

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &  
Professional Papers

Graduate School

---

2010

# DO TRADITIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL VARIABLES APPLY THE SAME IN AMERICAN INDIAN COMMUNITIES? A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION, SOCIAL BOND, AND SOCIAL LEARNING VARIABLES ON DELINQUENCY AND SUBSTANCE USE AMONG MERICAN INDIAN, WHITE, AND OTHER RACE YOUTH

Wendy Linn Running Crane  
*The University of Montana*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

---

### Recommended Citation

Running Crane, Wendy Linn, "DO TRADITIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL VARIABLES APPLY THE SAME IN AMERICAN INDIAN COMMUNITIES? A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION, SOCIAL BOND, AND SOCIAL LEARNING VARIABLES ON DELINQUENCY AND SUBSTANCE USE AMONG MERICAN INDIAN, WHITE, AND OTHER RACE YOUTH" (2010). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 333.  
<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/333>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

DO TRADITIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL VARIABLES APPLY THE SAME IN AMERICAN  
INDIAN COMMUNITIES?  
A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL DISORGANIZATION, SOCIAL BOND,  
AND SOCIAL LEARNING VARIABLES ON DELINQUENCY AND SUBSTANCE USE  
AMONG AMERICAN INDIAN, WHITE, AND OTHER RACE YOUTH

By

Wendy L. Running Crane

B.A., The University of Montana, Missoula, MT, 2007

THESIS

presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

Master of Interdisciplinary Studies  
in Sociology, Statistics, and Indian Law

The University of Montana  
Missoula, MT

Spring 2010

Approved by:

Dr. Perry Brown, Assistant Provost  
Graduate School

Dr. Dusten Hollist, Chairperson  
Sociology

Dr. Raymond Cross  
Law

Dr. David Patterson  
Mathematics

Dr. Daniel Doyle  
Sociology

**Do Traditional Sociological Variables Apply the Same in American Indian Communities?  
A Comparison of the Effects of Social Disorganization, Social Bonding, and Social  
Learning Variables on Delinquency and Substance Use among American Indian, White,  
and Other Race Youth**

Chairperson: Dusten Hollist, PhD

The history and current situations of American Indians are unique and important arenas to forward the study of crime and delinquency. There may be no better group available to study the combined effects of concentrated disadvantage, social disorganization, and abrupt societal change than the modern day American Indian community. But do traditional variables constructed to test sociological theories fit the study of this population? Findings from hypotheses testing the differences in overall effects of social control, social disorganization, social bonding, and social learning variables on delinquency and substance use suggest that there are differences in their ability to account for the variation among respondents of American Indian, White, and other racial backgrounds. The effect of social control variables for American Indian youth substance use and delinquency was particularly important. Social learning and social control variables were consistently strong predictors of delinquency and substance use for all races, while social bond variables were not. This might simply mean that not only are the variable models not adequate explanations for the patterns reported by AI youth, but they might not be adequate for any of the youth regardless of their race. But it could also indicate differences in worldview and the understanding of indicators used to measure variables. These findings support the applicability of some theoretical variables for the research of American Indians, but suggest that there are key differences that merit further attention in the literature, policy, and practice.

## DEDICATION

First, I dedicate this thesis to the Amskapi Pikuni youth of the Blackfeet Nation. I know that in your time our society will recover from wounds of the past to rediscover who we are as a Nation; and that your generation will lead us boldly into the future as a stronger, healthier people.

Next, I dedicate this thesis to my own children. Brooke and Chaniel, my twin daughters, you blessed my life with unconditional love at the young age of 17. I know you can overcome any obstacle and reach your dreams anyway. Ally you have already overcome things in your life that nobody should ever have had to face. You have proven yourself to be a strong Amskapi Pikuni woman. Without you, I wouldn't have looked so hard at the things our youth have to deal with. I am proud of the mothers and women you have become. You have so much to offer the world and I cannot wait to see you bloom. Thank you for your words of encouragement and faith in me. Dakota and Ethan, my sons, you are the light of my life. Through you I have learned to laugh at anything and everything, which is a key to coping with the harsh realities of life. Don't ever lose your sweet innocence, big dreams, good hearts, and self-confidence. Thank you for always being there for me; for helping me get through school by being my right hand men. You have so many gifts to offer- natural born leaders. To my tiniest little light- Fierra Sky- you came to me at a time in my life when I needed you the most with your soft little heart and beautiful smile. You were born in a time of hope and change and I know you can do whatever you set your mind to. I love you all so much!

Next, I dedicate this thesis to my grandchildren Aimalea, Shayden, and Shaina Sure Chief; Payton and Kyler Grant; Sienna Belle Gobert and future grandchildren- I dedicate this thesis to you in hopes that research like this will begin to improve things for you. I love you so much and I will always, always be here for you.

To my nieces and nephews I dedicate this thesis and pray that they will all find the courage and strength to follow in my footsteps and get an education. To Lil' Bob Burns and all those who we have lost along the way, I know you are there watching over us and giving us the courage to fight for something better.

I dedicate this thesis to my mother, Charlene Burns; my brother Lockley Bremner; and sisters Lona Burns and Dana Bremner, who let me believe that all things are possible, that I am worthy and capable of being whatever I want to be, that I can make a difference. I am proud of all you and love you so much.

To my husband Stephen Lee Running Crane, thanks for your love and support and being there for me to take care of the little things. Thanks for being you. I will love you always and pray that you will also find the road of your dreams.

Lastly, to my ancestors I dedicate this thesis. Thank you for having the foresight to see that education would be the key to our future. I am proud to carry on the heritage that you passed on to me. To Ih-sta-pa-ta-pi-opa, thank you for being there to guide and watch over me and for blessing my life with many blessings.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge Professor Dusten Hollist for his encouragement, support, and respect shown for me and my culture throughout my graduate program and this thesis project. I would also like to acknowledge the rest of my committee for their support and leadership: Professors Daniel Doyle, David Patterson, and Raymond Cross (an excellent Native American role model at UM).

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Penelope Kukuk and the SAPAI Program staff, Rachel Smith and Linda Mauer. Penny, thank you for everything you have done to help recruit, foster, and encourage Native American student scientists and for being a friend of my family. The SAPAI Program has been very important in helping me complete my thesis; and in gaining job, research, and grant-writing experience.

I would like to acknowledge the Bridges, TRAIN, and SAPAI staff, especially my fellow Blackfeet- Mom, Velden Calica, Vernon Grant, Kim Paul, Dr. Iris Prettypaint; and especially my newly adopted little sister, Aislinn Heavyrunner-Rioux, for being my role model and helping me navigate the entire process; and fellow SAPAI Scholars. Thanks for your help, friendship, and peer review.

I would like to acknowledge the UM Graduate School- especially Dr. Patrick Weasel Head and Dr. Sandy Ross, and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation for their support and encouragement of Native American students, including myself. Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the Blackfoot Project, Confederated Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska, The University of Montana Native American Studies, Sociology, and American Indian Student Services faculty and staff and the Helen Roberti Foundation for their support of my education. Thank you.

## VITA

Wendy Linn Bremner Running Crane, whose Blackfeet name is Aa-ky-ah-koi-ini-maa-kii (Many Pipes Woman), was born on October 28, 1969 and raised in Browning, Montana on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation.

Wendy's parents are Lockley Charles and Traci Redstone Bremner of St. Ignatius, Montana and Charlene Ann Bird and Robert H. Burns Sr. of Babb, Montana. Her parents-in-law of many years are Ronald and Shirley Running Crane of Browning, Montana.

Her paternal grandparents are Robert and Rita Bremner both of Browning, Montana; and maternal grandparents are the late Charles Anthony Bird of Browning, Montana; and Vicky Ulven Reichert of Sun City, Arizona. Wendy has one brother- Lockley Joseph Bremner and two sisters- Lona Bremner Burns and Dana Bremner; and one brother-in-law of many years, Richard Running Crane.

In 1989, Wendy married Stephen Lee Running Crane of Browning, Montana. They are the parents of six children: Brooke, Chaniel, Allyson, Dakota, Ethan, and Fierra Running Crane and currently the grandparents of six grandchildren: Aimalea, Shayden and Shaina Sure Chief; Payton and Kyler Grant; and Sienna Belle Gobert- all of Browning, Montana.

Wendy is an enrolled member of the Confederated Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska and a descendant of the Blackfeet Nation. She graduated with honors in 1988 from Browning High School.

Wendy received an associate's degree in Human Services: Criminal Justice from the Blackfeet Community College in Browning, Montana, graduating with honors in 2005. She received a bachelor's degree in Sociology with a Criminology emphasis, and a minor in Native American Studies from The University of Montana in Missoula, Montana in 2007.

This thesis project is the completion of Wendy's 2010 master's degree in Interdisciplinary Studies combining the disciplines of Sociology, Statistics, and Indian Law, from The University of Montana Graduate School.

Wendy is an Alfred P. Sloan Scholar, Students to Academic Professoriate for American Indians (SAPAI) Scholar, Blackfoot Project Scholar, and Helen Roberti Graduate Fellow.

## Table of Contents

<b>1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 The Blackfoot Paradigm.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.2 Historical Context.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>2.1 Social Disorganization Theory.....</b>	<b>23</b>
2.1a Social Control.....	24
2.1b Concentrated Disadvantage.....	25
<b>2.2 Social Learning Theory.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>2.3 Social Bond Theory.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3 LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3.1 Social Control and American Indians.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3.2 American Indians and Social Learning.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3.3 American Indian Youth Delinquency and Substance Use.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>4 RESEARCH STATEMENT.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>5 DATA AND MEASURES.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>5.1 Data.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>5.2 Measures.....</b>	<b>33</b>
5.2a Dependent Variables.....	33
5.2b Independent Variables.....	34
5.2c Control Variables.....	35
<b>6 STATISTICAL METHODS.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>6.1. Logic of the Analyses.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>7 RESULTS.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>7.1 Descriptives.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>7.2 Bi-variate Results.....</b>	<b>39</b>
7.2a Table 1 Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero Order Correlations.....	40
<b>7.4 Multi-variate Results.....</b>	<b>41</b>
7.4a Table 2 The Effects of SLT, SDT, and SBT Variables on Delinquency and Substance Use.....	41
<b>7.6 Hypothesis Two Results.....</b>	<b>43</b>
7.6a Racial/Sub-sample Group Analysis.....	43
<b>7.6b Table 3 The Effects of Social Controls, Social Bonding,             Social Learning, and Social Disorganization Variables             On Past Twelve Month Delinquency.....</b>	<b>43</b>
7.6c Table 4 The Effects of Social Controls, Social Bonding Social Learning, and Social Disorganization Variables On Lifetime Substance Use.....	45
<b>7.7 Hypothesis Three Results.....</b>	<b>46</b>

7.7a Analysis of Co-variance.....	46
7.7b Table 5 Analysis of Covariance Tests of the Differences in the Effects of SBT, SDT, and SLT Variables on Past Twelve Month Delinquency.....	47
7.7c Table 6 Past 12 mo. Delinquency Post Hoc Tests of the Differences in informal social control, delinquent peers, and Pro-delinquent attitudes.....	48
7.7d Table 7 Lifetime substance use Post Hoc Tests of the Differences in informal social control, formal social control, Delinquent peers.....	49
<b>8 DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>9 REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>APPENDIX A- SCALED VARIABLES.....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>APPENDIX B- Montana Prevention Needs Assessment Survey.....</b>	<b>70</b>



## CHAPTER ONE

### *Introduction*

Examining social structures of other societies enables researchers to remove themselves from the constraints of the proverbial box to find new solutions to old social problems in their own societies. Yet, rarely do criminologists in the United States look beyond western culture and society (Quinney 1991). Studying American Indian tribes offers unique insight into many of the questions we have about why people commit or do not commit crime, but inclusion of this group in research is usually only as an afterthought to studies that focus on other racial/ethnic groups. The vast majority of research that includes American Indians was designed with the general American population in mind (Heavyrunner-Rioux and Hollist 2008). This is a problem because it becomes impossible for the researcher to determine whether measured differences are really attributable to the variables or whether they are just attributable to differences in understandings of the indicators used to measure those variables. In addition, although traditional theories may help explain a significant portion of social problems for American Indian populations, they have only been shown to be generalizable in Western (Euro-American) settings with very few examples in a non-Western (non Euro-American) culture (Heavyrunner-Rioux and Hollist 2008).

For scientists who wish to conduct meaningful research on minority groups, it is difficult but extremely important to set aside assumptions that often support group oppression by perpetuating false information or hasty generalizations that could be taken out of context of that group's world (Waters 2004). In the hierarchy of Western knowledge, Tribal thought processes have been relegated to the primitive stage in a perceived evolution of knowledge (Little Bear

2000, Deloria 2004). In reality, it is not that Tribal knowledge is any less important or doesn't exist; it is that Western knowledge has often been privileged to the point of exclusion of any other ways of knowing.

It is difficult to conduct research on American Indian populations without first understanding the cultural context, or the worldview, from which American Indians see the world and how their unique history and political position within U.S. society has affected and still affects the world in which they live. Measures used to test theories and research methods have been largely built and designed from a Euro-American worldview, making them problematic to apply to non-Euro-American populations. To begin to understand the differences, one must first acknowledge that there *is* a difference.

How is American Indian thought different from Western thought, and what are the ramifications of these differences for the effectiveness of research on this group? Setting “an ideological context (Deloria 2004)” from which we can understand the American Indian worldview is a place to begin this discussion. To try to understand these differences, we will compare and contrast one American Indian worldview, the Blackfoot paradigm.

#### The Blackfoot Paradigm

In contrast to a common Euro-American belief that there is a plan and an order for the universe, the Blackfoot believe the universe is in constant flux. The pre-determined worldview of European belief can be demonstrated in a famous quote from Albert Einstein, “God does not play dice with the universe”. In the Blackfoot view, the only constant is change. The Blackfoot worldview includes a Creator, but the Creator is not seen as having everything pre-ordained. By their own actions, people and other beings are seen as playing a part in shaping the future. This reflects the “meaning-shaping principle of action” that Yazzie Burkhart (2004) talks about when

he says that we participate in the meaning making of the world rather than the world being an empty and meaningless bundle of cold, hard facts from which we measure our action. Because the world is in constant flux, knowledge is never completely knowable. We can only be involved in the process of knowledge, but we will never come to know it all because the all is not certain and will never be certain.

Everything in the Blackfoot paradigm is made up of energy waves in contrast to the Euro-American view that everything is made up of particles and matter. Each person is made up of a unique combination of energy waves that are referred to as spirit. All people, and all living things, share part of the make-up of these combinations so that we are all connected; we are all relations.

Since we are all part of shaping action and everything is made up of energy, our words contain action-creative power. Thus the questions researchers choose to pursue must have some meaning or reasoning that relates to the needs of American Indian communities or it could be seen as worthless and even dangerous. It could be taken as a sign of confusion for a researcher to pursue anything perceived as meaningless questions. Further, there are some things that American Indians believe should not be known, even when they could probably be found (Yazzie Burkhart 2004:18), because the very involvement in seeking it could create it. So with that in mind, American Indians would probably not want to answer questions exploring topics like death (Yazzie Burkhart 2004) or anything else perceived to be negative.

The questions we chose to ask are more important than any truths we might hope to discover in asking such questions, since how we act impacts the way the world is, the way in which a question will get answered. The way in which we ask questions (the way in which we act toward our relations) guides us, then, to the right answers, rather than the other way around wherein what is true directs the method of questioning and the question itself (i.e., we can ask any question we desire and in any way we desire, and the answer will remain the same) (Yazzie Burkhart 2004:16).

It is expected that a person conducting research seeks knowledge through the proper sources first- the ceremonial leaders who have received the rights to share this knowledge. The “belief practice thus could embody the community’s moral concern for the proper care we should take with respect to what we claim to believe and understand (DuFour 2004:38).” In American Indian tradition, it is inappropriate to speak of things that have not come to be understood through actual experience or ceremonial transfer of knowledge (DuFour 2004, Bastien 2004). Thus, research is invalid in the American Indian world unless the researcher took the time to receive the knowledge properly, through the proper transfers or from the proper source.

Honesty plays an extremely important role in this paradigm, and to understand this there is a need to explain the difference in the concepts of time. In contrast to the specific relativity of time in the Euro-American worldview, the Blackfoot worldview favors general relativity. What that means is that there is no dependence on a certain body (e.g. the Earth’s rotation around the Sun) that determines when things will happen. Time is only a measurement, it is not a law. Time is also circular, rather than linear, which means it always happens again and again. How this plays out is that for the Blackfoot thinker there are certain consequences of any action- whatever is done will eventually come back on the actor. A common Euro-American belief is that things will eventually be forgotten with the passage of time. In Euro- American tradition time heals wounds, erases memories, and brings distance between who exists today and who existed in the past and in the future for the Euro-American thinker. Like the waters of a stream passing by, the Euro-American believes the past is gone forever and will not be back.

For the Blackfoot thinker, ancestors and descendants are but two days away from the now; and their energy, assistance, and knowledge can always be accessed. Knowledge or memories are never lost because they can be sought out again. Knowledge received in dreams

and visions from ancestors and spirit helpers are as real to the Blackfoot thinker as experimental or observational knowledge because of this time/distance concept.

In the Blackfoot worldview, everything is animate because everything is made up of energy waves which are always in motion. Man does not have dominion over the earth, the animals, or anything else in the universe; he is merely a part of the universe. Man is actually the younger brother of things that have been here longer, like the land, the mountains, and the animals that hold much more knowledge through experience with the energy flux. Everything is about our relationships with these other energy forces/spirits (Bastien 2006).

Differences in understandings must be examined through language differences also, even if English has become the Blackfoot child's first language. English is a categorization-type language that seeks to differentiate "dog" from "non-dog". The word dog does not tell the listener anything at all about what the dog is, what he looks like, or does. Blackfoot is an action and process-oriented language. Therefore, the Blackfoot word for dog is *li-mii-taa*, literally translated as "a four-legged being of some kind that is constantly on the move (Little Bear 2010)." Blackfoot language reflects the belief in constant flux; it is extremely adaptable to change and readily accepts notions of transformation. It is difficult to put descriptive language words in a dictionary as words are descriptions of what the person is seeing at that moment. Imagine the frustration of the Blackfoot children who were forced to speak English in Boarding School as they still thought in descriptive verb-based terms but had to use categorical noun-based terms to say what they were thinking. Today, the way the English language is used by American Indian speakers still reflects this difference in thought so that American Indian students often struggle to speak "proper" English as required by school curriculums designed for the general English-speaking population.

For the outside observer, it would be a fallacy to think that just because American Indians today often practice Euro-American traditions they have given up their worldview altogether and have been assimilated. Because the American Indian worldview is very inclusive and adaptable to change, it was and is extremely possible for them to fold new things into their own paradigm. An example of this is the synchronistic way American Indians have folded Christianity into their own belief systems.

Much to the dismay and chagrin of the local missionaries and governmental officials, this practice made sense to the Native people, given their inclusive worldview. Individual tribal members would both go to the traditional ceremonies and attend the Christian church services on Sunday, believing that the practice of both religions had something of value and merit, and that the practice of both could only enhance an individual's religious and spiritual life (Smith 2004:120).

Western thought favors empirical knowledge- meaning rational, measurable, and physically testable knowledge. American Indian knowledge also favors empirical knowledge, but this does not discount the “existence of real but nonphysical things (Deloria 2004:7)” such as knowledge transferred through dreams and visions, the existence of spirits, and the belief that all things are animate. American Indian thought attempts to “understand the nature or essence of things, rather than specific discovery of ideas, concepts, or laws. This does not mean the exclusion of rational thought, but the inclusion of heart and being with rational perception to move beyond the surface understanding of a thing to a relationship which includes all aspects of one's self (Cajete 2004:55).”

American Indians are contextual thinkers, and therefore concepts like law, science, immediate family, or truth do not exist in the same way that they do for non-American Indian thinkers. Concepts like these arose in the context of European thought and tradition and may not have meaning, or the same meaning, in American Indian cultures. “To pretend that one can interpret a particular idea from an alien context without understanding that context is to engage

in misinterpretation, i.e. to make such ideas “plausible” only to those who think like ourselves (Cordova 2004:28).” This becomes particularly important in the operationalization stage in research. Questions and variables must be understood in the context they will be understood by those being researched or they have no meaning at all.

For American Indians, the passing on of stories, songs, rites, medicine, and power establish boundaries for living, and therefore thinking grand thoughts or giving grand names to these experiences does not substitute for the actual experience itself. In other words, “there is no philosophy of American Indians apart from the concrete actions of people in a well-defined physical setting (Deloria 2004:11).” This does not mean that we cannot engage in American Indian theorizing, it just means recognizing that there are different approaches that must be taken and an acknowledgement by the researcher of any assumptions that exist within ourselves as researchers such as “all people act solely from self-interest, humans are naturally bad, or all people believe in a god (Cordova 2004:28).”

Similar to contextual thinking, American Indians favor examination from a group standpoint, not unlike most sociological, especially phenomenological standpoints (Cajete 2004, Cordova 2004), but also in contrast to much of Western thought as explained in the quote below by Vine DeLoria Jr. (2004:10).

We know today that the idea of the individual is meaningless, but much of our philosophy, law, and religious thinking continue to make the individual the focus of attention and the starting point for all other analysis. From John Locke to John Rawls, the important decisions are made by individuals possessing neither father nor mother, village nor tribe, age nor gender. (For example), in tort law, we have the “reasonably prudent man” who always drives more carefully or acts with greater caution than real people.

For American Indians, it would be meaningless to study why individuals or groups behave the way they do without including the contextual background in which they live. American Indians

take for granted that all research should be “moral investigation that guides us on the right road for humans to walk (Yazzie Burkhart 2004:17).” Further, American Indian thought is derived from all experience rather than individual experience; from both our own experiences and our observations of the experiences of others. (Yazzie Burkhart 2004, Cajete 2004).

The Blackfeet, just as all other peoples, had their own ways of passing knowledge from one generation to the next. One of the most prominent pedagogical methods is oral story telling. It is often taken for granted that the oral tradition is primitive as compared to passing down knowledge in written form. It is also commonly believed that stories and myths passed down from generation to generation in Blackfeet culture are similar to those written by the Brothers Grimm; fairy tales to entertain children and teach little morals like don't talk to strangers. There are morals within the stories but they hold so much more. These stories hold the keys to understanding the sacred spiritual connections, world view, place of origin, sociology, scientific discoveries, and history of the Blackfeet people.

Passing knowledge down in written form, engraved and static throughout the ages, does not fit within the Blackfeet worldview's belief in the constant flux. To remain relevant and meaningful, shared knowledge should be able to move within the constantly moving and changing energy of the universe. In comparison to this belief, written stories are inert or stagnant. They take on the meaning of and are interpreted differently throughout the ages by different kinds of people; while often the original meaning that was meant to be passed on by the teller is lost in translation or misinterpretation. The meaning of oral stories are more easily preserved because it is the meaning that is more importantly passed on, while the telling is reshaped to fit the audience and the era for which it is being told.



## Historical Context

Federal Indian law and policy has changed over the course of history, depending on the mood of the era. “Over the past two centuries, the persistent and dramatic vacillation of federal policy has been one of the few constants in Indian Country (American Indian Law Training Program, Inc.: 1980)”. Prior to the American Indian treaty era tribes were totally sovereign Nations possessing all the powers that naturally derive from being an independent nation (Funke and Kickingbird, 1976, Pevar: 1992, Juneau: 2001). Tribes had their own systems and social structures and controlled their own destinies during this era (Duran and Duran: 1995, Juneau: 2001). During this period, acts considered socially unacceptable were defined as such by tribal custom. Tribes handled their own internal problems and disputes through customary dispute resolution processes which were very different from the modern justice systems (Ross: 2006). For example, Ross speaks of differences in meanings as an example of how each culture deals differently in defining and dealing with wrongdoing and the person doing wrong in the statement that follows.

Probably one of the most serious gaps in the system (today) is the different perception of wrongdoing and how best to treat it. In the non-Indian community, committing a crime seems to mean that the individual is a *bad person* and therefore must be punished... The Indian communities view a wrongdoing as a *misbehavior which requires teaching or an illness which requires healing* (Ross: 2006).

Because of this difference, tribes often had a very different view of the concept and even the need for law. Not only because tribes communicated and passed information from generation to generation orally; but also because they viewed each human being as having the capacity to control themselves- tribes historically did not have written or even oral laws that specifically laid out exactly which behaviors were considered criminal. It was expected that

each person knew right from wrong. There were no jails or guillotines. Yet order was maintained; largely because of the strength of the informal control structures that existed.

Children from a young age had extremely strong extended familial bonds. In addition, they developed strong, positive peer bonds that lasted a lifetime. Children were taught tribal values through story, song, and ceremony and these were reinforced by example. A strong belief in spirituality and the circular nature of action, and public praise for good behavior encouraged people to behave within the acceptable boundaries of tribal society.

People who did not behave in a socially acceptable manner were shunned or teased, and the wrong doer had real expectation and belief that something would happen to them or someone they loved unless they did something to fix what they had done, both spiritually and socially. They had the opportunity to fix it through healing ceremony, restitution, or some sort of public service that they themselves initiated. People most often did not think it inappropriate for a person to take vengeance on or demand payment from someone who had done them wrong and refused to make it right; as long as the punishment fit the wrongdoing. If the behavior was very egregious and threatened to disturb the harmony or safety of the community, tribal leaders would meet and discuss it with the offender and supporters present. Publicly administered punishment or formal sentencing was rare and specific to the individual situation. There was no punishment set in stone for any one type of crime, but when public or formal punishment was utilized it was swift and often harsh to make a statement of deterrence for that behavior to the rest of the community (Ross 2006, Grinell 1899, Schultz 1907, McClintock 1910, Wissler 1910, Ewers 1958, Ewers 1974, Bastien 2006, Getches 2006).

Tribes in Montana have historically been described by White ethnographers, social scientists, and historians who lived or did research among them as having socially orderly,

structured societies prior to colonization (Maximillian 1833, Grinnell 1899, Schultz 1907, McClintock 1910, Wissler 1910, Linderman 1935, Maslow 1938, Richardson 1938, Baker 1955, Ewers 1958, Johnson 1969, Ewers 1974, Hungry Wolf 2007).

Abraham Maslow, the father of humanistic psychology, conducted research on emotional security/insecurity among the Blackfoot people in 1938. To Maslow's amazement, he found that the Blackfoot were so emotionally secure that "about eighty to ninety percent of the population must be rated about as high in ego-security as the most secure individuals in our society, who comprise perhaps five to ten percent at the most (Maslow 1938)." "During many observations that corroborated his questionnaire results, he found the Blackfoot Indians to be quite emotionally secure in their day-to-day activities (Hoffman 1996)."

Parenting practices for most American Indian people were commonly close relationships between parent and child with the expectation that the child learn through the example of the parent. For example, in his recently published memoirs of his time with the Blackfeet, Maslow reported that generally, the Blackfoot people seemed very attached, almost inordinately so by North American standards, to their children. They constantly provided youngsters with food, treats and other displays of affection. Yet he observed that misbehavior was rare among Blackfoot children and punishment infrequently needed. It was so unusual for a child to have to be told something twice that such children were given a special name, literally translated, "hard ears"...In addition; Maslow was impressed with the absence of crime and violence (Hoffman 1988).

For Blackfoot peoples, social order was traditionally secured by the socialization of tribal members through the family and a system of societies. Some of the societies were age-graded, and peers of the same age would be inducted into them at the same time. Each child entered with

a peer partner and these partnerships and cohorts would develop friendships that were closer than the brother/sister relationship and were based on shared societal responsibilities and rights associated with the society they were in at the time (Maslow 1938, Bastien 2001). These peer partners would mature and process through the age-graded and often ceremonial societies together (Bastien 2001, Burns 1993, McClintock 1910).

Together, these strong peer and familial bonds, spiritual beliefs and strongly-held values, and community activities that reinforced the same constituted the informal social control structures of the Blackfoot people. Because of their strength, there was no need for formal social control structures such as codified law, courts, formal education, schools or churches.

Prior to the Treaty Era, Whites began to increasingly have more and more contact with American Indian tribes for goods and land. These exchanges were mutual and usually friendly and brought new products and ideas for both sides, but Indian tribes still maintained control of their own affairs. Initially the US government regarded Indian tribes as having the same status as foreign nations and the goal was to make them allies of the newly developing nation (Pevar 1992)". Tribes still possessed inherent authority to determine their own laws, punishments, and had the ability to largely control outsiders who entered within the boundaries of their aboriginal lands (Juneau 2001, Getches 2006).

In approximately 1787-1828, the newly created United States of America began pressured negotiations with American Indian tribes for lands that had been previously inhabited by the tribes. The pressures for these lands often included fraudulent acts such as forgery, bribery, and deceit; starvation; disease, war and massacre (Duran and Duran 1994). This is known as the Treaty Era (Juneau 2001, Pevar 1992, Getches 2006). Whether the negotiations were fair or not, these agreements for land exchange or peace were formalized through treaties

and agreements and most were ratified by Congress. Indian lands were reduced to small reserves carved from the original territory belonging to each tribe, or those set aside by Congress for that purpose. These areas became known as reservations, legally known as “Indian Country”, which refers to “all lands within the limits of any Indian reservation under the jurisdiction of the United States Government... (U.S. Code 2004, Juneau 2001, Pevar 1992, Getches 2006).”

In Montana, tribes barely began the treaty-making process with the United States, when that era officially ended. The Blackfoot Nation made their first treaty with the U.S. in 1851 and the treaty era officially ended in 1871. The land cession process did not end, but thereafter these exchanges were referred to as “Agreements” rather than treaties, signifying the different status tribes now had with the U.S., no longer recognized as foreign nations, but as “domestic dependent nations” (Juneau 2003, Pevar 1992, Getches 2006).

In 1871 Congress eliminated the practice of making treaties with Indian tribes. The federal government no longer considered Indian tribes as independent nations. Thereafter, Congress would deal with Indians by passing statutes, which, unlike treaties, did not require tribal consent (Pevar: 1992).

This began the Allotment and Assimilation era of Indian policy, which was the era of most destruction for tribal social control structures. The names for this era refer to specific policies the U.S. utilized to attempt to “civilize” American Indian peoples. The biggest political moves to assimilate Indians into the dominant culture were the General Allotment Act of 1887, mandatory education policies, and the creation of Indian courts (Juneau: 2003, American Indian Lawyer Training Program Inc.: 1980). In 1883, the Secretary of the Interior was authorized to create courts of Indian offenses to replace (traditional) tribal forms of justice. These courts had little to do with the administration of justice, but were, instead, intended to “educate” and “civilize” Indian tribes” and to eliminate traditional social control mechanisms that were seen as

interfering with the assimilation process by government and religious officials who had been sent to accomplish that task (American Indian Lawyer Training Program: 1980).

The *Indian General Allotment* or *Dawes Act* (1887) introduced the concept of private land ownership to tribes, where traditionally lands were communally owned (Juneau 2003, Pevar 1992, Getches 2006). This act forced tribes to divide lands held in common into parcels known as allotments. “Allotment came relatively late to the Blackfeet Nation. Pressure from a critical mass of new settlers and the slow bureaucratic progress of allotment policy implementation finally reaching Montana prompted Congress to pass the act of March 1, 1907 which sanctioned the allotment of the reservation and sale of the remaining land (Rosier 2001:14).” These were divided among the male heads-of-household and their single adult children, who were considered members of that tribe according to federal blood quantum policy. This was a political move of the federal government with the primary goal being to break up large family and clan relationships and the lifestyle that historically existed among the American Indian people (Pevar 1992, Juneau 2003, Getches 2006).

Mandatory education for American Indian children became legal policy in 1893, and is commonly referred to as “the Boarding School Era” by American Indian historians. For some American Indians including many Blackfeet, this was a painful, very traumatic period in American Indian history, during which the children were forcibly removed from their homes and placed in Boarding Schools, sometimes very far from home, in an attempt to assimilate them into the White culture (Braveheart 1998, Juneau 2001). On the other hand, many American Indian leaders, including many from the Blackfeet Nation, sent their children voluntarily to the Boarding Schools to be educated in the white way- seeing it as the only way to survive. Therefore, some of the very first American Indians to graduate from the first Indian boarding

school of this kind, Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, were Blackfeet. But even for children who were voluntarily sent to these schools, the drastic culture shock was extremely traumatic.

Children were often not allowed to return home for many years and some never did. Children were often allowed very minimal contact, if any, with their families. In addition, they were forbidden to speak their American Indian languages, answer to their American Indian names, practice American Indian customs, or wear traditional hairstyles or clothing- suffering corporal punishment if they did so. Even during summer breaks Carlisle students were sent on summer work assignments, living with white families, rather than being allowed to go home with their own families. Many children died from malnutrition and disease and suffered physical, mental, and sexual abuse while away at these boarding schools. Through this rigorous and abusive socialization process, American Indian children often developed Stockholm Syndrome-like attitudes- learning to identify more with the dominant culture and despising their own traditional cultures as evil or witchcraft. “Warrior children were punished for any behavior that remotely resembled the traditional image. The split ego readily attached to this in order to stop the abuse, and the price, was that of internalizing the hate for what was “true” tradition (Duran and Duran 1995)” (see also Juneau 2001, Braveheart 1998).

These assimilative practices severely disrupted traditional socialization processes and parental/familial attachment that an entire generation of American Indian children may have encountered and enjoyed in their own communities (Juneau 2003, Duran and Duran 1995, Bastien 2004, Hawkins, et al 2004). In addition, these children were robbed of the rites, responsibilities, and knowledge that should have been transferred to them through involvement in the age-graded and ceremonial societies (Bastien 2004). The process of passing on traditional

values, beliefs, and morals was severely disrupted and “what is right” became confusing to Indian children. “Once the idea of family is eradicated from the thinking and life world of an individual, cultural reproduction cannot occur (Duran and Duran 1995)”.

Back at home on their Indian reservations, “the assimilated ideal (Rosier 2001:21)” was being institutionalized and the life-styles of the Boarding School Era parents radically altered through policies of the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs (OIA). To understand the magnitude of this change, it is necessary to understand that for American Indians, there is no separation between church and state. Religion cannot even be called religion since it is the way of life and is intertwined with socialization and every part of everyday life. Mandatory Christian conversion policies passed during this same era, such as the 1882 Religious Crimes Code of the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs, often devastated and radically changed existing systems of social control for American Indian people (Bastien 2004, Duran and Duran 1995).

The Religious Crime Code, set forth by Commissioner of Indian Affairs William Teller, created Indian Courts along with a series of criminal statutes passed for enforcement to prosecute anyone caught practicing Indian religious ceremony. This actually meant anyone caught being American Indian. The policy especially targeted medicine men that Teller classified as “always in the anti-progressive party... to compel these imposters to abandon this deception and discontinue their practices, which are not only without benefit to them but positively injurious to them” (McLeod/Earth Island Institute 2008). Continuing with our Blackfoot example, this ban included the banning of the society system, since it was impossible to separate spirituality from anything remotely considered Blackfeet culture, and the societies were both spiritual as well as social structures (Bastien 2004). The Blackfeet formed the first Blackfeet Business Council with



Robert Hamilton as its President in the early 1900's (Rosier 2001). But even with an official government and constitution

“the OIA seemed particularly opposed to granting Robert Hamilton any management of tribal affairs, even though he had been declared ‘a competent Indian.’ Competency, it seems, extended only to those Indians willing and able to sell land to whites and to those acculturated Indians who shared the OIA’s contempt of all things tribal and its celebration of white individualism (Rosier 2001:31).

Brown and Desmond (1991), in their recent study of Montana tribal courts, concur with the claim that Indian courts were created to assimilate American Indian peoples- “Tribal courts in Montana (and elsewhere) derive their authority from inherent tribal powers; but to a great degree, they have not descended from traditional dispute-settling institutions. Rather, tribal courts were modeled on Anglo-American courts and functioned as assimilative devices.” These courts took social control processes that historically existed and forced upon tribes Euro-American models of justice that have never quite worked to create order.

When tribal courts were created and Indian customs outlawed, the society system was replaced with written legal codes and constitutions, written for the tribe by non-Indian governmental authorities and modeled after the American system of governance. Traditional tribal chiefs were replaced with tribal councils, loosely modeled on the U.S. legislative and executive branches. These policies and political systems replaced long-standing tribal social controls with social controls not meaningful to the American Indian people (Juneau 2003, Duran and Duran 1995).

The history of colonization has led to the subjugation of American Indians to the dominant American ideals, traditions, laws, form of government, and social structures. American Indians have been forced to assimilate from their own traditional American Indian socialization processes and institutions to the dominant American socialization processes and

institutions. U.S. Governmental policies did not leave tribes with the choice of continuing to live as they always had, because the Euro-centric attitudes of the policy makers in those days assumed American Indians were savage and uncivilized. Thus, while the 1935 Indian Reorganization Act was hailed as an historical piece of legislation that allowed Indians to take over the reins to create their own governments; the key problem was that the OIA wanted tribes to “create” something based on the cookie-cutter policies and governing designed by the OIA. So although tribes were allowed during this policy era to create their constitutions and by-laws, and to codify their own laws and regulations, they were never really their own, but were based on what the OIA and dominant society thought was good for them. American Indian community members had no stake in the process, creating anomic conditions where the rules and regulations created were largely non-binding on the society they were supposed to control.

Even as history progressed, as President Richard Nixon signed into law the Indian Self-Determination and Education Act and President William Clinton put the Tribal Self-Governance Act into action, policies did not shift to recognize that tribes are capable of maintaining their own order without at least some guidance from the “Great White Father”- the U.S. President and his emissaries. The other important piece of this is that tribes have become very dependent on Federal and State grant monies that come with their own guidelines that must be followed, and may be inconsistent with the tribes’ own value systems. Further, because the government’s Assimilation policies were often very successful with some American Indians and because a history of abuse has left others afraid of change, tribes themselves have become afraid of taking the reins for themselves using their own cultural values for fear of being beaten down once again. But the most devastating effect has been the loss of a collective agreement between the Blackfeet people and the ensuing chaos that has become the reality of the Blackfeet Reservation.

There is no question whatsoever that poverty is one of the main correlates of crime and delinquency (Rioux and Hollist 2008, Burfeind and Bartusch 2007, Hawkins et al 2004) and another result of all of this history has been to create one large pocket of poverty on most reservations including the Blackfeet. Of 800 households on the Blackfeet Reservation in the year 2000, 680 survived on an income of less than \$10,000 per year, 26% of adults 25 years or older had attained a high school diploma and unemployment hovered at 65% (Census 2000). Since American Indians have been referred to as the most disadvantaged group in the United States, we would expect this group to report higher levels of any behavior highly associated with poverty. American Indian communities in Montana have become the best examples of “concentrated disadvantage” in the State (Montana State Dept. of Health and Human Services 2008).

Spillane and Smith (2007) studied differences in what they called “Standard Life Enforcers”, which were the basic set of rewards individuals commonly work toward including good housing, employment, economic security, knowledge, and family closeness. These “SLRs” are commonly not available to individuals who do not abide by social norms, such as problem drinkers or drug addicts in white culture. However, for American Indians living on reservations, Spillane and Smith found a much weaker link between these things, which they concluded reflect “an absence of punishment for heavy drinking”. This is a reflection of low social control on Indian reservations, a condition which did not always exist. Further, these researchers proposed the theory that because of the history of colonization, American Indians may suffer lower levels of “General Self Efficacy”, defined as the perceived ability to change one’s world. This is normally used as an individual difference variable, but Spillane and Smith found that this variable encompasses the entire American Indian group.

In his 1971 study of the Navajo and Hopi tribes, Jerrold Levy tried in vain to link social disintegration to social pathologies such as homicide and suicide. His conclusion was that these could not be linked because social pathologies existed in both the least acculturated and the highly acculturated Navajo and Hopi villages in approximately equal rates. However, this study and others like it ignore totally the social structural context in which both the acculturated and non-acculturated Navajo and Hopi people are living within the structural system of the United States. Whether an American Indian is acculturated or not, if they are living in a reservation community, structural limitations faced by tribal people and communities due to their unique political history; such as limited jurisdiction and legal rights to exercise control within their boundaries are shared at some level by all American Indians and cannot be ignored.

Legal ramifications of being American Indian, such as being considered a non-competent dependent of the U.S. Government in need of a trustee; having a history of non-participation in defining the rules of the society in which one lives; historical poverty; the problem of people who have been raised as American Indian, but do not meet federal pedigree guidelines of the definition of Indianness; trust status that impedes individual American Indian land owners from using their own inherited property; and the inability to file criminal charges against non-Indians who commit crimes against American Indians or to decide how best to handle major crime occurring within reservation boundaries are all examples of very unique situations created by federal policy or federal case law is shared by all American Indians regardless of assimilation level.

Cultural heterogeneity also helps explain higher levels of social disorganization on Indian reservations in Montana. On most Indian reservations in Montana there are many different sub-cultures that fit between those who identify most with their traditional American Indian cultures

to American Indians who identify more with the dominant culture. In between those two extremes is a spectrum of cultural identities on either side of the extreme (Hawkins, et al 2004). Besides this, there are a large number of non-Indians who work within American Indian reservation communities as teachers, doctors, and other service professionals who often do not live within or identify with the American Indian communities they serve. These individuals lack knowledge and understanding of, much less the chance to support, American Indian values and ethics in their work. According to Social Disorganization theory, this increase in cultural

Depending on the level of assimilation the person has experienced, there is more and more confusion about which norms and values are binding within the community, traditional family and tribal community values- or those of the dominant culture; those of the Christian church or those of the traditional healers. This confusion increases as the youth becomes aware of the history of tribal colonization and how the Christian churches played a significant part in the forced assimilation of tribal cultures. They may increasingly become apathetic or rebellious, no longer knowing what to believe in. This could explain why some studies have shown correlations between increased cultural identity and problem behaviors (Mail 1997, Hawkins 2002). For example, in her 2002 research on urban American Indian youth, Hawkins found increased reported alcohol-related problems for youth who identified with “the Indian Way of Life” (Hawkins 2002).

In their study of risk and protective factors for delinquent behaviors in American Indian youth, Fisher, Stork and Bacon found the following:

Starting with the arrival of missionaries in the New World, the responsibility for the education of Indian youth has been a confusing matter, made even more so in the late 19th century when the Bureau of Indian Affairs established residential boarding schools around the United States...(these) traumatized youth and led to a situation in which large numbers of Indian children (later to become parents themselves) were raised in

institutional settings and lacked basic models of Indian culture and effective parenting (Fisher, Stork, and Bacon: 201).

When youth receive socialization within their family unit coming from their own cultural perspective- and different socialization within the school, church, and media coming from another cultural perspective; this leads to lower levels of informal social control and higher levels of social disorganization. The more social agencies promote the values and beliefs of the family unit which strengthen what is considered moral behavior within that same primary group- the lower the level of these behaviors will be. All of these historical and current circumstances make Indian Country a distinctive American landscape for sociological research. This distinction requires the researcher to take a different approach to measuring theory in Indian Country.

Understanding the unique nature of American Indian communities, especially the fact that they have undergone radical and often unwanted changes which has manifested in problems that are not a reflection of their own tribal cultures but of upheaval and disruption to those cultures, will provide more meaning to the research of this group (Duran and Duran 1995, PrettyPaint 2008, Walls 2008). The importance of understanding that American Indian communities have been deeply affected by historical trauma cannot be understated. American Indian researchers Duran and Duran (2005) stress that “the past five hundred years have been devastating to our (Native) communities; the effects of this systematic genocide are (just now) currently being felt by our people.”

Understanding the limits of the data being utilized, this research will attempt to look at two manifestations of this history: higher levels of juvenile delinquency and substance use among American Indian youth (State of Montana MPNA: 2006), to find out whether or not current leading criminological variables apply differently to this group.

## CHAPTER TWO

# *Theoretical Background*

### Social Disorganization Theory

Social disorganization theory (SDT) forwards social problems as being not so much controlled at the individual (micro) level, but rather by the social structures that surround individuals (macro). “Implicit in contemporary work is that structural factors, including disadvantage and residential instability, undermine collective efficacy and social control processes (Nagin and Tremblay 2005).” The community in which one is raised and the social structures/institutions within it play a very important part in determining future social problems one will face and the resources available to combat them (Shaw and McKay 1942, Sampson and Groves 1989, Sampson and Wilson 1995, Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997, Yang and Hoffman 1998, Morenoff, et al 2001, Hawdon and Ryan 2004, Parker and Maggard 2005, Nagin and Tremblay 2005, HeavyRunner-Rioux and Hollist 2008, Peterson and Krivo 2009).

The theory was first developed and used to study social problems by researchers from the Chicago School, most notably by Shaw and McKay in their criminological study of urban ghettos in the 1940’s (Shaw and McKay (1942) 1969). Their research showed differences in the organization of Chicago neighborhoods with high crime rates, as described below in a quote from one of their studies, *The Natural History of a Delinquent Career* (1976[1931]:229).

*In these communities...the conventional traditions, neighborhood institutions, and public opinion, through which neighborhoods usually effect a control over the behavior [of the] child, were largely disintegrated.*

SDT, according to Nagin and Tremblay (2005), is the best evidence against the argument that social problems, including delinquency, stem from differences in cultural/racial traditions.

Shaw and McKay studied Chicago neighborhoods, especially the areas where immigrants first came to live as they came to America. They discovered that it was the social and environmental conditions of the place and not the people living there that mattered with regard to crime and delinquency, and that any group of people put into the same conditions had the same social problems. The problem with the neighborhood was that there were high levels of residential mobility, immigrants moving in and quickly moving out to better parts of the city. The area was low in opportunity, and marred by poverty. Therefore, residents of the neighborhood were unable to establish social control, resulting in higher crime rates (Shaw and McKay (1942) 1969).

Robert Sampson and colleagues have more recently developed and tested a contemporary version of SDT. Findings from their work suggest that the strength of structural features such as families, religious institutions, schools, political and economic statuses, government and legal structures, etc... contribute significantly to how strongly a community can deal with misbehavior of its citizens. Communities with weak social structures, higher levels of poverty, higher rates of residential homogeneity, and higher rates of family disruption will report higher levels of social disorganization (Sampson and Groves 1989, Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997, Sampson and Raudenbush 1999, Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls 1999).

### Social Control

Social control is “the capacity of a group to regulate its members according to desired principles- to realize effective, as opposed to forced, goals” (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1996:918). Because ethics, values and what is considered right and wrong, is defined socially (Sampson and Groves 1989), there are differences among cultures.



Social control regulates conduct through both formal and informal social control. Formal social control is achieved through formal institutions designed specifically for that purpose such as law, government structures, police, courts, the church and the state, the education system, and formal group affiliations. Informal social control is achieved through small group and individual level socialization with family, friends, peers, neighbors, coaches, preachers and teachers.

Areas where residents have similar values and attitudes favorable to the law will have higher levels of social control. Consensus is the key to controlling the youth in a community (Hawdon and Ryan 2009). “One is unlikely to intervene in a neighborhood context in which the rules are unclear and people mistrust or fear one another (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997:919).”

Formal social control or public control is enacted through the state. In societies high in informal social control, there is little need for formal social control. Hawdon and Ryan (2009) argue that formal social control is not related to poverty because police efforts tend to focus on the most disorganized and disorderly parts of town. However, the quality of formal social control is related to poverty through social capital, or the differential ability to achieve safe communities due to lack of the connections and resources needed to do so. Although police efforts are heavily concentrated in areas of concentrated poverty (Sampson and Wilson 1995), they often lack the quality seen in more affluent neighborhoods.

### Concentrated Disadvantage

Poverty is a factor that reduces the likelihood that people within a community will bond together to attempt to exercise informal social control over misbehavior of its members. Robert Sampson and William Julius Wilson refer to areas where high levels of social inequality and disadvantage have become a structural part of the community (such as in urban ghettos) as

concentrated disadvantage. Concentrated disadvantage has extremely negative impacts on a community's level of social control (Sampson and Wilson 1995, Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1996, Nagin and Tremblay 2005, Steinman and Hu 2007, Peterson and Krivo 2009). Individuals or communities living in concentrated disadvantage areas have lower levels of social capital (meaningful connections to social advantages such as good education, employment, and health care) and are therefore less able to build common values that build informal social control and safety (Morenoff, et al 2001, Parker and Maggard 2005). Furthermore, these communities have less capacity to obtain extra-local resources (e.g. police protection, block grants, health services) that help sustain neighborhood stability and control (Yabiku et al 2007, Morenoff et al 2001).

Concentrated poverty decreases social capital and therefore decreases a community's chance of combating social problems through collective efficacy and informal social control. Another influencing factor on social capital is race, especially the percentage of white residents in a neighborhood. "Proximity to structural privileges associated with white race is core to understanding how neighborhoods gain access to social, political, and economic resources that distance communities from threats to safety and keep violence low (Peterson and Krivo 2009:102)." These areas are marked by inadequate educational opportunities, lack of resources, family instability, high unemployment rates that impact opportunities for economic success (Yabiku 2007, Rank 2005) and the ability of the individual to participate in or the community to provide structures within the community that promote pro-social activities (civic opportunities, sports or entertainment programs and businesses, adequate city parks and recreation, etc...) that could help combat social problems like delinquency and substance use.

## Social Learning Theory

Social learning theory (SLT) first emerged through Edwin Sutherland's theory of differential association in 1939. This theory posits that criminal behavior, including delinquency, is learned through interaction with intimate others. Individuals have differential association with delinquent peers. The delinquent beliefs transmitted in these groups, not the social disorganization of neighborhoods, explains variations in crime and delinquency rates. The more a child associates with delinquent children, the more likely the child will become delinquent. Mason and Windle (2002) found that association with delinquent peers was the strongest predictor of deviance in youth, especially boys.

Ronald Akers (1985) expanded Sutherland's theory by further explaining how crime is learned. From intimate contact with peers who are involved in delinquency, youth learn how to commit crime (Sutherland and Cressey 1924, Akers 1985), by learning how to neutralize and justify crime to ease the conscience (Sykes and Matza 1957). Rather than the association with the delinquent peers directly causing delinquency, it is the identification with the attitudes of those delinquent peers that causes delinquency. Eventually, after sustained contact with more delinquent peers than conventional peers, they develop pro-delinquent attitudes (Sutherland 1960, Agnew 1985, Akers 1985, Anderson 1994). Sooner or later, this association leads the delinquent youth to become a member of a sub-culture where deviance is accepted and the "code of the streets (Anderson 1994)" overrides any conventional socialization the youth may have acquired, when respect can be obtained through illegitimate means (Wolfgang and Ferracuti 1967, Anderson 1994).

### Social Bonding Theory

Social bonding theory (SBT) was first introduced by Travis Hirschi in 1969. This theory takes the position that an individual's bonds to society influence decisions to commit crime and delinquency. "Informal social controls lose their effectiveness when an individual's social bonds to conventional society are weakened or broken (Mason and Windle 2002:6)." Individuals decide to obey laws as the result of the possible threat that delinquency and substance use would likely have on bonds established with parents, teachers, and neighbors.

According to Hirschi, bonds are formed through the interconnection between attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief. The more an individual is attached to parents, school, and the neighborhood they live in, the less he or she will commit crime (Mason and Windle 2002). The more committed an individual is to social conventions like school or work, the less he or she will risk that commitment through deviant acts. Involvement in conventional activities and a belief in conventional rules of one's society will decrease the likelihood that one will deviate from them (Hirschi 1969, Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990, Mason and Windle 2002). Sampson and Laub (1993) found that during the adolescent period, the most important bonds are those of the family, peers, and the school.

## CHAPTER THREE

### *Literature Review*

#### Social Control and American Indians

In their 2007 comparison of urban vs. reservation American Indian youth, Stiffman et al. found that only 1 in 12 Reservation youth reported the variable 'safety' as a strength in their community, as compared to 1 in 5 for the Urban American Indian youth. This vast difference in perception of community safety is directly related to the breakdown of social control mechanisms which instilled order into American Indian society, leading to social disorganization.

The social control structures traditionally held by American Indian tribes were forcibly replaced by extremely inadequate systems of justice. Tribes have a difficult time finding funding for their justice systems in communities marked by concentrated disadvantage. In addition, federal jurisdictional and procedural limitations often impede true justice. The result is fewer arrests and less successful prosecution of crime and delinquency, which leads to less quality in formal social control. Knowing there may not be a quick response or no response at all, and little to no punishment for crimes, means less cost to committing crime for reservation community members. If the traditional informal social control mechanisms were still present, this would be of little consequence, but these mechanisms have been severely disrupted (Getches, Wilkinson, and Williams 2004).

#### American Indians and Social Learning

Stiffman et al, in their 2007 qualitative study of strengths in urban and reservation American Indian youth found that the urban American Indian youth were more than three times more likely to indicate the existence of parks in their community or neighborhood. In addition,

due to both poverty and often remote location, American Indian communities often do not have traditional American youth entertainment such as Little League or YMCA in their communities. Thus, there is less involvement in conventional activities and more time for involvement with delinquent activities and peers. Yabiku (2007) describes this problem.

...high poverty neighborhoods often lack funding and support for local institutions that may provide societal stability such as clubs, after-school centers, and community groups... Instead of these prosocial institutions, high poverty neighborhoods typically have a surplus of liquor stores, empty lots, and abandoned buildings (Yabiku 2007:184).

This is directly related to the breakdown in society explained by social disorganization theory, the increased involvement with delinquent peers as explained by social learning theory, and the lack of social conventions to bond with explained by social bonding theory; but has particular connotations for American Indian reservation communities.

American Indian communities at one time had their own pro-social institutions, such as age-graded social societies for some Plains Indian tribes (for more on this, see Appendix A and B). Traditionally, American youth organizations have the self-proclaimed mission of instilling American and Christian values into the youth within American communities. This is at odds with the anti-assimilative stance of many American Indian people and indicates a strong need for pro-social youth organizations that American Indian people recognize as supporting American Indian values, identified by each unique American Indian community.

#### American Indian Youth Delinquency and Substance Use

The literature on American Indian youth focus primarily on youth substance use and support that this is a problem area with this group. Steinmen and Hu (2007) found that “compared with their white peers, American Indian youth reported consistently higher rates of use of most types of substances at most grades. In 10 of the 15 substance type/grade group cells,

differences between the groups were significant at  $p < 0.01$ . In her study of Marijuana and Alcohol use among American Indian youth, Walls (2008) found that on average, American Indian youth show higher rates of alcohol and drug use than most other racial/ethnic groups and “Indigenous youth and their families have endured a significant exposure to historical and contemporary stressors that largely contribute to their disproportionately high rates of substance use (Walls 2008:1139-40)” (See also Beauvais 1996, Gfellner 1994, Wallace et al. 2003, Walls 2008).

Beauvais (2002) found the highest levels of substance use for American Indian children living on Indian reservations, the next for American Indians living off-reservation, and the lowest levels for White youth. Another Beauvais study (2006) found American Indian substance use levels were higher than any other ethnic group in the United States. However, in support of social disorganization theory, Yabiku et al. in 2007 found that the American Indian youth in Phoenix, Arizona public schools, were super resilient to neighborhood disorder, showing lower levels of drug abuse as compared to non-American Indian youth living in the same conditions of poverty and crime.

American Indians in Montana often live in conditions ripe for the existence of social disorganization, with well-documented high rates of poverty, unemployment and lower access to adequate medical care and adequate education (Montana State Dept. of Health and Human Services 2008, Montana State Office of Public Instruction 2007). In these conditions, we would expect to find high rates of juvenile delinquency and youth substance use, and this is supported by the previous literature (Steinmen and Hu 2007, Beauvais 1996, Gfellner 1994, Wallace et al. 2003, Kulis et al 2007, Heavyrunner-Rioux and Hollist 2008).

## CHAPTER FOUR

### *Research Statement*

The purpose of this research was to examine the consistency of traditional social variables in accounting for variations in delinquency and substance use among different racial groups. Of particular interest was the degree to which existing theories account for patterns among a group of American Indian Youth relative to White and Other minority youths. To evaluate these interests, the following hypotheses were tested in the analyses that follow:

H<sub>1</sub>: The impact of variables derived from social disorganization, social learning, and social bonding perspectives will be significantly associated with delinquency and substance use.

H<sub>1a</sub>: Youths living in socially disorganized communities will have higher levels of delinquency and substance use.

H<sub>1b</sub>: Youths who associate with delinquent peers will have higher levels of delinquency and substance use.

H<sub>1c</sub>: Youths whose social bonds to parents and community members are weak will have higher levels of delinquency and substance use.

H<sub>2</sub>: There will be differences in the effects of variables derived from social disorganization, social learning, and social bonding perspectives between AI, W, and OR youths in accounting for variation in past twelve months delinquency and lifetime substance use.

H<sub>3</sub>: There will be mean level differences between AI, W, and OR youths with regard to the influence of variables derived from social disorganization, social learning, and social bonding perspectives on past twelve months delinquency and lifetime substance use.



## CHAPTER FIVE

### *Data and Measures*

#### Data

The Prevention Needs Assessment Community Student Survey for the State of Montana (MPNAS) is administered in Montana public schools by the State's Department of Health and Human Services, Addictive and Mental Disorders Division, Chemical Dependency Bureau. The survey has been administered in even years since 1998. Each time, the data is drawn from a cross-sectional sample. The data analyzed for this project was drawn from the 2006 survey. The MPNAS is voluntary, and is administered to students in the Montana Public Schools in the 6<sup>th</sup> through the 12<sup>th</sup> grades. The survey instrument is a measure of risk or preventive factors for five social domains "Community, Family, Peers, School, and Health behaviors" (Heavyrunner-Rioux and Hollist: 2008). It consists of 138 questions which take approximately 45 minutes to complete (for full copy of Survey, please see Appendix D).

#### Measures

The following scaled variables were created based on the prior literature to measure as closely as the data allow those concepts that have been identified in the existing theories of crime and delinquency as consistently associated with self reported delinquency and substance use. For further information on specific questions used please see Appendix C.

#### Dependent Variables

*Lifetime Substance Use:* This variable was a scaled measure of ten indicators regarding self-reported alcohol, marijuana, and illicit drug use over the subject's lifetime ( $\alpha=.84$ ).

*Past Twelve Month Delinquency:* This variable was a scaled measure of seven indicators assessing self-reported delinquency in the previous twelve months prior to the completion

of the survey. Acts included in the scale range from simple status offenses such as school truancy to more severe delinquency such as assault ( $\alpha=.74$ ).

### Independent Variables

The following theoretically derived variables are used as predictors of delinquency and substance use in the analyses that follow:

#### *Social Disorganization Variables*

There are four SDT variables included in the analysis. The first two, *Neighborhood Disorder* and *Neighborhood Attachment* are the most common variables used in prior tests of the theory outlined above.

*Neighborhood Disorder* ( $\alpha=.86$ ) is based on four items measuring students' perceptions of the level of disorder in their neighborhoods indicated by drug dealing, broken windows, fights, and gang activity.

*Neighborhood Attachment* ( $\alpha=.88$ ) is a seven item indicator of how attached students reported being to the neighborhood in which they reside and the length of time that they have lived there.

The next two variables, *Informal Social Control* and *Formal Social Control* are also important concepts within SDT, but are neglected for the most part in the existing research as stand-alone variables.

*Informal social control* ( $\alpha=.86$ ) is a fourteen item indicator measuring students' expectations of the reactions of their parents, adult neighbors, and friends to their involvement in delinquent behavior; the clarity of rules against substance use in their family; as well as self-reported involvement in church or religious activities.

*Formal Social Control* ( $\alpha=.83$ ) includes ten items based on students perceptions of the effectiveness of law enforcement in their neighborhood with regard to responding to delinquent behavior, and how safe they feel in their neighborhood.

#### *Social Bonding Variables*

There are two SBT variables included in the analysis, *Parental Attachment* and *School Attachment*.

*Parental Attachment* ( $\alpha=.91$ ) is a twelve item indicator measured by the amount of time spent with, feelings for, communication with, and admiration for the respondent's parent.

*School Attachment* ( $\alpha=.81$ ) contains six items that examine how much the students enjoy and strive to achieve in school.

#### *Social Learning Theory*

Two variables were included in the analysis from the SLT perspective, *Delinquent Peers* and *Pro-delinquent Attitudes*.

*Delinquent Peers* ( $\alpha=.76$ ) is measured through six items measuring students' perceptions of their best friends' involvement in various delinquent acts. Like the self reported delinquency indicator identified above, these acts range from simple truancy violations to more serious forms of delinquency such as assault.

*Pro-delinquent Attitudes* ( $\alpha=.77$ ) is a five item indicator that measures students' attitudes toward the wrongness of delinquent activities from stealing to assault. The higher values are given to respondents with more delinquent peers and more pro-delinquent attitudes.

#### Control Variables

There are four main demographic correlates that were controlled in the analysis: *Grade Level*, *Male*, *Nonwhite* and *Mother's/Father's Education Level*.

*Grade Level* is an ordinal measure of the school grade of the respondent.

*Male* is a categorical variable with males being assigned the high value.

*Mother's/Father's Education Level* is an ordinal measure of socio-economic status.

*Nonwhite* is an ordinal measure of race/ethnicity, (White or non-White), with non-White being assigned the high value.

In the analysis of variance models,

*Race* was used in place of non-White, and is a categorical variable (White, American Indian, Other Race).

*Gender* was used in place of Male.

*Impulsivity* ( $\alpha=.78$ ) was a variable used to control for differences in individual temperament that have been shown in prior research to influence delinquency (Heavy Runner-Rioux and Hollist 2008). This is a seven item indicator measuring levels of propensity for involvement in risk taking and impulsive action in the individual respondent, with higher impulsivity being assigned the high value.

## CHAPTER SIX

# *STATISTICAL METHODS*

### Logic of the Analyses

Ordinary least squares regression was used in the analytic models to examine the effects of the theoretically-derived independent variables on delinquency and substance use. All variables with the exception of the demographic controls were continuous and although the data was drawn from a cross-sectional sample, the regression models assume that any variation in reported substance use and delinquency by the respondents will be explained by attitudes and peer relationships favorable to delinquency; low attachment to school, neighborhood, and parents; neighborhoods with higher levels of disorder; and lower levels of informal and formal social control. To test for differences in the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables between racial/ethnic sample groups, analysis of covariance was used. To examine between groups comparisons one-way analysis of variance models with Bonferroni method post hoc comparisons were run for each dependent variable with the independent variables that reported significant differences in the ANCOVA models. These models assume that any differences found will be explained by differences in the effects of one or more of the independent variables on the dependent variables between the racial/ethnic groups.

All statistical analyses were conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS Version 17). The analysis began with a series of basic descriptives to ensure that the responses were within the expected range and to evaluate the likelihood of bias in the regression model estimates due to coding errors or missing data. Once these decisions were made, the next step involved alpha reliability tests for the scaled variables. This was followed by a zero order correlations analysis. These provide the initial evidence for an association between the

dependent and independent variable and also provide a baseline for evaluating the full model estimates that are presented below. In the models that follow, all variables, with the exception of grade, non-White, male, mother's/father's education level, gender, and race are represented as standardized scores in the models that follow.

In order to estimate the analysis of co-variance model, SPSS was used to generate five random samples of 150 subjects from each of the racial/ethnic sub-group samples. In each case the sample used in the analysis is the one closest to the full racial/ethnic group sub-samples in terms of descriptives comparisons based on age, proportion male, and mother's/father's education level. The model presented evaluates whether or not there are group level differences in the effects of the social learning, bonding, control, and disorganization independent variables on youth substance use and delinquency between and within the White (n=150), American Indian (n=150), and Other Race (n=150) sub-groups.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

# *RESULTS*

### Descriptives

Reflective of the racial composition of the State of Montana, 82.6% of the 21,321 total students surveyed were White (n=17,155), 8.8% were American Indian or Alaska Native (n=1,828), 6.1% were Latin American/Hispanic (n=636), 1% were African American (n=202), 1.1% were Asian American (n=234), 0.6% were Pacific Islander (n=133), and 2.8% were of a race they self-identified as other than those listed (n=591). In addition, 2.5% of the respondents did not respond to the racial/ethnic group question on the survey (n=591). The number of male and female respondents was evenly distributed. The average grade level was 9.71, or about three quarters of the way through freshman year in high school. The average mother's/father's education level identified by the respondents was some college, with no degree.

### Bi-variate Results

Means, standard deviations, and zero-order Pearson's R correlations were conducted for the full data set (n=21,321). These are reported in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Zero Order Correlations (n=21,321)

Variables	Means (s.d.)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Male	1.50 (.500)	.012	-.028**	.018*	.189**	-.176**	.000	.140**	.151**	.002	.024**	-.094**	-.012	.119**	.032**
2. Grade	9.71 (1.66)	■	.058**	-.119**	.070**	-.133**	-.078**	.058**	.077**	-.081**	.002	-.245**	-.411**	.056**	.203**
3. White	1.62 (.779)		■	.001	-.073**	.012	-.085**	-.185**	-.096**	.107**	-.184**	.110**	-.003	-.137**	-.075**
4. Mother's/Father's Education Level	4.53 (1.45)			■	-.060**	.060**	.072**	-.076**	-.062**	.064**	-.073**	.130**	.110**	-.062**	-.093**
5. Impulsivity	.00 (1.00)				■	-.428**	-.361**	.335**	.533**	-.234**	.241**	-.421**	-.330**	.327**	.326**
6. School Attachment	.00 (1.00)					■	.382**	-.245**	-.417**	.321**	-.158**	.352**	.292**	-.225**	-.252**
7. Parental Attachment	.00 (1.00)						■	-.182**	-.336**	.420**	-.213**	.412**	.233**	-.167**	-.209**
8. Delinquent Peers	.00 (1.00)							■	.384**	-.144**	.284**	-.349**	-.226**	.552**	.414**
9. Pro-delinquent Attitudes	.00 (1.00)								■	-.246**	.260**	-.478**	-.304**	.405**	.351**
10. Neighborhood Attachment	.00 (1.00)									■	-.232**	.302**	.201**	-.115**	-.162**
11. Neighborhood Disorder	.00 (1.00)										■	-.367**	-.154**	.237**	.186**
12. Informal Social Control	.00 (1.00)											■	.383**	-.327**	-.405**
13. Formal Social Control	.00 (1.00)												■	-.203**	-.326**
14. Past 12 mo Delinquency	.00 (1.00)													■	.474**
15. Lifetime Substance Use	.00 (1.00)														■

\* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (two-tailed significance)  
 \*\*Correlation is significant at the .01 level (two-tailed significance)  
 \*\*\* Correlation is significant at the .001 level (two-tailed significance)

As predicted, the results showed positive and significant linear relationships between the dependent variables, *past 12 months delinquency* and *lifetime substance use* and the independent variables *delinquent peers*, *pro-delinquent attitudes*, and *neighborhood disorder*. As also expected theoretically, the results showed inverse and significant relationships between the dependent variables and *school attachment*, *parental attachment*, *neighborhood attachment*, *informal social control*, and *formal social control*.



## Multivariate Results

### Hypothesis One

An ordinary least squares regression model was run on the full data set (n=21,321) to explore the effects of the theoretical predictors on delinquency and substance use. The results of the model are shown below in Table 2.

Variables	Delinquency	Substance Use
Male	.015**	-.059**
Grade	-.03 (.01)	-.12 (.01)
White	-.002 (.004)	.05 (.004)
Mother/Father's Education	-.031***	-.007
Impulsivity	-.04 (.008)	-.01 (.008)
School Attachment	-.005	-.012
Parental Attachment	-.003 (.004)	-.01 (.008)
Delinquent Peers	.056***	.076***
Pro-Delinquency Attitudes	.05 (.007)	.08 (.008)
Neighborhood Attachment	-.010	-.025**
Neighborhood Disorder	-.009 (.007)	.03 (.007)
Informal Social Control	.019**	.006
Formal Social Control	.02 (.007)	.006 (.007)
Model R <sup>2</sup>	.439***	.270***
	.44 (.007)	.28 (.007)
	.169***	.077***
	.16 (.008)	.08 (.008)
	.028***	.006
	.03 (.006)	.006 (.007)
	.033***	-.020**
	.03 (.006)	-.02 (.007)
	-.061***	-.191***
	-.06 (.008)	-.196 (.009)
	-.012	.110***
	-.01 (.007)	-.196 (.008)
	.367	.298

Note: For each variable, the standardized coefficient is shown in the top row and the unstandardized coefficient and standard error (in parentheses) are shown in the bottom row.

\* p < .05 (two-tailed)  
 \*\* p < .01 (two-tailed)  
 \*\*\* p < .001 (two-tailed)

### Past twelve month delinquency

Equation one shows significant effects for *delinquent peers*, *pro-delinquent attitudes*, *neighborhood attachment*, *neighborhood disorder*, and *informal social control* as predictors of variations in *past twelve months delinquency* (p<.001) and for *parental attachment* (p<.01). However, it is important to realize that with a data set as large as this, statistical power is substantial. Therefore, the relative effects, indicated by the standardized regression slopes for

each theoretical variable relative to the others, will be the primary focus of the interpretation rather than whether or not the observed effects breaches the threshold for statistical significance.

The effects of SLT variables are the strongest predictors in the model. The influence of *delinquent peer associations* ( $\beta=.439$ ) is more than seven times more consequential than predictors from SDT and SBT perspectives; while the effect of *pro-delinquent attitudes* is almost three times more consequential ( $\beta=.169$ ). These two variables have a disproportionate role in the modest, but noteworthy amount of the variation in past twelve month delinquency (37%) that is accounted for by the model.

#### Lifetime substance use

In the equation examining lifetime substance use among the full sample, significant effects were found for *delinquent peers*, *pro-delinquent attitudes*, *informal social control*, and *formal social control* as predictors of *lifetime substance use* ( $p<.001$ ) and for *school attachment* and *neighborhood disorder* ( $p<.01$ ). *Parental attachment* and *neighborhood attachment* were not significant predictors of *lifetime substance use* in the multivariate equation.

Similar to the equation examining self reported delinquency, a SLT variable *delinquent peers* ( $\beta=.270$ ) was the most significant predictor of *lifetime substance use*. Its influence was at least twice as consequential as any other variable in the model. However, variables drawn from the SDT perspective examining the role of social control (*formal social control*,  $\beta=-.110$ ; *informal social control*,  $\beta=-.191$ ), also had a substantial effect, at least 7 times as consequential as *school attachment* ( $\beta=-.025$ ), *neighborhood disorder* ( $\beta=-.020$ ), or *pro-delinquent attitudes* ( $\beta=.077$ ). The combined effects for the full model accounted for thirty percent of the total variation in scores from respondents regarding their lifetime use of alcohol, marijuana, and illicit drugs.

## Hypothesis Two

### Racial/Ethnic Group Sub-sample Analysis

In order to begin the test needed for hypothesis two, three separate data sets were created from the full data file. Respondents were sorted into one of three racial/ethnic groups based on their self-reported identification as White (W, n=17,155), American Indian (AI, n=1,828), and any Other Race besides White or American Indian (OR, n=1,796). Ordinary least squares regression models were run for each of the racial sub-groups (W, AI, and OR) to examine and compare the partial effects of the predictors and explained variation between the models.

### Past twelve month delinquency

**Table 3. The Effects of Controls, Social Bonding, Social Learning, and Social Disorganization Variables on Past Twelve Months Delinquency**

Variables	White (n=17,155)	American Indian (n=1,828)	Other (n=1,796)
Male	-.008	-.038	-.073**
Grade	-.015 (.262)	-.075 (.07)	-.14 (.001)
Mother/Father's Education	.000 (.895)	.014	.017
Impulsivity	-.002 (.722)	.008 (.515)	.009 (.466)
School Attachment	-.002 (.722)	-.007	-.015
Parental Attachment	-.002 (.722)	-.004 (.742)	-.009 (.461)
Delinquent Peers	.045***	.139***	.064*
Pro-Delinquency Attitudes	.044 (<.001)	.140 (<.001)	.062 (.018)
Neighborhood Attachment	-.008	.032	-.019
Neighborhood Disorder	-.007 (.333)	.032 (.177)	-.018 (.452)
Informal Social Control	.016*	-.005	.050*
Formal Social Control	.015 (.046)	-.005 (.837)	.049 (.041)
Model R <sup>2</sup>	.447***	.409***	.383***
	.443 (<.001)	.404 (<.001)	.375 (<.001)
	.172***	.160***	.177***
	.165 (<.001)	.159 (<.001)	.170 (<.001)
	.018*	.037	.045*
	.017 (.017)	.037 (.095)	.043 (.049)
	.023***	.014	.079**
	.022 (.001)	.014 (.528)	.076 (.001)
	-.056***	-.118***	-.056*
	-.055 (<.001)	-.127 (<.001)	-.057 (.042)
	-.007	-.036	-.036
	-.007 (.398)	-.036 (.137)	-.035 (.144)
	.35	.42	.38

Note: For each variable, the standardized coefficient is shown in the top row and the unstandardized coefficient and standard error (in parentheses) are shown in the bottom row.

\* p < .05 (two-tailed)  
 \*\* p < .01 (two-tailed)  
 \*\*\* p < .001 (two-tailed)

Multivariate results showed consistent effects on *past twelve month delinquency* across all racial groups for *delinquent peers* (W,  $\beta=.447^{**}$ , AI,  $\beta=.409^{**}$ , OR,  $\beta=.383^{**}$ ); *pro-*  
*delinquent attitudes* (W,  $\beta=.172^{**}$ , AI,  $\beta=.160^{**}$ , OR,  $\beta=.177^{**}$ ); and *informal social control*

(W,  $\beta=-.056^*$ , AI,  $\beta= -.118^{**}$ , OR,  $\beta=-.056^*$ ). However, the influence of *parental attachment* (W,  $\beta=-.086^*$ , OR,  $\beta=-.045^*$ ) and *neighborhood disorder* (W,  $\beta=.023^*$ , OR,  $\beta=.079^{**}$ ) were significant predictors only in the equations for W and OR youth. These variables were not significantly associated with delinquency in the equation examining AI youth. In only one instance, the effect of *neighborhood attachment* on *past twelve month delinquency*, was there a significant effect for only one group (W,  $\beta= -.018^*$ ) and not in the equations for the other two. *School Attachment* and *Formal Social Control* were not significant predictors in any of the equations estimated in Table 3.

Lastly, there was an unexpected positive effect of parental attachment on past twelve month delinquency for W and OR youth and for Neighborhood Attachment for all youth. Results of variance inflation factor and other collinearity diagnostics reported no problems with collinearity in the model. However the effects of these variables on past twelve months delinquency were very weak and the sign change could be due to the “partialing out” of the influence of other variables on this relationship in the model.

## Lifetime substance use

**Table 4. The Effects of Controls, Social Bonding, Social Learning, and Social Disorganization Variables on Lifetime Substance Use**

Variables	White (n=17,155)	American Indian (n=1,828)	Other (n=1,796)
Male	.064*** .127 (<.001)	.058** .121 (.01)	.049* .097 (.02)
Grade	.079*** .045 (<.001)	.111*** .07 (<.001)	.07** .04 (.003)
Mother/Father's Education	.001 .001 (.91)	.021 -.013 (.34)	-.051* -.03 (.02)
Impulsivity	.078*** .077 (<.001)	.111*** .12 (<.001)	.052 .053 (.06)
School Attachment	-.022** -.022 (.008)	-.038 -.037 (.15)	-.013 -.013 (.61)
Parental Attachment	.015 .015 (.07)	-.047 -.05 (.06)	-.009 -.009 (.73)
Delinquent Peers	.265*** .271 (<.001)	.258*** .27 (<.001)	.276*** .28 (<.001)
Pro-Delinquency Attitudes	.087*** .086 (<.001)	.050 .051 (.07)	.049 .049 (.09)
Neighborhood Attachment	-.008 -.008 (.334)	.063** .07 (.008)	.023 .023 (.31)
Neighborhood Disorder	-.015* -.015 (.04)	-.041 -.043 (.09)	-.032 -.032 (.17)
Informal Social Control	-.180*** -.182 (<.001)	-.176*** -.196 (<.001)	-.267*** -.278 (<.001)
Formal Social Control	-.099*** -.098 (<.001)	-.160*** -.169 (<.001)	-.140*** -.141 (<.001)
Model R <sup>2</sup>	.29	.33	.36

Note: For each variable, the standardized coefficient is shown in the top row and the unstandardized coefficient and standard error (in parentheses) are shown in the bottom row.

\* p < .05 (two-tailed)

\*\* p < .01 (two-tailed)

\*\*\* p < .001 (two-tailed)

For *lifetime substance use* (results shown in Table 4), significant effects were found across all racial groups for *delinquent peers* (W,  $\beta=.265^{**}$ , AI,  $\beta=.258^{**}$ , OR,  $\beta=.276^{**}$ ); *formal social control* (W,  $\beta= -.099^{**}$ , AI,  $\beta= -.160^{**}$ , OR,  $\beta= -.140^{**}$ ); and *informal social control* (W,  $\beta= -.180^{**}$ , AI,  $\beta= -.176^{**}$ , OR,  $\beta= -.267^{**}$ ). Effects for *neighborhood disorder* (W,  $\beta=-.015^{*}$ ) and *school attachment* (W,  $\beta=-.022^{**}$ ) were found in the equation for W youth, but not in those for AI or OR youth. Similarly, significant effects were found in the equation examining AI youth for *neighborhood attachment* (AI,  $\beta=.063^{**}$ ) but similar results did not exist in the equations for W and OR youth. *Parental attachment* and *pro-delinquent attitudes* were not significant predictors in any of the models presented in Table 3.

The combined effects of the theoretical variables explained a modest amount of the variation in *past twelve month delinquency* and *lifetime substance use* in the equations for all youth regardless of race. The strongest combined influence on *past twelve month delinquency* is found in the equation based on AI youth ( $r^2=.42$ ;  $p < .000$ ), but the models for OR ( $r^2=.38$ ;  $p < .000$ ), and W ( $r^2=.35$ ;  $p < .000$ ), youth were respectable as well. In the equations examining *lifetime substance use*, the model based on OR youths accounts for the largest explained variation ( $r^2=.36$ ;  $p < .000$ ). However the models examining AI ( $r^2=.33$ ;  $p < .000$ ) and W youth ( $r^2=.29$ ;  $p < .000$ ) account for a far greater percentage of the variation than would be expected if there were no association between the predictors and dependent variables in the population.

There was an unexpected positive effect of parental attachment on lifetime substance use for W youth and for Neighborhood Attachment for AI and OR youth. Results of variance inflation factor and other collinearity diagnostics reported no problems with collinearity in the model. However the effects of these variables on lifetime substance use were very weak and the sign change could be due to the presence of the other variables in the model.

### **Hypothesis Three**

#### **Analysis of Co-Variance**

Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted to look for statistically significant differences in the mean effects of the theoretical variables on substance use and delinquency between racial groups. As outlined above in the logic of the analysis section, the model is based on 450 respondents. Each racial group is represented by the 150 respondents who most closely represent the demographic composition of the larger racial subsamples. The Levene's test of homogeneity for both models was non-significant (Past twelve month delinquency  $F=2.606$

( $p=.075$ ), Lifetime substance use  $F=1.92$  ( $p=.148$ ), indicating that the null claim of equal population variances among the groups cannot be rejected.

**Table 5. Analysis of Covariance Tests of the Differences in the Effects of SBT, SLT, and SDT Variables on Past 12 Month Delinquency and Lifetime Substance Use Between W, AI, and OR Youth (n=450).**

	Delinquency		Substance Use
Male	.732		9.01**
Grade	1.16		6.20**
Mother/Father's Education Level	4.26*		3.05
Impulsivity	4.75*		6.04**
School Attachment	.294		.051
Parental Attachment	.141		.218
Delinquent Peers	65.19***		38.21***
Pro-Delinquency Attitudes	6.44**		.217
Neighborhood Attachment	2.52		3.64
Neighborhood Disorder	.094		1.34
Informal Social Control	5.55**		14.28***
Formal Social Control	.077		6.66**
Model	.40		.38

Note: For each variable, the F obtained score examining the variation between groups divided by the variation within groups is reported.

\*  $p < .05$  (two-tailed)

\*\*  $p < .01$  (two-tailed)

\*\*\*  $p < .001$  (two-tailed)

### Past 12 Months Delinquency

ANCOVA results showed the most significant between group difference in the average effects of *delinquent peers* on past twelve month delinquency ( $p < .001$ ). Differences between groups for the mean effects of *informal social control* and *pro-delinquent attitudes* on were also significant ( $p < .01$ ). There were no significant differences found between the groups for the mean effects of *parental attachment*, *school attachment*, *neighborhood attachment*, *neighborhood disorder*, and *formal social control*.

Post hoc tests showed the differences in *delinquent peers* were found in the comparison between AI and W youth  $F=0.625$  ( $p<.001$ ), and in the comparison between AI and OR youth  $F=0.389$  ( $p<.01$ ); with AI youth reporting higher levels of association with delinquent peers. No significant differences were shown in the comparison between W and OR youth for *delinquent peers*. The differences in *informal social control* were found in the comparison between AI and W youth  $F= -0.405$  ( $p<.01$ ) with AI youth reporting lower levels of informal social control. There were no significant differences found in the comparisons between AI and OR or W and OR youth. There were no differences found in the between groups comparisons for *pro-delinquent attitudes* which may indicate that the differences reported in the ANCOVA model are attributable to within group differences of one or more of the three groups. There is however an indication that AI youth have slightly higher levels of *pro-delinquent attitudes* as compared to W youth  $F=0.054$  (not significant) and slightly lower levels of the same as compared to OR youth  $F= -0.051$  (not significant). See Table 6 below for full post hoc results:

Table 6. Post hoc test of the mean differences in delinquent peers, pro-delinquent attitudes, and informal social control between AI, W, and OR youth for Past Twelve Months Delinquency(n=450).

	AI -W Youth	AI-OR Youth	W-OR Youth
<b>Delinquent Peers</b>	(0.352, 0.897) 0.625***	(0.114, 0.663) 0.389**	(-0.509, 0.037) -0.236
<b>Pro-Delinquent Attitudes</b>	(-0.226, 0.335) 0.054	(-0.332, 0.230) -0.051	(-0.384, 0.174) -0.105
<b>Informal Social Control</b>	(-0.682, -0.128) -0.405**	(-0.468, 0.088) -0.189	(-0.061, 0.491) 0.215

Note: For each variable the 95% Confidence Interval and mean difference are reported.

\* $p < 0.05$  (two-tailed)

\*\* $p < 0.01$  (two-tailed)

\*\*\* $p < 0.001$  (two-tailed)

## Substance Use

The most significant between group differences for the dependent variable *lifetime substance use* were found in the mean effects of *delinquent peers* and *informal social control*



( $p < .001$ ). Differences between groups in the mean effects of *formal social control* were less pronounced, but also significant ( $p = .01$ ). There were no significant differences found for the mean effects of *pro-delinquent attitudes, school attachment, parental attachment, neighborhood attachment, and neighborhood disorder*.

Post hoc tests showed the differences found in *delinquent peers* to be in the comparison between AI and W youth  $F = 0.625$  ( $p < .001$ ) and in the comparison between AI and OR youth  $F = 0.339$  ( $p < .01$ ); with the AI youth reporting higher levels of association with delinquent peers. The differences in *informal social control* in the comparison between AI and W youth  $F = -0.405$  ( $p < .01$ ); with the AI youth reporting lower levels. There were no significant differences in *informal social control* found in the comparisons between AI and OR or W and OR youth. There were no significant differences found in the between group comparisons for formal social control, which could indicate there are within group differences in one or more of the groups. However, there is an indication that *formal social control* is lower for W as compared to OR or AI youth. See Table 7 below for full results.

Table 7. Post hoc tests of the mean differences in delinquent peers, pro-delinquent attitudes, And informal social control between AI, W, and OR youth for Lifetime Substance Use ( $n = 450$ ).

	<b>AI-W Youth</b>	<b>AI-OR Youth</b>	<b>W-OR Youth</b>
<b>Delinquent Peers</b>	(0.351, 0.897) 0.625***	(0.114, 0.663) 0.339**	(-0.509, 0.037) -0.236
<b>Formal Social Control</b>	(-0.052, 0.527) 0.237	(-0.095, 0.486) 0.196	(-0.323, 0.239) -0.042
<b>Informal Social Control</b>	(-0.682, -0.128) -0.405**	(-0.468, 0.088) -0.189	(-0.061, 0.491) 0.215

Note: For each variable the 95% Confidence Interval and mean difference are reported.

\* $p < 0.05$  (two-tailed)

\*\* $p < 0.01$  (two-tailed)

\*\*\* $p < 0.001$  (two-tailed)

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### *Discussion*

The questions this research addressed pertain to examining differences in the effects of SDT, SBT, and SLT variables on past twelve months delinquency and lifetime substance use. To examine these questions, equations were first estimated to look at how theoretically derived predictors contributed to explaining the variations in self reported delinquency and substance use among a sample of 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade students in the State of Montana. Additional equations were then estimated to examine whether these patterns changed when applied to three different racial groups comprised of AI, W, and OR youth.

Findings revealed that there were differences in the degree to which the theoretical variables predicted delinquency and substance use in the full sample models. The SLT variables, especially *delinquent peers* had the strongest effect, but *pro-delinquent attitudes* was also a strong correlate even after controlling for influences from other variables. A SDT variable *informal social control* was also a significant predictor while the SDT predictor measuring *neighborhood disorder* and the SBT variables measuring *neighborhood attachment*, and *parental attachment* were relatively less consequential. The combined effects of these variables on past twelve month delinquency accounted for just less than 37% of the variation in the full sample. For lifetime substance use these patterns remained very similar with SLT variables having the strongest effects. The effects of SDT variables were also consequential. Consistent with the pattern for delinquency, SBT variables were least influential in predicting substance use. The combined effects of all variables account for 30% of the variation in scores. These findings provide at least partial support for hypothesis one.

In analyzing the between groups comparisons, SLT variables continue to be the strongest predictors of *past twelve month delinquency* regardless of race. In contrast, SBT predictors were not significant across racial groups. The impact of *informal social control* was twice as consequential for AI as it was for W and OR youth. The effects of *neighborhood disorder*, *parental attachment*, and *neighborhood attachment* were significant for both the W and OR youth, but not for AI youth. The predictive ability of the model was modest for all racial groups accounting for the most variance in the equation for AI youth. As it pertains to substance use, the effect of *delinquent peers* was the most robust predictor. In contrast, *parental attachment* had no significant impact on lifetime substance use. The effect of *pro-delinquent attitudes* is roughly half in Table 4 as it was in the equations in Table 3 examining delinquency. In contrast, the effects of SBT variables were most consequential for substance use, although the impact varied between racial groups. The effect of *formal social control* on lifetime substance use was nearly twice as consequential as it was for W youths and the effect of *informal social control* had the strongest impact for OR youth, although it was also consequential for the other two racial groups as well. The models were good predictors of substance use across all racial groups, in particular in the equation for OR youth. Consistent with the findings for the full model equations the results based on W, AI, and OR youths provide partial support for hypothesis two.

The Analysis of Covariance showed that there are significant differences in how the variables influence past-twelve-month delinquency and lifetime substance use among the three racial groups. The largest average difference reported was for the effect of *delinquent peers*. The between groups comparisons show these to be attributable to differences between both W and OR youth compared to the AI youth, with AI youth reporting higher numbers of delinquent peers than either of the other groups. In contrast, between groups test found the influence of

*informal social control* on delinquency to be lower for AI than for W and OR youths when compared to the other two racial groups and while differences with regard to substance use were found only for AI and W youth. Similar to the conclusions for the previous hypotheses, the results show partial support for the claim in hypotheses three.

Before considering the implications of the findings from this research, we must go back to our earlier discussion in the introduction and remember that there are a number of issues to keep in mind. First and most importantly, even though the data set provide what is likely one of the largest samples of AI youth, the survey was designed with a general audience in mind. As such, the similarities in the patterns of findings reported here may be every bit as much associated with the wording and understandings of the indicator questions used in the survey as they may be to the causal mechanisms in the theories that these items were used to represent. Second, the questionnaire was developed to examine family, peer, and community issues of youths, not the delinquency theories that we have used to guide the analysis. As such, many of the variables included in the analysis are less comprehensive than those included in some of the prior tests reviewed above. Third, although the data have been collected in even number years since 1998, restrictions on the public use data prevent tracking respondents from the 8<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> grades. The research has relied upon guidance from theory and prior research in developing the hypotheses tested, but cannot establish the temporal role between the dependent and independent variables due to the cross-sectional nature of the data.

With these caveats in mind, the role of peer behavior and to a lesser extent peer beliefs in the etiology of delinquency is the common thread across all of the findings reported here. A careful examination of the findings in the bivariate and multivariate model show that the effects of SDT and SBT variables on a youth's decision to participate in delinquency and substance use

is substantially weakened when the SLT variables are introduced into the models. This highlights the importance of peer influence during adolescence and suggests that intervention and prevention policies should include community and family dimensions, but must focus on peer interactions if they are to be successful.

Also the finding that a youth's perception of the reactions of their parents, adult neighbors, and friends is a more consequential deterrent to delinquency than perceptions of the effectiveness of law enforcement to responding to delinquent behavior and maintain a feeling of community safety is informative. It shows perceptions of informal mechanisms of social control to be more effective than perceptions of formal social control. This has implications for practice, but in particular for policy. Many policy changes to address delinquency and crime involve the use of formal methods of control, using the law to inflict stricter punishment and increase police presence. However, results from the data suggest that it will be more beneficial to strengthen the bonds between family, the school, spiritual/cultural connections, and other pro-social institutions that strengthen informal social control within the community regardless of racial group of the youth.

In conclusion, this research was based on the need to evaluate the utility of variables from traditional delinquency theories to account for variations in delinquency and substance use and to assess whether there are differences associated with the race of the youth. Tests show similar patterns in the abilities of theoretically derived predictors to account for delinquency and substance use across racial groups. It is recommendable that future research focus on importance of peer interactions in the production of delinquency and substance use and the need to strengthen the informal social controls within communities to combat it. It is also hoped that future work focuses on the need to more fully understand the cultural and methodological

sensitivities for conducting work among American Indian youths. As this work is in its early stages there is a need for qualitative investigations and the use of methodological designs that from their inception are implemented with a Native population in mind.

Confusion created by societal change has deeply affected American Indian communities like the Blackfeet Nation in Montana. Disruption has resulted in a struggle to find the collective agreement of the Blackfeet people leaving them asking what their worldview is today. Has the worldview and culture shifted to meet the demands of today's world? Is there still enough of a Blackfeet worldview to even say there is a difference after the assimilation attack on Blackfeet culture left its scars? How much has the Blackfeet worldview changed and how has the substitution of customs and values of the dominant society affected Blackfeet social control? To understand delinquency and substance use on the Blackfeet Reservation we must first lay the proper foundation in which these questions can validly be measured. The findings reported here suggest that traditional theories are one approach of many that could be undertaken to more fully understand the processes of delinquency and substance use and how the similarities and differences across racial categories of youth can be explained.

## References

- Agnew, Robert. (1985). A revised strain theory of delinquency. *Social Forces*, 64:151-167.
- Akers, Ronald L. (1985). Social learning theory and adolescent cigarette smoking.” *Social Problems*, 32:455-73.
- Anderson, Elijah. (1999). *Code of the streets: decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- American Indian Lawyer Training Program, Inc. (1980). *Justice in Indian country*. Reno:American Indian Lawyer Training Program, Inc.
- Bastien, Betty. (2004). *Blackfoot ways of knowing: the world view of the Siksikaitapiti*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
- Beauvais, F. (1992). Comparison of drug use rates for reservation Indian, non-reservation Indian and Anglo youth.” *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research: Journal of the National Center*, 5:13-31.
- (1996). “Trends in Drug Use Among American Indian Students and Dropouts, 1975 to 1994.” *American Journal of Public Health*, 86:1594-1598.
- Beauvais, F., Jumper-Thurman, P., Plested, B. (2002). Prevention of alcohol and other drug abuse among Indian adolescent: An examination of current assumptions. In P. D. Mail, S. Heurtin-Roberts, S. E. Martin, & J. Howard (Eds.), *Alcohol use among American Indians and Alaska Natives* (NIH Publication No. 02-4231, pp. 187-209). Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Braveheart, Maria Yellow Horse and Lemyra M. DeBruyn. (1998). The American Indian holocaust: healing historical unresolved grief.” *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research*, 8:60-82.
- Brown, Margery H. and Brenda C. Desmond. (1991). Montana tribal courts: influencing the development of contemporary Indian law.” *Montana Law Review*, 52:211-305.
- Burfeind, James W. and Dawn Jeglum Bartusch. (2005). *Juvenile Delinquency: An Integrated Approach (1<sup>st</sup> Edition)*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.
- Burns, Charlene A. and Robert H. Burns. (1993). Personal Interview.
- Bursik, Robert J. Social disorganization theories of crime and delinquency: problems and prospects. *Criminology*, 26:519.

- Cajete, Gregory. 2004. "Philosophy of Native Science" in *American Indian Thought* Edited by Anne Waters. Malden, MA:Blackwell Publishing.
- Cardova, V.F. 2004. "Approaches to Native American Philosophy" in *American Indian Thought* edited by Anne Waters. Malden, MA:Blackwell Publishing.
- Deloria, Vine Jr. 2004. "Philosophy and the Tribal Peoples" in *American Indian Thought* edited by Anne Waters. Malden, MA:Blackwell Publishing.
- (2006). *The World We Used To Live In: Remembering the Powers of the Medicine Men*. Golden, Colorado: Fulcrum Publishing.
- Dorgan, Chairman Byron L. (November 2007). *Letter to the United States Senate Committee on Indian Affairs*. National Tribal Leaders Association: Washington, D.C.
- DuFour, John. 2004. "Ethics and Understanding" in *American Indian Thought* edited by Anne Waters. Malden, MA:Blackwell Publishing.
- Duran, Eduardo and Bonnie Duran. (1995). *Postcolonial Psychology*. Albany, NY: State New York University Press.
- Duro v Reina* (1990) 495 U.S. 676.
- Ewers, John C. (1958). *The Blackfeet, Raiders on the Northwestern Plains*. Norman:University of Oklahoma Press.
- Ex Parte Crow Dog*, 109 U.S. 556, 3 S.Ct. 396, 27 L.Ed. 1030 (1883).
- Fisher, P. A., M. Storck, and J.G. Bacon. (1999). In the eye of the beholder: risk and protective factors in rural American Indian and Caucasian adolescents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 69:294-304.
- Funke, Karl A. and Kirke Kickingbird. (1976). The role of American Indians in American legal history. *Law Library Journal*, 69:474-493.
- Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock*, 187 U.S. 553, 23 S.Ct. 216, 47 L.Ed. 299 (1903).
- Getches, David F., Charles F. Wilkinson, and Robert A. Williams. (2004). *Cases and Materials on Federal Indian Law: American Casebook Series (5<sup>th</sup> Edition)*. West Group.
- Gfellner, B. (1994). A matched-group comparison of drug use and problem behavior among Canadian Indian and white adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 14:24-48.



- Gregory, R., Abello, A., & Johnson, J. (1996). The individual economic well-being of Native American men and women during the 1980s: A decade of moving backwards. In G. Sandefur, R. Rindfuss, & B. Rohen (Eds.), *Changing numbers, changing needs: American Indian demography and public health* (pp. 133-171). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Grinnell, George Bird. (1899[2005]). *My Life as an Indian: The Story of a Red Woman and a White Man in the Lodges of the Blackfeet*. Kessinger Publishing.
- Hanks, Lucien M. and Jane Richardson (1945). Observations on Northern Blackfoot Kinship. *American Ethnological Society, Monographs*, 9 (1945):1-31.
- Hawdon, James and John Ryan. 2009. Social capital, social control, and changes in victimization rates." *Crime and Delinquency*, 55:526-548.
- Hawkins, Elizabeth H., Lillian H. Cummins and G. Alan Marlatt. (2004). Preventing substance abuse in American Indian and Alaska American Indian youth: promising strategies for healthier communities." *Psychological Bulletin*, 130:304-323
- Heavyrunner-Rioux, Aislinn and Hollist, Dusten. (2008). Community, family, and peer influences on alcohol, marijuana, and illicit drug use among a sample of American Indian youth: an analysis of predictive factors". Unpublished University of Montana Thesis Project.
- Hill, Augustus John. (2008). Unpublished University of Montana Thesis Project.
- Hirschi, Travis. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Hirschi, Travis, and Michel R. Gottfredson. (1990). *A General Theory of Crime*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hoffman, Edward. (1999). *The Right to Be Human: A Biography of Abraham Maslow*. McGraw-Hill.
- Hungry Wolf, Adolf. (2006). *The Blackfoot Papers Volumes I-IV*. Canadian Caboose.
- Juneau, Stan. (2001). A history and foundation of American Indian education policy." Montana Office of Public Instruction. Online Publication. [www.opi.mt.gov/IndianEd](http://www.opi.mt.gov/IndianEd).
- Kornhauser, Ruth Rosner. (1978). *Social Sources of Delinquency: An Appraisal of Analytic Models*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kulis, Stephen K., Scott K. Okamoto, and Andrea Dixon Rayle Soma Sen. (2007). Social context of drug offers among American Indian youth and their

- relationship to substance use: an exploratory study. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 12: 147-162.
- LaViolette, Paul A., PhD. 2004. *Genesis of the Cosmos: the Ancient Science of Continuous Creation*. Rochester: Bear & Company.
- Levy, Jerrold E. and Stephen J. Kunitz. (1971). Indian reservations, anomie, and social pathologies". *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 27:97-128.
- Linderman, Frank. (1935[1984]). *The Blackfeet Indians: Out of the North*. Burlington Northern.
- Little Bear, Leroy. 2000. "Jagged Worldviews Colliding" in *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision* edited by Marie Battiste. Vancouver:UBC Press.
- February 2010. Philosophy of the Blackfeet lecture. The University of Montana (Anthropology 595) held at the Blackfeet Community College.
- Mason, W. Alex and Michael Windle. (2002). Gender, self-control, and informal social control in adolescence: a test of three models of the continuity of the delinquent behavior. *Youth and Society* 33:479.
- Maximilian, Alexander Philip Prince of Wied and Karl Bodmer. (1833). *Travels in the Interior of North America 1832-34*. Omaha: Joslyn Art Museum.
- McClintock, Walter. (1999). *The Old North Trail: Life, Legends, and Religion of the Blackfeet Indians*. Lincoln:University of Nebraska Press.
- Merton, Robert K. (1938). Social structure and anomie." *American Sociological Review* 3: 672-682.
- Meyring, Westin. (2006). I'm an Indian outlaw, half Cherokee and Choctaw: criminal jurisdiction and the question of Indian status." *Montana Law Review*, 67:177.
- Montana State Department of Health and Human Services, Addictive and Mental Orders Division, Chemical Dependency Bureau. (2008). *Prevention Needs Assessment Community Student Survey for the State of Montana*. Online Publication: [www.mt.gov/pna](http://www.mt.gov/pna).
- Montana State Department of Labor and Industry Research and Analysis Bureau. (2008). *Demographic and Economic Information for the Blackfeet Reservation*. Online publication. [http://www.ourfactsyourfuture.org/admin/uploadedPublications/2683/Blackfeet\\_RF08\\_Web.pdf](http://www.ourfactsyourfuture.org/admin/uploadedPublications/2683/Blackfeet_RF08_Web.pdf).

- (2008). County Statistical Reports. Online Publication.  
<http://www.dphhs.mt.gov/statisticalinformation/index.shtml>
- Montana State Office of Public Instruction. (2007). *Facts about Montana Education*.  
Online Publication. <http://www.opi.state.mt.us/>.
- Morenoff, Jeffrey D; Robert J. Sampson, and Stephen W. Raudenbush. (2001).  
*Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of  
urban violence, report no. 00-451*. Population Studies Center at the Institute  
for Social Research:University of Michigan.
- Nagin, Daniel S.; Tremblay, Richard E. (2005). Integrating race, place, and motive in  
social disorganization theory: lessons from a comparison of Black and Latino  
homicide types in two immigrant destination cities.” *An Interdisciplinary  
Journal: The Official Publication of the American Society of Criminology*, 4:873.
- Norton-Smith, Thomas M. 2004. “Indigenous Numerical Thought” in *American Indian  
Thought* edited by Anne Waters. Malden, MA:Blackwell Publishing.
- Oliphant v. Suquamish Indian Tribe*, (1978) 435 U.S. 91.
- Parker, Karen F. and Scott R. Maggard. (2005). Structural theories and race-specific  
drug arrests: what structural factors account for the rise in race-  
drug arrests over time? *Crime and Delinquency*, 51:521.
- Pevar, Stephen L. (1992). *The Rights of Indians and Tribes: The Basic ACLU Guide to  
Indian and Tribal Rights*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Peterson, Ruth D. and Lauren J. Krivo. (2009). Segregated spacial locations, race-  
ethnic composition, and neighborhood violent crime. *The Annals of the  
American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 623:93-107.
- Philp, Kenneth R. (1986). *Indian Self Rule*. Howe Brothers.
- Piegán Institute Website for Nitzipuhwahsin Schools (2010).  
<http://www.pieganinstitute.org>.
- Prettypaint, Dr. Iris Heavyrunner. (2008). Unpublished University of Minnesota  
Dissertation Project.
- Quinney, R. (1991). *Criminology as Peacemaking*. Indiana University Press.
- Rank, Mark R. (2005). *One Nation, Underprivileged*. New York, NY: Oxford  
University Press.
- Rosier, Paul C. (2001). *Rebirth of the Blackfeet Nation, 1912-1954*. University of Nebraska

Press: Lincoln and London.

- Ross, Rupert. (2006). *Returning to the Teachings*. Penguin Canada.
- Roubideaux, Yvonne. (2005). Beyond Red Lake: the persistent crisis in American Indian health care. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 353(18):1881-3.
- Sampson, Robert J. and W. Byron Groves. (1989). Community structure and crime: testing social disorganization theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 23:336-340.
- Sampson, Robert, and John Laub. (1993). *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Sampson, Robert J. and William Julius Wilson. (1995). Toward a theory of race, crime, and urban inequality. *Crime and Inequality* edited by John Hagen and Ruth D. Peterson. Stanford, CA:Stanford University Press.
- Sampson, Robert J., Stephen W. Raudenbush and Felton Earls. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: a multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277:918-924.
- Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and Stephen Raudenbush. (2005). Social anatomy of racial and ethnic disparities in violence. *Public Health Matters*, 95:224-232.
- Schultz, James Willard. (1912). *With the Indians in the Rockies*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- . (1962) *Blackfeet and Buffalo: Memories of Life Among the Indians*. Norman, OK:University of Oklahoma Press.
- Shaw, Clifford R. and Henry D. McKay. (1942). *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas: A Study of Rates of Delinquents in Relation to Differential Characteristics of Local Communities in American Cities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . (1969). *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas: A Study of Rates of Delinquents in Relation to Differential Characteristics of Local Communities in American Cities, Rev. Ed.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shaw, Clifford R., with Maurice E. Moore. (1976) [originally published in 1937]. *The Natural History of a Delinquent Career*. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.
- Spillane, Nichea S. and Gregory T. Smith. (2007). A theory of reservation-dwelling American Indian alcohol use risk. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133:395-418.
- Steinman, Kenneth J.and Yini Hu. (2007). Substance use among American Indian

- youth in an eastern city. *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Abuse a Division of Health Behavior and Health Promotion*. Ohio State University School of Public Health, Columbus, OH. Online Publication.
- Stiffman, Arlene Rubin, Eddie Brown, Stacey Freedenthal, Laura House, Emily Ostmann, and Mann Soo Yu. (2007). American Indian youth: personal, familial, and environmental strengths. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 16:331-346.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Division (SAMHSA). (2007). *The NHSDA Report: Substance Use Among American Indians or Alaska Natives*. Online Publication. <http://www.oas.samhsa.gov/2k3/AmIndians/AmIndians.cfm>.
- Sutherland, Edwin H., and Donald R. Cressey. (1924). *Criminology*. 9<sup>th</sup> Edition. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.
- Sykes, Gresham M. and David Matza. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: a theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22.
- Trosper, R. (1996). American Indian poverty on reservations. In G. Sandefur, R. Rindfuss, & B. Rohen (Eds.), *Changing Numbers, Changing Needs: American Indian Demography and Public Health* (pp. 172-195). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2007). *Poverty: 2007 and 2008 American Community Surveys*. *American Community Survey Reports*. Online Publication. <http://www.census.gov/prod/2009pubs/acsbr08-1.pdf>
- U.S. Code. (2004). Title 18, Part I, Chapter 53, Section 1151.
- U.S. Code. (2004). Title 25, Section 1301-1303.
- U.S. Code. (2004). Title 25, Chapter 14, Subchapter V, Section 479.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2002. *A BJS Statistical Profile 1992-2002, of American Indians and Crime*. Washington, D.C.:U.S. Government Printing Office. Online Publication.
- U.S. v Lara*. (2004) 541 U.S. 193.
- U.S. v Wheeler* (1978) 435 U.S. 313.
- Wallace, J.M., Bachman, J.G., O'Malley, P.M., Schulenberg, J.E., Cooper, S.M. & Johnston, L.D. (2003). Gender and ethnic differences in smoking, drinking and illicit drug use among American 8th, 10th and 12th grade students, 1976-2000. *Addiction*, 98:225-234.

- Walls, Melissa L. (2008). Marijuana and alcohol use during early adolescence: gender differences among American Indian/First Nations youth.” *Journal of Drug Issues*, 1139-1160.
- Waters, Anne. 2004. “That Alchemical Bering Strait Theory” in *American Indian Thought* edited by Anne Waters. Malden, MA:Blackwell Publishing.
- Wissler, Clark. (1911). *The Social Life of the Blackfoot Indians*. New York, American Museum of Natural History.
- . (1912). *Ceremonial Bundles of the Blackfoot Indians*. New York, American Museum of Natural History.
- Wolfgang, Marvin E., and Franco Ferracuti. *The Subculture of Violence: Towards an Integrated Theory in Criminology*. London: Social Science Paperbacks: 1967.
- Yabiku, Scott T., Andrea Dixon Rayle, Scott K. Okamoto, Flavio F. Marsiglia, and Steven Kulis. (2007). The effect of neighborhood context on the drug use of American Indian youth of the Southwest. *Journal of Ethnicity in Substance Use*, 6:181-204.
- Yang, Shu-Lung, and John P. Hoffmann. (1998). A multilevel assessment of social disorganization theory in Taipei, Taiwan. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 14:222-247.
- Yazzie, Brian Burkhart. 2004. “What Coyote and Thales Can Teach Us” in *American Indian Thought* edited by Anne Waters. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

# ***APPENDIX A***

## **SCALED MEASURES**

Below is a description of questions used to build the following scaled variables.

***Lifetime Substance Use:*** For the following question, possible answers to choose from were “0, 1-2, 3-5, 6-9, 10-19, 20-39, or 40+” times.

On how many occasions, if any, in your lifetime, have you

- Had beer, wine, or hard liquor to drink – more than just a few drinks
- Used marijuana
- Used LSD or other psychedelics
- Used cocaine or crack
- Sniffed glue, breathed the contents of an aerosol spray can, or inhaled other gases or sprays in order get high
- Used methamphetamines (meth, speed, crank, crystal meth)
- Used stimulants other than methamphetamines (such as amphetamines, Ritalin, or Dexedrine) – without a doctor telling you to take them
- Used sedatives, (tranquilizers, such as Valium or Xanax, barbiturates, or sleeping pills)—without a doctor telling you to take them
- Used heroin or other opiates
- Used MDMA (‘X’, ‘E’, or Ecstasy)

***Past Twelve Months Delinquency:*** How many times in the past year (12 months) have you

- Been suspended from school
- Sold illegal drugs
- Stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle such as a car or motorcycle
- Been arrested
- Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them
- Been drunk or high at school
- Taken a handgun to school

The following answers were the options “0, 1-2, 3-5, 6-9, 10-19, 20-39, or 40+” times.



***Neighborhood Disorder:*** How much does each of the following statements describe your neighborhood?

- Crime and/or drug selling
- Fights
- Lots of empty or abandoned buildings
- Lots of graffiti

Possible answers were: NO! no, yes, or YES!

***Parental Attachment:***

- Do you feel very close to your mother?
- Do you share your thoughts and feelings with your mother?
- My parents ask me what I think before most family decisions affecting me are made.
- Do you share your thoughts and feelings with your father?
- Do you enjoy spending time with your mother?
- Do you enjoy spending time with your father?
- If I had a personal problem, I could ask mom or dad for help
- Do you feel very close to your father?
- My parents give me lots of chances to do fun things with them.
- It is important to be honest with your parents, even if they become upset or you get punished.

Possible answers were: NO! no, yes, or YES!

- My parents notice when I'm doing a good job and let me know about it.
- How often do your parents tell you they are proud of you for something you've done?

Possible answers were: Never or almost never, sometimes, often, or all the time.

***Neighborhood Attachment:***

- If I had to move, I would miss the neighborhood I now live in.
- My neighbors notice when I am doing a good job and let me know about it.
- I like my neighborhood.
- There are lots of adults in my neighborhood that I could talk to about something important.
- I'd like to get out of my neighborhood. (Reverse coded)
- There are people in my neighborhood who are proud of me when I do something well.
- There are people in my neighborhood who encourage me to do my best.

Possible answers were NO! no, yes, YES!

***School Attachment:*** Now, thinking back over the past year in school, did you:

- Enjoy being in school
- Hate being in school (reverse coded)
- Try to do your best work in school
- How often do you feel that the school work you are doing is important?

Possible answers were: Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Often, Almost Always

- How often do you feel the things you are learning in school are going to be important for your later life?

Possible answers were: Very important, Quite important, Fairly important, Slightly important, or Not at all important.

- How interesting are most of your courses to you? (Reverse Coded)

Possible answers were: Very interesting and stimulating, Quite interesting, Fairly interesting, Slightly Dull, and Very Dull.

***Delinquent Peers:*** Think of your four best friends, (the friends you feel closest to). In the past year (12 months), how many of your best friends have...

- Been suspended from school
- Carried a handgun
- Sold illegal drugs
- Stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle such as a car or motorcycle
- Been arrested
- Dropped out of school

Possible answers to these indicators were “0, 1, 2, 3, or 4”.

***Pro Delinquent Attitudes:*** How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to...

- Take a handgun to school
- Steal anything worth more than \$5
- Pick a fight with someone
- Attack someone with the idea of seriously hurting them
- Stay away from school all day when their parents think they are at school

Possible answers were “Very Wrong!, Wrong, A Little Bit Wrong, or Not Wrong At All!”

***Informal Social Control:*** How often do you attend religious services or activities?

Possible answers were: Never, Rarely, 1-2 times per month, and about once a week or more.

How wrong would most adults (over 21) in your neighborhood think it is for kids your age to...

- Use marijuana
- Drink alcohol
- Smoke cigarettes

How wrong do your parents think it would be for you to....

- Drink beer, wine, or hard liquor (such as Vodka, Whiskey, or Gin) regularly
- Smoke cigarettes
- Use smokeless tobacco
- Smoke marijuana
- Steal something worth more than \$5
- Draw graffiti, write things, or draw pictures on buildings or property without the owner's permission
- Pick a fight with someone

Possible answers to the above questions were as follows: "Very Wrong, Wrong, A Little Bit Wrong, or Not Wrong At All." (Reverse Coded)

- The rules in my family are clear.
- When I am not at home one of my parents knows where I am and who I am with.
- My family has clear rules about alcohol and drug use.

Possible answers to the above questions were: NO! no, yes, or YES! (Reverse Coded)

**Formal Social Control:** I feel safe in my neighborhood.

Possible answers to this question were NO! no, yes, and YES! (Reverse Coded)

- If a kid smoked marijuana in your neighborhood, would he or she get caught by the police?
- If a kid smoked cigarettes in your neighborhood, would he or she get caught by the police?
- If a kid drank some beer, wine, or hard liquor (for example vodka, whiskey, or gin) in your neighborhood, would he or she get caught by the police?
- If you wanted to get some cigarettes, how easy would it be for you to get them?
- If you wanted to get some beer, wine or hard liquor (for example vodka, whiskey, or gin), how easy would it be for you to get some?
- If you wanted to get a drug like cocaine, LSD, or amphetamines, how easy would it be for you to get some?
- If you wanted to get some marijuana, how easy would it be for you to get some?
- If you wanted to get some methamphetamines, how easy would it be for you to get some?

Possible answers to this question were Very hard, Sort of hard, Sort of easy, Very easy (Reverse Coded).

**Impulsivity:** How many times have you done the following things:

- Done what feels good no matter what
- Done something dangerous because someone dared you to do it.
- Done crazy things even if they're a little dangerous.

Possible answers were: Once a Week or more, two or three times a Month, About Once A Month, Less Than Once a Month, I've Done It, But Not In the Past Year, or Never.

- I do the opposite of what people tell me, just to get them mad.
- I like to see how much I can get away with.
- I ignore rules that get in my way.

Possible answers were: Very False, Somewhat False, Somewhat True, and Very True.

- It is important to think before you act.

Possible answers were NO! no, yes, or YES! This variable was reverse coded.

## ***APPENDIX B***

Montana Prevention Needs Assessment Survey

## MONTANA PREVENTION NEEDS ASSESSMENT COMMUNITY STUDENT SURVEY

1. Thank you for agreeing to participate in this survey. The purpose of this survey is to learn how students in our schools feel about their community, family, peers, and school. The survey also asks about health behaviors.
2. **The survey is completely voluntary and anonymous. DO NOT put your name on the questionnaire.**
3. This is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. We would like you to work quickly so you can finish.
4. All of the questions should be answered by completely filling in one of the answer spaces. If you do not find an answer that fits exactly, use the one that comes closest. If any question does not apply to you, or you are not sure what it means, just leave it blank. You can skip any question that you do not wish to answer.
5. For questions that have the following answers: **NO! no yes YES!**  
 Mark (the BIG) **NO!** if you think the statement is **DEFINITELY NOT TRUE** for you.  
 Mark (the little) **no** if you think the statement is **MOSTLY NOT TRUE** for you.  
 Mark (the little) **yes** if you think the statement is **MOSTLY TRUE** for you.  
 Mark (the BIG) **YES!** if you think the statement is **DEFINITELY TRUE** for you.  
  
 Example: Chocolate is the best ice cream flavor.  
 NO!    no    yes    YES!  
  
 In the example above, the student marked "yes" because he or she thinks the statement is mostly true.
6. Please mark only one answer for each question by completely filling in the oval with a #2 pencil.

**Please fill in the following questions with the help of your teacher/survey assistant.**

<p><b>District:</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><td>0</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>1</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> </table>	0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>School:</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><td>0</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>1</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> </table>	0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p><b>Student's Zip Code:</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><td>0</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>1</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>3</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>6</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>7</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td><td><input type="checkbox"/></td></tr> </table>	0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																														
0	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																													
1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																													
2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																													
3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																													
4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																													
5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																													
6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																													
7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																													
8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																													
9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																																																																																													

1. Are you:    MALE    FEMALE
2. How old are you?  
 10 or younger    12    14    16    18  
 11    13    15    17    19 or older
3. What grade are you in?  
 6th    7th    8th    9th    10th    11th    12th
4. Please choose the **ONE** answer that **BEST** describes what you consider yourself to be.  
 White, not of Hispanic origin  
 Black, or African American  
 American Indian/Native American, Eskimo, or Aleut  
 Hispanic/Latino/Spanish  
 Asian  
 Pacific Islander  
 Other (Please Specify \_\_\_\_\_ )

5. What is the highest level of schooling completed by your mother or father?  
 Completed grade school or less    Completed college  
 Some high school    Graduate or professional school after college  
 Completed high school    Don't know  
 Some college    Does not apply
6. Think of where you live most of the time. Which of the following people live there with you? (Mark all that apply.)  
 Mother    Grandfather  
 Stepmother    Uncle  
 Foster Mother    Other Adults  
 Grandmother    Brother(s)  
 Aunt    Stepbrother(s)  
 Father    Sister(s)  
 Steplather    Stepsister(s)  
 Foster Father    Other Children

Produced by the Montana Department of Health and Human Services, Addictive and Mental Disorders Division Phone: (406) 444-9656  
 Bach Harrison, L.L.C. Salt Lake City Utah Phone: (801) 359-2064



ACCUSCAN® 33771PCN105 (Revised) APPROXIMATE PRINT MANAGEMENT SERVICES

The next section asks about your experiences at school.

	NO!	no	yes	YES!
7. In my school, students have lots of chances to help decide things like class activities and rules.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Teachers ask me to work on special classroom projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. My teacher(s) notices when I am doing a good job and lets me know about it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. There are lots of chances for students in my school to get involved in sports, clubs, and other school activities outside of class.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. There are lots of chances for students in my school to talk with a teacher one-on-one.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. I feel safe at my school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. The school lets my parents know when I have done something well.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. My teachers praise me when I work hard in school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Are your school grades better than the grades of most students in your class?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. I have lots of chances to be part of class discussions or activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. Now thinking back over the past year in school, how often did you:

	Almost Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. enjoy being in school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. hate being in school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. try to do your best work in school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. How often do you feel that the school work you are assigned is meaningful and important?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. Putting them all together, what were your grades like last year?

Mostly F's       Mostly B's  
 Mostly D's       Mostly A's  
 Mostly C's

20. How important do you think the things you are learning in school are going to be for your later life?

Very important       Slightly important  
 Quite important       Not at all important  
 Fairly important

21. How interesting are most of your courses to you?

Very interesting and stimulating  
 Quite interesting       Slightly dull  
 Fairly interesting       Very dull

22. During the LAST FOUR WEEKS how many whole days of school have you missed because you skipped or 'cut'?

None     1     2     3     4-5     6-10     11 or more

The next questions ask about your feelings and experiences in other parts of your life.

23. Think of your four best friends (the friends you feel closest to). In the past year (12 months), how many of your best friends have:

	Number of Friends				
	0	1	2	3	4
a. participated in clubs, organizations or activities at school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. smoked cigarettes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. tried beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin) when their parents didn't know about it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. made a commitment to stay drug-free?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. used marijuana?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. tried to do well in school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. used LSD, cocaine, amphetamines, or other illegal drugs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. been suspended from school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. liked school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. carried a handgun?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. sold illegal drugs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. regularly attended religious services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle such as a car or motorcycle?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. been arrested?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. dropped out of school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

24. What are the chances you would be seen as cool if you:

	Very Good Chance				
	Pretty Good Chance				
	Some Chance				
	Little Chance				
	No or Very Little Chance				
a. smoked cigarettes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. worked hard at school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. began drinking alcoholic beverages regularly, that is, at least once or twice a month?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. defended someone who was being verbally abused at school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. smoked marijuana?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. used smokeless tobacco?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. carried a handgun?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. regularly volunteered to do community service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



25. How old were you when you first:

	8 or Younger	9 or 10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17 or Older
Never									

a. smoked marijuana?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. smoked a cigarette, even just a puff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. had more than a sip or two of beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. began drinking alcoholic beverages regularly, that is, at least once or twice a month?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. used smokeless tobacco (dip, snuff, chew)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. used methamphetamines (meth, ice, crystal, or speed)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. got suspended from school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. got arrested?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. carried a handgun?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

26. How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to:

	Not Wrong at All	A Little Bit Wrong	Wrong	Very Wrong
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. take a handgun to school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. steal anything worth more than \$5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. pick a fight with someone?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. attack someone with the idea of seriously hurting them?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. stay away from school all day when their parents think they are at school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. drink beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin) regularly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. smoke cigarettes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. smoke marijuana?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. use LSD, cocaine, amphetamines or another illegal drug?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

27. At school during the past 12 months, did you receive help from the resource teacher, speech therapist or other special education teacher?

No     Yes

28. How many times have you done the following things?

	Never	I've Done It, But Not in the Past Year	Less Than Once a Month	About Once a Month	2 or 3 Times a Month	Once a Week or More
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. done what feels good no matter what.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. done something dangerous because someone dared you to do it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. done crazy things even if they are a little dangerous?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

29. How many times in the past year (12 months) have you:

	Never	1 to 2 Times	3 to 5 Times	6 to 9 Times	10 to 19 Times	20 to 29 Times	30 to 39 Times	40+ Times
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. been suspended from school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. carried a handgun?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. sold illegal drugs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle such as a car or motorcycle?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. participated in clubs, organizations or activities at school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. been arrested?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. done extra work on your own for school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. been drunk or high at school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. volunteered to do community service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. taken a handgun to school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

30. Are you currently on probation, or assigned a probation officer with Juvenile Court?

No     Yes

31. Have you ever belonged to a gang?

No                       Yes, belong now  
 No, but would like to     Yes, but would like to get out  
 Yes, in the past

32. You're looking at CD's in a music store with a friend. You look up and see her slip a CD under her coat. She smiles and says "Which one do you want? Go ahead, take it while nobody's around." There is nobody in sight, no employees and no other customers. What would you do now?
- Ignore her
  - Grab a CD and leave the store
  - Tell her to put the CD back
  - Act like it is a joke, and ask her to put the CD back
33. You are visiting another part of town, and you don't know any of the people your age there. You are walking down the street, and some teenager you don't know is walking toward you. He is about your size, and as he is about to pass you, he deliberately bumps into you and you almost lose your balance. What would you say or do?
- Push the person back.
  - Say "Excuse me" and keep on walking
  - Say "Watch where you are going" and keep on walking
  - Swear at the person and walk away
34. You are at a party at someone's house, and one of your friends offers you a drink containing alcohol. What would you say or do?
- Drink it
  - Tell your friend, "No thanks, I don't drink" and suggest that you and your friend go and do something else
  - Just say, "No thanks" and walk away
  - Make up a good excuse, tell your friend you had something else to do, and leave
35. It's 8:00 on a weeknight and you are about to go over to a friend's home when your mother asks you where you are going. You say "Oh, just going to go hang out with some friends." She says, "No, you'll just get into trouble if you go out. Stay home tonight." What would you do now?
- Leave the house anyway
  - Explain what you are going to do with your friends, tell her when you will get home, and ask if you can go out
  - Not say anything and start watching TV
  - Get into an argument with her
36. How often do you attend religious services or activities?
- Never  1-2 Times a Month
  - Rarely  About Once a Week or More
37. I do the opposite of what people tell me, just to get them mad.
- Very False  Somewhat True
  - Somewhat False  Very True
38. I like to see how much I can get away with.
- Very False  Somewhat True
  - Somewhat False  Very True

39. I ignore rules that get in my way.
- Very False  Somewhat True
  - Somewhat False  Very True



	NO!	no	yes	YES!
40. I think sometimes it's okay to cheat at school.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41. It is important to think before you act.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42. Sometimes I think that life is not worth it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43. At times I think I am no good at all.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44. All in all, I am inclined to think that I am a failure.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
45. In the past year, have you felt depressed or sad MOST days, even if you felt okay sometimes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
46. It is all right to beat up people if they start the fight.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
47. I think it is okay to take something without asking if you can get away with it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

48. Sometimes we don't know what we will do as adults, but we may have an idea. Please answer how true these statements may be for you. WHEN I AM AN ADULT I WILL:

	NO!	no	yes	YES!
a. smoke cigarettes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. use smokeless tobacco.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. drink beer, wine, or liquor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. smoke marijuana.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. use LSD, cocaine, amphetamines or another illegal drug.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

49. How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they:

	Great Risk	Moderate Risk	Slight Risk	No Risk
--	------------	---------------	-------------	---------

a. smoke one or more packs of cigarettes per day?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. use smokeless tobacco?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. try marijuana once or twice?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. smoke marijuana regularly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. take one or two drinks of an alcoholic beverage (beer, wine, liquor) nearly every day?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. use methamphetamines (meth, ice, crystal, or speed)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



On how many occasions (if any) have you:

OCCASIONS

	0	1-2	3-5	6-9	10-19	20-39	40+
50. had alcoholic beverages (beer, wine or hard liquor) to drink in your lifetime – more than just a few sips?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
51. had beer, wine or hard liquor to drink during the past 30 days?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
52. used marijuana in your lifetime?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
53. used marijuana during the past 30 days?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
54. used LSD or other psychedelics in your lifetime?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
55. used LSD or other psychedelics during the past 30 days?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
56. used cocaine or crack in your lifetime?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
57. used cocaine or crack during the past 30 days?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
58. sniffed glue, breathed the contents of an aerosol spray can, or inhaled other gases or sprays, in order to get high in your lifetime?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
59. sniffed glue, breathed the contents of an aerosol spray can, or inhaled other gases or sprays, in order to get high during the past 30 days?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
60. used phenoxydine (pox, px, breeze) in your lifetime?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
61. used phenoxydine (pox, px, breeze) during the past 30 days?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
62. used methamphetamines (meth, speed, crank, crystal meth) in your lifetime?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
63. used methamphetamines (meth, speed, crank, crystal meth) during the past 30 days?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
64. used stimulants other than methamphetamines (such as amphetamines, Ritalin, or Dexedrine) without a doctor telling you to take them, in your lifetime?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
65. used stimulants other than methamphetamines (such as amphetamines, Ritalin, or Dexedrine) without a doctor telling you to take them, during the past 30 days?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
66. used sedatives (tranquilizers, such as valium or xanax, barbiturates, or sleeping pills) without a doctor telling you to take them, in your lifetime?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
67. used sedatives (tranquilizers, such as valium or xanax, barbiturates, or sleeping pills) without a doctor telling you to take them, during the past 30 days?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
68. used heroin or other opiates in your lifetime?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
69. used heroin or other opiates during the past 30 days?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
70. used MDMA (X, E, or ecstacy) in your lifetime?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
71. used MDMA (X, E, or ecstacy) during the past 30 days?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

72. Think back over the last two weeks. How many times have you had five or more alcoholic drinks in a row?

- None
- Once
- Twice
- 3-5 times
- 6-9 times
- 10 or more times

73. Have you ever used smokeless tobacco (chew, snuff, plug, dipping tobacco, or chewing tobacco)?

- Never
- Once or Twice
- Once in a while but not regularly
- Regularly in the past
- Regularly now

74. How frequently have you used smokeless tobacco during the past 30 days?

- Never
- Once or Twice
- Once or twice per week
- 3 to 5 times per week
- About once a day
- More than once a day

75. Have you ever smoked cigarettes?

- Never
- Once or Twice
- Once in a while but not regularly
- Regularly in the past
- Regularly now

76. During the past 30 days, on how many days did you smoke cigarettes?

- 0 days
- 1 or 2 days
- 3 to 5 days
- 6 to 9 days
- 10 to 19 days
- 20 to 29 days
- All 30 days

77. During the past 30 days, on the days you smoked, how many cigarettes did you smoke per day?

- I did not smoke cigarettes during the past 30 days
- Less than 1 cigarette per day
- 1 cigarette per day
- 2 to 5 cigarettes per day
- 6 to 10 cigarettes per day
- 11 to 20 cigarettes per day
- More than 20 cigarettes per day

78. Do you think that ceremonial use of tobacco among American Indian people promotes cigarette smoking as a habit?

- Definitely yes
- Probably yes
- Probably not
- Definitely not



These questions ask about the neighborhood and community where you live.

79. How wrong would most adults (over 21) in your neighborhood think it is for kids your age:

	Not Wrong at All	A Little Bit Wrong	Wrong	Very Wrong
a. to use marijuana?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. to drink alcohol?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. to smoke cigarettes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

80. How much do each of the following statements describe your neighborhood?

	NO!	no	yes	YES!
a. crime and/or drug selling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. fights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. lots of empty or abandoned buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. lots of graffiti	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	NO!	no	yes	YES!
81. If I had to move, I would miss the neighborhood I now live in.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
82. My neighbors notice when I am doing a good job and let me know about it.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
83. I like my neighborhood.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
84. There are lots of adults in my neighborhood I could talk to about something important.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
85. I'd like to get out of my neighborhood.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
86. There are people in my neighborhood who are proud of me when I do something well.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
87. There are people in my neighborhood who encourage me to do my best.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
88. I feel safe in my neighborhood.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

89. Which of the following activities for people your age are available in your community?

a. sports teams	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
b. scouting	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
c. boys and girls clubs	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
d. 4-H clubs	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
e. service clubs	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes

	NO!	no	yes	YES!
90. If a kid smoked marijuana in your neighborhood would he or she be caught by the police?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
91. If a kid smoked cigarettes in your neighborhood, would he or she be caught by the police?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
92. If a kid drank some beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin) in your neighborhood would he or she be caught by the police?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
93. If a kid carried a handgun in your neighborhood would he or she be caught by the police?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

90. If a kid smoked marijuana in your neighborhood would he or she be caught by the police?

91. If a kid smoked cigarettes in your neighborhood, would he or she be caught by the police?

92. If a kid drank some beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin) in your neighborhood would he or she be caught by the police?

93. If a kid carried a handgun in your neighborhood would he or she be caught by the police?

	Very Easy	Sort of Easy	Sort of Hard	Very Hard
94. If you wanted to get some cigarettes, how easy would it be for you to get some?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
95. If you wanted to get some beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin), how easy would it be for you to get some?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
96. If you wanted to get a drug like cocaine, LSD, or amphetamines, how easy would it be for you to get some?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
97. If you wanted to get a handgun, how easy would it be for you to get one?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
98. If you wanted to get some marijuana, how easy would it be for you to get some?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
99. If you wanted to get some methamphetamines, how easy would it be for you to get some?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

94. If you wanted to get some cigarettes, how easy would it be for you to get some?

95. If you wanted to get some beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin), how easy would it be for you to get some?

96. If you wanted to get a drug like cocaine, LSD, or amphetamines, how easy would it be for you to get some?

97. If you wanted to get a handgun, how easy would it be for you to get one?

98. If you wanted to get some marijuana, how easy would it be for you to get some?

99. If you wanted to get some methamphetamines, how easy would it be for you to get some?

The next few questions ask about your family.

100. How wrong do your parents feel it would be for YOU to:

	Not Wrong at All	A Little Bit Wrong	Wrong	Very Wrong
a. drink beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey or gin) regularly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. smoke cigarettes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. use smokeless tobacco?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. smoke marijuana?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. steal something worth more than \$5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. draw graffiti, write things, or draw pictures on buildings or other property (without the owner's permission)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. pick a fight with someone?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. drink beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey or gin) regularly?

b. smoke cigarettes?

c. use smokeless tobacco?

d. smoke marijuana?

e. steal something worth more than \$5?

f. draw graffiti, write things, or draw pictures on buildings or other property (without the owner's permission)?

g. pick a fight with someone?

101. Have any of your brothers or sisters ever:

	I don't have any Brothers or Sisters	
	Yes	No
a. drunk beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey or gin)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. smoked marijuana?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. used smokeless tobacco?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. smoked cigarettes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. taken a handgun to school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. been suspended or expelled from school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	NO!	no	yes	YES!
102. The rules in my family are clear.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
103. People in my family often insult or yell at each other.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
104. When I am not at home, one of my parents knows where I am and who I am with.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
105. We argue about the same things in my family over and over.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
106. If you drank some beer, wine, or liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey, or gin) without your parents' permission, would you be caught by your parents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
107. My family has clear rules about alcohol and drug use.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
108. My family has clear rules about cigarettes and tobacco use.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
109. If you carried a handgun without your parents' permission, would you be caught by your parents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
110. If you skipped school would you be caught by your parents?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
111. Do you feel very close to your mother?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
112. Do you share your thoughts and feelings with your mother?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
113. My parents ask me what I think before most family decisions affecting me are made.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
114. Do you share your thoughts and feelings with your father?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
115. Do you enjoy spending time with your mother?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
116. Do you enjoy spending time with your father?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
117. If I had a personal problem, I could ask my mom or dad for help.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	NO!	no	yes	YES!
118. Do you feel very close to your father?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
119. My parents give me lots of chances to do fun things with them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
120. My parents ask if I've gotten my homework done.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
121. People in my family have serious arguments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
122. Would your parents know if you did not come home on time?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
123. It is important to be honest with your parents, even if they become upset or you get punished.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

124. My parents notice when I am doing a good job and let me know about it.

Never or Almost Never       Often  
 Sometimes                       All the Time

125. How often do your parents tell you they're proud of you for something you've done?

Never or Almost Never       Often  
 Sometimes                       All the Time

126. How many brothers and sisters, including stepbrothers and stepsisters, do you have that are younger than you?

0    1    2    3    4    5    6 or more

127. How many brothers and sisters, including stepbrothers and stepsisters, do you have that are older than you?

0    1    2    3    4    5    6 or more

128. Have you changed homes in the past year (the last 12 months)?

No       Yes

129. How many times have you changed homes since kindergarten?

Never                       5 or 6 times  
 1 or 2 times               7 or more times  
 3 or 4 times

130. Have you changed schools (including changing from elementary to middle and middle to high school) in the past year?

No       Yes

131. How many times have you changed schools since kindergarten (including changing from elementary to middle and middle to high school)?

Never                       5 or 6 times  
 1 or 2 times               7 or more times  
 3 or 4 times

132. Has anyone in your family ever had severe alcohol or drug problems?

No       Yes

133. About how many adults (over 21) have you known personally who in the past year have:

	Number of Adults				
	0	1	2	3-4	5+
a. used marijuana, crack, cocaine, or other drugs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. sold or dealt drugs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. done other things that could get them in trouble with the police, like stealing, selling stolen goods, mugging or assaulting others, etc.?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. gotten drunk or high?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The next questions ask about tobacco use.

134. What rules does your school have about smoking or chewing tobacco on school property?

- Smoking or chewing is not allowed on school property
- Smoking or chewing is generally not allowed with a few exceptions
- Smoking or chewing is allowed in some areas
- There are no restrictions on smoking or chewing

135. During the past 30 days, have you seen any of the following groups smoking cigarettes on school property? (Mark all that apply)

- Students
- Teachers
- Other people who work at school
- People who don't work at school
- I have not seen anybody smoking on school property

136. During the past 30 days, have you been with somebody who was smoking? This could be at home, school, or any other place (Mark all that apply)

- Yes, I was in the same room
- Yes, I was in a car
- No, I was not around anybody who smoked

137. Do you think the smoke from other people's cigarettes is harmful to you?

- Definitely yes
- Probably yes
- Probably not
- Definitely not

138. Not counting yourself, does anyone who lives in your home do the following? (Mark all that apply)

- Smoke cigarettes
- Chew tobacco, snuff, or dip
- No one smokes or chews tobacco in my home

139. During the past 30 days, how did you usually get your own chewing tobacco, snuff, or dip?

- I did not use chew, snuff, or dip in the past 30 days
- I bought it in a store
- I stole it
- I got it from someone else
- I got it in some other way
- I gave someone else money to buy it for me
- A person 18 years old or older gave it to me

140. During the past 30 days, how did you usually get your own cigarettes?

- I did not smoke cigarettes in the past 30 days
- I bought them in a store
- I stole them
- I got them from someone else
- I got them in some other way
- I gave someone else money to buy them for me
- A person 18 years old or older gave them to me

141. When you bought or tried to buy cigarettes in a store during the past 30 days, were you ever asked to show how old you were?

- I did not buy cigarettes
- No, I was not asked to show proof of my age
- Yes, I was asked to show proof of my age

142. How honest were you in filling out this survey?

- I was very honest
- I was honest pretty much of the time
- I was honest some of the time
- I was honest once in a while
- I was not honest at all

Thank you for completing the survey