

Aging Out:
Outcomes of Youth Who Age Out of Foster Care

by

Jennifer Paige Mason, B.A.

A Thesis

In

SOCIOLOGY

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Approved by

Dr. Charlotte Dunham
Chairperson

Dr. Cristina Bradatan

Dr. Laura Lowe

Dr. Peggy Gordon Miller
Dean of the Graduate School

May, 2012

Copyright 2012 Jennifer Paige Mason

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A special and heartfelt thanks to those miraculous individuals who have spurred me on in my academic pursuits as well as all of my personal endeavors. I would surely not be in this position today had it not been for their relentless support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....ii

ABSTRACT.....v

LIST OF TABLES.....vi

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. LITERATURE REVIEW3

 Background.....3

 Introduction4

 A Profile of Foster Care Children5

 Aging Out Programs7

 Flaws in Available Research10

 Social Bonds Theory11

 Social Bonds and Aging Out13

 Novelty of My Research13

 Hypotheses15

 Conclusion15

III. METHODOLOGY16

 Sample Description16

 Variable Description17

 Ordinary Least Squares Regression20

IV. RESULTS21

 Attachment21

 Commitment22

 Involvement22

Stepwise	23
V. CONCLUSION	25
Surprising Results	25
Policy Implications	27
REFERENCES	30
APPENDIX.....	32
Tables.....	32

ABSTRACT

Current findings on outcomes for youth who age out of the foster care system depict an unfortunate picture. In comparison to their peers who do not age out of the foster care system, these youth face many disadvantages and are more likely to engage in greater levels of deviant behavior. In this study, I use the framework of social control theory to identify the factors that contribute to our understanding of these results.

Using data from *Crime during the Transition to Adulthood: How Youth Fare as They Leave Out-of-Home Care*, I will test the degree to which the elements of social control can be used to explain deviance in youth who age out of foster care. Elements of social control, as noted by Hirschi, consist of attachment, commitment, involvement and belief. Using Ordinary Least Squares regression, I examine whether those individuals who have lower levels of attachment, commitment and involvement are more likely to engage in deviance and experience greater levels of disadvantage. My results show social bonds theory explains very little of the variance in deviance in the lives of youth who have aged out of foster care.

LIST OF TABLES

1: Summary Statistics for Total Placements32

2: Summary Statistics for Maternal Closeness33

3: Summary Statistics for Miss Mom34

4: Summary Statistics for Closeness to Dad35

5: Summary Statistics for Miss Dad36

6: Summary Statistics for Caregiver Closeness37

7: Summary Statistics for College or Future Plans38

8: Summary Statistics for Current School Enrollment39

9: Summary Statistics for Employment40

10: Summary Statistics for Self-Reported Delinquent Acts41

11: Summary Statistics for Self-Reported Violent Acts42

12: Summary Statistics for Official Arrest Record43

13: Summary Statistics for Living Children44

14: Summary Statistics for Mental Health Diagnosis45

15: Summary Statistics for Alcohol and/or Drug Abuse46

16: Self-reported Deviance by Social Control Variables & Control Variables47

17: Self-reported Violent Offense by Social Control Variables & Control Variables48

18: Mental Health Issues by Social Control Variables & Control Variables49

19: Alcohol and/or Drug Abuse by Social Control Variables & Control Variables50

20: Living Children by Social Control Variables & Control Variables51

21: Official Arrest Record by Social Control Variables & Control Variables52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Current findings on outcomes for youth who age out of the foster care system depict an unfortunate picture. In comparison to their peers who do not age out of the foster care system, these youth face many disadvantages and are more likely to engage in greater levels of deviant behavior (Allen & Nixon 2000, Avery 2010, Kools 1997, Roman & Wolfe 1995). These youth deal with unemployment, physical and mental health problems, a lack of healthcare, early parenthood, incarceration, homelessness, poor education and dependence on public assistance programs at a higher rate than youth of the general population (Allen & Nixon 2000; Avery 2010; CWLA 2012; Wertheimer 2002).

In this study, I use the framework of social control theory (Hirschi 1969) to identify the factors that contribute to our understanding of these results. Hirschi identifies four aspects of the social bond that can be accessed to evaluate an individual's bond with society. These aspects are *attachment*, *commitment*, *involvement* and *belief*. Hirschi's theory states that those individuals with a weakened bond with society are those individuals that are more likely to be deviant. I propose that youth who have aged out of foster care have a weakened bond with society and this is what causes their greater propensity for deviance.

Using data from *Crime during the Transition to Adulthood: How Youth Fare as They Leave Out-of-Home Care*, I will test the degree to which the elements of social

bonds can be used to explain deviance in youth who age out of foster care (Cusick, Courtney, Havlicek & Hess 2010). Using Ordinary Least Squares regression, I examine whether those individuals who have lower levels of *attachment*, *commitment* and *involvement* are more likely to engage in deviance and experience greater levels of disadvantage.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Background

First, it may be helpful to provide some background information on the foster care system and children who enter it. According to information from Badeau and Gesiriech (2003), foster care is a substitute care arrangement for children who have been removed from the care of their parents or guardians through court action, Child Protective Services or another avenue. The state is responsible for providing and funding foster care in order to meet the needs of these children. Foster care is intended to be a temporary stop on the path to reunification with his/her family or, if the former is not possible, adoption into a new family. Foster care is sometimes necessary for the protection of children, however, foster care youth often suffer from health, behavioral and emotional problems as well as low self-esteem and can also face physical abuse (Kools 1997; Roman & Wolfe 1995).

According to information from Badeau and Gesiriech (2003), most children enter foster care because of neglect or abuse in their homes. Reports of neglect and abuse may be made by anyone, but over half are made by teachers, police officers and doctors. Other typical reporters are family members and neighbors. If the Child Protection Service (CPS) is not able to establish enough evidence of maltreatment, the case is deemed unsubstantiated and closed. When maltreatment can be established, CPS must make an important decision about whether removal of the child from the home is necessary. When it is determined that a child must be removed, a court decides where he/she should be

placed. This court, with the consultation of case workers and others, will also develop a plan of reunification for the family. According to information from the US Department of Health and Human Services and reported by Badeau and Gesiriech (2003), approximately 40% of these children are eventually reunified with their family, around 20% are adopted, about 8% are placed in long term foster care and 6% are emancipated. Of those who are placed in foster care, about half will end up in a foster family home, while the rest are placed in various other arrangements like kinship care, group homes and independent living. The court reviews the family's progress every six months and decides whether or not the problems in the home have been resolved and the family can be reunified. Over 30% of those youth who have been reunified are placed in foster care again within three years. When the families of origin do not meet the goals set in the reunification plan, the court considers termination of parental rights.

When a child reaches the age of majority, 18 to 21 depending on the state, and has not been reunified or adopted, he/she will leave the foster care system and become independent. His/her case is closed when he/she is said to "age out" of the system. My study focuses precisely on this group of youth who age out of the system.

Introduction

Current research on youth who age out of foster care demonstrate many negative outcomes. Those individuals who age out face many difficulties and are more likely to engage in deviant behavior after leaving the foster care system while transitioning into adulthood (Kools 1997). I propose that the relationship between these hardships and likelihood of engaging in deviant behavior can be explained by Travis Hirschi's (1969)

social bonds theory. The purpose of this research is to understand the relationship between the aspects of the social bond theory and these outcomes. It is my hope to contribute to the current knowledge about these problems which could improve policy.

There are around 500,000 children in foster care in the United States (Wertheimer 2002). Around 1.5% of children in the United States reside with someone other than a parent or grandparent, and foster care children make up over 40% of this population (Wertheimer 2002). The ultimate goal of foster care is to provide a safe place for children to live while the problems with their families are being resolved (Wulczyn, Chen & Hislop 2007). Thus, the state's desire is for children to eventually be reunited with their families. Although this is the goal, about 50% of children either age out of foster care or leave foster care for reasons other than returning home.

A Profile of Foster Care Children

Children are placed in foster care for many reasons. Most placements are due to the child's home environment being deemed unfit and/or dangerous or that the parents are deemed unable to care for the child (Kools 1997). These specific circumstances may include child abuse, child neglect, abandonment, familial homelessness, poverty, parental substance abuse, parental mental illness, or incidences of parental death (Kools 1997; Wertheimer 2002). Children may also be placed in foster care due to their own personal problems, which parents are unable to handle such as fighting, refusing to attend school, depression, suicide attempts and stealing.

During their stay in foster care, children suffer from many difficulties including poor academic achievement, health problems, behavioral and emotional problems, low

self-esteem, lack of orientation for the future, lack of familial connection and social isolation (Kools 1997). Children also sometimes experience abuse or neglect in foster care environments (Roman & Wolfe 1995). Even though children may have been removed from a dangerous and/or unfit environment in their family of origin, the foster care system often does not help them deal with problems they experienced as a result of difficulties at home and sometimes can even add to their problems. It is no wonder that, with compounding difficulties such as these, these youth continue to face difficulties once they age out of the foster care system. Foster care children are a vulnerable population, and those who age out of foster care are even more vulnerable (Wertheimer 2002). In addition to these problems, most individuals who age out of foster care typically have a more abrupt transition to adulthood, often times without guidance from their families or the foster care system (Cusick et al. 2010).

Around 20,000 to 25,000 young adults age out of foster care each year (Allen & Nixon 2000). In comparison with the general population, these individuals have a higher risk of unemployment and health problems, often lack healthcare, and experience early parenthood, incarceration, homelessness, poor education, and dependence on public assistance programs (Allen & Nixon 2000; Avery 2010; CWLA 2012). According to Wertheimer (2002), more than 38% of these individuals are mentally disturbed. These young adults are also unlikely to graduate from high school or receive any post-secondary education or training (Avery 2010). These educational deficits can make finding a job difficult and it is therefore not surprising that many of these individuals do not make enough money to be self-sufficient. Often times they experience a gap between

wages they earn and the cost of housing, which explains the high risk of homelessness for these individuals (Allen & Nixon 2000). To be more precise, various studies and official reports published by various child welfare agencies have shown that only 48% of youth who had aged out of foster care are employed, only 33% have health insurance, 11% report having sex for money, 50% experience early pregnancy, 25% are involved in crime, 24% report selling drugs to make money, 22% are homeless, almost 85% do not have a high school diploma or GED, over 15% are dependent on public assistance programs (Reilly 2004; Wagner & Wonacott 2008). Furthermore, over half have emotional, behavioral and/or physical and/or mental health problems and one third are living below the poverty level. Few of these young adults are able to receive any assistance from the foster care system after aging out of the foster care system (Reilly 2004).

Aging Out Programs

In order to help these youth transition to an independent life after they leave the foster care system, a number of aging out programs have been developed. They provide services such as mentoring, life skills training, self-sufficiency and postsecondary education and/or training (Cook 1988; Massinga & Pecora 2004). These programs are important because many youth leave foster care without knowing how to cook a meal, find a job, locate an apartment, maintain positive social relationships, live without dependence on the welfare system or budget money and expenses (Cook 1988). Most youth who age out of foster care lack a social network that is able and/or available to teach them these skills (Cook 1988). Overall, those youth who received training before

aging out of foster care report being more satisfied in all areas of their lives (Reilly 2003). Unfortunately, some programs aimed at benefitting foster care youth both before and after aging out of the foster care system are in the early stages of implementation and lack evaluation data (Massinga & Pecora 2004).

One program that has been implemented was formulated by Cook (1988) with the goal of providing support and life skills at different points of the aging out process. This program includes several steps. The first step is to encourage both informal and formal learning. Informal learning can be depicted through tasks such as grocery shopping with the individual's foster family. Formal learning can be depicted through tasks such as attending school, which will teach the individual the skills necessary for gaining employment. Other steps in this program include providing instruction in the areas of parenting and academic skills. In a final step, living skills are addressed through supervised practice living, when the individual still has a support system and safety net before he/she is independent. Once the individual has reached self-sufficiency, the ultimate goal, Cook (1988) proposes there still be an emotional support system for the individual consisting of social workers and similar professionals the individual has been acquainted with during the transition of aging out. It is the goal of this program that by the time the individual reaches the final stage, he/she will be successful in living independently. This program, however, is not widely available and is therefore not providing much aid to these youth who have aged out of foster care. This program should be continued and evaluated for efficacy.

Unfortunately for youth who have aged out of foster care, they do not have familial ties that are able to provide financial and social resources, such as money for college. For most of these youth, services and support end when they age out of the foster care system despite their continuing need. The expectation that these youth can be fully independent upon aging out is criticized as being highly unrealistic (Avery 2009). This is why Osgood, Foster and Courtney (2010) propose measures such as universal health care, raising of minimum wage, and extending the eligibility of helpful programs in order to make the transition from dependence to independence a more seamless one for individuals who have aged out of foster care.

A source of help for these particular youth can be found in Title IV-E of the Social Security Act which provides states, if they so choose, with funding to support foster care youth between the ages of 18 and 21 as long as they are completing high school or an equivalent program, attending vocational or postsecondary schooling, working at least 80 hours a month or are incapable of these tasks due to medical problems (Osgood, Foster & Courtney 2010). These individuals can live independently in a supervised location or continue to reside in foster care. However, only a limited number of states are currently utilizing this possibility.

Cook (1988) found that around half of the individuals who age out of foster care do not receive any training at all for their transition into adulthood. Only 28 states have programs in place to help youth that have aged out of foster care transition into adulthood (Cook 1988). Unfortunately, availability of these programs is very limited and even those individuals who receive help still report difficulties (Massinga & Pecora 2004). Programs

that do exist often lack adequate funding or training for the professionals and foster parents who are trying to aid these individuals (Cook 1988; Osgood, Foster & Courtney 2010). There is also a lack of communication between different agencies that seek to help these individuals. Providing better communication could provide better aid for these individuals. Further evaluation research is still needed on programs that are offered and the effectiveness of these programs.

Flaws in Available Research

Unfortunately, most studies cover small sample sizes, ranging in size from seventeen to one hundred individuals and are often limited to one city or state (Kools 1997; Cook 1988; Avery 2009; Reilly 2003). Other publications are atheoretical and simply review the current literature (Reilly 2003; Avery 2009; Wulczyn, Chen & Hislop 2007; Osgood, Foster & Courtney 2010; Massinga & Pecora 2004; Wagner & Wonacott 2008). A majority of the current research also lacks recommendations for improving the outcome of foster care youth who age out (Courtney et al. 2010; Wagner & Wonacott 2008; Wulczyn, Chen & Hislop 2007; Avery 2009). Some of the current available research was conducted through studies that covered hundreds of individuals across multiple states (Courtney et al. 2010). In this research, I will try to improve the literature on this topic by using better empirical data and a theoretical framework. I will use secondary data from over 700 youth from three different states to test how the social bonds theory explains the increased likelihood of deviant behavior observed in children who age out of the foster care system. My study uses a random, multi-state sample of

foster care youth, is based in theory and will provide recommendations for improving the outcome of these individuals.

Social Bonds Theory

Travis Hirschi's social bonds theory, also called Social control theory, states that people who have a weakened bond with society are more likely to be deviant (Hirschi 1969). Deviance, as defined by the Encyclopedia of Social Theory, consists of acts that depart from the accepted social norm and can include crime as well as other things that are considered deviant, such as homelessness and early pregnancies (Best 2004). Social bonds theory suggests that the stronger an individual's bond with society, the less likely he/she is to be deviant (Wiatrowski, Griswold & Roberts 1981). People are moral because they are social, or tied to the society, and people follow the norms of society because of their socialization, which helps them internalize norms (Durkheim 1997; Hirschi 1969; Wiatrowski, Griswold & Roberts 1981). They comply with these norms because their socialization has led them to see them as important, as do the majority of people in society.

The four aspects of Hirschi's theory are *attachment, commitment, involvement* and *belief* (Hirschi 1969). While Hirschi (1969) lists his four aspects of the social bond theory, Wiatrowski, Griswold and Roberts (1981) do an excellent job defining and explaining how to operationalize these four concepts. *Attachment* is defined as an individual's ties to others and it can be measured through his/her closeness with parents, peers and school (Wiatrowski, Griswold & Roberts 1981). According to Hirschi (1969), someone who is not close to these individuals will be unconcerned with the expectations

of others and will be free to deviate from their expectations and norms. *Commitment* can be measured by evaluating a person's goals. When an individual lacks commitment to traditional goals, he/she is free to deviate from them. This can be measured by an individual's goals for future educational attainment and career (Wiatrowski, Griswold & Roberts 1981). *Involvement* refers to the individual's participation in approved activities that confirm societal expectations, such as schooling. Being involved in conventional activities can keep the individual from engaging in deviant activities (Hirschi 1969). *Belief*, the fourth and final aspect of Hirschi's theory, is the acceptance of social norms. This can be measured by the individual's breaking of social norms, for example, does the individual lie and does he/she exhibit helping behavior to others (Wiatrowski, Griswold & Roberts 1981)? The more attached someone is to social norms, the less likely he/she is to violate them.

Like much of the literature on youth who age out of foster care has already indicated, foster care children are removed from their nuclear families. This removal can involve new schools, new social workers and new friends in addition to new people in the placement environment (Wulczyn, Chen & Hislop 2007). This disrupts relationships with origin families, which can cause weakened social bonds (Cusick et al. 2010). It is no far stretch to explain how multiple movements and placements can negatively affect the individual's attachment process as they disrupt the child's experiences with family and school, two main conveyors of attachment, goals, norms and values (Cook 1989; Daley 1980; Wulczyn, Chen & Hislop 2007).

Social Bonds and Aging Out

While operationalizing concepts differently and assessing different questions, my research replicates a study Cusick, Courtney, Havlicek and Hess (2010) which also incorporates Hirschi's (1969) social bond theory. Overall, these authors found limited support for social bonds theory explaining criminal acts in youths who have aged out of foster care. These authors found that youth who age out of foster care are more likely than the general population to commit crimes. Males were more likely than females to have broken the law. Males and females who have aged out of foster care are more likely to have been arrested than those individuals who have not aged out of foster care. Additionally, they found that youth who aged out of foster care, like the general population, are less likely to commit crimes the older that they become. Individuals with more placements were more likely to commit crimes and also more likely to be arrested. While African American foster care alumni were slightly more likely to have been arrested, no relationship was found between race and commission of crimes. Even though the authors had these results, they found limited support for the contention that social bonds can predict criminal acts but did find that it may prevent arrest.

Novelty of My Research

I am replicating the original study, but making changes, including the evaluation of deviance instead of crime and limiting predictor variables. The Midwest Study data set (Courtney & Cusick 2007), the data collected by Cusick et al. (2010), was the best data set available in order to assess deviance in youth who have aged out of foster care. Although criminal acts are deviant, deviance also includes other acts that are not

necessarily criminal. Cusick et al. (2010) neglect those individuals who are deviant but not criminals while my study includes them. My research expands on the work of Cusick et al. (2010) by adding other elements of deviant behavior besides criminal activity.

Cusick et al. (2010) use some variables, such as having living children, which is deviant due to the young age of the respondents, having a mental health problem diagnosis and alcohol and/or drug abuse as predictors of later criminal acts. In my study, however, I use these variables as measures of deviancy. Although they may be predictors of later criminal acts, they are also deviant behaviors that I am using as dependent variables.

Additionally, while Cusick et al. (2010) take into consideration abuse that has occurred before the youths' entrances into foster care, I am only looking at the effect specific to the foster care experience for these individuals. My intention is to highlight the effect of aging out of the foster care system has on these individuals. This will help professionals resolve the issues that youth face in foster care and the aging out process and improve their future outcomes. Their study also looks in depth at the type of living situation the participants resided in (traditional foster care home, group home, independent living, etc.) whereas I am examining the effects of foster care overall, regardless of the specific living environment.

Along with the differences between the original study and the study at hand, there are also differences between my study and other previous studies. As mentioned before, many studies consisted of small sample sizes, lacked geographic variability and theoretical explanations (Kools 1997; Cook 1988; Avery 2009; Reilly 2003; Wulczyn,

Chen & Hislop 2007; Osgood, Foster & Courtney 2010; Massinga & Pecora 2004; Wagner & Wonacott 2008). This study is important because it meets the generalizability and theoretical needs that have been unmet by these previous studies.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of the study at hand are as follows:

- I. The greater the attachment of the individual, the less likely the individual is to engage in deviant behavior.
- II. The greater the commitment to conventional activities, the less likely the individual is to be deviant.
- III. The greater the involvement in conventional activities, the less likely the individual is to be deviant.

Conclusion

In sum, youth in foster care face many difficulties both before and after they age out of the child welfare system. I believe these difficulties and acts of deviance can be explained by Hirschi's social bond theory, which states that youth who are not adequately attached to society are likely to become deviant (Hirschi 1969; Wiatrowski, Griswold & Roberts 1981).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Sample Description

This study uses data from The Midwest Study, which was a longitudinal survey that was collected over five years, from 2002 to 2007 in three different states; Illinois, Iowa and Wisconsin (Courtney & Cusick 2007; Cusick et al. 2010). The three states had varying policies for foster care and a range of offered services. The study collected information from 732 respondents during this time through the use of personal interviews. The interviews were done every two years and the study had a total of three waves. All of the respondents were between 17 and 18 at the first wave and all had turned 21 by the end of the interviews. Personally, I am only using data from one wave, which makes my study cross-sectional. Courtney and Cusick's (2007) survey consisted of 85 different variables, ranging from demographic and background variables to delinquency and social bonds variables.

The sample consisted of individuals who had reached the age of 17 while in foster care, had been in foster care at least a year and were placed in foster care because of abuse or neglect, not delinquency. Individuals were randomly selected. Those who were excluded were individuals who had disabilities or mental illnesses that prevented their participation or the individual did not speak English. Of the participants, 52% were female and 48% were male. 57% of the individuals in the survey identified themselves as black, 31% as white and 9% as Hispanic.

Variable Description

In order to test the relationship between deviance and the four elements of Hirschi's social bonds theory, I assess the individuals' bonds to society and thereby explain why these youth who have aged out of foster care are more likely to become deviant.

The concept of *attachment* was measured through use of the scores of the youths' total foster care placements, maternal closeness scale, presence or lack of a mother, paternal closeness scale, presence or lack of a father and caregiver closeness scale. Of 732 responses on total foster care placements, 727 were valid or not lacking information. Of the respondents, 55% had fewer than five placements and 44% had five or more placements (see Table 1). The variable of total foster care placements had a mean of .45. Of 732 total responses, 708 were valid for the variable of maternal closeness. Around 39% of participants said they were not close with their mother while around 58% said they were close with their mother. The mean score of maternal closeness was 2.67 (see Table 2). All 732 responses of presence or lack of a mother were valid, with 88% saying they had mothers and 12% of respondents saying they did not have mothers. The mean of this variable was 0.12 (see Table 3). Only 693 of the total 732 responses to the paternal closeness scale were valid. Around 56% of the respondents were not close to their father, around 39% were close with their father, and the overall mean for this variable was 2.12 (see Table 4). Of the respondents, 78% said they had a father and 22% said they did not. All 732 responses were valid. The mean of this variable was .22 (see Table 5). Around 74% of the respondents said they were close with a caregiver while almost 26% said they

were not. All 732 cases were valid and the mean of this variable was 3.02 (see Table 6). These are adequate measures of attachment because they gauge the individual's closeness with parents and other important adults (Wiatrowski, Griswold & Roberts 1981).

The concept of *commitment* can be measured with the youths' college or beyond plans. Of the participants, 27% did not have college and/or future plans while 71% did. Only 722 of the total cases were valid. The mean of this variable was 0.72 (see Table 7). This is an adequate measure of commitment because it indicates whether the individual is committed to traditional goals (Wiatrowski, Griswold & Roberts 1981).

The concept of *involvement* can be measured by whether the youths are currently in school and/or currently employed. Of the participants, 82% were in school and around 18% were not currently in school. All 732 cases were valid and the mean of this variable was 0.82 (see Table 8). Exactly 35% of the population was currently employed while around 65% were not. All but one case was valid. The mean for the variable of current employment was 0.35 (see Table 9). This is an adequate measure of involvement because it depicts how involved the individual is in traditionally accepted activities that conform to societal expectations (Wiatrowski, Griswold & Roberts 1981).

Belief is a concept that is difficult to operationalize and measure using the data that I have obtained. Due to this, it will be unavailable.

The dependent variables are all measures of deviance. Of the respondents, around 69% reported having committed delinquent acts, while around 31% reported no delinquent acts. All 732 respondents answered this question (see table 10).

Approximately 49% of the respondents did not report violent acts and approximately 11% reported violent acts. Only 438 of 732 total cases were valid for this variable (see table 11). A little over half, 53%, had not been arrested. A little less than half, 46%, had been arrested. Only 728 of the total 732 cases were valid (see table 12). Around 85% of the survey participants did not have living children and around 14% did have living children. Only 726 of the respondents answered this question (see table 13). Exactly 77% of the respondents reported they did not have a mental health diagnosis, while 23% of the respondents reported having a mental health diagnosis. All 732 cases were valid (see table 14). Around 80% of the respondents did not have alcohol and/or drug abuse problems, which means that a corresponding 20% of the respondents did have alcohol and/or drug abuse problems. All 732 respondents answered this question (see table 15).

All of the variables in the Cusick, Courtney, Havlicek and Hess (2010) study were made into dichotomous variables by the authors of the study. This was done in an attempt by the authors to protect the anonymity of the participants. The scale variables were transformed from a scale listing to a “yes” and coded “1”, or “no” and coded “0.” Number of placements was transformed into dichotomous categories of “0-5” (coded as “0”) and “5 or more” (coded as “1”). All variables in the original study, except for the official arrest record, were based on self-reports. The researchers confirmed official arrest records by the respondent’s name, social security number, age, date of birth, race and gender.

Ordinary Least Squares Regression

For the statistical analysis of the study at hand, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression was used. This form of analysis allows one to estimate the effects of the independent variable on the dependent variable after controlling for the effects of all other variables. T Tests were used in order to examine the zero order relationship, or the original relationship without any other influence. The dependent variables in this study are dichotomous, but OLS is robust enough that this should not cause errors in statistical analysis. A stepwise was done for each aspect of Hirschi's (1969) social bond theory. This allowed me to look at the effect of each element of each concept and how this progressively increased the variance explained.

The original study had three waves (Cusick, Courtney, Havlicek and Hess 2010). Due to attrition, however, I used only the first wave in my statistical analysis. This ensured that the largest sample size possible was used.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Attachment

I hypothesized that the greater the attachment of the individual, the less likely he/she was to be deviant. Being close to one's mother and self-reported delinquent acts were positively and significantly related with a coefficient of .022. This means that the closer the individual is to his/her mother, the more likely he/she is to be delinquent. This relationship was significant throughout each step of the stepwise and the coefficient became slightly stronger, changing from .021 in the first step to .022 in the last step (see table 16). Maternal closeness and self-reported violence were very strongly and significantly related at .402. This means that the closer the individual was to his/her mother, the more likely he/she was to report violent acts. This relationship is significant in all four stages of the stepwise and grows in strength from .389 in the first step to .402 in the last (see table 17). In regards to attachment, an individual's mental health problems and total number of placements had a significant relationship and a coefficient of .028 when it was introduced in the final stage. This means that those individuals who had incurred multiple placements were more likely to have a mental health diagnosis (see Table 18). When considering attachment, alcohol and/or drug abuse was significantly related to the individual's maternal closeness. In the first step, the coefficient is -.054 and it decreases until it is at -.047 in the final step but maintains significance. This means that those individuals who had close relationships with their mothers were less likely to have

alcohol and/or drug abuse problems. Also, total number of placements was found significant in the last step with a coefficient of .036. This means that those individuals who had incurred multiple placements were more likely to have alcohol and/or drug abuse problems (see Table 19).

Commitment

I hypothesized that the greater the commitment of the individual, the less likely he/she was to be deviant. College and/or future plans and having a living child were significant in the second stage with a coefficient of .095. In the third stage, the coefficient decreases to .068 but remains significant. This means that those individuals who have college plans and/or future plans were more likely to have living children than those who did not have college and/or future plans. In the final step, college plans loses significance (see table 20).

Involvement

I hypothesized that the greater the involvement of the individual, the less likely he/she was to be deviant. Being currently employed and self-reported delinquent acts show a significant relationship with a coefficient of .067. This means that individuals who were employed were more likely to be delinquent than those who were not employed. This relationship was significant at each level of the stepwise that it was used in. The coefficient, however, declines from .089 in the third step to .067 in the last step when the control variables were added (see Table 16). Employment and self-reported violence have a strong, significant relationship with a value coefficient of .785. This

means that those who were employed were more likely to report violent acts.

Employment is significant in each stage of the stepwise in which it is used. In the third stage, the coefficient is .934 and it drops to .785 in the fourth stage (see Table 17). One's official arrest record and current school enrollment also had a significant relationship of -.168. This negative relationship means that those individuals who were currently in school were less likely to be arrested. This relationship is significant throughout the stepwise. The coefficient increases from -.165 in the third step to -.168 in the fourth step (see Table 21).

Stepwise

When considered together, the attachment variables explained 1.6% of the variance in self-reported delinquent acts. Adding the commitment variables to the equation did not change the percent of variance explained. Adding the involvement variables increased the R^2 to 1.7 and therefore explained 2.9% of the variance. Adding control variables strengthened the variance explained by the equation to 4.5% (see table 16).

The attachment variables explained 4.6% of the variance in self-reported violent acts. Adding the commitment variable changed the variance explained to 4.7%. Stepping the involvement variables in increased the variance explained to 6.1%. In the final step, adding the control variables, the R^2 remained the same (see table 17).

The variance of official arrest records that was explained by the attachment variables was .4%. Adding the commitment variables did not change the explained

variance. After adding the involvement variables in the third step, however, the explained variance was increased to 1.1%. Adding the control variables in the final step of the stepwise, though, greatly increased to variance to 6.7% explanatory power (see table 21).

The variables of attachment explained .8% of the variance in having living children. Adding variables that represented commitment increased the explained variance to 2.5%. Variables that represented involvement were added in the third step and increased the explanatory power to 7%. In the final step, the explanatory power was increased to 10.4% when the control variables were added to the equation (see table 20).

The attachment variables explained .5% of the variance in mental health problems. Adding commitment variables in the second step made the R^2 .6%. The third step of the stepwise, when the involvement variables were introduced to the equation, the variance explained did not change. The fourth step greatly increased the explanatory power of the equation to 7.9% (see Table 18).

Variables representing attachment explained 2.4% of the variance in alcohol and/or drug abuse. The addition of commitment variables slightly decreased the explanatory power of the equation to 2.3%. Adding the involvement variables to the equation increased the variance explained to 3%. In the fourth step, the control variables increased the explanatory power to 7% (see Table 19).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

In this research, I hypothesized that those individuals who have attachment, commitment and involvement will be less likely to be deviant. I hypothesized that it was the presence of a social bond to society that made these individuals less likely to be deviant. My results, however, showed limited support for the theory of social bonds explaining deviance in youth who have aged out of the foster care system.

Surprising Results

Many results were surprising for various reasons. Some relationships were the opposite of the original hypotheses, while other relationships that were not hypothesized existed and had statistical significance. A majority of the hypothesized relationships, however, lacked statistical significance and therefore did not really explain the phenomenon of deviance in youth who age out of foster care. The surprising results are discussed below.

A relationship with one's mother was actually significantly and positively related to deviance. This was the opposite of what I had originally hypothesized as Hirschi's (1969) social bonds theory states that those with attachment will be less likely to be deviant. This means that, for youth who have aged out of foster care, having a close relationship to one's mother increases the likelihood of deviance. This could be due to the fact that the mother is not a positive role model. Therefore, it is possible that it is not just the presence of a relationship to one's parents but perhaps also the kind of relationship,

whether positive or negative, that exists which is really an indicator of future deviance. This is something that future researchers should seek to clarify.

I hypothesized that those individuals who were more involved in conventional activities would be less likely to be deviant. Conversely, those individuals who were involved (i.e.: currently employed and currently in school) were more likely to have children. This is the opposite of what was originally hypothesized. This may be a problem of causation. I hypothesized being involved may prevent having children, when in fact, having children may have occurred first. For example, an individual may have had a child and then sought employment in order to support the child whereas I hypothesized that being employed would have prevented having a child. Future research should include the timing of these events. It should seek to discover which came first: employment, school enrollment, or becoming a parent.

Females reported more violence than males. While this was not part of my original hypotheses, it is an interesting finding. This may be due to the fact that the females were reporting offenses more honestly than males. This could also be a sign that females are more sensitive to violence and are likely to report smaller acts, such as pinching or hair-pulling, as violence where males may be less sensitive to violence and only report larger acts, such as assaults with weapons. Future research should include a scale for the level of violence in order to ascertain whether or not females are more sensitive to violence than males. As per honesty, asking a similar question multiple times in different formats may help allude to dishonest answers about violence.

College and/or future plans were used to indicate commitment to conventional ideas. These plans, however, lacked significance in predicting future deviance in youth who had aged out of foster care. It is possible that a majority of these youth lack college plans since a majority of youth who age out of foster care do not complete high school (Wertheimer 2002). Future researchers may want to include future plans that are more related to employment, having a career, getting a GED, being married and having a family. These are more attainable goals for individuals who have not graduated high school.

Control variables, such as gender and race, often had significant relationships with the dependent variables, or the deviance variables. This was not originally hypothesized and came as a surprise as they are not indicators of a social bond. My results show that gender and race had more bearing on deviance than the aspects of the social bond, as gender and race were statistically significant in nearly every equation.

Policy Implications

Through this research, it was discovered that positive interpersonal relationships have a positive effect on the youth who have aged out of foster care while negative interpersonal relationships have a negative effect on these particular youth. For future policy and programming implications, it would be important that youth who are in foster care maintain strong positive relationships with positive role models. One such positive role model studied in this research was the foster caregiver. Future research could evaluate the role of teachers, counselors, social workers, ministers and other influential

adults. I hypothesize that these individuals may also have positive effects on the social bonds of youth in foster care. As for negative role models, it is important that youth in foster care avoid relationships with people who will damage their social bond with society. In this research, the relationship with the biological mother often negatively influenced the individual. For future policy and programming implications, it would be important that contact with these poor role models be limited. If the state does not terminate the parental rights of the biological parents, then all visits should be supervised by a social worker. This may help prohibit the poor role model from negatively affecting the youth. Future research should also look into the relationships the youth in foster care has with deviant peers. I hypothesize that these deviant peers may also be poor role models and may also damage the social bond of the foster care child.

Multiple placements also showed to be harmful to the individual's social bond. Due to this, in the future, placements should be limited and permanency for the child should be of utmost importance. Permanency would keep the foster care child in the same family, home, school, and with the same social workers. This would help reduce the relationships that are broken during the youth's stay in foster care and could also help reduce trauma to his/her social bond with society.

Gender and race were most often significant factors in an individual's propensity for deviance. Future policy and programming implications may need to include specific counseling and/or programming based on gender and race. This may help deter the more at-risk gender and race from becoming deviant.

As a majority of currently existing aging out programs lack evaluation data, I suggest that these programs be studied and evaluated. This is also true for all of my personal policy and programming suggestions. Efficacy can only be known after the policies and programs have been evaluated and evaluation studies are severely lacking in the area of youth who have aged out of foster care.

Many of the predictions and hypotheses drawn from Hirschi's (1969) social bond theory were proven opposite or insignificant when predicting the future deviance of youth who have aged out of foster care. This theory has limited support when applied to youth who have aged out of foster care. While this theory may be an adequate predictor of deviance for youth in the general population, overall it is not an adequate predictor of deviance in youth who have aged out of foster care according to the data used in this study. In the future, researchers may need to look to different theories in order to adequately explain the large occurrence of deviance in youth who have aged out of foster care.

REFERENCES

- Allen, M. & Nixon, R. (2000). The foster care independence act and John H. Chafee foster care independence program: New catalysts for reform for young people aging out of foster care. *Journal of Poverty Law and Policy*, 7(2), 197-216.
- Avery, R.J. (2009). An examination of theory and promising practices for achieving permanency for teens before they age out of foster care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 32(3), 399-408.
- Badeau, S. & Gesiriech, S. (2003). A child's journey through the child welfare system. Retrieved from [http://www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/Reports/Foster_care_reform/childsjourney\[1\].pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/Reports/Foster_care_reform/childsjourney[1].pdf)
- Best, J. (2004). Deviance. In the *Encyclopedia of Social Theory* online. Retrieved from http://www.sage-ereference.com/socialtheory/Article_n77.html
- Child Welfare League of America. (2012). Programs and resources for youth aging out of foster care. Retrieved from <http://www.cwla.org/programs/fostercare/agingoutresources.htm>
- Cook, R. (1988). Trends and needs in programming for independent living. *Child Welfare*, 67(6), 497-514.
- Courtney, M. & Cusick, G. Crime During the Transition to Adulthood: How Youth Fare as They Leave Out-of-Home Care in Illinois, Iowa and Wisconsin, 2002-2007 [Computer file]. ICPSR27062-v1. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], (2010). doi: 10.3886/ICPSR27062
- Cusick, G., Courtney, M., Havlicek, J., and Hess, N. (2010). Crime during the transition to adulthood: How youth fare as they leave out-of-home care. National Criminal Justice Service.
- Daley, M.R. (1980). Preventing worker burnout in child welfare. *Child Welfare*, 58(7), 443-450.
- Durkheim, E. (1997). *The Division of Labor in Society*. (Higher and Further Education, Trans.) New York, NY: The Free Press. (Original work published 1933).
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.
- Kools, S. M. (1997). Adolescent identity development in foster care. *Family Relations*, 46(3), 263-271.

- Massinga, R. and Pecora, P. J. (2004). Providing better opportunities for older children in the child welfare system. *The Future of Children, 14*(1), 150-173.
- Osgood, D.W., Foster, E.M. and Courtney, M.E. (2010). Vulnerable populations and the transition to adulthood. *The Future of Children, 20*(1), 209-229.
- Reilly, T. (2003). Transition from care: status and outcomes of youth who age out of foster care. *Child Welfare, 40*(1), 727-746.
- Roman, N.P. & Wolfe, N. (1995). *Web of failure: The relationship between foster care and homelessness*. Washington, DC: National Alliance to End Homelessness.
- Wagner, J.O. & Wonacott, M.E. (2008). Youth aging out of foster care. Retrieved from <http://cle.osu.edu/lwc-publications/youth-information-briefs/downloads/Youth-Aging-Out-of-Foster-Care.pdf>
- Wertheimer, R. (2002). Youth who “age out” of foster care: Troubled lives, troubling prospects. Retrieved from <http://www.childtrends.org/Files/FosterCareRB.pdf>
- Wiatrowski, M.D., Griswold, D.B. & Roberts, M.K. (1981). Social control theory and delinquency. *American Sociological Review, 46*(5), 525-541.
- Wulczyn, F., Chen, L., & Hislop, K.B. (2007) *Foster care dynamics 2000–2005: A report from the multistate foster care data archive*. Chicago: Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago.

APPENDIX

TABLES

Table 1

Summary Statistics for Total Placements

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	Less than 5	403	55.1%
1	5 or more	324	44.3%
-9 (M)	Blank	5	0.7%

727 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: .45

Table 2

Summary Statistics for Maternal Closeness

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not close	198	27.0%
2	Not Very Close	86	11.7%
3	Somewhat Close	177	24.2%
4	Very Close	247	33.7%
-9 (M0)	Blank	24	3.3%

708 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: 2.67

Table 3

Summary Statistics for Miss Mom

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	644	88.0%
1	Yes	88	12.0%

732 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: .12

Table 4

Summary Statistics for Closeness to Dad

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not Close	338	46.2%
2	Not Very Close	73	10.0%
3	Somewhat Close	145	19.8%
4	Very Close	137	18.7%
-9 (M)	Blank	39	5.3%

693 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: 2.12

Table 5

Summary Statistics for Miss Dad

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	571	78.0%
1	Yes	161	22.0%

732 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: .22

Table 6

Summary Statistics for Caregiver Closeness

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
1	Not Close	154	21.0%
2	Not Very Close	33	4.5%
3	Somewhat Close	187	25.5%
4	Very Close	358	48.9%

732 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: 3.02

Table 7

Summary Statistics for College or Future Plans

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	200	27.3%
1	Yes	522	71.3%
-9 (M)	Blank	10	1.4%

722 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: .35

Table 8

Summary Statistics for Current School Enrollment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequency	%
0	No	130	17.8%
1	Yes	602	82.2%

732 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: .82

Table 9

Summary Statistics for Employment

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequencies	%
0	No	475	64.9%
1	Yes	256	35.0%
-9 (M)	Blank	1	0.1%

731 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: 0.35

Table 10

Summary Statistics for Self-Reported Delinquency

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequencies	%
0	No	228	31.1%
1	Yes	504	68.9%

732 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: .69

Table 11

Summary Statistics for Self-Reported Violent Acts

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequencies	%
0	No	356	48.6%
1	Yes	82	11.2%
-9 (M)	Blank	294	40.2%

438 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: .21

Table 12

Summary Statistics for Official Arrest Record

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequencies	%
0	No	391	53.4%
1	Yes	337	46%
-9 (M)	Blank	4	.5%

728 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: .46

Table 13

Summary Statistics for Living Children

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequencies	%
0	No	624	85.2%
1	Yes	102	13.9%
-9 (M)	Blank	6	.8%

726 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: .14

Table 14

Summary Statistics for Mental Health Diagnosis

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequencies	%
0	No	564	77%
1	Yes	168	23%

732 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: .23

Table 15

Summary Statistics for Alcohol and/or Drug Abuse

Value	Label	Unweighted Frequencies	%
0	No	588	80.3%
1	Yes	144	19.7%

732 of 732 Valid Cases

Mean: .2

Table 16

Self-reported Deviance by Social Control Variables & Control Variables

	Step 1 (N = 732)	Step 2 (N = 732)	Step 3 (N = 732)	Step 4 (N = 732)
Close to Caregiver	-.001 (.015)	.000 (.015)	-.003 (.015)	.001 (.015)
Close to Mom	.021 * (.009)	.021 * (.009)	.022 * (.009)	.022 * (.009)
Miss Mom	-.049 (.056)	-.049 (.056)	-.050 (.056)	-.038 (.055)
Close to Dad	-.003 (.008)	-.003 (.008)	-.004 (.008)	-.005 (.008)
Miss Dad	-.058 (.043)	-.057 (.043)	-.061 (.043)	-.053 (.043)
College Plans		-.013 (.014)	-.021 (.014)	-.020 (.014)
Employed			.089 * (.03)	.067 * (.030)
In School			-.006 (.045)	-.003 (.045)
Gender				-.104 * (.034)
Total Placements				-.001 (.019)
White				.065 (.037)
R ²	.016	.017	.029	.045

* signifies statistical significance

Table 17

Self-reported Violent Offense by Social Control Variables & Control Variables

	Step 1 (N = 732)	Step 2 (N = 732)	Step 3 (N = 732)	Step 4 (N = 732)
Close to Caregiver	.054 (.14)	.061 (.140)	.016 (.141)	.063 (.142)
Close to Mom	.389 * (.085)	.390 * (.085)	.403 * (.085)	.402 * (.085)
Miss Mom	-.279 (.536)	-.272 (.536)	-.291 (.533)	-.182 (.531)
Close to Dad	-.006 (.073)	-.006 (.073)	-.012 (.073)	-.023 (.072)
Miss Dad	-.336 (.413)	-.330 (.413)	-.369 (.410)	-.305 (.409)
College Plans		-.111 (.135)	-.200 (.137)	-.201 (.138)
Employed			.934 * (.283)	.785 * (.291)
In School			.128 (.432)	.160 (.43)
Gender				-.956 * (.329)
Total Placements				.079 (.182)
White				.611 (356)
R ²	.046	.047	.061	.061

* signifies statistical significance

Table 18

Mental Health Issues by Social Control Variables & Control Variables

	Step 1 (N = 732)	Step 2 (N = 732)	Step 3 (N = 732)	Step 4 (N = 732)
Close to Caregiver	-.003 (.013)	-.004 (.013)	-.004 (.014)	.007 (.013)
Close to Mom	.013 (.008)	.013 (.008)	.013 (.008)	.013 (.008)
Miss Mom	.028 (.051)	.027 (.051)	.027 (.051)	.050 (.049)
Close to Dad	-.008 (.007)	-.008 (.007)	-.008 (.007)	-.011 (.007)
Miss Dad	-.040 (.039)	-.041 (.039)	-.041 (.039)	-.029 (.038)
College Plans		.009 (.013)	.008 (.013)	.007 (.013)
Employed			.017 (.027)	-.018 (.027)
In School			-.008 (.041)	-.001 (.04)
Gender				-.197 * (.031)
Total Placements				.028 * (.017)
White				.128 (.033)
R ²	.005	.006	.006	.079

* signifies statistical significance

Table 19

Alcohol and/or Drug Abuse by Social Control Variables & Control Variables

	Step 1 (N = 732)	Step 2 (N = 732)	Step 3 (N = 732)	Step 4 (N = 732)
Close to Caregiver	-.054 (.012) *	-.054 (.012) *	-.051 (.013) *	-.047 (.012) *
Close to Mom	-.014 (.008)	-.014 (.008)	-.015 (.008) *	-.012 (.007)
Miss Mom	-.014 (.048)	-.014 (.048)	-.012 (.048)	-.016 (.046)
Close to Dad	.009 (.006)	.009 (.006)	.009 (.006)	.008 (.006)
Miss Dad	.024 (.037)	.024 (.037)	.025 (.037)	.022 (.038)
College Plans		-.003 (.012)	-.003 (.012)	.002 (.012)
Employed			.017 (.025)	-.009 (.025)
In School			-.080 (.039) *	-.070 (.038)
Gender				.064 (.029) *
Total Placements				.036 (.016) *
White				.164 (.031) *
R ²	.031	.031	.037	.088

* signifies statistical significance

Table 20

Living Children by Social Control Variables & Control Variables

	Step 1 (N = 732)	Step 2 (N = 732)	Step 3 (N = 732)	Step 4 (N = 732)
Close to Caregiver	.007 (.028)	.001 (.028)	-.007 (.028)	.012 (.028)
Close to Mom	.028 (.017)	.027 (.017)	.030 (.017)	.027 (.017)
Miss Mom	.125 (.108)	.119 (.107)	.117 (.105)	.137 (.103)
Close to Dad	.001 (.015)	.001 (.015)	-.000 (.014)	.001 (.014)
Miss Dad	-.087 (.083)	-.092 (.083)	-.101 (.081)	-.100 (.08)
College Plans		.095 * (.027)	.068 * (.027)	.050 (.027)
Employed			.320 * (.056)	.286 (.057)
In School			-.135 (.085)	-.134 (.084)
Gender				-.197 (.064)
Total Placements				.126 (.036)
White				-.176 (.069)
R ²	.008	.025	.07	.104

* signifies statistical significance

Table 21

Official Arrest Record by Social Control Variables & Control Variables

	Step 1 (N = 732)	Step 2 (N = 732)	Step 3 (N = 732)	Step 4 (N = 732)
Close to Caregiver	-.015 (.027)	-.015 (.027)	-.004 (.027)	-.017 (.027)
Close to Mom	.011 (.017)	.011 (.017)	.009 (.017)	.012 (.016)
Miss Mom	.051 (.104)	.051 (.104)	.056 (.104)	.013 (.101)
Close to Dad	-.017 (.015)	-.017 (.014)	-.016 (.014)	-.012 (.014)
Miss Dad	-.085 (.080)	-.084 (.080)	-.078 (.08)	-.105 (.078)
College Plans		-.005 (.026)	.004 (.027)	.007 (.026)
Employed			-.067 (.055)	-.036 (.056)
In School			-.165 * (.084)	-.168 * (.082)
Gender				.400 * (.063)
Total Placements				.016 (.035)
White				-.109 (.068)
R ²	.004	.004	.011	.067

* signifies statistical significance

Table 22

Attachment Variables by Self-reported Delinquent Acts

Close to Caregiver	-.000 (.015)	.004 (.015)
Close with Mom	.020 (.009) *	.021 (.009) *
Miss Mom	-.493 (.056)	-.037 (.055)
Close with Dad	-.003 (.008)	-.005 (.008)
Miss Dad	-.058 (.051)	-.051 (.043)
Gender		-.109 (.034) *
Total Placements		.006 (.019)
White		.080 (.055) *
R ²	.016	.036

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 23

Commitment Variables by Self-reported Delinquent Acts

College Plans	-.012 (.014)	-.014 (.014)
Gender		-.121 (.034) *
Total Placements		.005 (.019)
White		.074 (.037) *
R ²	.001	.023

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 24

Involvement Variables by Self-reported Delinquent Acts

Employed	.075 (.029) *	.064 (.030) *
In School	-.019 (.045)	-.014 (.044)
Gender		-.113 (.034) *
Total Placements		-.006 (.019)
White		.067 (.037)
R ²	.009	.028

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 25

Attachment Variables by Self-reported Violent Acts

Close to Caregiver	.053 (.140)	.106 (.140)
Close with Mom	.389 (.085) *	.392 (.085) *
Miss Mom	-.279 (.536)	-.164 (.533)
Close with Dad	-.006 (.073)	-.019 (.073)
Miss Dad	-.337 (.413)	-.280 (.410)
Gender		-1.009 (.328) *
Total Placements		.157 (.178)
White		.755 (.353) *
R ²	.046	.065

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 26

Commitment Variables by Self-reported Violent Acts

College Plans	-.095 (.138)	-.112 (.138)
Gender		-1.171 (.332) *
Total Placements		.106 (.181)
White		.659 (.360)
R ²	.001	.022

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 27

Involvement Variables by Self-reported Violent Acts

Employed	.794 (.283) *	.675 (.290) *
In School	-.015 (.436)	.063 (.433)
Gender		-1.100 (.332) *
Total Placements		.002 (.183)
White		.591 (.361)
R ²	.011	.028

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 28

Attachment Variables by Arrest Event

Close to Caregiver	-.015 (.027)	-.027 (.027)
Close with Mom	.011 (.017)	.014 (.016)
Miss Mom	.051 (.104)	.008 (.101)
Close with Dad	-.017 (.014)	-.013 (.014)
Miss Dad	-.085 (.080)	-.110 (.078)
Gender		.403 (.062) *
Total Placements		.014 (.034)
White		-.110 (.067)
R ²	.004	.061

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 29

Commitment Variables by Arrest Event

College Plans	-.006 (.026)	-.002 (.026)
Gender		.392 (.062) *
Total Placements		.016 (.034)
White		-.111 (.067)
R ²	.000	.056

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 30

Involvement Variables by Arrest Event

Employed	-.068 (.054)	-.041 (.054)
In School	-.168 (.083) *	-.179 (.081) *
Gender		.391 (.062) *
Total Placements		.019 (.034)
White		-.110(.067)
R ²	.008	.063

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 31

Attachment Variables by Living Children

Close to Caregiver	.007 (.028)	.029 (.027)
Close with Mom	.028 (.017)	.026 (.017)
Miss Mom	.125 (.108)	.148 (.106)
Close with Dad	.001 (.015)	.002 (.014)
Miss Dad	-.087 (.098)	-.089 (.081)
Gender		-.235 (.065) *
Total Placements		.175 (.035) *
White		-.141 (.070) *
R ²	.008	.061

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 32

Commitment Variables by Living Children

College Plans	.096 (.027) *	.075 (.027) *
Gender		-.228 (.064) *
Total Placements		.155 (.035) *
White		-.131 (.070)
R ²	.017	.061

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 33

Involvement by Living Children

Employed	.342 (.055) *	.307 (.056) *
In School	-.133 (.084)	-.126 (.083)
Gender		-.209 (.064) *
Total Placements		.124 (.035) *
White		-.192 (.069) *
R ²	.053	.091

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 34

Attachment Variables by Mental Health Diagnoses

Close to Caregiver	-.003 (.013)	.006 (.013)
Close with Mom	.013 (.008)	.014 (.008)
Miss Mom	.028 (.051)	.050 (.049)
Close with Dad	-.008 (.007)	-.011 (.007)
Miss Dad	-.040 (.039)	-.029 (.038)
Gender		-.196 (.030) *
Total Placements		.026 (.016)
White		.124 (.032) *
R ²	.005	.078

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 35

Commitment Variables by Mental Health Diagnoses

College Plans	.009 (.013)	.006 (.013)
Gender		-.194 (.030) *
Total Placements		.024 (.016)
White		.122 (.033) *
R ²	.001	.073

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 36

Involvement Variables by Mental health Diagnoses

Employed	.017 (.026)	-.014 (.026)
In School	-.012 (.041)	.001 (.039)
Gender		-.196 (.030) *
Total Placements		.027 (.017)
White		.122 (.033) *
R ²	.001	.073

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 37

Attachment Variables by Alcohol and/or Drug Abuse

Close to Caregiver	-.054 (.012) *	-.050 (.012) *
Close with Mom	-.014 (.008) *	-.011 (.007)
Miss Mom	-.014 (.048)	-.018 (.046)
Close with Dad	.009 (.006)	.008 (.006)
Miss Dad	.024 (.037)	.020 (.036)
Gender		.064 (.029) *
Total Placements		.036 (.016) *
White		.165 (.031) *
R ²	.031	.083

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 38

Commitment Variables by Alcohol and/or Drug Abuse

College Plans	-.006 (.012)	-.004 (.012)
Gender		.057 (.029) *
Total Placements		.044 (.016) *
White		.170 (.031) *
R ²	.000	.058

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 39

Involvement Variables by Alcohol and/or Drug Abuse

Employed	.009 (.025)	-.019 (.025)
In School	-.098 (.038) *	-.086 (.037) *
Gender		.057 (.029) *
Total Placements		.045 (.016) *
White		.170 (.031) *
R ²	.009	.066

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 40

T Test: Self-reported Deviance (Wave 3)

	Yes	No
Close to Caregiver	3.024	3.022
Close to Mom	2.456	1.908
Close to Dad	1.617	1.320

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732

Table 41

T Test: Alcohol and/or Drug Abuse

	Yes	No
Close to Caregiver	2.646 *	3.116 *
Close to Mom	2.007	2.534
Close to Dad	1.528	1.524

* signifies statistical significance

N = 732