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INTRODUCTION

Research suggests that there has been a misrepresentation by the general public and media regarding Hispanics and crime (Harrisburg and Harrisburg 2004; Dowler 2003; Dixon and Linz 2000). Often times, minorities are portrayed negatively and disproportionately associated with crime and delinquency (Romer, Jamieson, and DeCoteau 1998; Sorenson, Manz, and Berk 1998; Turk 1989). However, studies regarding Hispanics and crime have shown mixed findings. Some studies have linked Hispanic ethnicity to delinquency, violent behavior, and other risky behaviors (Felson, Deane, and Armstrong 2008; Haynie and Payne 2006; McNulty and Bellair 2003). While other research has shown that Hispanic ethnicity is not associated with criminal activity and in fact, acts as a protective factor (Germán, Gonzales, and Dumka 2009; Brook, Whiteman, Balka, and Gursen 1998). The literature suggests that these mixed results might be due to Hispanics’ generational status (first vs. third generation) (Driscoll, Russell, and Crockett 2007; Buriel, Calzada, and Vasquez 1982). For instance, Morenoff and Astor (2006) state that crime rates were alarmingly high among second-generation immigrants, compared to first-generation immigrant. Similarly, Gibson and Ventura Miller (2008) have found that both second and third-generation Hispanics were more likely to offend than their first-generation counterparts. Of the studies done in this area, criminality has often been analyzed using non-foreign born compared to foreign-born Hispanics or across different generational statuses (Morenoff and Astor 2006).
In an effort, to contribute to this literature drawing from the theoretical framework of the social disorganization theory, this analysis explored how neighborhood conditions and collective efficacy also affect children’s positive development and delinquency. I also explored how acculturated primary caregivers affect Hispanic adolescents’ positive development, conceptualized through the five Cs and delinquent behaviors.

*Social Disorganization Theory*

During the 1920s and 1930s, researchers at the University of Chicago were increasingly concerned with the effect that growing urbanization, industrialization, and immigration were having on the social organization of Chicago Neighborhoods (Kurbin and Weitzer 2003). Two researchers in particular, Park and Burgess (1925) studied how dramatic changes of the time were affecting the city. With backgrounds in human ecology, Park and Burgess suggested that the struggle for resources, especially land, led to competition between groups and the division of the space. Wanting to advance the research done by Park and Burgess, Shaw and McKay (1942) demonstrated how crime the response to social, structural, and cultural characteristics of a community. They discovered that rates of crime were not evenly dispersed across time and space in the city. Instead, crime tended to be concentrated in particular areas of the city, and importantly, remained relatively stable within these concentrated areas despite continual changes in the populations living in each area. Shaw and McKay also found that a higher proportion of immigrants resided in these areas that were characterized by problems such as poverty, high
population turnover, and heterogeneity. These conditions of the neighborhood made immigrants susceptible to crime and delinquency. Shaw and McKay (1942) also revealed that the immigration and crime link was not based on racially inherited traits or individuals, but instead on the structural makeup of the neighborhoods in which they lived.

More, recent studies have found other contributing factors in addition to those in the social disorganization theory that impact individuals’ crime or delinquency rate (Sampson, Morenoff, and Raudenbush 2005). Sampson et al. (2005), used data from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN) and argued, “there are markers for a constellation of external and malleable social contexts that are differentially allocated by racial/ethnic status in American society” (page 224). In other words, Sampson et al. believed that race and ethnicity did not cause violence, instead their social conditions influenced the likeliness of participating in criminal acts. For instance, the prevalence of single-parent households, lack of financial resources, and the geographic concentration of poverty and reduced informal community controls influence the likelihood of participating in criminal activities. Their hypotheses were that these social contexts differently affected racial/ethnic minority groups and in turn influence “violence-inducing or violence-protecting condition” (page 224). The study sampled 2974 participants from three race/ethnic groups: whites, blacks, and Latinos living in varying neighborhood environments. Their results revealed that blacks were 85% more likely than whites to commit a violent act and Latinos were 10% lower. The study also found that several protective factors against violence including: residing in neighborhoods with residents that are employed in professional and managerial jobs or a higher concentration of immigrants. Overall, Sampson et al. (2005) found that the marital status of the adolescents’ parents, the
presence of professionals and managers, whether the adolescent first- or second-generation, and the concentration of immigrants in a neighborhood accounted for most of the difference in youth violent crime rates.

Zhou and Bankston (1994) have also found that immigrant cultural orientation had a significant positive influence on youth. Zhou and Bankston (1994) demonstrated how immigrant cultural orientation served as a form of social capital that facilitated access to benefits and resources and positively contributed to adolescents’ school achievement and afterward, despite living in a disadvantaged, impoverished community. Using data obtained from a case study on Vietnamese youth in a disadvantaged area of New Orleans, Zhou and Bankston found that students with strong obedience to their traditional family values and work ethic, and those involved in their ethnic communities were disproportionately receiving better grades and had definite college plans. So, how does the prevalence of immigrants in a community or adherence to ethnic identity and traditional family values positively impact adolescents despite living in troubled neighborhoods? Zhou and Bankston note, “in disadvantaged neighborhoods where difficult conditions and disruptive elements are often found, immigrants families may have to consciously preserve traditional values by means of ethnic solidarity to prevent the next generation from assimilating into the underprivileged segments of American society in which their community is located” (page 841). Therefore, the perseverance of ethnic identity and traditional beliefs is may operate as a protective factor for adolescents. Thus, my study will explore if the presence of Hispanic identity functions as a protective factor against delinquency among adolescents in Chicago neighborhoods.

*Collective Efficacy*
Collective efficacy focuses specifically on social organization and cohesion in neighborhoods. Sampson et al., (1997:919) defines collective efficacy as the combination of “mutual trust and willingness to intervene for the common good.” Research on collective efficacy finds that it is related to crime and delinquency, and that collective efficacy mediates the effects of neighborhood disadvantage and disorder on crime (Sampson and Raudenbush 2001/1999; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). In particular, Wikstrom and Sampson (2003) argued that delinquent and criminal behavior among adolescents is moderately influenced by the level of collective efficacy present in the neighborhood. Sampson et al. (1997) also found that violence, violent victimizations, and homicides varied by neighborhood collective efficacy. Their study found that higher rates of collective efficacy was associated with lower rates of violence and mediated the relationship between neighborhood structural characteristics (i.e., concentrated disadvantage and residential mobility) and crime (Sampson et al. 1997). Similarly, Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn (2000) found that neighborhood collective efficacy is one pathway through which neighborhood effects, such as neighborhood SES and peer influences, impact adolescent outcomes.

Hispanic Acculturation

Early immigration research focused on the effects of assimilation difficulties on European immigrants in America (Sommers, Fagan, and Baskin 1993; Sellin 1938; Thomas and Znaniecki 1927). Since then, researchers have shifted their attention to focus on Hispanics, the largest and fastest growing minority population in the United States. Recent research on Hispanic immigrants emphasizes the role of acculturation as a major factor in all aspects of Hispanic life in the United States (Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Acculturation refers to the process of change that occurs when culturally distinct groups and individuals come into contact with another
culture (Berry and Kim 1988). Cultural change occurs on a number of dimensions for acculturating individuals. It may include the gradual incorporation of the language, cultural beliefs, values, and behaviors of the dominant society, as well as changes in one’s loyalty and sense of belonging to the host culture and to one’s culture of origin (Samaniego and Gonzales 1999; Berry 1980).

Much of the early literature on Hispanic acculturation investigated the effects on individuals’ mental health (Chappin and Brook 2001; Aldrich and Vargiya 2000; Kaplan and Marks 1990; Burnam, Hough, Karko, Escobar, and Telles 1987; Caetano 1989; Buriel, Calzada, and Vasquez 1982). Burnam et al. (1987) examined the relationship between acculturation and specific psychiatric disorders. They studied the lifetime existence of eight major DSM-III mental disorders among Mexican adults in the Los Angeles area. They found that higher levels of acculturation were associated with higher lifetime ratings of phobia, alcohol abuse or dependence, and drug abuse or dependence. Also, Mexican immigrants indicated having lower rates of disorders than native-born Mexican, despite the possibility of stress associated with lower income and education and living in disadvantaged neighborhoods. Many other studies have found that foreign-born immigrants tend to have a lower prevalence of psychiatric disorders (Grant, Dawson, Stinson, Chou, Dufour, and Pickering 2004), psychosocial disorders (Griffith 1985), psychological distress (Kaplan and Marks 1990), and substance abuse disorders (Burnam et al. 1987). Use of drugs and alcohol are also more common among native-born Hispanics than foreign-born immigrants. Literature has also linked higher levels of American acculturation to the use of alcohol (Caetano 1987; Gilbert 1987; Neff, Hoppe, and Perea 1987), marijuana (Amaro, Coffman, and Heeren 1990; Bonn-Miller, Vujanovic, and Zvolensky 2008), inhalants
There is a growing literature on acculturation and its effect on criminological factors including gang membership (Lopez and Brummett 2003; Bonn-Miller, and Moos 2009), domestic violence victimization (Denham, Frasier, Hooten, Belton, Newton, Gonzalez, Begum, Campbell 2007; Grzywacz, Rao, Gentry, Marin, and Arcury 2009; Hazen and Soriano 2007), fear of crime (Brown and Benedict 2004), self-reported violence (Morenoff and Astor 2006), as well as delinquency (Lopez and O’Donnell-Brummett 2003; Marsiglia, Kulis, and Hecht 2001; Wong 1999; Szapocznik and Kurtines 1993; Touliatos and Lindholm 1980). Specifically focusing on delinquency, there are several explanations why acculturation may impact delinquency rates.

Some studies find that more acculturated adolescents who become involved with others and in activities outside the family domain have weakened/fewer traditional values and norms than their parents, which makes them more likely to engage in deviant behavior (Matsueda and Heimer 1987; Patterson and Stouthamer-Loeber 1984; Oetting and Beauvais 1986; Patterson, DeBaryshe, Ramsey 1989; Reuschenberg and Buriel 1989; Szapocznik and Kurtines 1993). Samaniego and Gonzales (1999) examined the relationship between acculturation and delinquency and found a mediating effect of family conflict, parenting practices, and deculturated ethnic identity. Using a sample of 214 Mexican students between the ages of 12 and 15, Samaniego and Gonzales found that acculturation status was positively correlated with delinquency. Of the seven variables they examined, four of them specifically mediated the effect of acculturation on delinquency. These four variables included: family conflict, inconsistent discipline, maternal monitoring, and negative peer hassles. Samaniego and Gonzales provide an
explanation for how families mediate the relationship between acculturation and delinquency. They state, “It is possible that there are factors, such as shared family values, that operate to prevent conflict and child aggression within more traditional (i.e., less acculturated) families, thus reducing the likelihood that adolescents will become involved in delinquency” (page 203). Similarly, Marin and Marin (1991) found that there were less interpersonal conflicts in less acculturated Mexican families because of their strong family ties and this contributed to the adolescents’ respectable social relationships.

The literature regarding adolescents, neighborhoods, and acculturation found consistent findings with that of Sampson et al. 2005. Desmond and Kubrin (2009) used a sample of 200 students in the 7th-12th grade from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health and examined how high levels of immigrants in a neighborhood acted as a protective factor against violence among various immigrant groups. Their results revealed that immigration concentration in a community did in fact reduce adolescent violence. They found that adolescents living rates of neighborhoods with a large number of immigrants reported fewer acts of violence. Thus, immigrant concentration was a significant predictor, even after controlling for traditional measures of neighborhood context and individual-level factors. Therefore, immigrant concentration represents an important aspect of community context that inhibits youth violence.

Positive Youth Development

Much of the literature regarding adolescent acculturation either focuses on their mental health, delinquency, or academic progress. To date, there are no studies that examine how acculturation impacts adolescents’ positive youth development, specifically their Five C’s. Thus, my study will help to fill the gap in this literature.
The Positive Youth Development (PYD) perspective places neighborhoods at the center focus, but unlike the social disorganization theory the focus is on how communities influence youth promotion and intervention. Positive youth development seeks “to promote healthy development to foster positive youth outcomes; focus on the whole child; focus on the achievement of developmental tasks; and focus on interactions with family, school, neighborhood, societal, and cultural contexts” (Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak, and Hawkins 2004:1). PYD argues that adolescents should be seen as individuals with potential to contribute positively to society and not as problems needing to be fixed (Lerner, Lerner, Almerigi, Theokas, Phelps, Gestsdottir, Naudeau, Jelicic, Alberts, and Ma 2005). PYD emphasizes the importance of focusing on youths’ strengths, instead of their risk factors to ensure that all youth grow up to become contributing adults (Benson 2006). Positive youth development is predicated on the notion that adolescents have certain assets that facilitate the development of individual abilities, academic skills, social functioning, and mental health, all of which are necessary for the transition to adulthood and becoming a productive member of society. According to practitioners and reviews of the adolescent development literature, (Eccles and Gootman 2002; Lerner 2004; Roth and Brooks-Gunn, 2003), the “five Cs” (competence, confidence, connection, character, and caring) are used as a way of conceptualizing PYD. These five Cs develop when adolescents are aligned with positive, growth promoting resources (Lerner et al. 2005). Specifically, Little (2000) and Lerner, Dowling and Anderson (2003) believe that when adolescents possesses all five Cs, a sixth C emerges. The sixth C is contribution and suggests that an adolescent with all five Cs will contribute “positively to self, family, community, and, ultimately, civil society” (Lerner et al. 2003 p. 23). Therefore, I can believe that adolescents that possess all or most of the five Cs will be less delinquent.
METHODOLOGY

This study aims to explore, through secondary data analysis, whether Hispanic acculturated parents, neighborhood disorder, and collective efficacy impact adolescents’ positive development, as conceptualized through the five Cs (character, caring, connection, competence, and confidence), and delinquency.

Hypotheses

Based on the information provided from the literature review above I can hypothesize that acculturation will act as protective factor against delinquency despite any neighborhood disorder present or low neighborhood socioeconomic status or low collective efficacy present. Specifically, I hypothesize that consistent with previous research:

(H1) Adolescents with less acculturated parents will be less delinquent, controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status.

(H2) Adolescents with less acculturated parents will have greater positive youth development, controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status.

(H3) At the individual level, adolescents with less acculturated parents that live in neighborhoods with more physical/social disorder will be less delinquent, controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status.

(H4) At the individual level, adolescents with less acculturated parents that live in neighborhoods with more physical/social disorder will have greater positive youth development, controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status.
Data

For this study, I used secondary survey data from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN) (Sampson, Sharkey, and Raudenbush 2008; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997; Tonry, Ohlin, and Farrington 1991). The PHDCN is a large-scale, interdisciplinary study of how certain factors such as families, schools, and neighborhoods affect youth and adolescent development (Tonry, Ohlin, and Farrington 1991). The PHDCN was designed to advance the understanding of the developmental pathways of both positive and negative human social behaviors (Sampson 2012). The PHDCN examined the pathways to juvenile delinquency, adult crime, substance abuse, and violence, and also provided a detailed look at the environments in which these social behaviors take place by collecting substantial amounts of data about urban Chicago, including its people, institutions, and resources (Sampson 2012).

The PHDCN study consists of four major components: the Longitudinal Cohort Study (LCS), Community Survey (CS), Infant Assessment Units (IAU), and Systematic Social Observation (SSO). The current project will incorporate data from the Longitudinal Cohort Study, the Community Survey, and the Systematic Social Observation components of the PHDCN.

The data from the Longitudinal Cohort Study was collected in three waves over a period of seven years from a sample of children, adolescents, young adults, and their primary caregivers. The study provided the changing circumstances of their lives and the personal characteristics that may lead them towards or away from a variety of antisocial behaviors. The age cohorts include birth, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 18 years. Data was collected at three points in time: 1994-1997, 1997-1999, and 2000-2001. Numerous measures were administered to respondents
to gauge various aspects of human development, including individual differences, as well as family, peer, and school influences (Marz and Stamatel 2005). The response rate for the Longitudinal Cohort Study was 75%.

The Community Survey gathered information from adult residents of Chicago on their perceptions of the neighborhoods in which they live. The survey questionnaire was a multidimensional assessment of the structural conditions and organization of the neighborhoods. Data collection consisted of a household interview of residents aged 18 and older to assess key neighborhood dimensions, including the dynamic structure of the local community, organizational and political structure, cultural values, informal social control, formal social control, and social cohesion. The Community Survey interviewed 8,782 adult Chicago residents across 342 neighborhood clusters. The Community Survey response rate was 78% in the 80 neighborhoods and 73% in the city of Chicago overall.

The Systematic Social Observation recorded the community social organization of the 80 sub-sample neighborhoods. The SSO measured the physical, social, and economic characteristics of neighborhoods, one block at a time (Earls and Visher 1997). A team of six observers attached video recorders to vans and captured the visual/physical conditions and social interactions and activities present in neighborhoods between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., seven days a week from June to October of 1995. The team videotaped 80 of the 343 neighborhood clusters.

This thesis focused on cohorts aged 12 and 15 from Wave One of the Longitudinal Cohort Study. I limit my analysis to include only these two cohorts because I am primarily interested in the perceptions of these age groups and these adolescents in this age range are particularly susceptible to engaging in delinquent behaviors or acts (Moeller, Barratt, Dougherty, Schmitz, and Swann 2001; Moffitt 1993). Also adolescents in this age range will be able to
respond on their own behalf for key variables, rather than relying on responses from primary caregivers. I excluded several racial/ethnic groups so that my sample only included Hispanics. The two cohorts (12 and 15) from Wave One that reported being Hispanic resulted in a sample of 558. Of these adolescents 273 are female and 285 are male. The average age of respondent was 13.56 (SD=1.51). In regards to the socioeconomic composition of the neighborhoods, 43% of the respondents lived in low SES neighborhoods, another 43% lived in medium SES neighborhoods, and 14% resided in high SES neighborhoods.

**Dependent Variables**

**Delinquency**

This thesis examined outcomes related to delinquency and positive development. Delinquency was constructed from the youth’s self-report of ever engaging in 7 types of illegal or criminal behavior. The Youth Self Report was developed by Achenbach (1991) to assess the internalizing and externalizing behaviors in adolescents in a standardized format. The index for delinquency was created using questions from the Youths’ Self-Report that asked respondents now or within the past six months if they had ever: carried a hidden weapon, caused trouble in a public place so that people complained about it, such as being loud or disorderly, purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you, purposely set fire to a house, building, car, or vacant lot, entered or broken into a building with the intention to steal, stolen something from a store, and were they ever in trouble with the police. Due to the distribution of the variable, I dummy coded it, with adolescent reporting 1 or more deviant acts labeled delinquent (coded 0) and those reporting no deviant activities not delinquent (coded 1).

**Positive Development**
The construct of positive development was created using outcomes that related to adolescents’ Five C’s (caring, character, competence, confidence, and connection). Drawing from Lerner’s (2005) working definitions of the Five Cs of positive youth development and Bowers, Li, Kiely, Brittian, Lerner, and Lerner (2010) scale of the Five Cs, I used questions from the Youths’ Self-Report to create a similar index for positive development. Caring was constructed from the respondents’ response to willing to help others and likes to help others. These items were summed and recoded where 0 signified an adolescent that is not caring and 1 indicated an adolescent that is caring. Character was conceptualized from the responses to I am friendly and I am honest. These items were summed and recoded where 0 signified an adolescent that did not possess good character and 1 indicated an adolescent with good character. The responses that represented competence was can work well with my hands and schoolwork is poor, which were recoded into good schoolwork. These items were summed and recoded where 0 signified an adolescent that is not competent and 1 indicated an adolescent that is competent. Confidence was represented through the question am I self-conscious, which was recoded to I am self-assured and do I feel worthless or inferior, which I also recoded to I feel worthy. These items were summed and recoded where 0 signifies an adolescent that is not confident and 1 indicates an adolescent that is confident. Lastly, connection was constructed through the questions do you keep from getting involved with others, which was recoded to keeps involved with others and enjoys being with others. These items were summed and recoded where 0 signified an adolescent that is not connected and 1 indicated an adolescent that is connected. Each C was summed to create a Global 5C measure with a range from 0 to 5 and recoded into 0 signifying poor positive development and 1 indicating youth with positive development.

Independent Variables
Hispanic Acculturation

In terms of the independent measures, I focused on Hispanic acculturation, neighborhood disorder, and collective efficacy. Hispanic acculturation was similarly coded the way Burnam et al. (1987) constructed their Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans. The variables included covered language familiarity and usage, ethnic interaction, and activities reflecting culture lifestyle. The information was derived from the demographic and culture interview of the PHDCN, in which interviewers obtained information relevant to race/ethnicity and family acculturation. Hispanic acculturation was measured from the demographic information obtained from the primary caregivers. Primary caregivers were asked: what was their first language learned, their primary language now, the language they spoke most with their child, the language they spoke with their friends, what was the language of the television programs they watched, what was the language of the radio stations listened to, and how good they consider their English to be.

Neighborhood Disorder

The independent variable neighborhood disorder was measured using five items that represent physical disorder in a neighborhood. Neighborhood disorder was derived from the Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment (HOME) Interview. The PHDCN version of HOME is a semi-structured interview in which the primary caregiver were asked about daily routines, other activities, and the ways that the home environment was structured to accommodate the child’s needs. Observational items about the interior and exterior physical environment were added and included questions taken from the Systematic Social Observational Checklist (Selner-O'Hagan, Kindlon, Buka, Raudenbush, and Earls 1998). The five items used to assess neighborhood disorder were: the condition of the buildings in face-block, the condition of
the street in face-block, was their garbage or broken glass in the street or sidewalk, was their drug, alcohol, or cigarette litter in the street or sidewalk, and how did the primary caregiver feel about parking, walking, and waiting in the neighborhood. These items were summed with a range from 0 to 6 and then recoded into 0 signifying neighborhood disorder and 1 indicating no neighborhood disorders.

Collective Efficacy

The data for Collective Efficacy came from the Community Survey, which was derived from the combination of the social cohesion scale and social control scale (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). A five-item Likert-type scale measured social cohesion. Respondents were asked how strongly they agreed that people around here are willing to help their neighbors, this is a close-knit neighborhood, people in the neighborhood can be trusted, people in this neighborhood generally don’t get along with each other, and people in this neighborhood do not share the same value. The social control scale was also created from a five-item Likert-type scale. Respondents were asked about the likelihood that their neighbors could be counted on to intervene in various ways if children were skipping school and hanging out on a street corner, children were spray-painting graffiti on a local building, children were showing disrespect to an adult, a fight broke out in front of their house, and the fire station closest to their house was threatened with budget cuts. These two sub-scales were added together to create the Collective Efficacy scale (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997).

Demographic Variables

I included several demographic variables in the model, since past research shows that delinquency varies across certain social categories. The current study included: gender, parental education, parental income, family structure, and neighborhood socioeconomic status control
variables. Gender was coded onto two variables females (0) and males (1). Primary caregiver’s highest educational attainment was coded into less than high school (1), some high school (2), high school graduate (3), more than high school (4), and bachelor’s degree or higher (5). Parental Caregiver (PC) income was coded into seven ranges: 1=less than $5000; 2=$5,000-$9,999; 3=$10,000 to 19,999; 4=$20,000 to 29,999; 5=$30,000 to 39,999; 6=$40,000 to 49,999; 7=$50,000 or higher. Family structure was coded into two family structure groups: the adolescent lives with both biological parents (coded 1) or lives in some other family arrangement (coded 0). Neighborhood level socioeconomic status (SES) was coded as low, medium, and high, with a range of 1-3.

Analytic Strategy

I used the statistical program STATA 13 (STATA Corporation 2013) to analyze data and run frequencies and descriptive statistics for all the variables. First, I ran independent t-test and chi square analyses to assess whether Hispanic acculturation, neighborhood disorder, and collective efficacy significantly affected adolescent participation in delinquent acts. In determining if difference were significant I set the probability level at p<.05. Due to the clustered nature of the PHDCN data, I closely followed the methodology used by Sampson and colleagues (2005) and performed a multilevel logistic regression analyses to estimate the effect of acculturation and neighborhood disorder on adolescents delinquency and positive development, using the xtmelogit routine in STATA 13. Since my dependent variables (delinquency and positive youth development) were dichotomous, it was sensible to perform this multilevel logistic regression analyses. Regarding my models, the first level included the individual-level variables: Hispanic acculturation the demographic variables: age, gender, parental education,
parental income and family structure, and neighborhood disorder. The second level included the neighborhood socioeconomic status and collective efficacy.

Model 1:
Level 1:
\[ Y(\text{DE})_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{HA}_{ij}) + \beta_{2j}(\text{DEMO}_{ij}) + e_{ij} \]
Level 2:
\[ \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}\text{CE}_j + \gamma_{01}\text{SES}_j + u_{0j} \]
\[ \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + u_{1j} \]

This model allowed me to test the effect of acculturation (HA) and demographic (DEMO) on delinquency (DE). Hypothesis 1 will be supported if lower scores of Hispanic acculturation are significantly related to lower levels of delinquency, controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status.

Model 2:
Level 1:
\[ Y(\text{PYD})_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{HA}_{ij}) + \beta_{2j}(\text{DEMO}_{ij}) + e_{ij} \]
Level 2:
\[ \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}\text{CE}_j + \gamma_{01}\text{SES}_j + u_{0j} \]
\[ \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + u_{1j} \]

This model allowed me to test the effect of acculturation (HA) and demographic (DEMO) on positive youth development (PYD). Hypothesis 2 will be supported if lower scores of Hispanic acculturation are significantly related to higher levels of positive youth development, controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status.

Model 3:
Level 1:

\[ Y(\text{DE})_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{HA}_{ij}) + \beta_{2j}(\text{ND}_{ij}) + \beta_{3j}(\text{HA}_{ij} \ast \text{ND}_{ij}) + \beta_{4j}(\text{DEMO}_{ij}) + e_{ij} \]

Level 2:

\[ \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}\text{CE}_{j} + \gamma_{01}\text{SES}_{j} + u_{0j} \]

\[ \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + u_{1j} \]

This model allowed me to test the effect of acculturation (HA), neighborhood disorder (ND), and demographic (DEMO) on delinquency (DE). Specifically, it tested how the relationship between acculturation and delinquency will be different depending on the level of neighborhood disorders. Hypothesis 3 will be supported if the interaction between lower Hispanic acculturation and lower neighborhood ratings is significantly related to lower levels of delinquency controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status.

Model 4:

Level 1:

\[ Y(\text{PYD})_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{HA}_{ij}) + \beta_{2j}(\text{ND}_{ij}) + \beta_{3j}(\text{HA}_{ij} \ast \text{ND}_{ij}) + \beta_{4j}(\text{DEMO}_{ij}) + e_{ij} \]

Level 2:

\[ \beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}\text{CE}_{j} + \gamma_{01}\text{SES}_{j} + u_{0j} \]

\[ \beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + u_{1j} \]

This model allowed me to test the effect of acculturation (HA), neighborhood disorder (ND), and demographic (DEMO) on positive youth development (PYD). Specifically, it tested how the relationship between acculturation and positive youth development will be different depending on the level of neighborhood disorders. Hypothesis 4 will be supported if the interaction between lower levels of Hispanic acculturation and lower levels of neighborhood ratings is
significantly related to higher levels of positive youth development controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status.
RESULTS

Descriptive Findings

As shown in Table 1, 53% of my sample was from cohort 12 and 47% were from cohort 15. Of these adolescents 49% were female and 51% were male. The average age of respondent was M=13.56, SD=1.51. In regards to the socioeconomic make up of the neighborhoods, 86% of the respondents lived in low to medium SES neighborhoods. Also, more than half of the adolescents 59% lived with both biological parents. In regards to the primary caregivers, 55% of them had less than a high school education and half of them earned between $10,000-$29,999 per year. Looking at the acculturated variables, 79% of the primary caregiver’s reported that English was not their primary language. Similarly, 90% of the primary caregivers interviewed stated that English was not the first language they were introduced to, 82% of the primary caregivers reported that they did not speak English to their children, 78% did not speak English to their friends, 71% of them reported watching television programs that were not English, 51% listened to radio stations that were not in English, and 64% of the primary caregivers believed they did not speak English well. Regarding the two dependent variables, 63% of adolescents reported not engaging in delinquent acts and 51% were developing positively.

Multilevel Logistic Regression Results

Multilevel logistic regression analysis was performed to predict how adolescents’ primary caregiver acculturation level impacted adolescents’ delinquency and positive youth
development. Four particular hypotheses were made regarding how acculturation impacted delinquency and positive youth development. The first hypothesis stated adolescents with less acculturated parents would be less delinquent, controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status. The second hypothesis predicted that adolescents with less acculturated parents would have greater positive youth development, controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status. Thirdly, at the individual level, adolescents with less acculturated parents that live in neighborhoods with more physical/social disorder would be less delinquent, controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status. Lastly, I hypothesized that at the individual level, adolescents with less acculturated parents that live in neighborhoods with more physical/social disorder would have greater positive youth development, controlling for neighborhood-level collective efficacy and socioeconomic status.

Table two revealed the results for the multilevel regression analysis of Hispanic acculturation predicting delinquency. The overall model was statistically significant, indicating that the Hispanic acculturation did have an effect on delinquency ($X^2 = 42.63$, effect on delinquency $p=0.000$). Consistent with the first hypothesis, table two revealed that controlling for all other factors, adolescents with less acculturated parents were significantly less likely to be delinquent. In general, for every unit increase in acculturation, adolescents were 1.19 times more likely to be delinquent [1.06, 1.34]. Table two also revealed that inconsistent with the third hypothesis, adolescents with less acculturated parents that live in neighborhoods with more physical/social disorder were not less delinquent. Table two also showed that consistent with previous research (Forehand et al. 1997; Nakaie, Silverman, and LaGrange 2000) age and sex also significantly affected adolescents’ delinquency. Table three revealed the results for the multilevel regression
analysis of Hispanic acculturation predicting delinquency. The overall model was not statistically significant (Wald’s $X^2=16.10, p=0.097$). Therefore, contrary to what was hypothesized, results revealed that adolescents with less acculturated parents did not have greater positive youth development ($b = 0.058, p = 0.796$) and adolescents with less acculturated parents that lived in neighborhoods with more physical/social disorder did not have a greater positive youth development ($b = 0.040, p = 0.612$)
CONCLUSION

Drawing from the theoretical framework of the social disorganization, the present study sought to explore how primary caregivers’ level of acculturation affected Hispanic adolescents’ positive development, conceptualized through the five Cs and delinquency, as well how neighborhood conditions and collective efficacy also affect adolescents’ positive development and delinquency. Much of the early literature on Hispanic acculturation investigated the effects on individuals’ mental health (Chappin and Brook 2001; Aldrich and Varyiam 2000; Kaplan and Marks 1990; Burnam, Hough, Karno, Escobar, and Telles 1987; Caetano 1989; Buriel, Calzada, and Vasquez 1982). This literature found that foreign-born tended to have a lower prevalence of psychiatric disorders, psychosocial disorders, psychological distress, and substance abuse disorders hence the Hispanic Paradox. Literature also revealed that a higher level of acculturation was associated with higher use of alcohol, inhalants, cigarettes, and cocaine (Burnam et al. 1987; Grant, Dawson, Stinson, Chou, Dufour, and Pickering 2004; Griffith 1985; Kaplan and Marks 1990). The effect of the acculturation process on adolescents’ delinquent behavior has also received considerable research attention in recent decades (Lopez and Brummett 2003; Bonn-Miller, and Moos 2009). In general, researchers have found that that more acculturated adolescents have weakened/fewer traditional values and norms than their parents making them more likely to engage in deviant behavior (Matsueda and Heimer 1987; Patterson and Stouthamer-Loeber 1984; Oetting and Beauvais 1986; Patterson, DeBaryshe, Ramsey 1989; Reuschenberg and Buriel 1989; Szapocznik and Kurtines 1993).
Much of the literature regarding adolescent acculturation has focused on adolescents’ mental health, delinquency, or academic progress. To date, there are no studies that examine how acculturation impacts adolescents’ positive youth development, specifically their Five C’s. My study attempted to fill the gap in this literature. Positive youth development is a philosophy that emphasizes the importance of focusing on youths’ strengths, instead of their risk factors to ensure that all youth grow up to become contributing adults (Benson 2006). Building on the available positive youth development research and theory, Pittman (1999) offered the model of the five Cs as a framework for understanding positive youth development outcomes. The five Cs consist of confidence - a sense of self-worth and mastery; having a sense of self-efficacy (belief in one's capacity to succeed), character - taking responsibility; a sense of independence and individuality; connection to principles and values, connection - a sense of safety, structure, and belonging; positive bonds with people and social institutions, competence - the ability to act effectively in school, in social situations, and at work, and caring - a sense of sympathy and empathy for others; commitment to social justice (Pittman 1999; Lerner 2007).

Using secondary survey data from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (PHDCN) I explored whether Hispanic acculturated parents, neighborhood disorder, and collective efficacy impacted adolescents’ positive development, as conceptualized through the five Cs and delinquency. Due to the clustered nature of the PHDCN data, I closely followed the methodology used by Sampson and colleagues (2005) and performed a multilevel logistic regression model that estimated the effect of acculturation. My analysis found that similar to previous research (Lopez and O’Donnell-Brummett 2003; Marsiglia, Kulis, and Hecht 2001; Wong 1999; Szapocznik and Kurtines 1993; Touliatos and Lindholm 1980) acculturation did have an effect on adolescents’ delinquency. In general, adolescents with less acculturated
parents were significantly less likely to be delinquent. However, regarding adolescents’ positive 
youth development, my study found that acculturation did not have an impact on their positive development.

Limitations and Future Direction

All of my findings need to be considered within the context of the study’s limitations. First, in my current study, I measured each five C only using two variables from the PHDCN in doing so I potentially limited my findings. Perhaps if I had measured each five C using four to five variables I would have a stronger measure for each C and could have possibly drawn different results. Moving forward, I plan to rerun my analysis with more than two variables per C. My second limitation involved my acculturation measure. The PHDCN only assessed primary caregivers’ acculturation level. Therefore, I was limited to examining how primary caregivers’ level of acculturation impacted their adolescents. Perhaps, had I mean able to measure the adolescent’s level of acculturation I would have drawn different results. Lastly, the data I used was collected specifically in Chicago, which limits the generalizability of my findings. Despite my limitations, it is essential to continue this study and to begin to narrow done why lower levels of acculturation is protecting adolescents from being involved in delinquency.

Moving forward, I would like to continue to further explore Hispanic acculturation and the positive youth development movement. Currently, psychologists primarily study the positive youth development framework, however, it is important that sociologists join the conversation and contribute to this literature as well. In my study, I found that Hispanic acculturation did not have an effect on positive youth development. Despite this finding, it is important to explore why it is that Hispanic acculturation did not impact positive youth development. Also my study solely focused on the five Cs of positive youth development. Moving forward, I would like to also
examine the developmental assets, a widely used framework for promoting positive youth development. Perhaps with the inclusion of the developmental assets and the five Cs, I will have a better measurement of positive youth development and will draw different results.
Table 1: Characteristics of Cohorts 12 and 15 from PHDCN Hispanics only, Wave 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (code)</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>298 (53%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>260 (47%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (1)</td>
<td>239 (43%)</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1.82 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (2)</td>
<td>240 (43%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (3)</td>
<td>79 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Caregiver Country of Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>2 (.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>402 (73%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>98 (18%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4 (.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>14 (2.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Central America</td>
<td>18 (3.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8 (1.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (0)</td>
<td>273 (49%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (1)</td>
<td>285 (51%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>11.53-15.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.56 (1.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Caregiver’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school (1)</td>
<td>325 (58%)</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1.95 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school (2)</td>
<td>94 (18%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished high school (3)</td>
<td>39 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some beyond high school (4)</td>
<td>74 (14%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA or more (5)</td>
<td>26 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Caregiver’s Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5,000 (1)</td>
<td>49 (9.2%)</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.81 (1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-9,999 (2)</td>
<td>46 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-19,999 (3)</td>
<td>171 (31%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-29,999 (4)</td>
<td>130 (24%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-39,999 (5)</td>
<td>82 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000-49,999 (6)</td>
<td>41 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50,000 (7)</td>
<td>39 (7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family structure (0)</td>
<td>227 (41%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives with two bio parents (1)</td>
<td>331 (59%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Caregiver Primary Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not English</td>
<td>443 (79%)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>115 (21%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Caregiver First Language Learned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not English</td>
<td>499 (90%)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>58 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Not English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Primary Caregiver Speaks w/ Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not English</td>
<td>410 (82%)</td>
<td>90 (18%)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Primary Caregiver Speaks w/ Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not English</td>
<td>389 (78%)</td>
<td>111 (22%)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Primary Caregiver Watches on TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not English</td>
<td>350 (71%)</td>
<td>140 (29%)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Primary Caregiver Listens to on the Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not English</td>
<td>253 (51%)</td>
<td>244 (49%)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Caregiver Thinks he/she Speaks English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Well</td>
<td>322 (64%)</td>
<td>178 (36%)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Collective Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.09-8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>342 (63%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>201 (37%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>265 (49%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>276 (51%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Multilevel Logistic Regression for Hispanic Acculturation Predicting Delinquency (n=474).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds Ratio (OR)</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>Odds Ratio (OR)</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Acculturation</td>
<td>1.19**</td>
<td>1.06-1.34</td>
<td>1.20**</td>
<td>1.06-1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.41***</td>
<td>1.23-1.61</td>
<td>1.41***</td>
<td>1.23-1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.60*</td>
<td>1.07-2.41</td>
<td>1.61*</td>
<td>1.07-2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.93-1.23</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.94-1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Caregiver Education</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.83-1.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.83-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Caregiver Income</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.90-1.22</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.90-1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Rating</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.65-1.36</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.64-1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation x Neighborhood Rating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.89-1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood SES</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.57-1.21</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0.57-1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.90-2.33</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.90-2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05      **p<.01      ***p<.001
Table 3: Multilevel Logistic Regression for Hispanic Acculturation Predicting Positive Youth Development (n=473)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds Ratio (OR)</td>
<td>95% CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Acculturation</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.90-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.79-1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.41-0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Structure</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.97-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Caregiver Education</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.89-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Caregiver Income</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.88-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Rating</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>0.58-1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation x Neighborhood Rating</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood SES</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.71-1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.66-1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001
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