chinese families without the negative developmental effect found in European American adolescents. Her findings revealed that authoritarian reared Asian adolescents achieved superior academic accomplishment relative to authoritatively-reared European Americans. Chao (1994) hypothesized that authoritarian parenting may have different cultural implications because it includes dimensions of obedience and strictness that equate to parental concern, caring and involvement. This is unlike the western conceptualization of authoritarian parenting. Chao (1994) also assessed the cultural connotation of authoritarian parenting in Chinese American and European American mothers. Chinese mothers were found to score significantly higher on the training ideologies. Chao (1994) concluded that western conceptualizations of authoritative and authoritarian parenting were somewhat ethnocentric concepts that did not included Chinese childrearing nor explain trends in academic success experienced by authoritarian-reared Chinese students.

The efficacy of authoritarian parenting has also been found in high-risk African American adolescents. Walker-Barnes and Mason (2001) examined the relative influence of peer and parenting behaviors on changes in adolescent gang involvement and gang-related delinquency within the period of an academic year utilizing a
predominantly minority sample of ninth graders. They found that risk factors for gang involvement and gang delinquency existed simultaneously within multiple social contexts. Significantly, peer influences were confirmed as the dominant social context influence on gang involvement and gang delinquency; however, their findings also illuminated the importance of the context of parenting and the parent child relationship. To assess ethnic and cultural variations in the effects of parenting, measures assessing behavioral control, type of control (lax and psychological) and parental warmth were used. Quite significantly, they found an interaction between parenting style and ethnic and cultural heritage. Specifically, the effects of parenting context were particularly salient for blacks who experienced higher levels of behavioral controls and lower levels of lax controls and reported higher levels of positive behavioral outcomes. Alternatively, high levels of behavioral control related to poorer outcomes over time for white and other youths. Walker-Barnes and Mason (2001) concluded that without assessing ethnic differences in parenting styles, the varying impact of parenting would have been lost and the role of parenting underestimated.

Higher levels of behavioral controls and parental restrictiveness were also found in ethnographic and observational studies of African American adolescents (Scanzoni, 1988; Wilson, 1996; Anderson, 1999). Wilson (1996:64) found that African American parents of children who experienced positive developmental outcomes preferred to socially isolate their children from negative peer influences and others who espouse non-mainstream values. He noted:

Some parents choose to protect their children by isolating them from activities in the neighborhood, including the avoidance and interaction with neighborhood families. Whenever possible, and often with great difficulty considering the problems of transportation and limited
financial resources, they attempt to establish contact and cultivate relations with individuals, families and institutions outside the neighborhood, such as church groups, schools and community recreation programs.

Anderson’s (1999:161) ethnographic and observational study of social interactions, personalities and street codes within Chicago African American communities (including neighborhoods comprising Chicago ghettoes) uncovered poor and decent African American parents of law abiding children. Remarking on their childrearing style, Anderson (1999:161) described these parents as:

Strict on their children, they impose curfews and tight supervision, demanding to know their children’s whereabouts at all times. Determined that their offspring will not become casualties of the inner-city environment, they scrutinize their children’s associates, rejecting those that seem to be no good and encouraging those who seem to be on their way to amount to something.

Buamrind’s (1972) study, conducted decades earlier, supports Anderson’s (1999) findings. Baumrind (1972) found that high-risk African American preschool girls benefited from authoritarian parenting and childrearing practices which recognized elevated exposure to risk. Further, she posited positive developmental outcomes of these high-risk African American preschool girls stemmed from their understanding of authoritarian childrearing as cultural and nurturing response of their parents to elevated risk exposure. Baumrind (1972) explained that black authoritarian parents emphasized training to be autonomous and independent at an early age because of the severe ecological vulnerabilities unique to black families.

Several other studies have demonstrated that authoritarian childrearing may facilitate positive developmental outcomes in high risk situations. Wilson (1974) found the restrictive nature of authoritarian parenting facilitated a protective effect over high-
risk children whose residence in the ghetto warranted elevated restrictions to prevent detrimental developmental outcomes. Baldwin and colleagues’ (1990) study of high and low-risk parents found that successful parents of children from low-risk environments show patterns of parenting variables different from successful parents that reside in high-risk environments. Baldwin and colleagues (1990) asserted that parental perceptions of noxious and immediate environmental threats warrant restrictive and protective childrearing family policies that would unnecessarily limit a child’s opportunities in a low-risk environment. In addition to adopting restrictive parenting practices, high-risk successful parents were found less democratic in decision-making and severe in disciplinary practices. Clarity of policy was found to be quite essential in the high-risk sample that incorporated restrictive and less democratic childrearing styles. Baldwin and colleagues (1990) explained that authoritarian parenting could be justified to high risk youths as responsible parental reactions to immediate environmental danger. Further, communication about ecological dangers in conjunction with parental modeling of competence to overcome risk factors was found to contribute to the efficacy of authoritarian parenting.

The hypothesis of authoritarian childrearing as a race socializing protective factor is quite plausible because of prior research that established a link between cultural and ecological factors and positive development outcomes. This study tests differences and similarities in the effects of authoritarian childrearing on high-risk African American and White adolescents exposed to comparable levels of ecological risk and dangers. Essentially, if authoritarian childrearing is a race socializing protective factor, diminished
rates of delinquency and violence in high-risk African American adolescents should be observed relative to White adolescents.

D. Summary

There has been considerable research on the nature, causes and correlates of delinquency and violence. However, very few studies of delinquency and violence examine resilient developmental outcomes, and far fewer studies focus on socio-cultural differences in resilience. Although explanations of resiliency are relatively rare in comparison to risk; there are quite a few examples of persons predicted at high-risk for delinquency and violence who overcame their risk profile to lead successful and law abiding lives. These individuals are characterized as resilient across bodies of social science literature because they possess the dual components of high-risk and protective factors that alter risk trajectories towards delinquency and violence.

Resilient African Americans adolescents include disadvantaged urban males who have adopted productive and law-abiding lives. Curiously, explanations of the factors that trigger positive developmental outcomes in high-risk African American adolescents are almost non-existent. Explanations of the variance in resilience across race and ethnic groups are vitally important because they illuminate socio-cultural mechanisms that differentially alter paths towards delinquent and violent offending (Sameroff and Seifer 1990; Gore and Eckenrode, 1996). Although authoritarian childrearing includes verbal reprimands and prohibitions, strict supervision and severe punishment, its’ perception as strategy by a responsive parent who faced with raising their child in a dangerous environment (Baumrind, 1972; Baldwin and colleagues, 1990; 1993) renders it quite plausible as a protective factor capable of deterring delinquency and violence. This
dissertation seeks to determine the differential impact of authoritarian parenting between African American and White adolescents at risk for delinquency and violence. There is evidence that race socialization strategies represent a viable resource for increasing the chances of positive developmental outcomes in high-risk African American adolescents (Brown and Gary, 1991; Stevenson et al., 1994a; 1997; Miller, 1999). However, the study of responsive parents who adopt restrictive childrearing strategies to neutralize the socio-ecological consequences of racial minority status is quite rare. In addition, this dissertation examines the sociological consequences of racism and its’ unique impact on risk factors that increase delinquency and violence in African American adolescents. If the hypothesis that authoritarian parenting is protective for high risk African American parents is supported, a case can be made for culturally based prevention and intervention strategies.
II. The Sociological Effects of Racism

A. Origins

The deleterious effect of racism accounts for many social, economic and psychological conditions that negatively impact the lives of African Americans (Peters, 1988a, 1988b; Utsey, 1998; Blake and Darling, 2000). Neither favored social class nor economic prosperity can protect African Americans from racism. African American families live under varying degrees of racism (Peters, 1988a, 1988b; Gary, 1995; Utsey, 1998). Peters (1988a) expressed that a multitude of studies of black families do not take account of the pervasive reality of racism and the consequences of chronic exposure to overt and covert discrimination that generate extreme environmental stress. Utsey (1998) asserted the chronic strain of racism has been linked to high blood pressure, cardiovascular disease, psychological disorder, low self-esteem and life satisfaction issues. Since most African Americans are unable to escape racism, research should seek to understand it as a chronic developmental threat.

The sociological effects of racism in America can best be understood within a historical context. In the development of colonial America, the primary basis for slavery was economic and initially race was not the primary consideration (Lincoln and Mamiya, 1990; Mitchell, 2004). However, over time, African physiological differences of skin color and body type became the basis of race superiority and the rationale for intertwining race and the economics of American chattel slavery (Lincoln and Mamiya, 1990). The 400-year institution of slavery embedded the notion that blacks were inferior to whites and vestiges of racism still exist within an entrenched foundation established centuries ago. Indeed, congressional legislation and legal decisions in American history
are quite clear on the issue of inequality of the races. African Americans were once legislatively considered three-fifths of a person. In addition, the U.S. Supreme Court in its capacity as the highest law making judicial body, has upheld decisions that supported racial superiority (Higginbotham, 1996). For instance, in Plessy v. Furguson, 163 US 537, 552 (1896), the Court ruled “If one race be inferior to the other socially, the constitution of the United States cannot put them on the same plane.”

The Plessy decision lasted six decades until the U.S. Supreme Court (Brown v. Board of Education, 1954) overturned it. However, most scholars note the Brown court did not unravel the institution of racism and the entrenched harm that had been allowed to fester during the previous century (Higginbotham, 1996; Leary and Colleagues, 2005, Brown- Marshall, 2007). Consequently, both de facto racism and social inequality continues to exist.

B. The Prevalence of Contemporary Racism

The prevalence of contemporary racism and its consequences has been observed in research investigations that have examined racial attitudes and their impact on African Americans. Watts and Carter (1991) surveyed a sample of African American civil service workers in a northeast city to assess their attitudes towards the prevalence of racism in public service employment. They found that the most significant evidentiary factor that fueled African American employees’ perception of racism was the absence of minorities in positions of power and authority. Watts and Carter (1991) noted the sample of African American civil service employees were angry and frustrated because promotional barriers suggested evidence of systemic and institutional racism.
In a sample of African American women, Hughes and Dodge (1997) studied racism in employment by seeking to identify characteristics of the work setting that impede or promote racial bias. They hypothesized that exposure to racial bias diminished job performance. They found historical organizational areas of bias that included inequitable salaries and benefits, unfavorable job assignments and few opportunities for advancement. In addition, more subtle forms of bias such as differential treatment in interpersonal interactions, stereotyping and feelings of discomfort on the part of white co-workers and supervisors were reported. Hughes and Dodge (1997) concluded that the day-to-day interpersonal interactions and attitudes serve as a perpetual reminder to African American women that their work environment is one in which they are not completed accepted and that they are essentially socially isolated from the organizational mainstream.

Instances of institutional racism within the workplace are quite apparent to adults and clearly visible to African American adolescents as well. African American adolescents who experience racism develop anger, frustration and depression as a result of encounters with a society that denigrates their self-worth. Leary and colleagues (2005) found that African American adolescents who encounter debilitating racist experiences become frustrated with the larger social system’s mistreatment and marginalization. Consequently, they develop anger towards people and institutions that disrespect them and often resort to violence.

Stevenson et al. (1997) examined the relationship between African American adolescent attitudes towards racial socialization and psychological adjustment on changes in adolescent anger experiences, expression and depression. In their study, they also
delineated a typology of race-related anger: temperamental trait anger assessed the
disposition to experience and express anger without a specific provocation; reactive trait
anger assessed the disposition to experience and express anger when criticized or treated
unfairly by other individuals. Race socialization was defined as the process of preparing
minority youths for a world unprepared to understand that they have potential to be
productive and contributing members of society. Racial socialization was operationalized
according to the level of adolescent experience with racism awareness training. They
found global racial socialization measures correlated with sad mood, instrumental
helplessness, and low self-esteem, three of the nine depression items. Measures tapping
adolescents with extended family support and cultural pride reinforcement (CPR)
experiences were significant across all sets of psychological adjustment variables. Most
importantly, Stevenson and colleagues (1997) found that high levels of cultural pride
diminish both the expression and experience of racial anger. More specifically, they
found an inverse relationship between African American males with higher levels of
cultural pride reinforcements and lower levels of temperamental anger, anger suppression
and frequencies to express anger in any form. They concluded that the cohesive
development of racial identity in African American adolescents is especially tumultuous
and stressful; however, racially-socialized children with cultural pride experience a
protective effect that shields against the consequences of membership as a racial
minority.
C. The Effect of Racism on African Americans Adolescents

The prevalence of racism and its enduring legacy affects African American adolescents quite severely and early in life. Indeed, quite a few research investigations that examined the consequences of racism have identified problems in developing ethnic and personal identities which contribute significantly to the barriers that impede mainstream assimilation (Jones, B., Gray, B., and Jospitre, J., 1982; Boykins and Toms, 1988; Harrison, 1988; Reese, L., Vera, E., and Paikoff, R., 1998; Stevenson, et al., 1994a; 1997). It is important to note that developmentally, adolescence is the period associated with the formation of one’s personal and ethnic identity (Lazarus, 1979; Oetting and Beauvais, 1991; Phinney, 1992; Miller, 1999). African American adolescents internalize cognition of race differences into the formation of their ethnic identity with special notation of their membership in a disfavored social group (Phinney, 1992). In addition, African American ethnic identity development exposes adolescents to historic encounters with prejudice, devalued social status and social inequality. Boykins and Toms (1988) theorized that the development of identity in African American adolescents includes simultaneous assimilation into both the mainstream and African-rooted cultures and the realization of their membership in a status-oppressed racial group. Smith and Carlson (1997) identified problems of ethnic identity development in African American youths and suggested the deployment of cultural pride programs because African Americans’ culture and ethnic identity are denigrated by mainstream culture. Rosenberg (1979) theorized that identity development is facilitated by reflective appraisals and social comparisons. Undoubtedly, under Rosenberg’s (1979) theory, positive identity
development in African American adolescents would not be likely especially in comparison to identity development in white adolescents.

Peters (1988a) recognized the developmental challenges associated with internalized effects of racism. She summarized that the essence of the problem is raising black children in a society where blackness is devalued. Gibbs (1989) asserted that African American adolescents encounter significant numbers of social and psychological barriers but none more difficult than the injury of racism. Similarly, Greene (1974) found that African American children encounter a legacy of stigmatizing folklore and an antagonistic environment manifested in centuries of racism. Ford (1994) found that intellectually gifted black children face numerous socio-psychological challenges that are consequences of discrimination experiences. Psychological challenges include self esteem, racial identity and ideology issues. Sociological consequences include undesirable relationships with teachers, counselors and conventional peers.

In summary, negative race messages, early cognition of inferior social position, alienation and mainstream contempt threaten the development of healthy ethnic and personal identities in African American adolescents. Consequently, there is a strong likelihood of antisocial behaviors. The enormous challenge for African American adolescents is to develop healthy personal and ethnic identities in a mainstream culture that historically and institutionally denigrates African American people (Peters, 1988b). A consequence of failure to develop healthy personal identities is the assimilation of detrimental social identities and oppositional values evident by poor school performance, substance abuse, juvenile delinquency and violence (Anderson, 1999).
D. Adverse Social Identities and Antisocial Behaviors

Numerous social scientists have theorized about the social and psychological consequences of racism on African American adolescents (Peters, 1988b; Landrine, H., and Klonoff, E. 1996; Anderson, 1999). Other research investigations have derived empirical findings that have linked the effects of racism with oppositional and detrimental social identities, adherence to street codes, and externalized antisocial behaviors (Ogbu, 1988; Clark, 1991; Grier and Cobb, 1992; Ford, 1994; Nagel, 1994; Wilson, 1996; Stevenson et al., 1997; Anderson, 1999; Miller, 1999; Leary, 2005).

Lazarus (1979:137) explained the complications associated with social identity development. He stated that the natural coping response to psychological conflict in identity development is regulation of emotional distress to protect one’s self-esteem. Moreover, “anger gives way to guilt or melts and grows stronger with each successive exchange.”

Grier and Cobbs (1992) referred to heightened sensitivity to racism and potential exploitation by whites as cultural paranoia. They believed that cultural paranoia was a realistic adaptive way of approaching frequently antagonizing situations involving interracial adversity. Ford (1994) asserted black youths who experience emotions of fear and anger towards racism often develop an oppositional social identity characterized by rebellion against authority figures, ineffective coping styles, school alienation and consequently poor school performance. Clark (1991) also noted that developing oppositional social identities include externalized antisocial behaviors that center on rebelliousness and resistance to mainstream socialization.
Clark (1991) and Ford (1999) also discussed other problems associated with adverse social identities. According to Clark (1991), adolescents who develop race-less identities are subject to alienation from same race peer groups at a time when peers are developmentally important. Ford (1994) asserted the development of diffused social identity is characterized by low self esteem and alienation from both the African American and mainstream culture. She asserted the consequences for these adolescents include poor social competencies that place them at risk for educational, social and psychological adjustment problems. Moreover, they often exhibit heightened risk for internalized disorder symptoms such as alcohol or substance abuse. Ford (1999) asserted that diffused identity is most likely to develop when there is incongruence between the values, attitudes and behaviors espoused in the home and in the school.

There are other negative developmental outcomes as well that support these findings (Clark, 1991; Ford, 1999). Brookins (1996) asserted that African American adolescents’ adaptations to social, economic and political oppression often lead to short and long-term consequences including teen pregnancy, school failure, gang memberships, prison, unemployment and dissolution of family units and communities.

Theoretical assertions of behavioral risk and consequences of adverse social identities and oppositional personalities derived from racism have also found empirical support. Anger due to racism has been found to affect African American males in numerous ways including debilitating physical and psychological symptoms, negative and self defeating attitudes, poor job performance, self-destructive behaviors, general despair and limited aspirations. Recall that Stevenson and colleague’s (1997) study of race socialization found a link between suppressed racism related-anger and poor health
consequences including depression and anger. More specifically, higher levels of race
related anger and expressions of temperamental and reactive trait anger were found to
correlate with higher rates of psychosocial and psychosomatic disorders in African
American male adolescents.

African American adolescent internalization of oppositional values with
adherence to street codes and ghetto-related behavior was also found by Wilson (1987,
and Family Life study, included data derived from an ethnographic investigation and an
employers’ survey. Addressing the significance of racism, Wilson (1996) found that the
disappearance of available jobs and the growth of related problems in the ghetto
aggravated an already tense racial situation in urban areas. He asserted that African
Americans and White Americans have different perceptions of race issues that are
derived fundamentally from dissimilar racial experiences. Moreover, Wilson (1996)
posed the racial experience of African Americans include the burden of racial injustice;
however, the racial experience for whites is largely free of bigotry and hatred.
Significantly, Wilson (1996) found evidence that oppositional value assimilation and
adverse social identity development preceded excessive concerns for respect and the
glorification of violence by African American adolescents. Similarly, Anderson’s (1999)
ethnographic survey of impoverished African American Philadelphia neighborhoods
revealed a link between adverse African American adolescent social and ethnic identities
and adherence to oppositional cultural values or street codes that deemphasize academic
and mainstream social competence. Anderson (1999) found that adoption of an
oppositional values system that glorifies getting respect and violence represent street
codes that encourages African American adolescents towards delinquent and violent behaviors.

Leary and colleagues (2005) studied the attitudes of African American adolescent males after experiencing racism and perceived disrespect. They found African American adolescents often externalize their anger into violence when disrespect is perceived to be experienced by themselves, their family and their culture. To assess measures of respect, Leary and colleagues (2005) developed an African American Respect scale comprised of three subscales designed to tap African American youths’ opinions about family, peer and societal respect. Using a matched sample of incarcerated and non-incarcerated youths, the three measures of respect were assessed against levels of racial socialization and the intensity of violence. African American male youth who were not incarcerated were found to have significantly higher scores on all three prosocial respect sub-scales than the youth who were incarcerated. Significantly, all three subscales were found inversely related to the intensity of violence measure. In addition, the societal and family respect subscales correlated with higher rates of racial socialization. The use of violence measure indicated a highly significant negative correlation with the African American respect scale. Leary and colleagues (2005) concluded that African American attitudes towards respect and the neutralizing benefits of race socialization reflect opportunities to prevent violence from race based anger.

E. Summary

Racism remains the most significant factor that separates the quality of lives of African American and White adolescents. Racism in America has been firmly entrenched
by a 400-year legacy that includes judicial and legislative support. Indeed, studies of contemporary institutional racism reveal that workplace prejudice towards African Americans continues to be prevalent, and consequently, African American workers feel frustrated and alienated from the mainstream.

Unfortunately, the consequences for African American adolescents are even more significant because they are challenged to develop healthy personal, social and ethnic identities within a denigrating context of social subjugation. Theories about the deleterious consequences of racism are supported by empirical evidence linking psychosocial and psychosomatic consequences to race related anger (Stevenson, 1997) and race-related anger and violence to African American adolescent perception of peer, family and societal disrespect (Leary and colleagues, 2005). A major consequence of societal racism is the development of adverse social identities that are characterized by rejection of mainstream values and assimilation of street codes. These codes place significant value on getting and maintaining respect and also promote illicit activities and violence (Wilson, 1987, 1996; Anderson, 1999; Leary and colleagues, 2005). Some theorists have found the assimilation of adverse and detrimental social identities in African American adolescents and subsequent antisocial behaviors to be a natural coping response (Lazarus, 1979; Grier and Cobbs, 1992) and consequence of racism (Stevenson, 1997; Leary, 2005). Drawing upon these findings, it is feasible to consider that racism adds a unique and deleterious quality to African American adolescents’ risks for delinquency and violence. Therefore, it is quite plausible that authoritarian childrearing may be a viable race socialization strategy that ultimately produces a uniquely different effect on delinquency and violence for African American and White adolescents.
III. Risk Factors for Delinquency and Violence

A. Overview of Risk Factors in the Theoretical Model

The theoretical model proposes that authoritarian parenting will have a race socialization protective effect that will differentially neutralize delinquency and violence in high-risk African American adolescents. This hypothesized race socialization protective effect can be assessed by examining its influence on the cumulative effect of risk factors for delinquency and violence. Five risk factors with strong correlations to high levels of delinquent and violent offending as well as to gang membership are proposed to develop a risk index to test the hypothesis. It should be noted that gang membership has been found to be highly associated with elevated levels of delinquency and violence. Thornberry et al. (2003) using longitudinal data from the Rochester Youth Development study found that self reported gang membership correlated with the highest levels of delinquent and violent offending in comparison to both non gang members and other delinquent peer group associations. In addition, gang members, representing a third of their sample, accounted for two thirds of all delinquency and violence. Thus, risk factors for gang membership are also viable to study as an index of delinquent and violent offending.

The risk index includes the following five risk factors: (1) percent in poverty in community of residence, (2) community arrest rate, (3) low parental education, (4) single parent household and (5) experiences with negative life events. Research has already demonstrated that these risk factors have direct, indirect and cumulative effects on delinquency and violence. The cumulative risk hypothesis is designed to tap the additional effect derived from the exposure to cumulative risk that is separate from the
effects of individual risk factors. Consequently, adolescents exposed to multiple risk factors are at greatest risk because of the accumulative effects of multiple risks (Rutter, 1979; Seifer and Sameroff, 1987; Thornberry et al., 2003). The notion of a cumulative risk effect is important to understand in the risk index.

In addition to cumulative effects of risk factors, exposure to risk factors that span multiple life domains such as neighborhood and family risk place adolescents at even greater risk for gang membership, delinquency and violence (Thornberry et al., 2003; Hall, Thornberry and Lizotte, 2006). This notion of individual and domain based cumulative risk effects has received empirical support from numerous investigations of antisocial behaviors (Rutter, 1979; Seifer and Sameroff, 1987; Masten and Colleagues, 1988; Sameroff, Seifer, Baldwin and Baldwin, 1993; Garmezy, 1996). Moreover, several studies have linked cumulative risk effects to delinquency and violence (Farrington, Loeber, Stouthamer-Loeber, 1999; externalizing behaviors that correlate with delinquency and violence (Deater-Deckard and colleagues, 1998); and gang membership (Thornberry and colleagues, 2003).

Farrington, Loeber, Stouthamer-Loeber (1999) found a link between the cumulative risk effect of socio-economic risk factors (non-intact families, low socioeconomic status, and receipt of welfare) and violent offending. Similarly, Deater-Deckard and colleagues (1998) investigated cumulative and individual effects of socioeconomic factors (low socioeconomic status, single mother households, and teenage pregnancy) on externalizing behaviors that correlated to delinquency and adult criminality. They found the variance between individual risk factors and externalizing behaviors was supplemented by additional variance that stemmed from their cumulative
effect. These studies clearly support the cumulative risk hypothesis. However, they measured a single domain that taps family socioeconomic characteristics.

Thornberry et al. (2003) also found support for the cumulative risk hypothesis but added the insight that risk also accumulates across multiple life domains that significantly increase the prevalence of gang membership. Using both a variable and domain-based model to analyze the influence of cumulative risks domains, they found both models demonstrated significantly strong and positive relationships with gang membership. However, the domain-based model demonstrated the strongest relationships with gang membership.

The risk index employed in this study is designed to identify the highest risk adolescents by selecting those adolescents that are above the median on the following risk factors: percent in poverty, community crime rate, and negative life events. Assignment as a high-risk adolescent will also be determined from dichotomous level risk factors assessed from responses of less than 12 years to the highest school grade completed of the principal wage earner and from determining adolescents that do not reside with both their biological parents. In addition, the risk index will constitute three non-redundant life domains consisting of the five risk factors capable of reflecting cumulative domain risk effects found by (Thornberry et al. 2003) to have the strongest relationships to gang membership, delinquency and violence. These domains include important life venues such as area characteristics, family socioeconomic context, and individual characteristics. Area characteristics, comprised of two risk factors including percent in poverty and community arrest rate, assess a degree of neighborhood disorder. Family socioeconomic characteristics assess parental education and family structure. This
domain considers adolescents at risk if their parents have less than a high school
education or if the adolescent does not live with both biological parents. The individual
characteristics domain that place adolescents at risk are derived from their experiences
with stressors and negative life events. Using these multi-domain cumulative risk factors
allow for the highest risk adolescents to be identified. Theoretical and empirical support
for including these risk factors in the risk index follows.

B. Area Characteristics: Poverty and Community Crime

Thornberry et al.'s (2003) longitudinal study of the antecedents of gang
membership found that objective measures of area characteristics predicted gang
membership more consistently than subjective measures (i.e., parental perception of the
neighborhood). Objective measures included neighborhoods with: higher proportions of
African Americans; poorer residents; and higher arrest rates.

Accordingly, several dimensions of area risks are included because they tap
neighborhood disorder and consequences of adolescent exposure to noxious
environments. Numerous studies have found that disordered neighborhoods
characterized by deficits in collective efficacy correlate with high levels of delinquency
and violence (Sampson, 1997; Bursik, 1988; Bennett and Fraser, 2000; Webster,
McDonald and Simpson, 2006). Percent in poverty and community arrest rate are
included in the risk index as risk factors because of their strong association with gang
membership and the likelihood of delinquency and violence. Support for including the
area risk factors that link them to gang membership, delinquency and violence follows.
Community Poverty

During the last three decades, the prevalence of poverty increased significantly along with levels of delinquency and violence and other negative development outcomes. Under federal poverty guidelines, white children constituted 12.5%, 11.2% and 13.6% of all poor children in calendar years 1989, 1999, and 2002 respectively. During the same period, African American children constituted 39.8%, 33.1% and 31.5% of all poor children. In 1980, 10.2% of adult whites and 32.5% of adult blacks were poor. Twenty one years later in 2001, 11.7% of adult whites and 22.7% of adult blacks comprised the proportion of whites and blacks that met federal poverty guideline criteria (US Census Bureau, 2003). Poverty in many families has endured several decades and has become a social problem that predicts numerous negative developmental outcomes.

The relationship between poverty and delinquency has been studied throughout decades of criminological research. Rutter and Giller (1983) asserted that the presumed strong association between low social class and delinquency constitutes the basis for some of the leading sociological theories of crime. Walter Miller (1969) hypothesized that the polarization between high and low social classes increased the likelihood of low social class acceptance of gang delinquency. Merton (1957) and a generation of strain theorists proposed that it is the greater frustration of youths in lower social class that leads these adolescents towards delinquency.

Multiple studies conducted over the years have found poverty to be a risk factor for delinquency. Wilson (1974, 1980) found a link between adolescent boys’ self reporting of serious misbehaviors and degree of social handicap. Elliott and Ageton (1980) found that lower class youth reported four times as many offenses as do middle
class youths and 1.5 more offenses than working class youth. In addition, they observed a
class differential between lower class youth and all others for both self reported
delinquency and predatory crimes robbery and aggravated assault. The correlation
between lower class youths and predatory crimes against persons was more pronounced
than all others.

In Werner’s (1989) birth cohort study, she found a direct correlation between
poverty and delinquency. She reported that the majority of youths with a record of
delinquency by the age of 18 were raised in poverty. Further support for the poverty and
delinquency relationship was established in the review of risk factors for alcohol and
drug abuse by Hawkins and colleagues (1992). These investigators found that adolescents
who abused drugs and alcohol came from poverty-stricken homes, overcrowded living
space and poor housing, all of which influence conduct problems and delinquent
behavior. Similarly, McLoyd (1998) concluded that low socioeconomic status (SES) was
a risk factor for chronic delinquency and the early onset of antisocial behaviors. She
found that low SES correlated with other risk factors including large family size, family
discord and parental mental illness. In addition, she determined that social class
differences related to differences in externalizing problem behaviors during pre-school
and early school years as well as other socioeconomic risk factors measures that linked
poverty to reported violence. The other socioeconomic risk factors included low SES,
receipt of welfare, small living space, and non-intact families. In summary, these studies
establish a plausible relationship between poverty, delinquency and violence.
Community Crime

There is a strong case for including community crime rates as an area risk factor. Research on gangs suggests that gangs proliferate in high crime, socially disorganized areas (Thornberry et al., 2003). The inclusion of community crime rate within the risk index represents another dimension of area risk. Community crime rates, analyzed at the census tract level, allow for an analysis and measurement of the relative effects of adolescent exposure to crime delinquency and violence. Essentially, it is an index of community crime assigned to each respondent based on their census tracts of residence. A analysis of high and low census tracts arrest rates against rates of delinquency and violence will allow for a test of whether residence in communities of high arrest correlate with elevated levels of delinquency and violence. The risk index includes community arrest rates calculated from the percentage of the total population in the respondents’ census tracts arrested in 1986.
C. Family Socioeconomic Characteristics: Low Parental Education, Single Parent Households

Low Parental Education

Low parental education has been found to both directly and indirectly predict gang membership, delinquency and violence. Hawkins and colleagues (1992) found that low parental education predicted later childhood behavior problems that increased the risks for alcoholism and drug use, known correlates of delinquency. Hawkins and others (1998) along with Lipsey and Derzon (1998) detected a direct relationship between low parental education and both delinquency and violence. Moreover, Thornberry et al. (2003) observed a relationship between low parental education and gang membership, another known correlate of delinquency.

Studies which focus on consequences of low maternal education on delinquency and violence are also quite relevant. Low maternal education, measured by failure to complete 12 years of education, has been found to correlate with family poverty and other co-occurring risk factors that predict delinquency, violence and assorted behavioral problems (Yoshikawa, 1994; McLoyd, 1998; Kaufman, 2005). A number of research investigations have found evidence of an indirect effect between low maternal education level and delinquency and other negative developmental outcomes (McLoyd, 1998; Kaufman, 2005). McLoyd’s (1998) meta-analysis revealed that the low maternal education level of single mothers contributed to the deterioration of children’s economic well-being and cognitive functioning. Both of these factors have been determined to be correlates of delinquency (Werner, 1992; Yoshikawa, 1994).
Kaufman (2005) found an inverse relationship between mothers’ education level and violence that complemented other component measures of SES. Nagin (1997) and Nagin and Tremblay (2001) found low maternal education to be a risk factor that increased the odds of a high aggression trajectory of male offspring by 77%. Moreover, early childbearing (before age 18) was empirically linked to low maternal education and the offspring’s later childhood aggression.

Undoubtedly, low maternal education is one of those risk factors that contribute to delinquency. Wilson’s (1987) study of urban poverty sought to explain the ramifications of low maternal education. He explained that that young mothers with little education accessed fewer work opportunities and consequently, fewer financial resources. Hence, he found the possibility of living in poverty significantly increased when maternal education was low. In addition to the strong correlation with poverty, low maternal education has also been found to correlate with delinquency via poor family management processes and cognitive deprivation inherent in the early childrearing environment (Smith and Krohn, 1995).

The inclusion of low parental education as a family socioeconomic risk factor taps low maternal education but, more importantly, recognizes the consequences for the family principal wage earner, regardless of parental gender. Low parental education is included in the risk index because of its indirect effects on gang membership, delinquency and violence via adolescent poverty (Thornberry et al., 2003).

**Single Parent Households**
Studies that have examined the relationship between intact and non-intact families and delinquency indicate two parent families are at comparatively less risk for delinquency and violence or gang membership. Wells and Rankin’s (1991) utilized a meta-analysis to detect a pattern of association between non-intact homes and delinquency. They found the prevalence of delinquency in broken homes was 10 to 15% higher than in intact homes. Thornberry et al., (2003) found, among other factors, living in homes where both biological parents are not present increases the likelihood of males becoming gang members.

An interesting corollary of family composition over the last three decades should be noted. Most non-intact African American families include a prevalence of single or female heads of households. For example, the racial composition of federally defined poor white children under the age of 18 and in the care of a single head of household in calendar years 1973 and 2002 was 14.2% and 16.3% respectively. In contrast, poor black children under the care of a single head of household constituted 40.6% and 31.3% of all black children in 1973 and 2002 respectively (Children’s Defense Fund, 2004).

According to Wilson (1987), female-headed households are not just likely to be poor; they are also more likely than male-headed households to be persistently poor. Wilson (1987) noted that 36.3% of all female-headed households were impoverished and black female-headed households constituted 56.2% of all female-headed households. In addition, more than 55.3% of black children were found to be born to single unwed mothers. Safyer (1994) proposed that the disproportionately elevated rates of African American female-headed households, teenage and out-of-wedlock births are contributing factors to delinquency and violence because of their co-variation with poverty and other
negative developmental outcomes. McLoyd’s (1998) meta-analysis also found a relationship between high rates of female-headed households and poverty rates among African American women.

The socioeconomic adversity linked to female-headed households indirectly affects the parent-child attachment relationship critical to predicting delinquency. Essentially, researchers have found that female-headed households moderate the effect of poverty on delinquency through poor family management processes (Barbarin, 1993; Smith and Krohn, 1995; Stern, Smith and Jang, 1999; Jaffee, Caspi, Moffitt, Belsky and Silva, 2001). These investigators propose that economic scarcity increases stress on single parents that often impair ability to execute critical aspects of sound family management (Larzelere and Patterson, 1990) including parental involvement (Babar in, 1993) and attachment (Sokol-Katz and Dunham, 1997). Stern, Smith and Jang (1999) found that stressed parents, particularly in female-headed households, face family adversities such as poverty and suffer from disrupted family management practices and social isolation. These factors influence parental distress, a lack of control over children and subsequently a lack of discipline. Stern, Smith and Jang (1999) concluded these factors contribute to internalizing and externalizing problems that lead to delinquent and violent behavior among African American adolescents.

The indirect effect of female headed households through poverty and deficits in family management practices is assessed in the risk index from adolescent responses to not living with both biological parents. Single Parent Households is included in the model as a risk factor because it is a unique family socioeconomic characteristic that predicts delinquency.
D. Individual Characteristics: Negative Life Events

Several studies have used measures of negative life events as an index to assess the impact of stressful events on the personal constitution of adolescents. Negative or stressful life events include adolescent experiences with a range of misfortunes including parental separation or divorce, illness of a family member, close friend or of one’s self, breaking up with a girlfriend or boyfriend, suspension from school or death of a family member, (Garmezy, 1983; Thornberry et al., 2003; Fishbein and others, 2006; Maschi, 2006).

Fishbein and colleagues (2006) examined the impact of negative life events on the adolescent stress-substance abuse relationship. They found that negative stressful life events related to risky behaviors and poor social competence. However, social competence was found to mediate the effects of stress from negative life events on substance abuse. Among several measures of individual characteristics, Thornberry et al. (2003) found that adolescents who experienced negative life events increased their odds of joining a gang threefold.

Using the National Survey of Adolescents data, Maschi (2006) found that both cumulative and differential effects of trauma predict male delinquency. Trauma was defined as being a violence victim, witnessing violence or experiencing stressful life events. Maschi (2006) found the cumulative effect of exposure to stressful life events increased the odds of youths engaging in property offending. The odds of youths committing property offenses were found to be 1.31 greater for adolescent males who had experienced stressful events in the past year than for adolescents who had not. Finally, it should be noted that perhaps one of the more significant negative or stressful
life events for adolescents is the loss of a parent. Raphael (1983) found that adolescents who are unable to work through their grief often become aggressive, hostile and destructive and at increased risk for alcohol, substance abuse and delinquent behavior. A negative life events index is included to assess another domain of adolescent life that influences their well being and the likelihood of delinquent and violent offending.

E. Summary of the Risk Factors to be Included in the Risk Index

The five risk factors comprise three life domains that span a large proportion of adolescent life venues and cumulative wellbeing. The area characteristics risk factors assess aspects of neighborhood disorder including objective measures that reflect different dimensions (percent in poverty and community arrest rate) of the adolescent’s environmental risk. The family socioeconomic domain includes low parental education and not living with both biological parents. Finally, a domain that assesses individual characteristics stemming from experiences with negative life events that correlate highly with delinquency and violence is included.

Previous research has yielded findings that indicate that individually and cumulatively, these risk factors, lead to delinquent and violent behavior among African American adolescents. Therefore, the theoretical model is configured to include a risk index that conceptualizes high-risk as adolescents who are above the median for the continuous level risk factors and assigned risk as determined from the dichotomous risk factors. If evidence of a significant and greater moderating influence of authoritarian parenting on high risk African American adolescents is detected, then support for the race socializing protective factor hypothesis is warranted.
IV. Contributions of Resilience Research

A. Origins

The hypothesis that Authoritarian Parenting operates within an overall race socialization strategy proposes that it will protect against risk by altering trajectories towards delinquency and violence. Resilience research studies successful developmental outcomes in the presence of elevated risks (Garmezy, 1996; Smith et al. 1995). The origin of resilience research can be traced to the field of marine insurance where the very first risk assessment concepts were developed and the fundamental underpinnings of epidemiology was established (Garmezy, 1990; Pelligrini, 1990). Contemporary studies of resilience, as a specialized area, continue within the epidemiological tradition by focusing on the incidence and prevalence of survivorship.

The resilience literature reveals numerous studies and reports where risks were overcome by intervening factors that altered paths towards negative outcomes. Many studies have developed theories of protection that focus on explaining why some high-risk individuals achieve highly improbable success while others do not (Rutter, 1979; Anthony, 1983; Garmezy, 1978, 1987; Werner, 1992; Pelligrini, 1990). Clinically, an increasing number of social workers, psychologists, and educators are realizing the practical implications of resilience. To this end, assessment instruments are being developed to identify protective resources that enhance social, personal and academic competencies and reduce undesirable behavior. A focus on the narrow contexts of protective mechanisms will give practical insight into the potential of resilience as an effective prevention or intervention strategy.
B. Early Findings

In Rutter’s (1979) seminal epidemiological study of psychiatric resilience, he found competent mental functioning in high-risk schizophrenic offspring, the product of factors that modify, ameliorate, or alter a person’s response to environmental hazard that otherwise predisposes to a maladaptive outcome. He noted one important protective factor was presence of an affective relationship with the remaining functioning parent, characterized by high warmth and the absence of severe criticism. On the importance of the home environment, Rutter (1979) found schizophrenic offspring who resided in discordant homes with family problems were protected from later conduct disorder when they subsequently resided in harmonious homes with good family relationships. Rutter (1979) also measured scholastic attainment, children’s behaviors and psychiatric state. He found that rates of conduct disorder were lower among children of superior academic attainment. Rutter (1979) concluded self esteem and self efficacy were also important protective factors that served to protect his sample of schizophrenic offspring from psychiatric disorder in the presence of family stress or adversity.

Garmezy (1991) conducted another early investigation of resilience with a sample of urban high-risk African Americans children. Essentially, Garmezy (1991) studied the factors relevant to the competence of resilient urban African American children exposed to risk of poverty and prejudice. He found numerous protective attributes including child dispositional characteristics, family cohesion and warmth, and supportive role models in the environment or school to be factors that contributed towards competence.

Emmy Werner’s (1989) comprehensive interdisciplinary investigation of a thirty-year old birth cohort on the Hawaiian island of Kauai was also a prominent early study of
resilience. She found ameliorative factors that distinguished competent from incompetent functioning among high-risk youth within the birth cohort. These factors included temperamental characteristics such as high activity, social and personal competence and good health. The correlates of competent functioning included academic competencies, age appropriate reading skills and the absence of problem behaviors in the classroom. Parental care giving style and diverse sources of support including significant others, teachers and ministers, faith and prayer, and a supportive spouse were found to be protective factors.

Felsman and Vaillant (1983) examined protective factors in the control group of Sheldon and Eleanor Gluecks’ (1950) sample. Using the Boyhood Competency Scale and measures of later adult outcomes, they found that high self efficacy and self esteem, were psychological strengths that served as protective factors. In addition, resilient high-risk boys were found to be self-directed and self-starters, flexible, determined, and persistent.

These early studies of resilience show research continuity. Rutter (1979), Felsman and Vaillant (1983), Werner (1989) and Garmezy (1991) all detect protective factors related to child disposition and temperament, the parent child relationship and the environment.

These initial studies of protective factors provided the direction for future resilience research by inviting questions about the social and psychological context within which protective mechanisms operate successfully. To meet this challenge, an interdisciplinary body of research focusing on examining dimensions and circumstances surrounding successful adjustments include biological factors (Raine et al., 1995; 1996); psychological factors (Rutter, 1979; Pelligrini, 1990), social economic status (Garmezy,

This interdisciplinary research effort has revealed a common characteristic of all resilience studies; protective mechanisms are tailored to narrow contextual outcomes. Consequently, generalizing findings across diverse social and personal contexts are problematic. Luthar (1993:441) asserted “overall social competence among high-risk individuals is not necessarily paralleled by superior adjustment on covert mental health indices”. She recommended that resilience research models adopt methodologies that sharply define resilience within specific domains such as academic, social or emotional resilience. Similarly, Herrenkohl (1994) wrote of the dual quality and limitations of protective factors. He found that high functioning in the academic sphere, a characteristic of resilient children found in early resilience research, does not guarantee healthy functioning in the emotional, interpersonal sphere. Clearly, an understanding of the specific context within which interactions of risk and protective factors influence a successful protective mechanism framework would advance knowledge in the field considerably. Here, the focus is on outcomes of behavioral competence.

C. Risk-Protective Factor Interaction Effects

A critical research proposition that focused resilience research on risk and protective factor interaction was articulated by Michael Rutter (1983; 1985; 1987; 1991; 1996). Rutter (1987) criticized constructs of protective factors that asserted they were
polar opposites of risk factors; he posited that the protective effect is the product of the interaction between risk and protective factors. Rutter (1987:317) asserted:

The essence of the concept of protection is that the vulnerability or the protective effect is evident only in combination with the risk variable. Either the vulnerability or protective effect has no effect in low-risk populations or its effect is magnified in the presence of the risk variable. It is crucial that this interactive component be put to rigorous empirical test. Without its presence, there is no point in differentiating risk mechanisms from vulnerability processes.

Moreover, he noted that protection lies not in the absence or evasion of risks, but in the successful engagement of risks where the encounter between the risk and protective variables produces resilient survivors that defy high-risk profiles. Rutter’s (1987:317) proposition of this protective-risk factor mechanism narrowed the scope of resilience research to “developmental and situational mechanisms involved in protective processes”. Rutter’s (1987) focus on protective mechanisms has been adopted by investigators whose research examines the context of resilience and hence, the interaction between risk and protective factors (Pelligrini, 1990; Sameroff and Seifer, 1990; Garmezy, 1990).

Race and ethnic differences in childrearing under adverse ecological circumstances is an important and relevant context to assess resilience to delinquent and violent offending. Hypothetically, an adverse urban ecology is exactly the negative context where authoritarian parenting may have the opportunity to favorably interact with risk factors. The research context may reveal potential developmental and situational protective mechanisms and the scope of the protective effect. Prime examples are the works of Baldwin and colleagues, (1993) and Walker-Barnes and Mason (2001). Baldwin and colleagues (1993) found that high-risk authoritarian reared black adolescents reported
better mental health rates than high-risk authoritarian reared white youths. Similarly, Walker-Barnes and Mason’s (2001) investigation of parenting control practices on predictions of gang involvement and gang delinquency detected an interaction effect between race and ethnicity and behavioral controls. High levels of behavioral control and low level of lax control related to better behavioral outcomes in African American adolescents; however, high behavioral control yielded worsened outcomes for white and other youths. Walker-Barnes and Mason (2001) concluded that without assessing race and ethnic differences, the unique influence of behavioral controls on black adolescents would have been lost and the role of parenting underestimated. In both studies, strict parenting practices within a high-risk ecological context produced favorable outcomes for African American adolescents but not for white adolescents. Moreover, consistent with Rutter’s (1979) conceptualization, favorable outcomes required both the risk factor and the protective factor to facilitate the protective effect. These findings support the plausibility of race and ethnic protective factors that differentiate the influence of parenting styles on high-risk black and white adolescents.

D. Summary

The recent history of resilience as a discreet area of psychopathology research reveals numerous accounts of high-risk subjects influenced by intervening factors that altered their path towards delinquent and violent behavior. Multidisciplinary theorists and clinicians are beginning to recognize the practical implications of resilience research. Early resilience research has identified common factors and the effects of protective factor influences that modify high-risk trajectories. However, later studies illuminate the narrow scope of the protective effect and the concern for findings within diverse social
and personal contexts. The recognition of a narrow scope of protection magnifies the need to understand specific contextual interactions of risk and protective factors. The findings of specific interactions within the narrow scope of protection, is consistent with Rutter’s (1987) model of resilience which explains the co-existence and interaction of risk and protective factors as the essence of the concept of protection.

There is substantial evidence that support the notion of a limitation in the scope of the protective effect and that protective mechanisms tend to be contextually specific. Protection in one area does not guarantee complete and normative functioning in all areas. The hypothesis of authoritarian childrearing is based on theoretical and empirical findings that variations in outcomes will depend on the situational context of resilience. The high-risk ecological and cultural milieu within which urban African Americans adolescents reside presents an adverse negative ecological risk context where authoritarian parenting may differentially alter trajectories for delinquency and violence.

V. Dimensions of Authoritarian Parenting

A. Authoritarian Parenting: The Hypothesized Race Socialization Protective Factor

This study is based on the notion that there are race and cultural differences in the protective effects of authoritarian parenting. In addition, theoretical and empirical findings form the foundation that links authoritarian child rearing to favorable developmental outcomes. These findings provide the impetus for examining dimensions of authoritarian parenting. Authoritarian parenting is conceptualized as a parenting style that incorporates three dimensions of childrearing including: (1) responsiveness, (2) monitoring and, (3) restrictive parental control.
Most studies of childrearing assess parenting styles on the basis of composite levels of parental responsiveness and restrictiveness. For instance, Baumrind (1971) re-conceptualized her fourfold parenting typology into dual parenting dimensions of responsiveness and demandingness. Similarly, Maccoby and Martin (1983) fourfold parent classification grid classified authoritarian parents as demanding and unresponsive. In addition, studies that have used modified versions of the Block Childrearing Practice Report detected dual parenting dimensions of nurturance and restrictiveness (Rickel and Biasatti, 1982; Kochanska, Kuczynski and Mason Radke-Yarrow, 1989; Dekovic, Jansens and Gerris, 1991; Gonzales, Cauce, Friedman and Mason, 1996).

This conceptualization of authoritarian parenting also includes these parenting dimensions. Specifically, authoritarian parents and their children are hypothesized to share an affective bond within a relationship of mutual responsiveness to the child’s needs and parental guidelines and regulations. Rothbaum (1994) noted the reciprocal nature of responsive parent-child relationships in a meta-analysis of parenting studies. He found that parental approval and guidance motivate children and foster behaviors that meet the expectation and desires of their parents. Moreover, the dimension of responsiveness reflects the extent to which adolescents perceive their parents as loving, supportive and involved. However, monitoring, an orthogonal dimension of parenting, includes parental behavioral control practices of surveillance, regulation setting, supervision and contingent and consistent discipline (Maccoby and Martin, 1983; Lamborn and colleagues, 1991).

Authoritarian parenting, under this hypothesized conceptualization, includes a third dimension indicative of parental use of restrictive control techniques. Restrictive
control includes parental practices of intrusiveness, non-democratic decision-making, and severe disciplinary practices (Baldwin and colleagues, 1990). However, it is important to note that the fundamental premise of this study is that authoritarian parenting is a parental choice and reaction to severe and dangerous environmental contexts and the circumstantial needs of their children. In a dangerous situational context, authoritarian childrearing is theorized as a protective factor capable of intervening in the socialization process of internalizing negative race messages and risk factors that threaten healthy emotional and psychological development. Recall, Billingsley (1968) and others lamented the dual socialization process that African American adolescents encounter includes internalization of conflicting mores and values that compromise healthy identity development. To explore this issue, the conceptualization of authoritarian parenting as a race socializing protective factor proposes that African American parents seek to proactively interrupt the negative socialization process at the identity development stage of adolescence.

Parents who seek to shape and control adolescent emotions, attitudes and behaviors and instill their values without verbal give and take epitomize the restrictive control practices of authoritarian parents. Restrictive and controlling parents adopt childrearing practices that incorporate higher degrees of constraints and limit-setting (Rothbaum, 1994) and a willingness to interfere frequently in child activities, peers, choices and decisions (Pettit and colleagues, 2001). In addition, parent-child communications that include an absence of verbal give and take reflect a deficit in psychological autonomy characteristic of the likely practices of a restrictive and controlling parent. Psychological autonomy evident by the presence of verbal give and
take and/or democratic family decision-making are parental behavioral practices that are not included within the behavioral domain of high-risk authoritarian parents.

In addition to intrusive and controlling parenting behaviors, severe disciplinary practices also characterize authoritarian parents. These disciplinary practices include lengthy restrictions on freedom, anger and corporal punishment. Discipline practices of this type illuminate a higher degree of punishment severity which is particularly relevant in late adolescence where increasing freedom and decreasing parental supervision is normative. In summary, under this hypothesis, parental practices of intrusiveness, non-democratic decision-making and severe discipline constitute practices of the restrictive and controlling style of authoritarian parenting.

B. Authoritative Parenting: A Related Style of Parenting

Recall authoritative parenting is a related childrearing style that incorporates two of the dimensions (responsiveness and monitoring) of authoritarian parents. Authoritative childrearing has been described as an engaging childrearing style where parents affectively bonded with their children are both responsive to and demanding of their children and encourage psychological autonomy. In addition to supervising activities and behaviors of their children, discipline that is consistent and clearly contingent on non-compliance is incorporated within the context of democratic family decision-making over matters affecting the child. These parents provide developmentally age-appropriate levels of independence and engage their children in subject matters and decisions about them. In addition, independent thinking is encouraged by these parents who render gradual developmentally normative freedoms throughout early and late
adolescent years. Their disciplinary practices include comparatively less non-coercive punishments coupled with dialogue that is rarely guilt or anxiety-inducing. Typical practices of authoritative parents include attachment behaviors and parenting practices in which behavioral control through monitoring and regulation of activities is used to achieve conformity, consistent and contingent discipline, verbal give-and-take, and democratic decision-making. Authoritative parents are responsive to their children to the extent to which they provide a supportive and cooperative parent-child relationship design to achieve mutually agreed upon child developmental goals.

Baumrind’s (1971) initial conceptualization of authoritative parenting was the first that revealed responsiveness and monitoring as parenting practice clusters indicative of a healthy parent-child relationship. These behaviors characterized demanding parents that observed, regulated and controlled their child’s behavior. Similarly, Maccoby and Martin (1983) asserted that authoritative childrearing reflected parenting behaviors that included child-acceptance, inductive and consistent discipline and non-punitive punishment practices. Kochanska and colleagues (1989) examined everyday maternal control and discipline items and found that authoritative parenting included rational guiding of the child, inductive non-coercive disciplinary methods, discussing misbehaviors together, fostering individuality and responsibility, and recognition of the child’s rights in family decisions. Lastly, Kaufman and colleagues (2000:232) wrote “authoritative parents were more democratic and less concerned with strict adherence to the rules than with explaining the rules and helping their child understand the reasons behind them.” Steinberg et al. (1991) conceptualized parental authoritativenss under dimensions of acceptance-involvement, firm control and psychological autonomy. They
found that parents who were high in acceptance and involvement and firm control also encouraged psychological autonomy through use of non-coercive democratic discipline and encouragements of individuality.

It is apparent that authoritarian and authoritative parents share some similarities. However, the authoritarian parent’s use of restrictive parental control techniques and the authoritative parent’s orientation towards child psychological autonomy reflect clear philosophical and behavioral differences in these parenting styles. Under this hypothesis, authoritative parenting is not sufficient for high-risk African American adolescents; high-risk African American adolescents need a firmer hand and stronger authority which can be provided through the restriction and control practices of authoritarian parents.

C. Distinctions between Authoritarian and Authoritative Parenting Behaviors

Both authoritarian and authoritative parents place high demands on their children and expect their children to behave appropriately and obey parental rules. However, authoritarian parents also expect their children to accept their judgments, values, and goals without question. In contrast, authoritative parents are more open to give and take with their children and make greater use of explanations. Although authoritative and authoritarian parents are equally high in behavioral control, authoritative parents tend to be low in restrictive control while authoritarian parents tend to be high. Authoritarian and authoritative childrearing styles include dimensions of attachment and monitoring. These dimensions reflect the care, responsiveness and reciprocal relationship indicative of an affective parent–child bond and behavioral control practices of monitoring, regulation and consistent discipline. However, there are fundamental differences between these parenting styles that clearly distinguish authoritative from authoritarian parenting.
Authoritative parents encourage psychological autonomy, render age-appropriate freedoms, develop their child’s individuality, utilize democratic decision-making, and incorporate verbal give and take between parent and child. These parenting practices reflect behaviors designed to encourage psychological autonomy and fully include the opinions and feelings of the child.

However, the idea of fostering psychological autonomy is antithetical to the philosophical beliefs and behavioral practices of authoritarian childrearing. Authoritarian parents practice more restrictive parenting behaviors designed to attain restrictive control in lieu of psychological autonomy. Clearly, the principal difference between these two parenting styles concerns the issue of restrictive parental control. An important element of the race socialization protective factor hypothesis is that authoritarian parents include an affective and responsive parent-child relationship characterized by parents who monitor and control their children. In addition, these parents employ restrictive control through intrusiveness, non-democratic decision-making and severe discipline.

Finally, it is important to consider that the type and severity of disciplinary techniques reflects another significant distinction in the two parenting practices. Maccoby and Martin’s (1983) early studies of parenting and discipline classified discipline techniques under two major headings: power assertive discipline and love oriented discipline. Power assertive discipline included physical punishments, yelling, shouting, forceful commands and threats. Love oriented discipline included showing disappointment, isolation and withdrawal of love and contingent giving of affection and reasoning. Authoritative parents tended to use non-coercive, less power assertive-disciplinary control techniques (Baumrind, 1971, 1991; McCoody and Martin, 1983;
Fletcher et al., 1995; Grey and Steinberg, 1999; Pittman and Chase-Lansdale, 2001; Kaplan, 2003). Kochanska and colleagues (1989) found that the authoritative pattern of parenting was negatively related to the use of physical enforcements, prohibitive interventions and direct commands. In addition, inductive rather than coercive techniques are emphasized as the form of discipline.

Alternatively, authoritarian parenting has been found to include severe and physical discipline (Maccoby and Martin, 1983; Baldwin and colleagues, 1990, 1993). Kaufman and colleagues (2000) found that an authoritarian parenting style included emphasis on physical and verbal punishment as consequences for disobedience. Moreover, Kelly, Power and Wimbush (1992) found the practice of harsh punishment and expectation of unquestioned obedience characteristic of low income authoritarian parents. The choice and severity of disciplinary techniques represent a clear delineation between authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles. The constellation of authoritarian parenting behaviors including restrictive parental control practices of intrusiveness, non-democratic decision-making and severe discipline delineate the major distinction between authoritative and authoritarian parenting.

In summary, this conceptualization of authoritarian parenting incorporates three dimensions that characterize the practices and behaviors of authoritarian parents: (1) parental responsiveness, (2) monitoring and (3) restrictive parental control. Responsiveness and monitoring are characteristics present in the related parenting style of authoritative childrearing. However, the constellations of behaviors that constitute the additional dimension of restrictive parental control reveal distinct parenting behavior differences. Table V.1 illustrates the dimensions and behavioral practices that distinguish
authoritative from authoritarian parents. The focus of this study is on authoritarian parenting because of a potential link to positive developmental outcomes in high-risk African American youth. Moreover, the study explores whether authoritarian parenting has a greater moderating impact on delinquency and violence than authoritative parenting.

Table V.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions/Practices</th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveillance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Discipline</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Parental Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrusiveness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Decision-Making</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Discipline</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Research Design and Methodology

A. Research Questions

The hypothesis that authoritarian childrearing acts as a race socializing protective factor is based on the proposition that this parenting style produces a significantly different buffering effect in high-risk African American adolescents relative to high-risk white adolescents. Three research questions are proposed to test the hypothesis:

1. Does authoritarian parenting reduce delinquency and violence more strongly in high-risk African American youth than authoritative parenting?
2. Does authoritarian parenting reduce delinquency and violence more strongly in high-risk African American youth than in low-risk African American youth?

3. Does authoritarian parenting reduce delinquency and violence more strongly in high-risk African American youth than in high-risk white youth?

B. Sample Description

Over the past two decades, the Rochester Youth Development Study (RYDS) has collected a wealth of developmental, life-course and offending data and evolved as a rich data source for unexplored areas of delinquency, violence and substance abuse. The RYDS longitudinal panel design affords assessment of developmental causes and correlates of offending over the twenty-year life course of its subjects. The initial data collection effort began in spring, 1988 with Wave 1 and subsequent semi-annual data collection continued until 1992. After a two-year respite, annual data collection began in 1994 and continued until 1997, constituting 12 total waves of data with an overall retention rate of 85% (Pogarsky et al., 2003).

This study uses a sub-sample of RYDS that includes African American and white male adolescents to test the hypothesis that authoritarian parenting facilitates a race socialization protective effect. The initial RYDS panel included 1,000 seventh and eighth grade students who attended Rochester City public schools during the 1987-1988 academic years. To ensure that serious chronic offenders were included in the study, the RYDS sample over-represented males (75% males to 25% females) because males were considered more likely to engage in serious deviant behavior leading to chronic offending. As a consequence of this sampling strategy, a sufficient number of females are not available for study. The absence of females is noteworthy. However, it is an
acceptable and planned concession designed to maximize the sampling of high-risk male offenders for study. This study seeks to examine male delinquent and violent behavior, but within the narrower context of the relative effects of two different parenting styles.

In addition to over-sampling male students, the sampling strategy also included selecting students according to census tract resident arrest rates. By estimating the arrest rates from the total population of the census tracts, students from tracts with the highest rates were proportionately overrepresented because they were at highest risk for serious delinquency. The RYDS sampling design is well-suited for this study because a major component of the hypothesis of authoritarian parenting is that a race socialization protective effect will emerge in the presence of elevated risk.

With respect to composition and retention rates within the male RYDS sample, African American males constitute 69% of the total sample. Of the sample retained through Wave 10, 66.8% were African American male subjects. Hispanic American and white males constituted 17% and 14% of the sample respectively. Age ranges at Wave 1 ranged between 11 and 14, though 75% of the sample was between the ages of 13 and 14. These proportions reflected the population characteristics of Rochester Schools and the decision to over-sample high-risk youths (Thornberry and colleagues, 1987). White males comprise 17% of the total sample, with 89% retained through Wave 10. The retention rates for both African American and white males are excellent for the entire sample. A comparison between African American and white adolescents retained and not retained throughout the sample was not statistically significant. This indicates that the loss of respondents in either racial group over 10 waves of data collection did not affect the overall demographic portrait of respondents (Krohn and Thornberry, 1999).
This study includes 464 African American males and 134 white males. The mean ages for African American males at waves 1, 5 and 6 through 9 are 14.04 (n=451), 15.95 (n=422) and 17.30 (n=416) respectively. The mean ages for white males at waves 1, 5 and 6 through 9 are 13.75 (n=130), 15.75 (n=126) and 17.1 (n=126) respectively. To assess delinquent and violent outcomes, waves 6 through 9 general delinquency and violence will be regressed on wave 5 authoritative and authoritarian parenting and wave 1 risk factors.

C. General Introduction to Measures

Six types of measures are used to assess the impact of the hypothesized protective factors. These measures are: (1) background, (2) risk, (3) authoritative parenting, (4) the hypothesized protective factor, authoritarian parenting, and outcome measures of (5) delinquency and (6) violence. The background measures assess age and ethnicity.

Risk measures include: (1) percent in poverty in community of residence, (2) community arrest rate, (3) low parental education, (4) single parent households and (5) experiences with negative life events.

The measure of authoritative parenting includes items assessing parental responsiveness derived from the Hudson Index of Parental Attitudes (Hudson, 1982). In addition, items assessing parental monitoring including surveillance, regulation and consistent discipline, sub-dimensions hypothetically shared with authoritarian parenting are included. The measures of the hypothesized protective factor, authoritarian parenting, include items tapping restrictive parental control (intrusiveness, non-democratic decision-making, and severe discipline).
Outcome measures of delinquency and violence are derived from responses to the 29 item self-reported delinquency inventory.

**D. Background Measures**

Background measures proposed as control variables include the adolescents’ age and race. **Adolescent age** was derived from the adolescent interview at Wave 1. **Race** was determined from ethnic self-designation questions that include the response category of White, Black, Mixed Racial Background, Hispanic, Asian, or Something Else. For analytic purposes, only responses of black and white subjects are considered for the study sample. Race is measured with a dummy variable that includes African Americans with whites as the reference category.

**E. Risk Measures**

Recall from Chapter 3 that individual and cumulative risk factors for gang membership, delinquency and violence that cross multiple life domains are included in the risk index. Area poverty includes the type of underclass membership traditionally associated with risk for delinquency and violence (Farnworth, 1984; Wilson, 1987, Farnworth et al., 1994). In this conceptualization, poverty is measured by “percentage in poverty,” a standard 1980 census tract measure that assigns a rate of poverty based on the percentage of the total population in poverty within the adolescents census tracts. **Community arrest rate** is another measure that uses census tracts as a unit of analysis. This measure assigns an arrest rate to each respondent based on the percentage of total population arrested in the respondent’s census tract in 1986. **Negative life events** is a
scale that measures adolescents experience with eight life stressors such as breaking up with a boy/girlfriend, being suspended from school or being seriously ill.

**Parent education** is derived from the parents’ responses to the question “What was the highest grade completed by the family’s principal wage earner?” Responses range from sixth grade to one year of college. **Low parental education** was assessed from parental responses of less than 12 years of education completed. Dichotomized responses of yes or no was used to assign risk according to whether or not the adolescents’ parent principal wage earner completed twelve years of education or a General Equivalency Diploma (GED).

In addition, a risk factor was assigned to adolescents that reside within **single parent households** or within a family constellation other than both biological parents. This measure is derived from parental responses to family structure questions from the interview schedule at Wave 1. A construct file with household member residence data was utilized to determine whether adolescents resided with two biological parents or some other type of family constellation. It is important to note that although risk is assigned to adolescent who live within single parent households, adolescents who reside within a household that does not include both biological parents were also assigned risk.

The summated risk index or count variable that includes the five risk factors was constructed to identify the adolescents at greatest risk. Initially, each risk variable was dichotomized according to an assigned value of zero to designate the absence of the particular risk factor; or one, which will represent the presence of the risk factor. Adolescents who are above the median in most of the continuous risk factors will be classified as at risk. The count variable was constructed to calculate the number of risk
factors adolescents are exposed to that place them at elevated risk for gang membership, delinquency and violence. As previously reported, any one or two of these risk factors individually or in combination, influences delinquent outcomes. Conceivably, exposure to multiple risk factors will generate a higher probability of delinquency and violence because they cross critical life domains (Thornberry et al., 2003) and aggravating effects exacerbate risk for a range of antisocial behaviors (Rutter, 1979; Rutter and Giller, 1983; Farrington, 1999). More importantly, the count variable will detect and identify a high-risk sample that will allow a test of the race socializing effects of authoritarian parenting.

**F. Proposed Protective Factor Measures**

To assess the hypothesized protective effect of authoritarian parenting, it is important to ensure valid and reliable measures reflect the actual influence of this parenting style. Many of the measures in RYDS, especially the core measures, undergo constant validity and reliability testing with the emergence of new waves. However, not all potential measures have been tested for all possible subgroups. The essence of the hypothesis is that the effect of authoritarian parenting will vary by racial subgroup. Since authoritarian parenting is hypothesized to reduce delinquency and violence in high-risk African Americans, internally consistent scales that capture the underlying constructs of responsiveness, monitoring and restrictive parental control were constructed. These scales facilitated an assessment of the parenting dimensions within both race group subsamples of African American and European American male adolescents.
G. Dimensions of Authoritarian Parenting

To develop a scale with sufficient internal consistency, reliable measures of the dimensions that constitute the hypothesized protective effect were identified. Authoritarian childrearing has been theoretically and empirically linked to items within three interrelated parenting dimensions of responsiveness*, monitoring and restrictive parental control. (See Table V.1, pg.53 for hypothesized authoritarian parenting dimensions and Table VI.1, pg 61 for relevant items by dimension.) Items that comprise these dimensions were derived from Wave 5 of the student interview schedules (Table VI.1).
Table V1.1

*Dimensions and Items - Authoritarian Parenting Reliability and Item Analysis*

Student Questions

1. Parental Responsiveness

Response Set: Often (4), Sometimes (3), Seldom (2), or Never (1)

How often would you say that…?

1. You feel you feel get along with your (caretaker)?
2. You feel that you can really trust your (caretaker)?
3. Your (caretaker) does not understand you? *
4. You really enjoy your (caretaker)?
5. You think your (caretaker) is terrific?
6. You feel very angry towards your (caretaker)? *
7. You feel very violent towards your (caretaker)?*
8. You feel very proud of your (caretaker)?
9. You have a lot of respect for your (caretaker)?

* Reverse coded response set items

2. Parental Monitoring

Response Set for 10-12 and 15-29: Often (4), Sometimes (3), Seldom (2), Never (1)

A. Monitoring and Regulation

10. In the course of a day, how often does your __________ know where you are?
11. How often would ________ know who you are with and when you are not home?
12. When ________ is away from home, how often do you know how to get in contact with them?

Response set for items 13-14: Very Important (4) Important (3) Not Very Important (2) and Not Important at all (1)

13. How important is it for parents to know who your friends are?
14. How important is it for ____ parents to know where you are?

B. Consistent Discipline

Response Set: Never (1), Seldom (2), Sometimes (3), Often (4)

*Reverse Code: Often (4), Sometimes (3), Seldom (2) and Never (1)

15. Once your caretaker (decides/decide) a punishment, how often can you get out of it? **
16. How often do you get away with things? **
17. How often do you know what to expect from (caretaker) when you have done something wrong?*
18. How often do you get punished sometimes, but not other times for doing the same things? **
19. How often (do/does) (caretaker) have to ask you to do the same thing? **
3. Restrictive Parental Control

Response Set for items 20-29: Often (4), Sometimes (3), Seldom (2) Never (1)

A. Intrusiveness

20. How often would you say your caretaker interferes with your activities?
21. How often would you say your caretaker is too demanding?

B. Non-democratic Decision-making

**Recoded Response Set: Never (1), Seldom (2), Sometimes (3), Always (4)

22. How often does _____ ask you what you think before making a decision about you? **
23. How often does _____ give you reasons for his/her/their decisions about you? **
24. How often do you and ____ compromise during disagreements? **

C. Severity of Discipline

When you do something you shouldn’t do, how often does______?

25. Hit or slap you?
26. Call the police?
27. Tell you to get out or lock you out of the house?
28. When parents are disciplining a child, sometimes the child is physically hurt. Since (date of last interview) has this happened to you? ***
29. How often did this happen to you? Would you say (once, twice, 3-5 times, 6-10 times, more than 10 times, DK)? ***

*** Items 28 and 29 combined and recoded to form new variable labeled “Times physically hurt during discipline.”

The first dimension, responsiveness, examines the affective and responsive relationship between parent and child. Responsiveness is measured by a nine item adaptation of Hudson’s Index of Parental Attitudes that include questions about warmth and the absence of hostility in the mother-child relationship as reported by the child(Hudson, 1982). In other analyses, attachment reflects the parent-child affective relationship. However, in this conceptualization, responsiveness is used to reflect the affective and responsive nature of the parental child bond. Six items within this scale
reflect greater frequencies of responsiveness incorporating the response set of Often (4), Sometime (3), Seldom (2), and Never (1). Three items within this scale include the frequency in which “you feel your caretaker does not understand you”; “you feel very angry towards your caretaker”; and “you feel very violent towards your caretaker”. These items were reverse coded to incorporate Never (4) as the highest level of responsiveness and Often (1) as the lowest level.

The second dimension, monitoring, is assessed by studying items reflecting parental surveillance, regulations and consistent and contingent discipline. Items that tap parental surveillance reflect the extent to which parents monitor their child and intervene in inappropriate activities. Five items tap the frequency in which mothers are aware of their child’s whereabouts, friends, and activities. Items include questions such as “In the course of a day, how often does _____ know where you are” and “when____ isn’t at home, how often do you know how to get in contact with them?” Response values range from the two highest levels of supervision often (4) and sometimes (3) to the two lowest, seldom (2) and never (1).

In addition, the items assessing consistent and contingent discipline include five questions that tap how often primary care givers are consistent in the contingency of child punishment. Item questions include “once a punishment is decided, how often can you get out of it”; “how often do you get away with things?”; “how often do you know what to expect from ______, when you’ve done something wrong?”; how often do you get punished sometimes but not other times for the same things?. Value options currently range from Often (4), Sometimes (3), Seldom (2) to Never (1) (See Table VI.1). The values for four of five of these items were recoded to associate the higher values with
greater frequencies of consistent discipline for each item. After recoding, response set values that reflect greater consistency in discipline include Never (4) Seldom (3), Sometimes (2) and Often (1). In the recoded configuration, the value labeled Often (1) represents the lowest level of consistency in all five discipline consistency items. In addition, the value for the item “how often do you know what to expect from ________, when you’ve done something wrong?” was reverse coded so that higher levels of consistent discipline reflect responses of (4) Often and (3) Sometimes.

There is also theoretical and empirical support (Baldwin et al, 1990) for a dimension unique to authoritarian parenting that taps restrictive parental control. Recall restrictiveness describes the degree to which parents exercise parental control, involvement and restrictions over their child’s activities. Items assessing restrictive parental control include measures of intrusiveness, non-democratic decision-making, and severe discipline. Two items expected to assess adolescents’ perception of parental intrusiveness include the frequency with which students perceive their parents as “interfering” and “too demanding”. Three items that tap “Non-democratic decision-making” assess the level of parental authority and degree of autocracy in the parental decision-making process over the adolescent’s activities, options and issues. Non-democratic decision-making is evident where there is negligible adolescent input and a high frequency of parental input and authority over decisions involving the adolescent’s life. The question items that examine democracy in decision-making assess the frequency in which 1) parents sought input from their child on matters pertaining to the child; 2) parents explained the basis for parental decisions and 3) were willing to compromise in disagreements. Present scaled values for all these items include a four option response set
ranging from Often (4) to Never (1). This coding is consistent with assessing the extent to which parents seek child input, explain their decisions and express willingness to compromise with their children. Higher frequencies are associated with greater levels of democratic decision-making. However, these items will require recoding to express higher levels of democratic decision-making (parent child input and compromise) as lower levels of non-democratic decision-making. The recoded values will reflect Never (4), Seldom (3), Sometimes (2), and Often (1). The highest coded values of non-democratic decision-making, Never (4) and Seldom (3) will thereby reflect the most infrequent or seldom use of democratic decision-making.

The last group of items expected to assess restrictive parental control tap the type, degree and frequency of severe discipline. Before combining, five items tap the degree and extent of different types of discipline severity methods. These items include yelling, hitting, slapping, locking out, calling the police and other parental discipline choices. The text of these items focus on types of discipline such as “when you do something wrong, how often does ____ “hit or slap you?”; “tell you to get out or lock you out of the house?”; “call police or authorities?” Response values range from “Often” (4) to “Never” (1). Two additional question items assess whether the adolescent was ever physically hurt during discipline and the frequency of being physically hurt while being disciplined. These two question items were combined and recoded into a new variable labeled “times physically hurt during discipline”. Response values now range from none (1), once or twice (2), three to five times (3), or six or more times (4).

The highest values on the severity of discipline scale for the first three question items include responses of Often and Sometimes. Highest values for “times physically
hurt during discipline” include responses of three to five times (3) and six or more times (4). The items hypothesized to reflect the restrictive parental control dimension of authoritarian parents are also assessed at Wave 5 of the student interview scale.

**H. Dimensions of Authoritative Parenting**

Recall authoritarian and authoritative parenting share certain dimensions (see Table V.1, pg 53). These dimensions include parental responsiveness and monitoring (surveillance, regulation and consistent discipline). The additional dimension unique to authoritarian parents reflect restrictive parental control practices inclusive of more extreme levels of parental control involving intrusiveness, non-democratic decision-making and severe discipline. Clearly, restrictive parental control practices represent a philosophical and behavioral distinction between the two parenting styles. Authoritative parents rarely exercise restrictive parental control. They employ a more democratic style of decision-making and utilize milder disciplinary methods.

To assess differences in these parenting styles internally consistent scale(s) that measure the dimensions of authoritative parenting (responsiveness and monitoring) were tested separately on African American and White adolescents. This allowed for a comparison of differences in the influence of authoritative parenting on delinquency and violence on each group of adolescents. However, to examine the independent effect of authoritarian parenting, the restrictive parental control scale reflective of items derived from questions regarding parental intrusiveness, non-democratic decision-making and severe discipline was appended to the model. The effect of the additional dimension was
monitored for additional model explanatory power consistent with the hypothesis of a race socializing protective effect of authoritarian parenting.

It should be noted that RYDS does not have independent measures of non-intrusiveness and democratic decision-making. Consequently, these dimensions cannot be directly assessed. However, this analytic strategy seeks to first examine the degree to which authoritative parenting (responsiveness and monitoring dimensions) predicts delinquency and violence in both race groups. Secondly, the analysis examines whether additional explanatory power in the expected direction is derived from adding the restrictive parental control dimension to the model. Recall restrictive parenting control is the unique dimension indicative of the hypothesized authoritarian parenting behaviors.

I. Reliability and Item Analyses

To develop the parenting scales, reliability and item analyses that assess internal consistency and the importance of selected items were conducted. First, the items and dimensions that reflect authoritative parenting practices were assessed for internal consistency. Subsequently, the internal consistency of the restrictive parental control items was also analyzed. Essentially, the items within each scale were summed and the scale’s reliability assessed. Consistent with the criteria recommended by Spector (1992), we attempted to achieve an alpha coefficient of .70 to reflect an internally consistent and reliable scale. Spector (1992:31) asserted “alpha coefficient is a direct function of the number of items and their magnitude of intercorrelation.” As such, it can be a measure of internal consistency of one or perhaps several related underlying constructs. The process of selecting the optimal subset of items included efforts to maximize reliability.
The parenting scales show a robust measure of the parenting styles (see table VI.2). Consistent with the theoretical foundation, the 17 items within the authoritative parenting scale constitute a strong and reliable measure of the effect of this style of child-rearing. Moreover, examining authoritative parenting across the total, African American and White samples reflect a considerable degree of racial invariance with respect to the reliability of these measures. Alpha coefficients for the total sample, African American and White samples are .78, .79 and .77 respectively.

The nine items representing restrictive parental control also demonstrates acceptable, albeit not ideal, levels of reliability. However, consistent with one perspective, some racial variability was detected with respect to the reliability of the restrictive parental control across subsamples. Alpha coefficients for the restrictive parental control measure of authoritarian parenting for the total and African American samples are .62 and .64 respectively. The reliability of the white participants is slightly lower, .55. An item analysis for the restrictive parental control scale did not indicate items to delete which would improve the reliability of the scales and there are no other items that measure this concept in the Rochester Youth Development study data set.

**Table VI.2**

*Parenting Scale Reliability Coefficients by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th># of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATP</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J. General Delinquency and Violence Subscale

RYDS originally developed delinquency measures from 44 types of delinquent behavior that were derived from the National Youth Survey. However, items that potentially double counted delinquency were excluded and this adaptation led to the development of the RYDS General Delinquency Scale (see Table VI.3). The scale represents the range of delinquent behaviors considered police actionable offenses that would result in an arrest.

The RYDS General Delinquency scale can also be characterized as an omnibus type scale with substantial internal variability because of its wide diversity of illegal behaviors. The offenses within the general delinquency scale range from minor to major offenses. Minor offenses include: running away from home, skipping classes, lying about one’s age, hitchhiking, public disorder, begging, public drunkenness, vandalism, avoiding payment of services and petty theft (stealing goods valued at $50 or less). Major offenses include stealing goods valued over $50, fencing, taking cars without permission, auto theft, check and credit card fraud, con games, simple and aggravated assault, gang fights, throwing objects at people, armed robbery, obscene phone calls, being paid for sex, committing rape and selling marijuana or hard drugs. Greater frequencies of offending within the overall general delinquency scale will be used to delineate higher levels of offending.

In addition, a violent delinquency subscale (Table VI.4) was constructed to assess whether authoritarian parenting varies with prevalence for violent offending. The violence subscale incorporates the predatory offense classification developed by Glaser
and included in Elliott and Ageton’s (1980), original self reported delinquency inventory. These offenses include predatory violent offenses such as arson, purse snatching, robbery, simple and aggravated assault, gang fights and rape.

Table VI.3

*General Delinquency Scale*

Self-Reported Delinquency Items
Since (date of last interview), have you...

1. Run away from home?
2. Skipped Classes without an excuse?
3. Lied about your age to get into some place or to buy something?
4. Hitch-hiked a ride with a stranger?
5. Carried a hidden knife, gun, or other weapon and you got in trouble?
6. Been loud or rowdy in a public place where somebody complained and you got in trouble?
7. Been drunk in a public place?
8. Damaged, destroyed or marked up somebody else’s property on purpose?
9. Set fire on purpose or tried to set fire on purpose to a house, building, or car?
10. Avoided paying for things like a movie, taking bus rides, using a computer, or anything else?
11. Gone into or broken into a building to steal or damage something?
12. Tried to steal or actually stolen money or things worth $5.00 or less?
13. Tried to steal or actually stolen money or things worth between $5.00 and $50.00?
14. How about between $50.00 and $100.00?
15. How about more than $100.00?
16. Snatched someone’s purse or wallet or picked someone’s pocket?
17. Tried to buy or sell things that were stolen?
18. Taken a car or motorcycle for a ride without the owner’s permission?
19. Stolen or tried to steal a car or other motor vehicle?
20. Forged a check or used fake money to pay for something?
21. Used or tried to use a credit card, bank card, or automatic teller card without permission?
22. Tried to cheat someone by selling them something worthless or not what you said it was?
23. Used a weapon with the idea of seriously hurting or killing someone?
24. Hit someone with the idea of hurting them?
25. Been involved in gang fights?
26. Thrown objects such as rocks or bottles at people?
27. Used a weapon or force to make someone give you money or things?
28. Sold marijuana, reefer or pot?
29. Sold other drugs such as heroin, cocaine, crack, or LSD?
Table VI.4

Violence Subscale Items

Since (date of last interview), have you…

1. Set fire on purpose or tried to set fire on purpose to a house, building or car?
2. Used a weapon with the idea of seriously hurting or killing someone?
3. Hit someone with the idea of hurting them?
4. Been involved in gang fights?
5. Thrown objects such as rocks or bottles at people?
6. Used a weapon or force to make someone give you money or things?
VII. Assessing Resiliency: Analytic Techniques and Procedures

Several sub-analyses reported in the next chapter comprise the tests of authoritarian parenting as a race socializing protective factor. The first analysis examines the model’s risk factors as predictors of delinquency and violence for the entire sample.

A bivariate analysis was conducted to assess the significance and strength of relationship between the summated risk measure and delinquency and violence. Once the predictive power of the risk measure was determined, the moderating influence of the parenting styles was modeled, compared and assessed for significance.

The analysis began by centering all predictor variables to address the potential of non-essential collinearity that could occur between first, second and third order cross-product interaction terms (Cohen et al, 2003). Centering makes the regression coefficients of the first order term meaningful because they reflect the regression function at the mean of the predictor. Most importantly, centering eliminates extreme multicollinearity associated with using powers of predictors in a single equation (Cohen et al, 2003). In the core model (equation 4), all independent or predictor variables were centered so that B coefficients represent the regression of delinquency on the mean level of the summated risk measure developed from the risk factors.

The next step in the analysis included using least squares regression analysis to tests for the main effects of authoritative parenting. Essentially, the main effects analysis of authoritative parenting revealed both its directional influence and predictive power on delinquency and violence. However, the test critical to the race socialization hypothesis is the analysis of differences in explanatory power between the two term authoritative
parenting model; and the three term model inclusive of authoritative parenting and restrictive parental control. This test is quite important because it distinguishes the unique predictive power of authoritarian parenting. If the predictive power of the model increases with the addition of restrictive parental control in the African American sample, then the hypothesis will be supported. To this end, models were run first with the authoritative parenting scale and subsequently, with the authoritative parenting scale and the restrictive parental control scale. These main effect parenting models essentially include two and three terms for authoritative parenting and restrictive parental control respectively. The two term model with authoritative parenting is depicted as follows:

\[
DEL = B_0 + B_1 (RF) + B_2 (ATP)
\]  
where RF = cumulative risk and ATP = authoritative parenting

The three-term model that adds authoritarian parenting is depicted below:

\[
DEL = B_0 + B_1 (RF) + B_2 (ATP) + B_3 (RPC)
\]  
where RPC = restrictive parental control

However, it is important to note that main effects differences do not completely support nor disprove the race socializing protective factor hypothesis because main effect analysis does not model interaction with risk factors. Risk and protective factor interaction is a key tenet of the hypothesis. Luthar (1993:449), noting the importance of interaction models, asserted “interaction models pertain to specific moderating processes and seek to discover which attributes are associated with differential competence levels at high but not necessarily low levels of risk”. In addition, Luther (1993) and Cohen and colleagues (2003) concluded that simultaneous examination of main and interaction effects could provide the most complete understanding of the specific role of these
variables in relationship to one another. In this analysis, both main and interaction effects were assessed to parcel out incremental increases in explanatory power to test the hypothesis.

Accordingly, the addition of the cross-product terms (RF*ATP) and (RF*RPC) to the two term and three term models are useful towards examining incremental increases in explanatory power that will support or refute the core hypothesis that risk and protective factor interact to produce a protective effect. The model depicted in equation (3) tests the effect of authoritative parenting and its interaction with risk:

\[ \text{DEL} = B_0 + B_1 (RF) + B_2 (ATP) + B_3 (RF*ATP) \quad (3) \]

The model reflects the main effect (B₁) of risk (RF), the main effect (B₂) of (ATP), and (B₃), and the cross-product interaction effect of (RF*ATP) on delinquency. The coefficient (B₃) is quite critical to the hypothesis because it represents the influence of the interaction of risk and authoritative parenting beyond the main effects of these factors.

To assess the additional impact of authoritarian parenting, the addition of restrictive parental control is included to reflect our core model. The model presented in equation (4) depicts the additional impact of authoritarian parenting:

\[ \text{DEL} = B_0 + B_1 (RF) + B_2 (ATP) + B_3 (RPC) + B_4 (RF*ATP) + B_5 (RF*RPC) \quad (4) \]

In the core model, equation (4), main and interaction effects of restrictive parental control and (RF*RPC) are added to the authoritative parenting model in equation (3). In the two and three term main effects model of risk and protective factors, the effects of the RF coefficient, (B₁), the (ATP) coefficients (B₂) and RPC coefficients (B₃) are additive.
Essentially, the regression of either factor is constant over all values of the other factor (Jacard and colleagues, 1990; Cohen and colleagues, 2003). However, with multiple term models reflecting cross-product interaction terms (RF*ATP), and (RF*RPC), their coefficients represent the partialled component of the unique and combined effect of all these variables synergistically working beyond the additive combination of their separate effects (Cohen et al, 2003). Jaccard and colleagues (1990) asserted that main effect coefficients in multiple term models with the cross product term coefficient estimate conditional relationships where variables outside the one in question equals zero; in contrast, multiple term models reflecting main effect coefficients estimate general relationships at each level of the other variable.

An examination of the \(B_3\) coefficient in equation 4 provides an estimate of the explanatory power added by the restrictive parental control dimension. Statistically significant differences in variances between main effect and cross product term models reveal whether of additional explanatory power exists, (Jaccard and colleagues, 1990; Cohen and Colleagues, 2003) across parenting styles.

At this stage in the analysis, the core model depicted in equation (4) was deployed. Three regression models were constructed to derive regression coefficients of each race group under each parenting styles. Recall these coefficients, particularly those reflecting risk and parenting style interaction, test for the additional explanatory power of authoritarian parenting. These models allow for analysis of differences in explained variance across parenting styles and reveal whether authoritarian parenting has explanatory power beyond the shared parenting factors of authoritative parenting. Most important, the models allow for assessment of whether high-risk African American
adolescents are differentially affected by authoritarian parenting. The models depicted in equations (5), (6) and (7) were incorporated to test the hypothesis by assessing model significance, interaction coefficients and predictive power.

\[ \text{DEL} = B_0 + B_{1AA} (RF) + B_{2AA} (ATP) + B_{3AA} (RF\times ATP) \]  

(5)

\[ \text{DEL} = B_0 + B_{1AA} (RF) + B_{2AA} (ATP) + B_{3AA} (RPC) + B_{4AA} (RF\times ATP) + B_{5AA} (RF\times RPC) \]  

(6)

\[ \text{DEL} = B_0 + B_{1EA} (RF) + B_{2EA} (ATP) + B_{3EA} (RPC) + B_{4EA} (RF\times ATP) + B_{5EA} (RF\times RPC) \]  

(7)

To summarize, the race socialization protective factor is supported if the analysis indicates that the African American interaction coefficient of authoritarian parenting and high risk \( B_{5AA} (RF\times RPC) \) has a stronger negative effect on delinquency and violence than either the African American interaction coefficient of authoritative parenting \( B_{4AA} \) and high risk \( (RF\times ATP) \) or the white interaction coefficient \( B_{5EA} (RF\times RPC) \). To this end, the most significant test of the hypothesis is facilitated by the deployment of the core model to the longitudinal data within the Rochester Youth Development Study. However, before the deployment of the core model, several selection processes were incorporated to identify adolescents at highest risk. Essentially, the selection process involved identifying high risk adolescent males at wave 1. Subsequently, high risk adolescent males reared under authoritative parenting and restrictive parental control were identified and selected at waves 5 where their median ages are 16 and 16.4 respectively. Once the high risk sample was identified and parenting styles delineated, the core model was deployed. Utilizing this model, the longitudinal effects of authoritative parenting and restrictive parental control were derived by regressing general delinquency and violent offending at waves 6 through 9 on authoritative parenting and restrictive parental control at wave 5. In
essence, the application of the core model to the longitudinal data revealed the predictive influence of authoritative parenting and authoritative parenting with restrictive parental control. Further, the core model facilitated an assessment of offending between high-risk adolescents; high-risk adolescents by race groups; and if there is a propensity toward violent offenses.

VIII. Testing the Race Socialization Protective Factor Hypothesis

We start with an examination of mean levels of parenting, risk and outcome measures. Subsequently, we focus on the intercorrelations among the risk variables. We then assess the impact of the risk variables on delinquency and violence. Following these preliminary analyses we present our assessment of the core hypotheses of this study.

A. Descriptive Statistics

The analysis begins with a description of mean levels of risk, parenting styles and offending by race using t-tests to test for statistical significance. Tables VIII.1 indicates that the African American sample (M=2.6, S.D.=1.3) experiences higher mean levels of cumulative risk than the white sample (M=1.5, S.D.= 1.22; p<.01). An examination of the individual risk factors reveals that the African American sample experiences higher mean levels of risk on all five risk factors. This finding is consistent with previous research that indicates that African American experience higher rates of poverty and single parent families, among other risk factors. Here, the African American samples mean rate of poverty (M=.55, S.D. =.50) is considerable higher than that of the white sample (M=.33, S.D. =.47; (p<.01). Similarly, the African American sample’s residence within single parent households families (M=.70, S.D. =.45) are substantially higher than that of the
White sample (M=.48, S.D. =.50; p<.01). The African American sample also experienced a higher mean level of negative life events (M=.40, S.D.=.49) than the white sample (M=.30, S.D.=.46; p<.05). There is also a substantial difference between the African American (M=.57, S.D.=.50) and white samples’ (M=.20, S.D. = .40; p<.01) mean community arrest rates. Finally, the parents of the African American sample (M=.36, S.D. =.48) reported lower mean levels of education than the parents of the white sample (M=.25, S.D. = 44; p<.05)

With respect to parenting styles, only small mean differences are evident. The African American sample reported a slightly higher mean level of authoritative parenting (M= 56, S.D. = 5.6) than the white sample (M=55, S.D. = 5.1; p<.01. In contrast, the white sample reflects a slightly higher mean level of restrictive parental control (M= 14.8, S.D. = 2.5) than the African American sample (M=14.5, S.D. =3.1; p=.320) but their respective means were not significantly different from one another.

Finally, with respect to offending, the African American sample indicates slightly higher mean levels of delinquent offenses (M= 2.0, S.D. = 2.0) than the White sample (M= 1.6, S.D. = 1.8; p=.08); however, these means are marginally not significantly different. Regarding violent offending, the African American sample reports a larger mean level of violent offenses (M=.77, S.D. = 1.08) than the white sample (M=.56, S.D. = .86; p<.05).
**B. The Development of the High Risk Measure**

The conceptual foundation for the construction of the high-risk measure is based on the significance, strength and direction of the correlations between individual risk factors and delinquency and violence. As Table VIII.2 illustrates, in the total sample, four of the five risk factors are significantly related to delinquency. These relationships...
exist across all life domains. For instance, negative life events bear a robust relationship
with delinquency \((r=.22)\). Likewise, area characteristics including percent of the
neighborhood in poverty \((r=.10)\) and community arrest rates \((r=.13)\) predict delinquency.
The parenting factors domain also demonstrates relationships with delinquency.
Adolescents who lived within a single parent household have higher incidents of
delinquency \((r=.09)\); moreover, adolescents whose parents have not attained a high
school education reflect a marginally insignificant but positive relationship with
delinquency \((r=.09)\).

Several of the risk factors are also significantly related to violence and though
some are insignificant, they are all in the expected direction. Negative life events predicts
violence \((r=.22)\). Community arrest rates are marginally significant but positively
associated with violence \((r=.08)\). These individual significant relationships to
delinquency and violence provide the conceptual foundation for combining them into one
cumulative measure to identify adolescents at the highest risk.

Methodologically, the high-risk measure incorporates a median-based dichotomy
of the three continuous risk factors: (1) negative life events, (2) percent of the
neighborhood in poverty and (3) community arrest rate to assign risk. In addition, the
remaining risk factors, low parental education and single parent households, are
dichotomized according to whether parents did not achieve a 12th grade education and
whether the adolescent actually resided within a single parent household or a family
constellation other than both biological parents. After dichotomization of the risk factors,
the presence (1) or absence of risk (0) is assigned and the number of risk factors summed
for each adolescent. The summed variable entitled cumulative risk indicates individual
risk levels for each adolescent.

As Table VIII.2 also indicates, the bivariate relationship between individual risk factors and the cumulative risk index reflects very strong relationships. Cumulative risk is highly correlated with negative life events ($r=.40$); percent in poverty ($r=.67$); community arrest rate ($r=.67$); single parent households ($r=.47$); and with low parental education ($r=.50$); Most importantly, cumulative risk, significantly predicts delinquency ($r=.23$) and violence ($r=.16$).
Table VIII.2

*Risk Factor Correlation and Cumulative Risk, Delinquency and Violence for Total Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Negative Life Events</th>
<th>Percent in Poverty</th>
<th>Community Arrest Rate</th>
<th>Single Parent Household</th>
<th>Low Parental Education</th>
<th>Cumulative Risk</th>
<th>General Delinquency</th>
<th>Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total (n=562)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Delinquency</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01. *p<.05. *p<.10
Examining the risk factor correlations by race reveals that these variables are more highly correlated with delinquency and violence for white adolescents than African American adolescents (See Tables VIII.3 and VIII.4). Table VIII.3 illustrates that negative life events significantly predict delinquency \((r=.20)\) and violence \((r=.21)\) for African American adolescents, though percent of the community in poverty \((r=.09)\) is marginally significant for delinquency.

However, several of the risk factors predict delinquency and violence across numerous life domains for white adolescents. Table VIII.4 illustrates that both negative life events \((r=.23)\) and percent of the community in poverty \((r=.24)\) predict delinquency; similarly community arrest rate \((r=.24)\) predicts delinquency and low parental education, though marginally significant, \((r=.15)\) reflect a positive relationship with delinquency.

Most of the risk factors predict delinquency and violence for white subjects. In addition to predictions of delinquency, negative life events \((r=.24)\) predict violence. Similarly, community arrest rate \((r=.33)\) and low parental education \((r=.18)\) predict violence. Consistent with the pattern established using the individual risk factors, cumulative risk is also a significantly stronger predictor of general delinquency for white adolescents \((r=.30)\) compared to African Americans \((r=.19)\). Moreover, cumulative risk significantly predicts violence \((r=.37)\) exclusively in white adolescents (See Table VIII.4).

In summary, examining the total sample reveals cumulative risk is related to delinquency \((r=.23)\) and violence \((r=.16)\). Moreover, examining the effects by race indicates that cumulative risk is a less powerful predictor of delinquency and violence for
African-Americans relative to the White or the total samples. In addition, cumulative risk is not significantly related to violence at all for African American adolescents. This finding somewhat diminishes the potential strength of the test of the race socialization hypothesis since reduction in delinquent and violent offending by high risk African Americans adolescents is critical to the hypothesis. However, it is the strongest available measure we have to test the hypothesis and cumulative risk does retain a significant relationship with delinquency in African American adolescents.
### Table VIII.3

*Risk Factor Correlation, Cumulative Risk, Delinquency and Violence – African American Sample*  
\((n=435)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Negative Life Events</th>
<th>Percent in Poverty</th>
<th>Community Arrest Rate</th>
<th>Single Parent Household</th>
<th>Low Parental Education</th>
<th>Cumulative Risk</th>
<th>General Delinquency</th>
<th>Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Delinquency</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01 **p<.05 +p<.10

### Table VIII.4

*Risk Factor Correlation, Cumulative Risk, Delinquency and Violence – White Sample*  
\((n=127)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Negative Life Events</th>
<th>Percent in Poverty</th>
<th>Community Arrest Rate</th>
<th>Single Parent Household</th>
<th>Low Parental Education</th>
<th>Cumulative Risk</th>
<th>General Delinquency</th>
<th>Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Delinquency</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.05, +p<.10
C. Parenting Style Inter-correlations- Authoritative Parenting, Restrictive Parental Control, General Delinquency and Violence

The bivariate analysis in Table VIII.5 reflects the correlations between the parenting styles, general delinquency and violence for the total, African American and white samples. These correlations are quite significant to the hypothesis because they establish the strength and direction of the relative effects of the parenting styles across races. Recall the hypothesis is supported when restrictive parental control, a key dimension of authoritarian parenting, moderates the effects of high risk on delinquency and violence to a significantly greater extent for African American adolescents relative to white adolescents.

To begin, we examine the relationship between authoritative parenting and restrictive parental control across the total, African American and white samples. It is interesting to note that the relationship between authoritative parenting and restrictive parental control is racially invariant. The correlation for the total sample is $r=-.64$; the African American sample $r=-.62$; and the white sample, $r=-.72$. As evidenced by the strong, negative relationship between these parenting styles, parents who adopt an authoritative parenting style are unlikely to also incorporate restrictive parenting control. Theoretically and empirically, the size and direction of these coefficients are consistent with theories and studies that have found these to be two opposing parenting styles.

The bivariate analysis of the parenting styles on both outcome measures reveal findings that are unsupportive of the hypothesis that restrictive parental control will differentially diminish delinquency and violence in African American adolescents. The finding that authoritative parenting reduces delinquency in all adolescents however is
consistent with studies that found this to be the optimal parenting style. In our analysis, authoritative parenting reduces delinquency in the total \((r=-.15)\); African American \((r=-.12)\) and white \((r=-.31)\) samples. The finding that the strength and direction of the negative influence of authoritative parenting is twice as large for the white sample is consistent with the theorists who purport that this parenting style has its optimal influence on mainstream white adolescents.

The Restrictive Parental Control (RPC) dimension reflects that authoritarian parenting significantly increases general delinquency in white adolescents, \((r=.28)\) as expected. However, the hypothesized negative effect on delinquency does not materialize in the total or African American samples. In fact, restrictive parental control is marginally significant in the African American sample \((r=.09)\) and the positive direction of the coefficient suggests that it would promote delinquency. This finding is unexpected and contrary to the hypothesis. Restrictive parental control is also significant and positively related to general delinquency in the total sample \((r=.12)\).

The analysis of the relationships between the parenting styles and violence indicates the hypothesis still does not find support. Authoritative parenting is negatively related to violence in African American adolescents \((r=-.13)\) and in the total sample \((r=-.13)\), and is marginally significant \((r=-.19)\) in the white sample. The hypothesized influence of restrictive parental control is not found to be significantly related to behavior in the African American sample; nor is the direction of the coefficient consistent with expectations. Restrictive parental control is also not significantly related in the total sample. Moreover, the positive direction of the coefficient suggests it would promote rather than diminish delinquency. Restrictive parental control also has a marginally
significant positive effect on violence in the white sample ($r=.19$). However, this is consistent with the notion that restrictive parenting may be least desirable in white adolescents.

**Table VIII.5**

*Parenting Style Inter-correlations for Total, African American and White samples*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ($n=523$)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restrictive Parental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>African American ($n=434$)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restrictive Parental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White ($n=127$)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restrictive Parental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-.72**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01. *p<.05. +p<.10**
The bivariate analyses do not support the hypothesis of authoritarian parenting as a race socializing protective factor that differentially buffers high risk African American adolescents from delinquency and violence. In fact, the analyses reflects authoritative parenting as a racially invariant childrearing style because its’ pervasive negative effect on delinquency and violence in the total, African American and white samples. Next, we look at the main effects of these parenting styles to analyze their relative influence on delinquency and violence in both African American and white adolescents.

D. Main Effects Models for General Delinquency

The Relationship between General Delinquency and Authoritative Parenting and General Delinquency, Authoritative Parenting and Restrictive Parental Control-African American Sample

Table VIII.6 presents a summary of a hierarchical linear regression model that predicts general delinquency within the African American subsample. Step 1 indicates a significant model, $R^2 = .05$, $p < .01$, where both cumulative risk and authoritative parenting are significantly related to the outcome variable. Specifically, increased levels of authoritative parenting are significantly related to lower levels of delinquency, $B = -.046$, $\beta = -.129$, $p < .01$. Additionally, cumulative risk is significant and positively related to delinquency, $B = .254$, $\beta = .165$, $p < .01$.

Step 2 also indicated a statistically significant model, $R^2 = .05$, $p < .01$. However, within this multivariate model only cumulative risk, $B = .253$, $\beta = .164$, $p < .05$ is significantly related to the delinquency. Recall bivariate correlations between authoritative parenting and restrictive parental control reflected a statistically significant
negative but very strong relationship ($r =-.62$). Here, contrary to the hypothesized negative relationship between restrictive parental control and general delinquency in the African American sample, the coefficient for restrictive parental control is essentially zero.

**Table VIII.6**

Summary of Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting General Delinquency- African American Sample (n=357)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.254*</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.046*</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.253*</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Parental Control</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: For Model 1, $R^2 = .05$ for step 1; $R^2 = .05$ for Step 2; ADJ $R^2 = .04$ for Step 1; ADJ $R^2 = .04$ for Step 2; df = 355, $F = 8.540$ for Step 1, $F = 5.743$ for Step 2; $p < .01$ for Step 1; $P < .01$ for Step 2.

¹The dependent variable was transformed through taking the Log Odds.

*$p<.05$
Table VIII.7 presents a summary of hierarchical linear regression for two models with variables predicting general delinquency for the white subsample. Step 1 indicates a statistically significant model, $R^2 = .13$, $p < .01$. Within step 1, both independent variables are significantly related to the dependent variable, general delinquency. Specifically, higher levels of authoritative parenting are related to lower levels of general delinquency, $B = -.099$, $\beta = -.265$, $p < .01$. In addition, cumulative risk is positively related to delinquency, $B = .345$, $\beta = .236$, $p < .01$.

Step 2, also evidenced a statistically significant model, $R^2 = .14$, $p < .01$. Within this model only one of the three independent variables are significantly related to the dependent variable. Cumulative risk is positively related to delinquency, $B = .348$, $\beta = .238$, $p < .01$. Authoritative parenting, though marginally significant, reflects a negative relationship with delinquency as evident by the direction of the coefficient $B = -.084$, $\beta = -.225$, $p = .07$. However, restrictive parental control, the third variable in the model, did not demonstrate a significant relationship to general delinquency but the positive direction of the coefficient suggest that it would actually promote delinquency in white adolescents. This finding is consistent with the hypothesis and with findings of prior studies of the efficacy of parenting styles.
Table VIII.7

Summary of Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting General Delinquency—White Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.345*</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.099*</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.348*</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.084*</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Parental Control</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .13$ for step 1 ($p < .01$); $R^2 = .14$ for step 2 ($p < .01$); Adj. $R^2 = .12$ for step 1; Adj. $R^2 = .11$ for step 2; $df = 103$, $F = 7.847$ for step 1; $F = 5.268$ for step 2; $p < .01$ for step 1; $p < .01$ for step 2.

*The dependent variable was transformed through taking the Log Odds.

*p < .01. **p < .05. *p < .10

E. Main Effect Models for Violence

The Relationship between Violence and Authoritative Parenting and Violence, Authoritative Parenting and Restrictive Parental Control—African American Sample

Table VIII.8 presents a summary of hierarchical linear regression model predicting violence within the African American sample. Step 1 reflects statistical significance, $R^2 = .03$, $p < .01$. In this model, only authoritative parenting is significantly related to violence. Increased levels of authoritative parenting are significantly related to lower levels of violence, $B = -.027, \beta = -.147$, $p < .01$.

In Step 2 restrictive parental control is added to the model and again a
A statistical significant model is indicated: $R^2 = .03$, $p < .01$. However, even with the addition of restrictive parental control, only authoritative parenting attains statistical significance, $B = -.034$, $\beta = -.182$, $p < .01$. Neither cumulative risk nor restrictive parental control is significantly related to violence.

Table VIII.8

Summary of Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Violence- African American Sample ($n = 357$)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.027*</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.034*</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Parental Control</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For Model, $R^2 = .03$ for step 1; $R^2 = .03$ for Step 2 ($p < .05$) 
ADJ $R^2 = .02$ for Step 1; ADJ $R^2 = .02$ for Step 2 
df = 355, $F = 4.906$ for Step 1. $F = 3.520$ for Step 2; 
$p < .01$ for Step 1; $\Delta P = .01$ for Step 2.

1The dependent variable was transformed through taking the Log Odds. 
*p<.01.
The Relationships between Violence and Authoritative Parenting and Violence, Authoritative Parenting and Restrictive Parental Control - White Sample

Table VIII.9 presents a summary of a hierarchical linear regression for a model with variables predicting violence for the white subsample. Step 1 indicates a statistically significant model, $R^2 = .09, p< .01$. Within step 1, only the independent variable, cumulative risk is significantly related to the dependent variable, violence. Higher levels of cumulative risk reflect a statistically significantly relationship with violence, $B=.174, \beta =.282, p<.01$.

Step 2, also evidenced a statistically significant model, $R^2 = .09, p<.01$. As depicted in step 1, only cumulative risk is significant, $B=.173, \beta =.280, p<.01$. In the second step, the model includes restrictive parental control. However, neither authoritative parenting nor restrictive parental control reflects statistically significant relationships.

In summary, based on the insignificance of the parenting style coefficients, neither authoritative parenting nor restrictive parental control influence violence. However, there is a significant and positive relationship between cumulative risk and violence ($B=.173$) both before and after adding restrictive parental control to the model.
Table VIII.9

Summary of Linear Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Violence—White Sample

(n=105)¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrict Parent Control</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. R² = .09 for step 1 (p<.01); R² = .09 for step 2 (p<.01); Adj. R² = .07 for step 1; Adj. R² = .06 for step 2; df = 103, F = 5.235 for step 1; F=3.495 for step 2; p = .01 for step 1; p <.01 for step 2.

¹The dependent variable was transformed through taking the Log Odds.

*p <.01.

F. Summary of Main Effects Analysis of Authoritative Parenting, Restrictive Parental Control and General Delinquency

The main effects analysis of authoritative parenting and general delinquency proved to be consistent with theories and empirical findings that it is an effective parenting style for all adolescents (Baumrind, 1971, 1991; Maccoby and Martin, 1983; Fletcher et al, 1995; Grey and Steinberg, 1999; Pittman and Chase-Lansdale, 2001; Kaplan, 2003). Contrary to the hypothesis, we found authoritative parenting an effective parenting style for both African American and white high risk youth. Although authoritative parenting appeared to have a much greater influence on white adolescent
delinquency \( (B = -0.099) \), significant negative effects on delinquency in high risk Africans Americans \( (B = -0.046) \) were also very clear (see tables VIII.6 and VIII.7). A test for the equality of authoritative regression coefficients (Brame and colleagues, 1998; Paternoster and colleagues, 1998) between African American and white adolescents indicated that the apparent differences between the two coefficients were not significant in their effects on delinquency. The test produced a Z statistic \( (Z = 1.51) \) which failed to reach the critical value of \( Z (1.96) \) specified by Brame (1998). As a result, there are no significant differences in the negative effects of authoritative parenting on delinquency in the African American or white samples.

The addition of restrictive parental control to the models in the White and African American samples revealed some unexpected findings. First, restrictive parental control did not evidence significant relationships. Moreover, the positive direction of the coefficients indicated that restrictive parental control would actually promote delinquency in both African American and white adolescents. This is problematic for the race socialization protective factor hypothesis because restrictive parental control is hypothesized to differentially reduce delinquency in African American adolescents. The statistical insignificance and positive direction of the coefficient in the African American sample undermines the hypothesis. Clearly, the main effect analysis does not support the race socialization hypothesis. Quite unexpectedly, the analysis indicates that authoritative parenting is an efficacious and racially invariant parenting style that diminishes delinquency in both African American and white adolescents.
G. Summary of Main Effects Analysis of Authoritative Parenting, Restrictive Parental Control and Violence

The main effects analysis of authoritative parenting, restrictive parental control and violence is also unsupportive of the hypothesis. First, authoritative parenting reflects a statistically significant relationship that diminishes violence exclusively in the African American sample ($B = -.027$). Although the coefficient is negative for white adolescents, a statistically significant relationship was not found (see tables VIII.8 and VIII.9). However, a test of the equality of the significant African American authoritative parenting regression coefficients and the non-significant white authoritative parenting coefficient indicate that they are not significantly different.

With the addition of restrictive parental control, neither authoritative parenting nor restrictive parental control is significant for white participants. Quite unexpectedly, we found the addition of restrictive parental control to the model slightly increased the strength of authoritative parenting ($B = -.034$) with African American participants. In addition, though insignificant, the coefficient for restrictive parental control is negative.

These findings counter the hypothesis of a race socialization effect that differentially reduces violence in African American adolescents. Here, the main effects analysis indicates that authoritative parenting diminishes violence in African American adolescents. In addition, restrictive parental control, although negative, has no significant influence on African American adolescents. These findings further undermine the race socialization protective factor hypothesis.
H. Moderation Effect Models for General Delinquency

Cumulative risk, Authoritative Parenting, Restrictive Parental Control, and General Delinquency-African American sample

Two general linear models are depicted in Table VIII.10 to identify significant moderating effects on general delinquency in the African American sample. Each of the models incorporates effects of independent and dependent variables discussed earlier as well as the moderator variables presented as one-way interaction terms to detect differences in moderating effects. The independent variables were centered so that B coefficients would represent the regression of delinquency on the mean level of cumulative risk and parenting styles and to eliminate potential non-essential collinearity issues (Cohen et al, 2003). As table VIII.10 indicates, both models are significant but very little of the variance is explained by either of these models (R²=.05, p<.01 in step 1 and R²=.05, p< .01 in step 2). In the first model, the contributions of individual variables indicates cumulative risk is positively related to delinquency, B=.254, β=.165, p<.01; in contrast, authoritative parenting is negatively related to general delinquency, B=-.047, β=-.132, p<.01. The cross product term reflecting the interaction between cumulative risk and authoritative parenting did not attain significance. As a result, the interaction term does not add explanatory power to the model.
Table VIII.10

Summary of Linear Regression Analysis for Simple and Moderation Effects Predicting General Delinquency for the African American Sample

(n = 357)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.254*</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.047*</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*ATP</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.256*</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Parental Control</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*ATP</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*RPC</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .05$ for step 1 (p<.01); $R^2 = .05$ for step 2 (p<.01) Adj. $R^2 = .03$, step 1. Adj. $R^2 = .03$ for step 2, df = 355, $F = 4.32$, step 1; $F=3.54$ for step 2.
*p <.01.  **<.05.
Table VIII.10 also illustrates a second model designed to assess differential influences of restrictive parental control and interaction with cumulative risk on general delinquency. The second model is quite critical to support for the race socialization protective factor hypothesis. The model includes the simple effects of cumulative risk, authoritative parenting, restrictive parental control, and the cross product terms reflecting interactions between cumulative risks and authoritative parenting and between cumulative risk and restrictive parental control.

The analysis indicates that the simple effect of cumulative risk is positively related to general delinquency, $B=.256, \beta=.167, p<.01$; neither the simple effects of authoritative parenting, restrictive parental control nor the interaction terms between cumulative risk and authoritative parenting or cumulative risk and restrictive parental control are significant.

This finding considerably undermines the hypothesis with respect to general delinquency. First, neither the main effect of restrictive parental control nor its interaction with cumulative risk significantly influence general delinquency as expected; recall restrictive parental control is proposed as the race socialization protective factor that hypothetically distinguishes differences in delinquency between the African American and White adolescents. Additionally, by incorporating Rutter’s, (1987) definition of protection as the product of factors that successfully engage risk, an absence of a significant interaction effect suggests the absence of a true protective effect. Contrary to the hypothesis, the relationship between cumulative risk and general delinquency is not moderated by the main effect of restrictive parental control nor the interaction between cumulative risk and restrictive parental control in the African American sample.
Cumulative Risk, Authoritative Parenting, Restrictive Parental Control, and General Delinquency-White sample

An identical set of general linear models were constructed to detect significant moderating effects on general delinquency in the white sample. Tables VIII.11 reflect models that incorporate independent and dependent variables previously included in this study, and two one-way interaction terms to assess the moderating effects of the parenting styles in the White sample.

The analysis reveals both models are significant and explain some of the variance in general delinquency \( R^2 = .14, p < .01 \) for step 1 and \( R^2 = .14, p < .05 \) for step 2. However, the variance does not change from one model to the other. Table VIII.11 indicates that the simple effect of cumulative risk is positively related to delinquency \( B = .341, \beta = .233 \) \( p < .01 \). Moreover, the simple effect of authoritative parenting reflects a negative relationship with delinquency, \( B = -.104, \beta = -.280, p < .05 \). The interaction between cumulative risk and authoritative parenting also reflects a negative but insignificant relationship to general delinquency.

The second model illustrated in table VIII.11 depicts the addition of restrictive parental control and the interaction terms between cumulative risk and authoritative parenting and cumulative risk and restrictive parental control within the white sample. Only cumulative risk retains its significance to delinquency \( B = .330, \beta = .225 p < .05; \) Authoritative parenting is marginally insignificant but negatively related to delinquency, \( B = -.097, \beta = -.260, p < .10 \).

The interaction terms and main effects of cumulative risk and restrictive parental
control are not significantly related to general delinquency. However, the negative effect of authoritative parenting on delinquency, though only marginally significant can be observed from one model to the other.

### Table VIII.11

*Summary of Linear Regression Analysis for Simple and Moderation Effects Predicting General Delinquency for the White Subjects*  

(n = 105)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk²</td>
<td>.341*</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.104**</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*ATP</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk²</td>
<td>.330**</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.097+</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Parental Control</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*ATP</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*RPC</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $R^2 = .14$, step 1 (p<.01); $R^2 = .14$, step 2 (p<.01); Adj. $R^2 = .10$, step 1; Adj. $R^2 = .09$, step 2; $df = 104$, $F = 3.93$, step 1; $F=3.15$ for step 2.  
*p < .01.  **< .05.  +p < .10.
I. Moderation Effects Models for Violence

**Cumulative Risk, Authoritative Parenting, Restrictive Parental Control, and Violence – African American sample**

The two general linear models constructed to detect potential significant moderating effects on general delinquency were also applied to assess modifying effects on violence. Again, each model incorporated ratings of independent and dependent variables included in this study, as well as two one-way interaction terms that examine moderating effects. Both models were significant but explain little of the variance in violence for the African American sample $R^2=.03$, $p<.01$ for step 1 and $R^2=.03$ $p<.05$ for step 2. Here again, the variance did not change from model to model.

Table VIII.12 depicts the first step in the analysis where the main and interaction effects of cumulative risk and authoritative parenting on violence in the African American sample are presented. The main effect of authoritative parenting reflects a significant negative relationship with violence, $B=-.025, \beta=-.134, p<.01$. However, cumulative risk and the potential partial effect of its interaction with authoritative parenting are not significant.

Table VIII.12 also reflects the second model which includes the main effect of cumulative risk, authoritative parenting, restrictive parental control and the interaction terms cumulative risk by authoritative parenting and cumulative risk by restrictive parental control. Recall these simple and interaction effects were incorporated into a core model to assess moderation effects of the influence of high risk on delinquency and violence across the race groups and parenting styles.
Table VIII.12

Summary of Linear Regression Analysis for Simple and Moderation Effects Predicting Violence for the African American sample—Authoritative Parenting

(*n=357*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>ß</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk (^2)</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.025**</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*ATP</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk (^2)</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.030**</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Parental Control</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*ATP</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*RPC</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. R\(^2\) = .03, step 1 (p<.01); ∆ R\(^2\) = .03, step 2 (p<.05); Adj. R\(^2\) = .02, step 1; Adj. R\(^2\) = .02, step 2; df = 355, F = 3.55, step 1; F=2.34, step 2.*

\(*p < .01. \quad **p < .05.\)
The analysis reveals that authoritative parenting is negatively related to violence in the African American sample, $B=-.030, \beta=-.163, p<.05$. Neither the simple effects of cumulative risks and restrictive parental control nor their interaction are significant. Consequently, they do not add explanatory power to the model. This finding substantially undermines the notion of a race socializing influence on violence because a significant association between restrictive parental control and violence was not detected. In addition, the inability of the model to correlate the cumulative risk measure to delinquency in the African American sample undermines the test. Clearly, a determinable level of risk is a precursor to assess a reduction in violence in high risk samples.
Cumulative Risk, Authoritative Parenting, Restrictive Parental Control, and Violence – White sample

A final set of general linear models were constructed to detect potential significant moderating effects beyond that of main effects for violence in the white sample. Table VIII.13 depicts models that incorporate ratings of independent and dependent variables and two one-way interaction terms that examine potential moderating effects. The analysis revealed that both models were significant with a slight change in explained variance (R²=.09, p<.05, step 1; R²=.11, p<.05, step 2) from the first to the second model. In the first model, only cumulative risk is positively related to violence, B=.177, β=.288, p<.05. Neither authoritative parenting nor its interaction with cumulative risk is significant. However, the coefficient for authoritative parenting in this model is negative.

The second model, designed to assess the influence of simple and interaction effects, reveals no significant relationship or interaction effect with restrictive parental control and violence in the white sample. Only the positive main effect of cumulative risk, B=.162, β=.263, p<.01 significantly influenced violence. This finding does not support or refute the hypothesis.
Table VIII.13

*Summary of Linear Regression Analysis for Simple and Moderation Effects Predicting Violence for the White Sample*

(n = 105)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk</td>
<td>.177*</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*ATP</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Risk²</td>
<td>.162*</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive Parental Control</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*ATP</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumrisk*RPC</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. R² = .09, step 1 (p<.05); R²=.11, step 2 (p<.05); Adj. R²=.07, step 1; Adj. R² = .07, step 2; df = 103, F = 3.49, step 1; F=2.48, step 2.  
*p <.01, **<.05*
J. Summary of Moderator Effect Model for General Delinquency

The tests for race socialization protective effects did not support the hypothesis that restrictive parenting would differentially diminish delinquency and violence in high risk African American adolescents. Table VIII.10 illustrated two models that displayed a linear regression analysis with both simple and moderation effects that predict delinquency in the African American sample. The models were significant but no significant moderation effects were detected. Quite critical to the hypothesis, neither the simple effect of restrictive parental control nor its interaction with cumulative risk generated significance. Contrary to the hypothesis, Table VIII.10 also shows the strength and enduring negative influence of authoritative parenting in the African American sample.

Table VIII.11 illustrated the same two linear models to assess simple and moderation effects that predict general delinquency in the white sample. Though the models were significant, no significant moderation effects on delinquency in the white sample were detected. In the first model, only the simple positive effects of cumulative risk on delinquency and the negative effect of authoritative parenting was significant.

The second model retained the predictive effect of cumulative risk on delinquency and the simple effect of authoritative parenting though marginally insignificant, reflected a negative relationship with delinquency. An assessment of Tables VIII.10 and VIII.11 for the African American and white samples respectively indicates that restrictive parental control, the critical parenting style for the hypothesis does not predict general delinquency in either sample. However, authoritative parenting sustains its negative relationship with delinquency in two of the four models and is only
marginally insignificant a third model. This finding suggests that authoritative parenting may be racially invariant with respect to its negative influence on delinquency in both the African American and White high risk samples.

**K. Summary of Moderator Effect Models for Violence**

Table VIII.12 incorporated the general linear model to assess moderation effects in violence in the African American sample. No moderation effects were found in either models and authoritative parenting retained its statistical significance and negative relationship with violence throughout both models. The absence of significance associated with restrictive parental control and its interaction with cumulative risk does not support the hypothesis. Restrictive parental control does not significantly predict general delinquency or violence. This finding suggests that the influence of restrictive parental control does not vary by the type of the offense.

Table VIII.13 displays the moderation effects in violence in the white sample. The models were significant but neither restrictive parental control nor its interaction with cumulative risk attained significance. Taken together, the cumulative effect of these findings contradicts the hypothesis.

Finally, an important and unexpected finding that demonstrates some consistency throughout the analysis deserves comment. Specifically, the bivariate, main effect and moderator models demonstrate that the explained variance for the African American sample is generally lower than for the white sample. We comment on conceivable explanations for weaknesses in the models for the African Americans sample in the discussion section of the concluding chapter.
IX. Conclusion

A. Purpose

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the influence of traditional parenting and socialization practices on a representative sample of African American adolescents at risk for delinquency and violence and contrast this with styles found efficacious in predominantly white adolescents. The existence of authoritarian parenting in the high risk African American communities is well documented (Baldwin and colleagues, 1990; Anderson, 1999; Walker-Barnes, C. and Mason, C. 2001). However, few studies of criminological relevance look at race specific parenting styles as a deterrent for those at greatest risk for delinquency and violence.

The core hypothesis of this study is that authoritarian parenting, characterized by parental responsiveness, monitoring and restrictive parental control, is a proactive African American childrearing socialization strategy designed to overcome risk for negative developmental outcomes. Specifically, it was hypothesized that a race socialization protective effect results when authoritarian parenting is adopted to neutralize elevated risk for delinquency and violence in African American adolescents. If the hypothesis had found support, a crime deterrence strategy that incorporates a time honored cultural parenting practice in the African American community may have been indicated to overcome elevated risk for delinquent and violent offending. Research on the efficacy of parenting styles has primarily studied an authoritative childrearing style in relation to a range of positive developmental outcomes (Baumrind, 1971; Maccoby and
Authoritative parenting has been described as a more engaging childrearing style incorporated by parents who are affectively bonded with their children in a relationship inclusive of monitoring and responsiveness. Parental monitoring incorporates critical dimensions of supervision and regulation of behavior through consistent and contingent discipline for behavioral non-compliance (Baumrind, 1971). Historically, most research and findings of efficacy on this parenting style has been conducted with white adolescents (Dornbush and colleagues, 1987; Steinberg and colleagues, 1991).

Authoritative parents have been conceptualized as responsive to their children’s needs and engaging within a supportive and cooperative parent-child relationship. Moreover, communication and concurrence about mutually agreeable child developmental goals are indicative of the engaging parent-child-relationship (Kochanska, 1989). Authoritative parents also seek to develop and foster individuality and psychological autonomy and use non-coercive forms of discipline (Steinberg et al, 1991).

By contrast, restrictive parental control, the predominant additional characteristic of authoritarian parents, and more characteristic of African American families, includes dimensions of intrusiveness, non-democratic decision-making and severe discipline (Baumrind, 1972; Wilson, 1974; Baldwin and colleagues, 1990; Anderson, 1999). Authoritarian parents do not develop or foster independence and psychological autonomy but utilize interference and psychological control to overcome danger and risk of noxious environments.

Authoritarian parenting and authoritative parenting share several dimensions that include parental attachment and monitoring but differ in the use of restrictive parental
control. Although authoritative and authoritarian parents are equally high in behavioral control, authoritative parents tend to be low in restrictive control while authoritarian parents tend to be high. In essence, restrictive parental control is the fundamental difference between these parenting styles and clearly distinguishes the behavioral practices between authoritative and authoritarian parents. Without the restrictive parental control dimension, generalizations about the efficacy of authoritarian parenting would be subject to questions about whether the shared dimensions with authoritative parenting dimensions actually reduce delinquency and violence. Our analyses allowed us to examine the shared authoritative parenting dimensions, and subsequently, the potential influence of restrictive parental control as both a main and moderator effect.

Under this conceptualization of authoritarian parenting, responsiveness, monitoring, and restrictive parental control characterize the behaviors of authoritarian parents. Responsiveness and monitoring are characteristics that are also present in the related parenting style of authoritative childrearing. Behaviors that constitute the additional dimension of restrictive parental control reveal distinct parenting behavior differences that allow us to test the effects of these parenting styles on delinquency and violence. However, as detailed below, hypotheses about the positive impact of authoritarian parenting for African American adolescents were not supported.

**B. Research Questions**

To look at this issue, we composed three research questions to test the core race socialization hypothesis that authoritarian parenting will differentially reduce delinquency and violence in high risk African American adolescents in contrast to white
adolescents. The research questions are:

1. Does authoritarian parenting reduce delinquency and violence more strongly in high-risk African American youth than does authoritative parenting?

2. Does authoritarian parenting reduce delinquency and violence more strongly in high-risk African American youth than in low-risk African American youth?

3. Does authoritarian parenting reduce delinquency and violence more strongly in high-risk African American youth than in high-risk white youth?

Several sub-hypotheses allowed us to address the research questions. First, we postulated that the African American main effect coefficient of restrictive parental control would have a stronger negative effect on delinquency and violence than the African American main effect coefficient of authoritative parenting. This question addressed the predictive validity of restrictive parental control by distinguishing its influence from authoritative parenting in the African American sample. A significantly stronger main effect would warrant support for the hypothesis that restrictive parental control is an efficacious parenting style for African American adolescents.

The second sub-hypothesis asserted that restrictive parental control would be stronger in high risk African American adolescents than in low risk African American adolescents. Addressing the second research question, this sub-hypothesis establishes the viability of authoritarian parenting as an efficacious parenting style in high risk African Americans adolescents. The third research question examined whether restrictive parental control has a stronger negative effect on African American adolescents’ risk for delinquency and violence than white adolescents. Thus, the sub-hypothesis for this research question states that the influence of restrictive parental control in the African American adolescents.
American sample is significant and greater than the influence of restrictive parental control in the white sample.

C. Research Design

The study design included developing a cumulative risk measure from 5 risk factors estimated to have individual relationships with delinquency and violence. Adolescents at greatest risk for delinquency and violence were selected to study based on the highest levels of exposure to these risk factors: percent of census tract in poverty, community arrest rate, negative life events, single parent households and low parental education. Two high risk samples of African American and white adolescents at greatest exposures to accumulated risk for delinquency and violence were identified for study. To measure parenting styles, authoritative and authoritarian parenting constructs were developed using reliability and item analyses to derive the best set of items that incorporated the theoretical meaning of the parenting styles. The authoritative parenting construct included parental responsiveness and monitoring. Recall monitoring included sub-dimensions of supervision, regulation and consistent discipline. The authoritarian parenting construct added the restrictive parenting dimensions of intrusiveness, nondemocratic decision-making and severe discipline. Reliability analyses for the parenting constructs reported reflect acceptable levels of reliability.

For each of the two samples, four hierarchical linear models were estimated, including main and moderator models with outcome measures of delinquency and violence. The purpose of the multiple models was to estimate differences in the effects of
parenting styles on the relationship between cumulative risk and delinquency and violence for both samples. Focusing first on delinquent outcomes, the first model included the cumulative risk index and authoritative parenting as two main effect predictors within the African American sample. The second step incorporated restrictive parental control to estimate additional explanatory power when this key predicted aspect of African American parenting is included. This model facilitates an analysis and contrast of main effect parental influences on the relationship between cumulative risk and delinquency and violence. However, main effects influences do not reflect the theoretical operation of a protective factor that interacts with risk for a moderated outcome (Rutter, 1989).

The next set of models incorporate the core model by adding moderating terms of cumulative risk and authoritative parenting and cumulative risk and restrictive parental control to the models that included the simple effects of cumulative risk and authoritative parenting. Similarly, two models were constructed to assess differences in significance and explained variance when moderated terms of cumulative risk and the parenting styles were used to predict violence as an outcome for both subsamples.

D. Findings

The preliminary analysis revealed some unexpected findings in the relationships between cumulative risk, individual risk factors, delinquency and violence for the African American and white samples. Mean levels of cumulative and individual risk factors are generally higher for the African American sample. However, bivariate correlations indicate that the relationship between both cumulative risk and delinquency and violence,
and the relationships between individual risk factors and delinquency and violence is significantly stronger for the white sample. Cumulative risk is correlated with delinquency in the African American sample. However, negative life events is the only risk factor correlated with both delinquency and violence in the African American sample.

Unexpectedly, we found cumulative risk demonstrated a stronger relationship to delinquency in the white sample than the African American sample and was exclusively correlated with violence in the white sample. In contrast to the African American sample, negative life events, percent in poverty, community arrest rate and low parental education are all significantly related to delinquency and violence in the white sample (see table VIII.3 and VIII.4). Neither the cumulative risk measure nor the individual risk factors correlate highly with delinquency or violence in the African American sample.

The analysis of parenting style inter-correlations reveals a stronger negative relationship between the authoritative parenting and delinquency in the white sample in contrast to the African American sample. However, authoritative parenting demonstrates an exclusive moderate negative influence on violence in the African American sample. Authoritative parenting is not significantly related to violence in the White sample. However, restrictive parental control has a positive and strong relationship to delinquency in the White sample, but a marginally insignificant weak, but positive relationship with delinquency in the African American sample (see Table VIII.5).

These findings were obviously not anticipated. Authoritative parenting is associated with reduced delinquency in both the African American and white samples. These inter-correlation findings indicate that authoritarian parenting tends to increase rather than
decrease delinquency in both samples. The hypothesis states that restrictive parental control will reduce delinquency and violence in the African American sample; however, the direction and significance our inter-correlation results indicate authoritarian parenting actually promotes delinquency and violence.

The main effect analysis indicates that authoritative parenting has a robust negative influence on the correlation between cumulative risk and delinquency and violence. In 3 of the 4 models, authoritative parenting retains a significant negative influence on delinquency and violence in the presence of cumulative risk. This finding is consistent with research that has found authoritative parenting to be the most efficacious parenting style for white adolescents. However, our findings reveal that authoritative parenting has a more pervasive impact on African American adolescents because it has an exclusive negative effect on violence in the African American sample.

The addition of restrictive parental control to the delinquency and violence models did not add additional explanatory power to either of the models for African American or the white samples. Interesting, the positive direction of the coefficients in the models indicates that restrictive parental control would actually promote delinquency and violence in both samples. This is consistent with the inter-correlation findings of a significant positive relationship between restrictive parental control and delinquency and violence.

In summary, the main effects analysis did not find restrictive parental control negatively related to delinquency in either the African American or white samples. On the contrary, our findings indicate that authoritative parenting is negatively related to general delinquency and its impact is racially invariant. However, authoritative parenting
does demonstrate some race effects because it diminishes violence, in the presence of risk, exclusively in the African American sample.

The moderator models also assessed the significance and direction of the simple effects and interaction terms. No significant interaction terms were found to have significant negative associations with delinquency and violence for the African American sample. The simple effect of authoritative parenting was found significant, but neither the simple effect of restrictive parental control nor the interaction between cumulative risk and authoritative parenting or the interaction between cumulative risk and restrictive parental control added to the explanatory power of the models. Only main or simple effects of authoritative parenting demonstrate a consistent negative influence on delinquency and violence throughout the models. It is important to note that authoritative parenting retains its significance and negative influence in the African American models of delinquency and violence even after the main effect of restrictive parental control and the moderator terms were added.

E. Summary

This research sought to answer three research questions. The first research question sought to determine if authoritarian parenting was negative and stronger than authoritative parenting in the high risk African American sample. Essentially, this question focuses on the efficacy of authoritarian parenting in the African American high risk sample. It addressed the underlying hypothesis that authoritarian parenting will reduce delinquency or violence more strongly than authoritative parenting in the high risk African American sample. We found authoritarian parenting, measured as dimensions of
restrictive parental control was not significantly related to either delinquency or violence. Contrary to the hypothesis, the impact of authoritative parenting was found to negatively influence delinquency and violence in the African American sample. Clearly, the underlying hypothesis that proposed authoritarian parenting as a stronger more robust negative predictor of delinquency and violence in the African American sample was not supported.

In the second research question, authoritarian parenting was also hypothesized to reduce delinquency and violence more strongly in high risk African American adolescents than low risk African American adolescents. Essentially, this proposition tests the relationship between authoritarian parenting and levels of risk in the African American sample. However, a significant relationship between cumulative risk, authoritarian parenting and delinquency and violence was not detected in the African American sample. Contrary to the hypothesis, the impact of authoritarian parenting is similar among high and low risk African American adolescents.

The third research question examines whether restrictive parental control has a stronger negative influence on risk for delinquency and violent outcomes in the African American sample than for white sample. This question is linked to the underlying hypothesis that the interaction between cumulative risk and restrictive parental control will have stronger negative influence in African American adolescents than the interaction of cumulative risk and restrictive parental control in white adolescents. Both our main effect and moderator models indicated restrictive parental control does not reduce risk of delinquency or violence in either the African American on White samples. In the majority of the models, only authoritative parenting emerged as having a
significant and negative influence on delinquency and or violence. Although the effect is
generally stronger in the white sample, the main and simple effects of authoritative
parenting are negative. Neither the main effect of restrictive parental control nor the
expected moderator effects that include the interaction with cumulative risk are
significantly greater than authoritative parenting in either the African American or white
high risk samples.

Authoritative parenting maintains its robust negative influence throughout 6 of the
8 main effect and moderator models reflecting a general influence over all adolescents in
the study. This finding considerably undermines the race socialization hypothesis because
there is no evidence of differentiation from the effects of restrictive parental control.
More importantly, restrictive parental control does not reduce delinquency or violence in
the African American sample. None of the interaction terms that incorporate restrictive
parental control were found significant in any model. Authoritarian parenting was not
found to reduce delinquency and violence as hypothesized amongst African American
youth, and more predictably, did not do so in the white sample. The proposed beneficial
effect of restrictive parental control in the face of high levels of cumulative risk was not
supported. Interestingly, throughout most of these models, the enduring and simple
dampening effect of authoritative parenting on delinquency and violence was stronger in
the white sample but maintained significance and negative direction in the African
American sample as well.

F. Discussion

This study examined the proposition that authoritarian parenting operates as a
race socializing protective factor that differentially reduces outcomes of delinquency and violence in African American adolescents. It is based on considerable evidence that has found authoritarian parenting a nurturing response to noxious environments by African Americans parents (Baumrind, 1972; Wilson, 1974; Baldwin and Colleagues, 1990) and an efficacious parenting style in other cultures (Lin and Fu, 1990; Chao, 1994).

The notion that a true protective factor would differentially reduce problem outcomes where risk is high, rather than low (Rutter, 1989) was modeled; however, the expected race socialization protective effect was not detected. Using Rutter’s criteria, authoritarian parenting did not serve a protective function for these adolescents. Essentially, restrictive parental control, the defining behavioral practice of authoritarian parenting, did not retain predictive validity as evidenced by the lack of influence on delinquency or violence in our study. Our test of the effects of authoritarian parenting did not support it as a race socializing protective factor capable of differentially reducing delinquency and violence in high risk African American adolescents.

Clearly, these findings call into question the parenting practices that are historically documented and theoretically supported for African Americans in high risk communities. Several factors may explain the absence of support for authoritarian parenting practices in reducing delinquency and violence for high risk youths. First, our models do not examine the potential for reciprocal influences of delinquency and violence on authoritarian parenting. Essentially, our models assess the influence of authoritarian parenting on delinquency and violence but we do not test the possibility that delinquency and violence may influence authoritarian parenting. Using the same data from the Rochester Youth Development Study, Jang and Smith (1997) found
bidirectional relationships between supervision and delinquent involvement. They also found that attachment did not affect delinquency, although delinquency did reduce attachment. To the extent that reciprocal influences are present that are not modeled in this study, the influence of specific parenting practices could appear weaker.

Another explanation for the lack of predicted findings is that our models are static and do not examine the developmental changes in the parent child relationship during early, middle and late adolescence. Conceivably, the influence of parenting attenuates as adolescence reach middle to late adolescents. This may be particularly true in African American adolescents where the developmental trend towards autonomy may be accelerated because of economic pressure and the prevalence of single parent households. Essentially, as adolescents mature, responsive parents gradually lose their influence on children’s attitudes and behaviors and community and peer influences become more potent (Jang and Smith, 1997). It is quite conceivable that the influence of authoritarian parenting as a stage setting for later delinquency may be greatest during early adolescents. However, we do not assess parenting during the early childhood stage. These factors may account for the absence of support for the efficacy of authoritarian parenting in the African American sample. In future research, it would be prudent to test models during childhood and middle and late adolescents to assess both reciprocal influences and the natural developmental changes in the parent child relationship that occurs as adolescent mature and attain more autonomy.

Interestingly, we found support for prior studies that have linked authoritative parenting to positive developmental outcomes among adolescents in general.
Authoritative parenting, conceptualized under dimensions of parental warm and monitoring, retained a consistent negative influence on delinquent offending in both African American and white adolescents and exclusively on violent offending in African American adolescents. This is consistent with Werners’ (1989) study that found parental-child caring style an ameliorative effect capable of diminishing risk for negative developmental outcomes.

This finding has considerable implications for parenting practices generally and parenting in high risk African American communities particularly. First, our results indicate that restrictive parental control practices do not diminish outcomes of delinquency or violence in either African American or white adolescents. Though positive developmental outcomes have been reported, our findings indicate restrictive parental control may enhance risk for delinquency and violence in both African American and white adolescents. Therefore, parents in high or low risk communities should be discouraged from using restrictive practices because they may actually contribute to their child’s risk for delinquency and violence.

Secondly, authoritative childrearing, the related parenting style, should be encouraged for several reasons. Steinberg and colleagues (1991) found the benefits of authoritative parenting transcended ethnicity, socioeconomic status and family structure on four indicators of adjustment including school performance, self reliance, psychological distress and delinquency. Additionally, there is evidence that high risk ecological context may provide an appropriate context for authoritative parenting to work beyond its mainstream influence on white adolescents. Pittman and Chase-Lansdale (2001) found the context of high poverty neighborhoods placed African American female
adolescent girls at higher risk, when they were without maternal connectedness displayed through a warm mother-daughter relationship characterized by limit setting. This is consistent with Kochanska’s (1989) assertion of the importance of communication and concurrence with children about mutually agreeable child developmental goals. Perhaps it is the more severe sociological context such as elevated exposure to violence that enables authoritative parenting to negatively influence violent offending. Unexpectedly, we found authoritative parenting to have a more pervasive influence in the African American sample because it also negatively influenced the relationship between cumulative risk and violence, unlike the white sample. This is an important finding because it suggests authoritative parenting may be incorporated as a strategy to neutralize exposure to violence in dangerous neighborhoods where high risk African American adolescents reside.

Authoritative parenting incorporates parenting skills such as parental surveillance, regulation setting and consistent discipline. These practical parenting techniques and processes have been found to correlate negatively with delinquency (Patterson and Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984). Our results indicate that the best chance high risk children have to avoid trajectories towards delinquency and violence are to be reared in homes where there is parental warmth, responsiveness, monitoring, regulations, and consistent discipline. This study clearly substantiates theory and research on the positive developmental outcomes of authoritative parenting in all adolescents (Rickel, A. and Biasatti, 1982; Kochanska, G. L. Kuczynski and Radde-Yarrow (1989); Kochanska, G. 1990; Dekovic, M.J. Janseens and J. Gerris, 1991; Kaufmann D., Gesten E., Lucia M., Salcedo, O. and Gobioff, R., 2000). However, it also illuminates the exclusive negative
influence of authoritative parenting on African American trajectories towards violence.

Parent education and family management skill training programs within high risk African American communities should focus on educating parents about the importance of an engaged and affectionate (responsive) relationship with their children and the deterrent effects it has on exposure levels to violence. These findings suggest that programs dedicated towards preventing or intervening in high rates delinquency and violence in the African American community may well be served by educating parents on the beneficial effects of authoritative parenting.

Several weakness of the study should be noted. First, we note that throughout these models very little of the variance in delinquency or violence is explained in the African American adolescent sample. Cumulative risk weakly influences delinquency unlike the white sample where cumulative risk is a moderate and positive influence on delinquency and violence. This pattern is maintained throughout both the main effect and moderation models.

Several factors may explain the relatively low explained variance in the African American models. First, in some studies, African Americans have been found to systematically underreport offending (Thornberry, 2003). African Americans demonstrate the lowest levels of validity with respect to self reports of delinquent and violent offending. Thus, measurement of the dependent variable may be differentially biased in the African American sample. Perhaps high risk African American adolescents do not tell interviewers about all instances of their offending. Conceivably, this may be because of the historic distrust of African Americans and the criminal justice system reflected in disbelief of assurances regarding the anonymity or confidentiality of the self
report instruments. Thornberry and colleagues (2003) noting further research was imperative, found a potentially serious problem of differential validity with African American reflecting lower validity than Hispanic males in a comparison of self reports to official data.

Another possibility is that socio-demographic risk and negative life events do not adequately explain risk for delinquency and violence in African American adolescents. In fact, some studies have found socio-demographic risk normative in high risk African American communities (Wilson, 1987; Anderson, 1999). Peer delinquency and school achievement could conceivably reflect more salient risk factors for delinquency and violence in the African American sample (Walker-Barnes and Mason, 2001).

There is also the possibility that family variables are just not highly important factors in predicting delinquency and violence in African American adolescents. The low explained variance in the African American models may reflect the absence of this association. However, the robust measure of authoritative parenting and its negative influence throughout the main and moderator models suggest authoritative parenting would negatively influence delinquency and violence in African American models with stronger validity and less measurement error.

Another weakness of the study is the absence of independent measures of intrusiveness and non-democratic decision-making. These measures were constructed from student responses about relationships and communication with parents. Consequently actual dimensions designed to assess authoritarian parenting were not directly assessed. Preferably, a scale with proven parental reliability items such as the Block Childrearing practice report would have enhanced the validity of the parenting
measures. However, variations in parenting styles were not the initial focus of RYDS data collection efforts. Therefore, parenting measures were developed from RYDS parenting items that were theoretically sound, relevant and available.

It is also possible that the Rochester Youth Development study sampling design increased the difficulty of testing this hypothesis. The Rochester study is limited to an urban sample and it oversampled at risk youth. This sampling strategy may have constrained the variance, especially for African American youth, on many of the study variables making it harder to detect significant differences.

However, this study does provide findings that are an important addition to the body of literature on parenting influences in African American and white adolescents. It addresses a gap in criminological research by examining differential deterrent effects of race specific parenting styles on delinquency and violence. The study advances research because it focuses on the distinction in risk profiles of urban kids of different races, and incorporates Rutter’s (1989) notion that protective factors should modify risk trajectories towards negative developmental outcomes. Though the race socialization protective factor hypothesis was not supported, the finding that authoritative parenting reduces violence exclusively in the African American sample is noteworthy.

Several strengths of the study should be noted. The study incorporated a strong overall design with temporally ordered variables. A representative sample with sufficient adolescents in both subgroups were used and a theoretically-informed measurement of both parenting styles. In addition, the lack of empirical studies of criminological relevance that have tested the protective effects of authoritarian parenting makes this study somewhat unique.
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