

The Influence of Parental Emotional Support and Monitoring on Self-Reported Delinquent Impulsive Behavior and Noncompliance Among Juvenile Offenders: An Examination of Gender Differences

Jenna R. Silverman and Roslyn M. Caldwell

This study examined the relationships and influence of parental emotional support and monitoring on impulsive delinquent behavior and noncompliance among a sample of 288 adjudicated juvenile offenders (203 males and 85 females). Among males, increased levels of maternal and paternal supervision and monitoring were associated with decreased levels of noncompliance, and increased maternal supervision significantly decreased impulsive delinquent behavior. Among females, increased maternal and paternal supervision and paternal emotional support was significantly associated with decreased impulsive delinquent behavior, and paternal emotional support was significantly associated with decreased noncompliance among females. For both males and females, parental emotional support and monitoring significantly predicted impulsive delinquent behavior and noncompliance. Maternal monitoring best predicted impulsive delinquent behavior and noncompliance among males. Results revealed no significant gender differences in the prediction of impulsive delinquent behavior. Among females, paternal emotional support better predicted noncompliance. The findings in the current study highlight the significance of gender differences among juvenile offenders when examining the effects of parental involvement and risk to delinquency related behavior.

Over the past decade, the number of offenses committed by juvenile offenders has shown increasing disparities between males and females, with research showing females committing more crimes and with greater severity. Juvenile justice systems throughout the nation witnessed an increase of 50% in female juvenile offenses between 1990 and 1999, as compared with an increase of only 4% in male juvenile offenses over this same time period (Harms, 2003). Additionally, between 1993 and 2002, while arrest rates among male juvenile offenders decreased, female juvenile offender arrest rates increased by more than 18%, with the largest increases occurring in assaults, drug abuse and liquor law violations (Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2004; Synder, 2003). For example, although arrest rates for aggravated assault decreased by 29% for males, rates increased by 7% for females (Synder, 2003). An alarming trend among female offenses is also the increase in violent offenses. Between 1980 and 2002, the rates of female juvenile arrests increased

by 99% for aggravated assault, 258% for simple assault, and 125% for weapons law violations (Chesney-Lind & Pasko, 2004; Snyder, 2003). Additionally, overall female delinquency court caseloads grew by more than 80% between 1988 and 1997 (Sickmund, 2000).

Despite the increase in the number of juvenile arrests, and the nature and severity of crimes committed by females as compared to males, few studies have examined gender differences in the factors related to delinquency. While the study of juvenile delinquency has been dominated by the study of males, the small number of existing studies examining gender differences have found a number of related and causal factors including parental, peer, and school attachment and involvement (Caldwell, Silverman, Lefforge, & Silver, 2004;), association with delinquent peers (Brendgen, Vitaro, & Bukowski, 2000), and poor psychosocial adjustment, such as depression, anxiety, and low self-esteem (Pedersen, 1994).

Jenna R. Silverman, Department of Psychology, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Roslyn M. Caldwell, Department of Forensic Psychology, John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Roslyn M. Caldwell, Ph.D., John Jay College of Criminal Justice, 445 W. 59th St., 2124N, New York City, NY 10019 (Email: rcaldwell@jjay.cuny.edu).

Among these factors related to delinquency, the strongest correlate found among male and female adolescents has been the relationship between an adolescent and their parent(s) (Barnes & Farrell, 1992; Kim, Hetherington, & Reiss, 1999). These studies have revealed that increases in juvenile offending are related to the quality of the parent-adolescent relationship, with more serious offenders experiencing a negative relationship with their parent(s). Studies have suggested that a positive parental-adolescent relationship can serve as a buffer in times of stress by aiding and protecting the adolescent against challenges encountered in other domains (e.g., peer rejection, puberty, identity development), and decreasing the likelihood that an adolescent will engage in delinquent or maladaptive behavior (Gauze, Bukowski, Aquan-Assee, & Sippola, 1996). Conversely, juveniles who experience a negative or weak relationship with their parent(s) are less restrained by this social bond and, as a result, are more likely to engage in delinquent or maladaptive behavior.

Although studies show support for this relationship (Dornbusch Erikson, Laird, & Wong, 2001; Svensson, 2003), few of these studies focus on differences between male and female juvenile offenders (Anderson, Holmes, & Ostresch, 1999; Huebner & Betts, 2002). The studies that do examine these differences have found mixed results. For instance, there is evidence that females who experience closer ties to their parents show less involvement in delinquent behavior (Griffin, Botvin, Scheier, Diaz, & Miller, 2000; Henggeler, Edwards, & Borduin, 1987; Huebner & Betts, 2002). On the other hand, studies have also revealed that although females may report similar or higher levels of parental involvement, low levels of parental involvement tend to decrease the likelihood of engagement in delinquent behavior more for adolescent males than it does for adolescent females (Anderson et al. 1999; Canter, 1982).

In addition to the relationship between parent-adolescent involvement and delinquency, it appears that the *nature* of the parent-adolescent relationship can also have an impact on delinquent behavior. Studies have revealed that the most predictive characteristics of the parent-adolescent relationship are parental emotional support and parental monitoring (Anderson et al., 1999; Jacobson &

Crockett, 2000). Parental emotional support, that is, an adolescent's perceptions of communication with and emotional closeness to parents, appears to be inversely related to delinquency, such that adolescents reporting low levels of parental emotional support also report high levels of delinquent behavior (Anderson et al., 1999; Caldwell et al., 2004). While some studies indicate that the influence of parental emotional support on delinquency is stronger for females (Huebner & Betts, 2002; Laundra, Kieger, & Bahr, 2002) others show a stronger relationship for males (Anderson et al., 1999).

Parental monitoring, which refers to the direct supervision of an adolescent as well as parental awareness of the adolescent's whereabouts, activities, and friends, appears to be negatively associated with delinquency (Jacobson & Crockett, 2000). Studies examining gender differences in parental monitoring and the adolescent's involvement in delinquency indicate that monitoring by parents has a greater effect on risk for delinquency for females than males (Jacobson & Crockett, 2000; Mak, 1996; Weintraub & Gold, 1991).

In sum, there is extensive evidence that the parent-adolescent relationship is an important factor in determining the general emotional and behavioral adjustment in adolescents. However, the gender of both the parent and the adolescent also seems to affect the adolescents' risk of engaging in delinquent behavior. Studies have shown that female adolescents with high degrees of maternal monitoring are less likely to engage in delinquent behavior, including alcohol and drug use, as compared to male adolescents (Webb, Bray, Getz, & Adams, 2002). Additionally, Kim and colleagues (1999) examined the effects of parental monitoring and conflict and the association with delinquent peers on negative externalizing behavior among adolescents, and found that maternal monitoring was more predictive of externalizing behavior than paternal monitoring in both males and females.

Whereas this study indicated that maternal relationships have a significant effect on adolescents' vulnerability to engage in delinquent behavior, other studies suggest that the paternal-adolescent relationship contributes more to juvenile delinquency. Mak (1996) examined the relationship between delinquency, parental care (attachment) and parental protection (i.e., parental control and

hypothesis is that both parental monitoring and emotional support are expected to have a greater influence on delinquency among females. Specifically, females who report high levels of impulsive behavior and noncompliance are expected to report lower levels of parental monitoring and emotional support than males. In examining the parental relationship (i.e., maternal or paternal) and the influence on impulsive behavior and noncompliance, many studies have indicated that the maternal relationship has the strongest effect on delinquency among both males and females (Barnes & Farrell, 1992; Kim et al., 1999; Webb et al., 2002). Therefore, the second hypothesis of this study is that low levels of maternal monitoring and emotional support should best predict impulsive behavior and noncompliance, regardless of participants' gender.

METHOD

Participants

The participants in this study were 288 (203 male and 85 female) adjudicated adolescents detained in detention facilities throughout the state of Nevada. Ages ranged from 12 to 18 years (for males $M = 15.8$, $SD = 1.29$, for females $M = 15.86$, $SD = 1.26$). The ethnic/racial composition of participants was 41% Caucasian, 19.8% Mexican American, 19.4%

of mixed ethnicity, 10.8% African American, and 9% of other racial/ethnic backgrounds. The most frequently reported current charges by males were drug abuse violations (20.2%) and violation of probation (19.7%). Among females, the most frequently reported current charges were violation of probation (37.6%) and drug abuse charges (15.3%). Other commonly reported charges among males included motor vehicle theft (8.9% males, 2.4% females) and possession of a weapon (6.9% males, 0% females). Among females, other commonly reported charges were runaway (2% males, 8.2% females) and aggravated assault (3.9% males, 7.1% females).

As part of examining the relationships between parental monitoring and emotional support with self-reported delinquent impulsive behavior and noncompliance, information regarding participants' residing with caregivers was also elicited. Responses were grouped by gender (See Table 1) and into categories of mother only, father only, two-parent (i.e., mother and father, mother and stepfather, or father and stepmother), or other (i.e., other relative, foster family, or state custody).

Definitions and Measures

Parental Emotional Support and Monitoring-Family Assessment Device (FAD) (Epstein, Baldwin, & Bishop, 2000). For the purposes of this study,

Table 1
Frequencies of Reported Caregivers in the Home for Males (N = 203) and Females (N = 85)

Caregivers in the Home	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mother only	32.5% ($n = 66$)	22.4% ($n = 19$)
Father only	8.9% ($n = 18$)	10.6% ($n = 9$)
Two-parent (mother/father, mother/stepfather, or father/stepmother)	44.3% ($n = 90$)	42.4% ($n = 36$)
Other (i.e., live alone, other relative, foster parents, or custody of the state)	14.3% ($n = 29$)	24.7% ($n = 21$)

parental emotional support and monitoring was adapted and modified from the FAD, a 60-item self-report inventory which describes structural and organizational characteristics of family functioning based upon interactions between family members. The FAD is a widely used assessment device that has been applied both domestically and internationally in various clinical and non-clinical populations and has been found to have solid psychometric properties. The FAD has been utilized in several studies, translated in at least 7 different languages, and is regarded as one of the most researched family assessment tools available. The FAD scales have shown good internal consistency (alphas ranging from .71 to .92) with test retest reliabilities ranging from .66 to .76. This measure has illustrated strong validity in numerous studies (see review by Epstein, et al., 2000). Items pertaining to parental emotional support and monitoring were displayed in a demographic questionnaire that was developed for this study and used as an independent measure to obtain participants' background and history information (i.e., age, sex, race/ethnicity, education level, family composition, and socioeconomic status).

Parental Emotional Support. Parental emotional support was defined as an adolescents' report of their ability to seek out emotional support and/or advice from their parents. Level of parental emotional support consisted of an index of four questions: "If you needed some information or advice about something, is there someone you could talk with? If you were having trouble at home, is there someone you could talk to about it? If you got into some serious trouble, is there someone you could talk with? If you had to depend on just one *person* to help you out whenever you needed it, who would you depend on?" If the participant answered yes to any of the first three questions, the participant was then asked to specify which person they could confide in for emotional support (i.e., "mother or stepmother; father or stepfather; sibling; other relative such as an aunt, uncle, grandparent, cousin; close friend; teacher; other adult in community, neighborhood, or church; and other"). For the final question, the participant was asked to select one person from the above possible choices. The questions were added to produce individual indices for maternal emotional support and paternal emotional support. For the

purposes of this study, only responses about parents were examined in order to investigate the influence on parental emotional support on impulsive delinquent behavior and compliance. For this measure, male participants' scores ranged from 0 (*no emotional support*) to 4 (*high emotional support*) for both maternal emotional support ($M = 2.2, SD = 1.48$) and paternal emotional support ($M = 1.13, SD = 1.42$). Female participants' scores ranged from 0 (*no emotional support*) to 4 (*high emotional support*) for both maternal emotional support ($M = 1.94, SD = 1.55$) and paternal emotional support ($M = 1.12, SD = 1.43$).

Parental Monitoring. Parental monitoring was defined as the adolescent's perception of parental supervision related to progress in school, extra-curricular activities, and their knowledge of the adolescent's peer group and affiliation. Parental monitoring consisted of an index of four statements for each parent: "My mother/stepmother/female guardian (father/stepfather/male guardian) keeps close track of how well I am doing in school; My mother/stepmother/female guardian (father/stepfather/male guardian) almost always knows where I am – what I am doing; My mother/stepmother/female guardian (father/stepfather/male guardian) knows most of my friends; My mother/stepmother/female guardian (father/stepfather/male guardian) approves of most of my friends." Participants responded to questions by circling "True," "False," or "Does Not Apply." The questions were added to produce individual indices for maternal monitoring and paternal monitoring. For the purposes of this study, only responses about parents were examined in order to investigate the influence on parental monitoring on impulse delinquent behavior and noncompliance. The indices on the Parental Monitoring Scale ranged from 0 (*no parental monitoring*) to 4 (*high parental monitoring*) for maternal monitoring ($M = 2.18, SD = 1.36$) and paternal monitoring ($M = 1.3, SD = 1.43$) among males and maternal monitoring ($M = 1.74, SD = 1.36$) and paternal monitoring ($M = 1.40, SD = 1.44$) among females.

Impulsivity and Compliance – Manifestation of Symptomatology Scale (MOSS) (Mogge, 1999). The MOSS is a brief self-report inventory consisting of 124 true/false items intended to measure a variety of behaviors and mental states among juvenile offenders (Mogge, 1999). Given that the MOSS is

brief and easy to read, this measure addresses several of the obstacles frequently encountered in gathering accurate information from children and adolescents who enter the juvenile justice system (i.e., reading problems) compared to other personality instruments that require a great deal of time and higher levels of concentration (Mogge, 1999). The intercorrelations (construct validity) between the two subscales are desirable (.53), suggesting measurement of different aspects (i.e., impulsivity and compliance) of the larger construct (acting out) (Mogge, 1999).

Impulsivity Content Scale (Mogge, 1999). The Impulsivity scale assesses participants' control over delinquent impulsive behaviors and angry reactions (i.e., "I most often think before I act" (reverse scored) and "I lose my temper often"), and includes 11 items. High scores on this scale indicate a greater likelihood to act out. Internal consistency for the Impulsivity scale, as measured by Cronbach's α , has been found to be .82, (Mogge, 1999). The Impulsivity scale has shown good test-retest reliability, $r = .87$ (Mogge, 1999). In the present study, participants' T-scores ranged from 39 to 77 ($M = 55.58$, $SD = 11$) among males and from 41 to 80 ($M = 57.18$, $SD = 11.94$) among females.

Compliance Content Scale (Mogge, 1999). The Compliance scale consists of 11 items designed to assess participants' propensity to engage in behavior involving the legal system or to disregard rules (i.e., "I do not do what adults tell me" and "It is hard to follow the rules"). High scores indicate a greater likelihood to break rules and laws and greater levels of noncompliance. Internal consistency for the Compliance scale, as measured by Cronbach's α , has been found to be .73, and the scale reveals good test-retest reliability, $r = .84$ (Mogge, 1999). In the current study, participants' T-scores ranged from 36 to 78 ($M = 56.81$, $SD = 9.03$) among males and from 49 to 85 ($M = 64.72$, $SD = 11.46$) among females.

Procedures

Parental consent forms were obtained from participants' parent(s) or guardian(s) prior to test administration. Testing was conducted in a group setting utilizing classrooms at the detention facilities. All assessments were presented in a randomized packet format to minimize carryover effects and administered on one day in a two-hour time period.

Participants were allowed to take five-minute breaks every half-hour to minimize fatigue.

RESULTS

Reliability of Scores of the Parental Emotional Support and Parental Monitoring Measures

Intercorrelations were examined among the first three items in the parental emotional support measure to assess the relationships among the items. As shown in Table 2, intercorrelations ranged from .53 to .61 with Cronbach's $\alpha = .79$ for male participants. Intercorrelations ranged from .22 to .78 with Cronbach's $\alpha = .76$ for female participants. The responses to the first three yes/no items were examined in three separate 2 x 2 tables for both males and females to assess if items measured different aspects of the emotional support construct. For example, one 2 x 2 table was the number of "yes" responses and the number of "no" responses to the first and second familial emotional support questions. Chambers' ϕ coefficient was used with each of the 2 x 2 tables to estimate the correlation of responses between each of the first three familial emotional support items (Chambers, 1982). This coefficient has been found to be a better predictor of ρ than the phi coefficient (Alexander, Alliger, Carson, & Barrett, 1985). The Chambers' ϕ coefficients ranged from .83 to .89 for males and from .65 to .88 for females, indicating that the items were measuring similar aspects of the emotional support construct (See Table 2). Frequencies of responses to the "check all that apply" portion of the first three items and responses to the fourth item, which was categorical, are presented in 3 to examine participants' selection of various family members, depending on the question item.

For the parental monitoring measures, intercorrelations were examined among the four items in the maternal monitoring measure and separately for the four items for the paternal monitoring measure to assess the relationships among the items. Internal consistency of scores on maternal monitoring and paternal monitoring measures were assessed using Cronbach's α . Internal consistency and intercorrelations for these two measures were assessed separately for males and females. For males, intercorrelations for items on the maternal monitor-

Table 2

Intercorrelations Among the Parental Emotional Support Items for Males (N = 203) and Females (N = 85)

		22.	23.	24.
Males				
22.	If you needed some information or advice about something, is there someone you could talk with?	—	.53 e=.84	.62 e=.89
23.	If you were having trouble at home, is there someone you could talk to about it?		—	.54 e=.83
24.	If you got into some serious trouble, is there someone you could talk with?			—
Females				
22.	If you needed some information or advice about something, is there someone you could talk with?	—	.79 e=.97	.22 e=.65
23.	If you were having trouble at home, is there someone you could talk to about it?		—	.49 e=.88
24.	If you got into some serious trouble, is there someone you could talk with?			—

ing measure ranged from .36 to .62 with Cronbach's $\alpha = .76$ (See Table 4). Intercorrelations for items on the paternal monitoring measure ranged from .62 to .82 with Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$. For female participants, intercorrelations ranged from .19 to .62 with Cronbach's $\alpha = .73$ for maternal monitoring. Intercorrelations on the paternal monitoring measure ranged from .52 to .75 with Cronbach's $\alpha = .87$ (See Table 5).

Relationships Among Parental Emotional Support, Parental Monitoring, Impulsive Delinquent Behavior, and Noncompliance

Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to identify the patterns of bivariate relationships among maternal emotional support, paternal emotional support, maternal supervision, paternal supervision, impulsive delinquent behavior, and noncompliance for male and female participants. A Bonferroni-Holm correction (Holm, 1979) was used to correct for Type I error. Results related to males indicated maternal and paternal supervision and maternal emotional support were significantly and negatively correlated with noncompliance (See

Table 6). Maternal supervision was significantly and negatively correlated with impulsive delinquent behavior. Among females, maternal and paternal supervision and paternal emotional support were significantly and negatively correlated with impulsive delinquent behavior (See Table 7). Paternal emotional support was significantly and negatively correlated with noncompliance.

Gender Differences and Family Structure Differences in Parental Emotional Support and Parental Monitoring

A multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to assess for differences between males and females as well as differences among family structures on maternal emotional support, paternal emotional support, maternal monitoring, and paternal monitoring. A Bonferroni adjustment was used to control for Type I error. No significant interactions were found between gender and family structure for maternal monitoring, $F(3, 280) = .08, p > .05$, paternal monitoring, $F(3, 280) = .3, p > .05$, maternal emotional support, $F(3, 280) = .02, p > .05$, or paternal emotional support, $F(3, 280) = .61, p > .05$.

Table 3
Percentages and Frequency of Responses to Familial Emotional Support Items (N = 86)

Response Choice	Question			
	22 ^a	23 ^a	24 ^a	25
Mother or Stepmother	58.1 (n = 50)	45.3 (n = 39)	52.3 (n = 45)	32.6 (n = 28)
Father or Stepfather	36 (n = 31)	29.1 (n = 25)	34.9 (n = 30)	9.3 (n = 8)
Sister or Brother	56.7 (n = 47)	29.1 (n = 25)	37.2 (n = 32)	16.3 (n = 14)
Other relative (Aunt, Uncle, Grandparent, Cousin, etc.)	45.3 (n = 39)	37.2 (n = 32)	41.9 (n = 36)	9.3 (n = 8)
Close friend	68.6 (n = 59)	67.4 (n = 58)	79.1 (n = 68)	17.4 (n = 15)
Teacher at the school you attend	31.4 (n = 27)	16.3 (n = 14)	15.1 (n = 13)	2.3 (n = 2)
Other adult in community/ neighborhood/ church	40.7 (n = 35)	33.7 (n = 29)	30.2 (n = 26)	2.3 (n = 2)
Other	68.6 (n = 59)	72.1 (n = 62)	68.6 (n = 59)	2.3 (n = 2)

^aMay add up to more than 100%

A main effect for gender differences showed a trend toward significance for maternal monitoring, $F(1, 280) = 3.77, p > .05$. Male participants reported higher rates of maternal monitoring ($M = 2.18$) than female participants ($M = 1.74$). No significant gender differences were found for maternal emotional support, $F(1, 280) = .18, p > .05$, paternal emotional support, $F(1, 280) = .01, p > .05$, or paternal monitoring, $F(1, 280) = .09, p > .05$.

A main effect for family structure was significant for maternal monitoring, $F(3, 280) = 8.02, p < .01$, paternal monitoring, $F(3, 280) = 27.01, p < .01$, maternal emotional support, $F(3, 280) = 12.65, p < .01$, and paternal emotional support, $F(3, 280) = 28.65, p < .01$. Student Newman-Keuls range tests were used to examine whether the four groups compared among each other for all parental

relationship variables. Participants from two-parent households reported significantly higher levels of maternal monitoring ($M = 2.37$) than did participants from other family structures ($M = 1.72$), or father only households ($M = .96$). Participants from mother only households ($M = 2.13$) and other family structures reported significantly higher levels of maternal monitoring than participants from father only households. Participants from father only households ($M = 2.56$) reported significantly higher levels of paternal monitoring than participants from two-parent households ($M = 1.83$), other family structures ($M = 1.12$), or mother only households ($M = .33$). Participants from two-parent households reported significantly higher levels of paternal monitoring than participants from other family structures, than participants who reported signifi-

Table 4

Intercorrelations Among the Parental Monitoring Items for Males (N=203)

		Maternal Monitoring			
		8A.	8B.	8C.	8D.
E8A.	My mother/stepmother/female guardian keeps close track of how well I am doing in school.	—	.43	.36	.35
8B.	My mother/stepmother/female guardian almost always knows where I am – what I am doing.		—	.47	.47
8C.	My mother/stepmother/female guardian knows most of my friends.			—	.62
8D.	My mother/stepmother/female guardian approves of most of my friends.				—
		Paternal Monitoring			
		8E.	8F.	8G.	8H.
8E.	My father/stepfather/male guardian keeps close track of how well I am doing in school.	—	.69	.62	.59
8F.	My father/stepfather/male guardian almost always knows where I am – what I am doing.		—	.75	.72
8G.	My father/stepfather/male guardian knows most of my friends.			—	.82
8H.	My father/stepfather/male guardian approves of most of my friends.				—

cantly higher levels than those from mother only households. Participants from mother only households ($M = 2.48$) and two-parent households ($M = 2.44$) reported significantly higher levels of maternal emotional support than those from father only ($M = 1.22$) or other family structures ($M = 1.22$). Participants from father only households ($M = 2.33$) reported significantly higher levels of paternal emotional support than those from two-parent households ($M = 1.65$), other family structures ($M = .5$), or mother only households ($M = .34$). Participants from two-parent households reported significantly higher paternal emotional support than participants from other family structures or mother only households. Overall, these findings suggest that participants from mother only and two-parent households reported similarly high levels of maternal

monitoring and emotional support whereas participants from father only households reported higher levels of paternal monitoring and emotional support. Participants who live in other family structures reported moderate levels of maternal and paternal monitoring and emotional support when compared with participants who lived in single or two-parent households.

Parental Emotional Support and Parental Monitoring as Predictors of Impulsive Delinquent Behavior Among Males and Females

Separate standard multiple regression analyses were used to predict impulsive delinquent behavior from maternal emotional support, paternal emotional

Table 5
Intercorrelations Among the Parental Monitoring Items for Females. (N = 85)

		Maternal Monitoring			
		8A.	8B.	8C.	8D.
8A.	My mother/stepmother/female guardian keeps close track of how well I am doing in school.	—	.58	.39	.23
8B.	My mother/stepmother/female guardian almost always knows where I am – what I am doing.		—	.42	.19
8C.	My mother/stepmother/female guardian knows most of my friends.			—	.62
8D.	My mother/stepmother/female guardian approves of most of my friends.				—
		Paternal Monitoring			
		8E.	8F.	8G.	8H.
8E.	My father/stepfather/male guardian keeps close track of how well I am doing in school.	—	.59	.67	.52
8F.	My father/stepfather/male guardian almost always knows where I am – what I am doing.		—	.68	.57
8G.	My father/stepfather/male guardian knows most of my friends.			—	.75
8H.	My father/stepfather/male guardian approves of most of my friends.				—

support, maternal monitoring, and paternal monitoring for males and females. The overall regression equation for males suggested that maternal emotional support, paternal emotional support, maternal monitoring, and paternal monitoring significantly predicted impulsive delinquent behavior, $R^2 = .064$, $F(4, 198) = 3.37$, $p < .05$. Maternal monitoring contributed a significant amount of variance to the equation, $F(1, 198) = 5.9$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .028$. For females, the overall regression equation suggested that maternal emotional support, paternal emotional support, maternal monitoring, and paternal monitoring significantly predicted impulsive delinquent behavior, $R^2 = .152$, $F(4, 80) = 3.58$, $p < .01$. No single predictor contributed a significant amount of the variance to the regression equation, although paternal emotional support showed a trend toward significance. A test of the equality of slopes was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the two regression equations. The test indicated that there was no significant difference between the equations, $F(5, 278) = .58$, $p > .05$. These

findings suggest that there was no significant gender difference in how well maternal and paternal emotional support and monitoring predict impulsive delinquent behavior.

Family Structure Differences in Parental Emotional Support and Parental Monitoring as Predictors of Impulsive Delinquent Behavior

The MANOVA results suggested that parental emotional support and monitoring differs as a function of family structure, but not as an interaction between gender and family structure. In order to test the effect of family structure alone on how well these parental relationship factors predict impulsive delinquent behavior, separate standard multiple regression analyses were conducted among the four categories of family structure. The independent variables were maternal emotional support, paternal emotional support, maternal monitoring, and paternal monitoring and impulsive delinquent behavior was the dependent variable. The overall regression

Table 6
Bivariate Correlations of Parental Emotional Support, Parental Monitoring, Impulsive Delinquent Behavior, and Compliance among Males
 (N = 203)

	Maternal Monitoring	Paternal Monitoring	Maternal Emotional Support	Paternal Emotional Support	Impulsive Delinquent Behavior	Compliance
Maternal Monitoring	—	.358*	.36*	.156	-.221*	-.386*
Paternal Monitoring		—	-.033	.545*	-.131	-.209*
Maternal Emotional Support			—	.254*	-.117	-.200*
Paternal Emotional Support				—	-.154	-.141
Impulsive Delinquent Behavior					—	.511*
Non-compliance						—

* $p < .05$ using Bonferroni-Holm correction

Table 7
Bivariate Correlations of Parental Emotional Support, Parental Monitoring, Impulsive Delinquent Behavior, and Compliance among Females (N = 85)

	Maternal Monitoring	Paternal Monitoring	Maternal Emotional Support	Paternal Emotional Support	Impulsive Delinquent Behavior	Compliance
Maternal Monitoring	—	.34*	.315*	.034	-.22	-.328*
Paternal Monitoring		—	.069	.626*	-.223	-.38*
Maternal Emotional Support			—	.261	-.214	-.175
Paternal Emotional Support				—	-.298*	-.351*
Impulsivity					—	.595*
Non-compliance						—

**p* < .05 using Bonferroni-Holm correction

equations were significant for father only households, $R^2 = .43$, $F(4, 22) = 4.14$, $p < .05$ and two-parent households, $R^2 = .09$, $F(4, 121) = 2.96$, $p < .05$. These findings suggested among participants from father only or two-parent households, maternal emotional support, paternal emotional support, maternal monitoring, and paternal monitoring significantly predicted impulsive delinquent behavior. In father only households, paternal emotional contributed a significant amount of variance to the equation, $F(1, 22) = -2.92$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .22$. In two-parent households, maternal monitoring contributed a significant amount of variance to the equation, $F(1, 121) = -2.56$, $p < .05$, $R^2 = .05$. The regression equations for mother only households, $R^2 = .08$, $F(4, 80) = 1.81$, $p > .05$, and other family structures, $R^2 = .04$, $F(4, 45) = .47$, $p > .05$, were nonsignificant. A test of the equality of slopes was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the four regression equations. The test indicated that there was no significant difference between the four regression equations, $F(15, 268) = .85$, $p > .05$. These findings suggest that there was no significant effect of family structure on how well maternal and paternal emotional support and monitoring predict impulsive delinquent behavior.

Parental Emotional Support and Parental Monitoring as Predictors of Noncompliance Among Males and Females

Separate standard multiple regression analyses were used to predict noncompliance from the four predictors of maternal emotional support, paternal emotional support, maternal monitoring, and paternal monitoring among males and females. Noncompliance was used as the dependent variable. The overall regression equation for males suggests that maternal emotional support, paternal emotional support, maternal monitoring, and paternal monitoring significantly predicted noncompliance, $R^2 = .16$, $F(4, 198) = 9.55$, $p < .01$. Maternal monitoring contributed a significant amount of variance to the equation, $F(1, 198) = 17.34$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .072$. The overall regression equation for females suggests that maternal emotional support, paternal emotional support, maternal monitoring, and paternal monitoring significantly predicted noncompliance, $R^2 = .23$,

$F(4, 80) = 5.99$, $p < .01$. Maternal monitoring contributed a significant amount of variance to the equation, $F(1, 80) = 5.82$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .05$. A test of the equality of slopes was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the two regression equations. Again, paternal emotional support showed a trend toward significance. Results from a test of the equality of slopes revealed a significant difference between the two regression equations, $F(5, 278) = 8.41$, $p < .01$. These findings suggest that although maternal monitoring significantly contributes to noncompliance among both males and females, the effect of paternal emotional support on noncompliance appears to be more influential on females than males.

Family Structure Differences in Parental Emotional Support and Parental Monitoring as Predictors of Noncompliance

In order to test the effect of family structure alone on how well these parental relationship factors predict noncompliance, separate standard multiple regression analyses were conducted among the four categories of family structure. The independent variables were maternal emotional support, paternal emotional support, maternal monitoring, and paternal monitoring and noncompliance was the dependent variable. The overall regression equations were significant for mother only households, $R^2 = .36$, $F(4, 80) = 11.31$, $p < .01$, father only households, $R^2 = .38$, $F(4, 22) = 3.34$, $p < .05$, two-parent households, $R^2 = .108$, $F(4, 121) = 3.67$, $p < .01$, and other family structures, $R^2 = .238$, $F(4, 45) = 3.51$, $p < .05$. These findings suggested among all types of households, maternal emotional support, paternal emotional support, maternal monitoring, and paternal monitoring significantly predicted noncompliance. However, with the exception of mother only households, no one predictor accounted for a significant amount of variance in the regression equations. Among mother only households, maternal monitoring, $F(1, 80) = -4.66$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .17$, and paternal emotional support, $F(1, 80) = -2.91$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .07$, both contributed a significant amount of variance to the equations. A test of the equality of slopes was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the four regression equations. The test indicated that there was no

significant difference between the four regression equations, $F(15, 268) = 1.33, p > .05$. These findings suggest that there was no significant effect of family structure on how well maternal and paternal emotional support and monitoring predict non-compliance.

DISCUSSION

The primary objectives of this study were to examine: (a) the relationships between parental emotional support and involvement, impulsive delinquent behavior, and noncompliance among male and female adjudicated juvenile offenders; (b) gender differences between parents and adolescents on such relationships; and (c) parental gender differences between emotional support and involvement in predicting impulsive delinquent behavior and noncompliance. As an exploration, this study also examined gender and family structure differences in parental emotional support and parental monitoring.

With respect to the first research question, results suggest that among males, low levels of maternal and paternal supervision and maternal emotional support are significantly correlated with higher levels of noncompliant behavior. Low levels of maternal supervision are significantly correlated with high levels of impulsive delinquent behaviors. Among females, decreased paternal supervision is significantly correlated with higher levels of noncompliance. Low levels of maternal and paternal supervision and paternal emotional support were significantly correlated with high levels of impulsive delinquent behavior.

In regards to gender differences between parents and adolescents, although males reported higher rates of maternal monitoring than females, no differences in maternal and paternal emotional support, or paternal monitoring were found.

Results pertaining to the third research question revealed that for both males and females, parental emotional support and monitoring significantly predicted noncompliance and impulsive delinquent behavior. Maternal monitoring best predicted impulsive delinquent behavior and noncompliance among males. Among females, paternal emotional

support was a better predictor of noncompliance. Results regarding family structure and parental emotional support and monitoring revealed no significant differences in predicting noncompliance and impulsive delinquent behavior.

Consistent with our findings and previous studies, parental emotional support and monitoring have a significant impact on an adolescent's involvement in delinquent behaviors (Caldwell et al., 2004; Gauze et al., 1996; Henggeler et al., 1987; Hoge, Andrews, & Leschied, 1996; Pedersen, 1994; Snyder & Patterson, 1987). Research has suggested that adolescents who experience their caregiver as "inconsistently" available and "inadequately" responsive, form attachments that are characterized with anxiety and ambivalence that can result in externalizing behaviors such as aggression or violence, and other delinquent acts (Moretti, Dasilva, & Holland, 2004). From a parental involvement standpoint, increased monitoring of adolescents' activities diminishes the opportunity for adolescents to engage in delinquent activities. Previous research has shown that parental involvement in general, and monitoring in particular, has become increasingly important because as children mature into adolescence they develop cognitively, emotionally, and behaviorally (Flannery, Williams, & Vazsonyi, 1999; Keiley & Seery, 2001; Kim et al., 1999). Moreover, adolescents spend less time with the family and spend more time with outside forces (i.e., peers) (Kim et al., 1999). The findings related to parental monitoring also suggests that maternal monitoring seems to be a more salient factor in the prediction of impulsive delinquent behavior and compliance. This finding was somewhat surprising given that previous research reveals monitoring by both parents as important (Barnes & Farrell, 1992; Cookston, 1999; Flannery et al., 1999; Jacobson & Crockett, 2000; Patterson & Dishion, 1985; Weintraub & Gold, 1991). However, the finding in the current study may be due to the fact the structure of the family, particularly families of juvenile offenders, often consist of single parent households in which the primary caregiver is most often a single mother. (Dunifon & Kowaleski-Jones, 2002; Dunn et al., 1998). Also, it may be that mothers may spend more time monitoring the adolescent than do fathers (Kim et al., 1999), unless the adolescent resides in a father only household (which would also be consistent with

the finding in the current study). The fact that males in this study reported higher rates of maternal monitoring than did females suggests that perhaps males' perception and reporting of monitoring by parents is in fact due to more stringent monitoring by parents, and/or due to their heightened perception of monitoring by their parents as a result of their legal involvement in the juvenile justice system. This finding of males' reporting of higher rates of maternal monitoring is in contrast to previous findings in the general area of research among adolescence. Conventional gender roles tend to socialize males, rather than females, toward independence and autonomy (Moretti et al., 2004). On the other hand, this finding may be due to the racial/ethnic composition of the sample in the study (i.e., over 40% of participants identified themselves as being a part of a racial and/or ethnic minority group). For instance, among racial and ethnic minority populations (particularly African American and Latino populations), it is not uncommon for adolescent males to experience increased monitoring and supervision by parents and to be socialized in ways that may not provide them with independence and autonomy, but rather collectivism and interdependence (Caldwell et al., 2004; Parham, White, & Ajamu, 2000).

Limitations of the current study should be noted. First, we had a fairly large number of males compared to females. An increase in the number of females may have yielded different results. In addition, inclusion of parents' perceptions and/or the use of multiple informants (i.e., school teachers) would enable comparisons of the familial-adolescent relationship and the adolescents' behavioral and emotional adjustments.

The above findings have important implications for both treatment prevention and intervention purposes. It seems that treatment should be targeted toward assisting families to foster increased monitoring and supervision (and emotional support) with adolescents, particularly those involved in the juvenile justice system. It appears that such treatment should focus on assisting parents and adolescents with specific skills that are characteristic of better monitoring and supervision along with strengthening emotional support (i.e., communication, support, empathy) in an effort to decrease delinquent related and impulsive types of behavior. Apart from the

theoretical relevance of this research, findings are pertinent to the development of gender-based treatment prevention and intervention programs that include family based domains.

Future research should examine how specific family processes and relationships impact familial attachment, involvement, and delinquency. The influence of such factors may be particularly important among juvenile offenders. Although this study focused on gender differences, it would be interesting and beneficial to focus on racial/ethnic/cultural differences of parental monitoring and emotional support and the influence such practices have on delinquent behavior. Perhaps, the types and quality of parental involvement and practices may vary as a function of cultural values and practices. Given the over-representation of racial and ethnic minorities in the juvenile justice system and the increasing proportions and variations of diverse families, such research would have greater generalizability and important implications. Along with this over-representation, the number of females (racial and ethnic in particular) entering the juvenile justice system and the degree of their criminal offending, warrants significant understanding of familial life in the context of culture and gender. Comparison of parent to adolescent perceptions of these issues would serve to foster a more comprehensive intervention that would target the family in its entirety. In conclusion, the findings further emphasize the need for positive family involvement in the lives of adolescents, in general, and juvenile offenders in particular. This study significantly adds to the limited body of research pertaining to gender differences in delinquency and juvenile offending.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, R. A., Alliger, G. M., Carson, K. P., & Barrett, G. V. (1985). The empirical performance of measures of association in the 2 * 2 table. *Educational & Psychological Measurement, 45*, 79-87.
- Anderson, B. J., Holmes, M. D., & Ostresh, E. (1999). Male and female delinquents' attachments and effects of attachments on severity of self-reported delinquency. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 26*, 435-452.
- Barnes, G. M., & Farrell, M. P. (1992). Parental support and control as predictors of adolescent drinking, delinquency, and related problem behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54*, 763-776.

- Brendgen, M., Vitaro, F., & Bukowski, W. M. (2000). Deviant friends and early adolescents' emotional and behavioral adjustment. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 10*, 173-189.
- Caldwell, R. M., Silverman, J., Lefforge, N., & Silver, N. C. (2004). Familial emotional support, self-esteem, and emotional well-being as predictors of delinquency among adjudicated Mexican American adolescents. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 32*, 55-69.
- Canter, R. J. (1982). Family correlates of male and female delinquency. *Criminology, 20*, 149-167.
- Chambers, R. G. (1982). Correlation coefficients from 2 * 2 tables and from biserial data. *British Journal of Mathematical & Statistical Psychology, 35*, 216-227.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Pasko, L. (2004). Girls' troubles and female delinquency. In Chesney-Lind, M., & Pasko, L., *The female offender: Girls, women, and crime* (2nd ed., pp. 9-30). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cookston, J. T. (1999). Parental supervision and family structure: Effects on adolescent problem behaviors. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 32*, 107-121.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Erickson, K. G., Larid, J., & Wong, C. A. (2001). The relation of family and school attachment to adolescent deviance in diverse groups and communities. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 16*, 396-422.
- Dunifon, R. & Kowalski-Jones, L. (2002). Who's in the house? Race differences in cohabitation, single parenthood, and child development. *Child Development, 73*, 1249-1264.
- Dunn, J., Deckard, K. D., Pickering, K., O'Conner, T. G., Golding, J. & ALSPAC Study Team. (1998). Children's adjustment and prosocial behavior in step-, single-parent, and non-stepfamily settings: Findings from a community study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 39*, 1083-1095.
- Epstein, N. B., Baldwin, L. M., & Bishop, D. S. (2000). Family assessment device (FAD). *Handbook of psychiatric measures*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Flannery, D. J., Williams, L. L., & Vazsonyi, A. T. (1999). Who are they with and what are they doing? Delinquent behavior, substance use, and early adolescents' after-school time. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 69*, 247-253.
- Gauze, C., Bukowski, W. M. & Aquan-Assee, J. (1996). Interactions between family environment and friendship and associations with self-perceived well-being during adolescence. *Child Development, 67*, 2201-2216.
- Griffin, K. W., Botvin, G. J., Scheier, L. M., Diaz, T., & Miller, N. L. (2000). Parenting practices as predictors of substance use, delinquency, and aggression among urban minority youth: Moderating effects of family structure and gender. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 14*, 174-184.
- Harms, P. (2003). *Detention in 1990-1999*. Retrieved December 21, 2004 from <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojdp/fs200307.pdf>.
- Henggeler, S. W., Edwards, J., & Borduin, C. M. (1987). The family relations of female juvenile delinquents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 15*, 199-209.
- Hoge, R. D., Andrews, D. A., & Leschied, A. W. (1996). An investigation of risk and protective factors in a sample of youthful offenders. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 37*, 419-424.
- Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, 6*, 65-70.
- Huebner, A. J., & Betts, S. C. (2002). Exploring the utility of social control theory for youth development: Issues of attachment, involvement, and gender. *Youth & Society, 34*, 123-145.
- Jacobson, K. C., & Crockett, L. J. (2000). Parental monitoring and adolescent adjustment: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 10*, 65-97.
- Johnson, R. E. (1987). Mother's versus father's role in causing delinquency. *Adolescence, 22*, 305-315.
- Keiley, M. K., & Seery, B. L. (2001). Affect regulation and attachment strategies of adjudicated and non-adjudicated adolescents and their parents. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal, 23*, 343-366.
- Kierkus, C. A., & Baer, D. (2002). A social control explanation of the relationship between family structure and delinquent behavior. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 44*, 425-458.
- Kim, J. E., Hetherington, E. M., & Reiss, D. (1999). Associations among family relationships, antisocial peers, and adolescents' externalizing behaviors: Gender and family type differences. *Child Development, 70*, 1209-1230.
- Laundra, K. H., Kieger, G., & Bahr, S. J. (2002). A social developmental model of serious delinquency: Examining gender differences. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 22*, 389-407.
- Mak, A. S. (1996). Adolescent delinquency and perceptions of parental care and protection: A case control study. *Journal of Family Studies, 2*, 29-39.
- Mogge, N. L. (1999). *Manifestation of Symptomatology Scale*. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Association.
- Moretti, M. M., Dasilva, K. D., & Holland, R. (2004). Aggression from an attachment perspective: Gender issues and therapeutic implications. In Moretti, M.M., Odgers, C.L., & Jackson (Eds.), *Girls and aggression: Contributing factors and intervention principles* (pp. 41-56). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Parham, T. A., White, J., Ajamu, A. (2000). *The psychology of blacks: An African centered perspective* (pp. 24-38). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Patterson, G. R., & Dishion, T. J. (1985). Contributions of families and peers to delinquency. *Criminology, 23*, 63-79.
- Pedersen, W. (1994). Parental relations, mental health, and delinquency in adolescents. *Adolescence, 29*, 975-990.
- Sickmund, M. (2000). *Offenders in juvenile court, 1997*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Snyder, H. N. (2003). *Juvenile Arrests 2002*. Retrieved December 21, 2004, from <http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojdp204608/contents.html>.
- Snyder, J., & Patterson, G. (1987) Family interaction and delinquent behavior. In H. C. Quay (Ed.), *Handbook of juvenile delinquency* (pp. 216-243). England: Wiley.

- Sokol-Katz, J., & Dunham, R. (1997). Family structure versus parental attachment in controlling adolescent deviant behavior: A social control model. *Adolescence, 32*, 199-216.
- Svensson, R. (2003). Gender differences in adolescent drug use: The impact of parental monitoring and peer deviance. *Youth & Society, 34*, 300-329.
- Webb, J. A., Bray, J. H., Getz, J. G., & Adams, G. (2002). Gender, perceived parental monitoring, and behavioral adjustment: Influences on adolescent alcohol use. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 72*, 392-400.
- Weintraub, K. J., & Gold, M. (1991). Monitoring and delinquency. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health, 1*, 268-281.