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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Gang involvement among youth has significantly increased over the past two decades in Sonoma County. The rising population within the last two decades has accounted for the rapid distribution of gang violence across small towns and cities. In 1991, it was reported that over 300 gang members were identified in Sonoma County (Doyle, 2005). A decade later, the number had increased nearly eight times to approximately 2,800 local gang members and 35 different gangs (Doyle, 2005). Furthermore, two years after that report, The Press Democrat (Mason, 2007) reported that there were approximately 3,500 documented gang members and more than 4,300 gang associates in Sonoma County, an increase of 300 known identified gang members from the year 1991. The article also noted an alarming rise in gang activity in Petaluma and Windsor. From 1993 to 1998, gangs were responsible for only 40% of Sonoma County murders, compared to 70% from 1999 to 2004. Currently, there are over 44 identified gangs in Sonoma County, of mainly Latino background, made up of youth from different socioeconomic status as well as different ethnic backgrounds. Latino gangs, Nortenos and Surenos, are the strongest and most respected gangs in Sonoma County at this time (Mason, 2007).

Sonoma County, and more specifically the city of Santa Rosa, has experienced a gang problem in recent years. As stated in the documentary completed by the History Channel “Gangland: Blood in Blood out”, Santa Rosa, California, was the epicenter for a
violent incident between two rival street gangs, the Nortenos and Surenos. This episode took place on May 5, 2002, after the Cinco de Mayo festivities and it resulted in the shooting and stabbing of three gang members. More than fifty Nortenos and equal number of Surenos were involved in this battle (Root of all Evil, 2010). Santa Rosa’s Mayor, Jane Bender, stated that Santa Rosa had the “image of a small town and that people do not see it as an urban area with urban problems” (Doyle, 2005, p. 1). It was after this event that the city of Santa Rosa and Sonoma law enforcement became aware of the increasing number of gang members within the county, specifically Santa Rosa. In November of 2004, Santa Rosa voters declared a war against gangs by passing Measure O, which provides $1.4 million in bond money per year to fund youth development, gang prevention and intervention programs in Santa Rosa. The funds from the bond are also used to create and coordinate the Mayor’s Gang Prevention Task Force to reduce gang activity in the city of Santa Rosa. Endless efforts have been put in place by the Sonoma County District Attorney’s Office, Sonoma County Juvenile Probation, local law enforcement agencies, Sonoma County voters and community based organizations to decrease gang activity and gang involvement. Sonoma County Juvenile Probation in collaboration with The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship (The Center) have implemented evidence based models to work more effectively with gang youth and aggressive offenders in attempts to reduce involvement and recidivism.

Aggression Replacement Training (ART) is a multimodal approach to working with aggressive offenders. ART has been applied in a variety of environments, including but not limited to schools, community programs, gang intervention programs, group
homes and correctional facilities (McGinnis, 2003). ART has been proved to be an evidence based model and effective method to reduce aggressive behavior, improve interpersonal communication, address value systems, acquiring skills and improving the ability to make better choices (Goldstein, Nensen, Daleflod & Kalt, 2004). McGinnis (2003) suggests that evidence based models like ART would produce positive and durable results for aggressive youth. Aggression Replacement Training used for the purpose of this project will guide youth, as well as, their parents in the acquisition of skills to improve their ability to make effective choices, improve interpersonal communication, learn to manage their anger and improve their communication with each other.

Statement of Collaboration

This research project will be co-authored by both, Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez and Cindy Yang.

Background

Curry & Decker (1998) reported that the United States had seen a rise in the numbers of gang and gang related activity in the late 1800, 1900s, 1960’s and 1990s. Sharpe (2003) stated that the presence of gangs and gang membership along with their crime involvement has been documented and debated by researchers for many years. In 2007, The Department of Justice and the National Youth Gang Survey reported that approximately 788,000 gang members and 27,000 gangs were active in the United States (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2009b; National Youth Gang Survey, 2009; California Department of Justice, 2005, 2006, 2006).
The country’s most notorious “super gangs” originated in California and are known as: “The Crips”, “Bloods”, “Hell’s Angels”, “Mexican Mafia”, “Nuestra Familia”, “Mara Salvatrucha”, “18th Street”, “Sur Trece” and the “Aryan Brothers” (Rodriguez, 2005). The National Youth Gang Center (2009) estimated approximately 788,000 gang members in the United States by the year 2007. Gang membership by ethnicity is 49 percent Hispanic/Latino, 35 %, African American, 9 % white and 7 % of other ethnicities. Moreover, it estimated that there are more than 27,000 gangs identified in the United States.

There is an apparent relationship between prison gangs and street gangs. Valdez (2009), states that street gang members honor and pay homage to state prison gang members and that street gangs are heavily influenced by prison gangs. Many street gang members aspire to become prison gang members. The Mexican Mafia and Nuestra Familia are the most active Latino prison gangs.

The Mexican Mafia was initiated approximately in 1957 at the Deuel Vocational Institution located in Tracy, California. The Mexican Mafia was originally founded by thirteen inmates who were from different street gangs in Los Angeles (Mexican Mafia, 2010). The Mexican Mafia was formed for personal protection from other prison gang, inmates and prison staff. Valdez (2009) points out that the Mexican Mafia has a strong influence on young street gang members and is consistently recruiting new members. The use of symbolism is highly important in the Mexican Mafia. Members will often tattoo themselves with a black hand “la mano negra” or the word “Eme” which means the letter M in Spanish. Their tattoos often display an eagle holding a serpent in its mouth.
The eagle represents the eagle embedded in the Mexican flag. In addition, members of the Mexican Mafia will identify themselves with the term “Sur” which is an abbreviation for “Sureno” or “southerner” as well as the number 13, which symbolizes the 13 founding fathers and the letter M for the 13th letter of the alphabet.

The Nuestra Familia was formed at a correctional training facility in Soledad, California in the mid-1960s. The Nuestra Familia was formed to fight oppression and protect themselves from members of the Mexican Mafia. The Nuestra Familia members were from Northern California (Root of all Evil, 2010; California Department of Justice, 2004). The use of symbolism in Nuestra Familia is also highly important. Members have adopted a sombrero and a bloody dagger with the word “Nuestra Familia” embedded and will often tattoo as their symbol for membership. In addition, they also identify with the letter N, the word “Ene” which is the letter N in Spanish and the number 14, which represents the fourteen letter of the alphabet, which is the letter N.

The formation of both the Mexican Mafia and Nuestra Familia was mainly for protection. Competition for power and control over criminal activity within the prison system and out of the streets began to arise between both gangs (Valdez, 2009). Both gangs have established an imaginary boundary dividing California into a Northern and Southern region. The imaginary line became the city of Bakersfield in which any Latino gang member from the north of Bakersfield would be part of the Nuestra Familia prison gang and any Latino gang south of Bakersfield would be part of the Mexican Mafia. Valdez (2009), states that these gang members became known as Nortenos, or Northernners, and became the source of members for the Nuestra Familia.
It is important to place a great emphasis in Sonoma County when Nuestra Familia membership is considered due to the direct connection with Nuestra Familia members and Sonoma County. In April of 2001, a historical investigation led by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and in collaboration with California Department of Corrections, U.S. Attorney and other local law enforcement uncovered prison gangs, prison gang activities, drug activity and murders. The operation known as “Black Widow” and took place in Santa Rosa (Nuestra Familia, 2010). Sonoma County has become an area of interest to study due to the dynamics of the gangs. One of the reasons is because the Nuestra Familia has a strong influence in both Sonoma and Mendocino counties, especially in the cities of Santa Rosa, Windsor and Ukiah. Additionally, the Nuestra Familia gang leaders and founders were natives of Sonoma County. Northern California became a meeting place for high ranking gang leaders including the three higher ranking leaders of Nuestra Familia, thus Northern California is the homeland of the Nuestra Familia members (Nuestra Familia, 2006).

Latino gang members who resided south of Bakersfield are known as “Surenos” and are a power source for the Mexican Mafia prison gang. This fact is imperative as it lends itself to a better understanding of the formation, purpose, and gang dynamics of the Latino street gangs and the rapid emersion and distribution across the state of California. Valdez (2009) reports that members of Nuestra Familia and Mexican Mafia will attack each other whenever they came into contact with one another. As a result, in 1980, The California Department of Corrections began to place gang members affiliated with the Mexican Mafia and Nuestra Familia into separate institutions in the attempt to prevent
the escalation of gang violence. As in prison, the rivalry and violence between the Nuestra Familia and the Mexican Mafia spread to the streets where Nortenos and Surenos street gangs were constantly fighting each other to maintain control of drug sales, power and protection. As Valdez (2009) explains, “frequent violent encounters continued to be common between surenos and nortenos.”

Statement of Research Problem

There are numerous of studies that have been conducted on the risk factors and motivation of gang involvement. In addition, there have also been studies that discussed the different intervention models to deal with gang youth. However, there have been minimal studies conducted about the effects of Aggression Replacement Training on communication barriers between gang youth and their parents. ART has been proved to be an evidence based model and effective method to reduce aggressive behavior, improve interpersonal communication, address value systems, acquiring skills and improving the ability to make better choices nonetheless there is not much data that supports its effectiveness when used to improve communication among gang involved youth and their parents.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Aggression Replacement Training currently used as the core curriculum while providing gang intervention programs to gang involved youth and their parents at The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship (The Center). The way in which ART’s effectiveness to increase communication between parent and youth will be evaluated is by the use of a pre
and post questionnaires conducted at intake and conclusion of the program in which the youth and parents participate in. Parents and youth will be given the questionnaires when they enroll in their respective programs. The importance of this study is to focus on the parent and youth communication, which has been identified as a criminogenic need that influences adolescent delinquency. Therefore, by the use of questionnaires, the researchers would be able to identify if using Aggression Replacement Training with the parents as well as with youth would increase the communication among them. The researchers hope that Aggression Replacement Training used for the purpose of this project will guide youth and their parents in the acquisition of skills to improve their ability to make effective choices, manage their anger, and improve their communication with each other.

Latinos are known for placing a great emphasis on family unity therefore it is imperative for them to learn to communicate effectively with their youth. Gang involvement among Latino youth is increasing on a fast rate, therefore involvement of parents in their youth’s life is very important so that the youth feels valued. Communication between Latino youth and their parents tends to deteriorate as the youth becomes more acculturated. Many of these parents are first generation parents in this country while their youth were born in the United States. Communication barriers tend to arise between the youth and first generation parents due to the difference in values and level of acculturation. Therefore, the researchers are hoping that this study will also educate the parents and increase their awareness and understanding of the differences in
values and differences in the way their youth are being raised compared to how the parents were raised.

Theoretical Framework

Aggression Replacement Training (ART) is a multimodal approach used to work with aggressive offenders. Hollin (2003) referenced in her work that Goldstein was a firm believer that aggression is a “primary learned behavior, learned by observation and imitation, as well as direct experience and rehearsal” (p.132). The two main theoretical frameworks used in Aggression Replacement Training are cognitive behavioral theory as well as social learning theory (Goldstein et al., 2004). We believe that the success of ART is due to a multimodal approach using three components concurrently; skill streaming, anger control training and moral reasoning training.

Skillstreaming is the first component of ART and it is considered to be the cognitive behavioral component which was designed to improve pro-social skill levels in participants. The skillstreaming process involves the teaching of skills that serve to change the aggressive and destructive behaviors with prosocial and constructive behaviors (Goldstein et al., 2004; Goldstein, Glick, & Gibbs, 1998; Goldstein & Glick, 1994; Glick & Goldstein, 1987; Calame & Parker, 2003). Skillstreaming highlights cognitive behavioral based programs as a source of positive treatment and is shown to be effective. (Flores, Russell, Latessa, & Travis, 2005). The skillstreaming component in ART teaches constructive social skills to manage key social situations (e.g. negotiating, making a claim).
Anger Control Training (ACT), the second component of ART, is considered to be the emotion oriented component which teaches the participants different alternatives to aggression (Goldstein et al., 1998, p. 34). Anger control training uses the Antecedent-Behavior-Consequence (A-B-C) sequences to determine the triggers for anger. In addition, youth are trained to respond to provocation with alternatives methods, other than aggression. After recognizing the triggers, ACT also uses anger management techniques by improving self awareness of internal cues (e.g. relaxations, deep breathing, reflection, skills training, teaching coping strategies and social problem solving skills. (Glick & Goldstein, 1987; Goldstein et al., 1998, 2004).

Moral Reasoning Training is the third and final component of ART and it is considered to be the ethical component of ART. In his work, Goldstein references Kohlberg (1964, 1978) in arguing that moral reasoning develops in a sequential manner. In addition Kohlberg describes different levels of moral development (Goldstein et al., 1998, 2004; Amendola & Oliver, 2003; McGinnis, 2003). Palmer (2005) suggests that moral reasoning training is used to address the moral development, moral reasoning and the egocentric bias. This component seeks to improve the participants’ moral reasoning skills and expand their social perspective taking (Goldstein et al., 2004). These skills are achieved by the participants through skills training, a guided peer group, social decision making group meetings, social problem solving and through self-instruction training. (Goldstein et al., 1987, 1998, 2004).
**Definition of Terms**

Criminal Street Gangs: The term, criminal street gang, will be defined as, “an ongoing organization, association, or three or more persons that have a common interest and/or activity characterized by the commission of or involvement in a patterns of criminal or delinquent conduct” (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2009a).

Prison Gangs: The term, prison gang will be defined as any gang, which originated and has its roots within the department or any other prison system (California Department of Justice, 2005).

Multiple Marginalities: The term, multiple marginalities, will be defined as, a conceptual framework “leading itself to a holistic strategy that examines linkages within the various factors and the actions and interactions among them and notes the cumulative nature” of gangs (Vigil, 2003).

Acculturation: The term, acculturation, will be defined as, “the process by which people’s attitudes and behaviors from one culture are changed as a result of their contact with another culture” (Forman & Moyerman, 1992; Flannery & Fridrich, 1995).

Criminogenic Need: Attributes of offenders that can be changed and are directly connected to the criminal behavior.

Aggression Replacement Training: Evidence based practice model used to reduce aggression in juveniles. Moreover it uses a Multimodal approach to work with aggressive which uses three components; skills streaming, anger control training and moral reasoning.
Evidence Based Practice: Evidence based practice is the use of treatments and programs in which there is enough persuasive evidence to support their effectiveness in attaining the desired outcomes.

Assumptions

This project is based on the principle that communication in families is essential for gang involved youth and their parents. The researchers believe that by using Aggression Replacement Training, which is evidence based model, youth and their parents will acquire the needed skills to increase their communication. The researchers believe that if youth and parents have a good communication, it is more likely that the parents will be involved in the life of the youth thus helping them escape the gang lifestyle.

Justification

This project is of a great importance to the field of social work as it attempts to educate social workers and other practitioners who work with aggressive adolescents or with gang involved youth. It is also imperative for social workers to understand how to work with gang involved youth and their families because social workers might work on private or community settings where they have to facilitate gang-related programs.

In addition, it is important for social workers to understand the importance of evidence based models to address aggression among youth. It is important for social workers to understand the value of using evidence based models when dealing with intervention programs for adolescents. Therefore, learning about evidence based models will help social workers to be knowledgeable in evidence based models which in the
future most agencies will require in order for them to receive funding for their programs. It is important to understand that using evidence based models ensure that the outcomes would be measurable making the programs more effective and with high validity.

In addition, working with Latino families will help social workers to become more cultural competent when working with the Latino populations. It is imperative for social workers to become more educated on the dynamics of gang involved youth and their families so that we can better assist them. As social workers, we need to be aware of the impact that gang involvement has on local communities like Sonoma County, the state of California and the nation as a whole.

Limitations

The researchers will analyze secondary data from participants in Sonoma County, California who are involved in the Juvenile Justice System. Therefore, the effectiveness of the multimodal approach, known as Aggression Replacement Training, among gang involved youth and their parents/guardians will be limited to its implementing county, Sonoma County. Therefore, the examination cannot be applied to larger county and should only be used as a reference for future research comparisons. Moreover, this study will only concentrate on Latino participants who have identified themselves as Hispanic and who are first or second generation immigrants. Furthermore, it is important to note the sample size is small and might not adequately represent the Latino population in Sonoma County.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction/Overview

The contents of this literature review will be divided into three major headings. The literature will be organized by using the deductive method for each major heading. The first major heading will discuss the social environment’s (i.e. ecological, socioeconomic, sociocultural, and sociopsychological) linkage to gang formation and the second major heading will discuss the activities (i.e. economic gain, school, peers, family, and individual characteristic) that influences the youth into gangs. Finally, in the third heading the literature will introduce the intervention model, Anger Replacement Training, which aims to help improve communication among the gang involved youth and their parent/caretaker.

Multiple Marginalities

The Latino population represents the largest and fastest growing population in the United States, with the majority living in the country’s six largest states—California, New York, Florida, Illinois, and New Jersey (Earner, Dettlaff, & Phillips, 2009). While the reasons why families immigrate into the United States vary, for families living in poverty, financial attraction like better wages and job opportunities are possible motives (Jennissen, 2007). Once in their new country, immigrants are faced with new stresses such as language barriers, lost of support systems, unfamiliar customs, and for the undocumented immigrants, exploitation by employers (Earner et al., 2009). As parents are faced with these new challenges, their children are also faced with their own stresses
such as acculturation difficulties and peer pressure. Therefore, when attempting to tap into the causes of gang formation among youths, Vigil (2003) suggests that gang formation is the result of multiple marginalities, a conceptual framework which “[lead] itself to a holistic strategy that examines linkages within the various factors and the actions and interactions among them and notes the cumulative nature of urban street gang violence.” Suggesting that gang formation is not only the influence of the individual’s routine activities, like hanging out with friends, but that gang formation is the consideration of all possible risk factors such as “ecological, socioeconomic, sociocultural, and sociopsychological” (Vigil, 2003).

Ecological

The ecological risk factor, in part of the multiple marginality framework, implies the examination of the environment in which the youth is exposed to. In search for a better life, immigrant families often settle into parts of the cities in which they can afford (Vigil, 2003). Consequently, urban neighborhoods with high concentration of immigrants are also experiencing a rise in juvenile crimes (Bankston, 1998).

Reiboldt (2001) investigated the issues surrounding neighborhood and family dynamics of two Mexican American families; one Mexican American family with one adolescent son in gang and the other Mexican American family with an adolescent son trying to stay out of gangs (Reiboldt, 2001). Reiboldt (2001) interviewed the two families whom were both from poor urban neighborhoods that fit into the picture of poverty, gang activity, and violence. The findings revealed that regardless of neighborhood influence and family factors, gangs are integrally linked to cities and
streets and the adolescent certainly has knowledge about gangs (Reiboldt, 2001). The results of the research support that gang involvement among immigrant youth is high risk due to their environmental social control. Although, not all children of immigrants involve themselves in gang activities, the ecological risk factor in part of the multiple marginality experience, only suggest a connection between the rise of violent crimes and the concentration of immigrants in poor urban communities (Bankston, 1998). Amongst the youth living in urban areas, merely an average of 10% of youth is at risk to becoming gang members (Vigil, 2003).

Socioeconomic

The socioeconomic risk factor, in part of the multiple marginality framework, is the examination of social control elements (i.e. family, school, and law enforcement) and of ecological and economic stressors (i.e. highest parental education, cultural identity, and social isolation) (Esbensen & Freng, 2007; Vigil, 2003). To suggest that social institutions are disrupted by economic conditions, Esbensen and Freng (2007) examined the relationship between race/ethnicity and gang membership through the use of the multiply marginality framework. Esbensen and Freng (2007) found that youth with less parental monitoring, less school commitment, less positive attitudes towards police were significantly associated to gang membership. Whereas, ecological and economic stressors, such as cultural identity and social isolation, had less of an impact for youth involved gangs (Esbensen & Freng, 2007). However, “highest parental education… did significantly impact the odds of an individual being a current gang member with the individual whose parents had less than a high school education having greater odds of
current gang membership than those whose parents obtained a high school or higher education” (Esbensen & Freng, 2007, p. 612).

Socioculture

Socioculture, from a multiple marginality framework, is to understand it through the socialization process, a learning experience from “learning the culture to which one belongs” (Vigil, 2003). Suggesting that the gang involved youth learns the culture of gangs through the exposure in which he/she is living in. The culture of gang can also be translated as street socialization. Vigil (2003) explains street socialization as the direct link to the gang involved youth spending too much time in the street, thus being “street socialized” and displaying the attitudes and identity traits similar to what is found in the streets.

Socio-psychological

The sociopsychological factor, from a multiple marginality framework, is described through the personality identification gang members put forward to distinguish themselves as legitimate gangsters. The key to street gang identity is learning to act crazy to survive (i.e. “loco” for Latino gangs), to be unpredictable, ready for any action, even killing somebody, and to show you are “down” for your homeboys and set or barrio” (Vigil, 2003). Gang members are psychologically socialized to act in a particular way which informs the general public that they are not to be underestimated (Vigil, 2003).
Risk Factors

When attempting to identify the risk factors of gang participation, possible causes such as economic gain, school, peers, family, and individual characteristic were of the common identified risk factors (Seals, 2009; Esbensen, Freng, Peterson, & Taylor, 2007). Risk factors identified focus on the influences which persuade the decision of the individual to involve themselves into gangs.

Economic Incentive

The economic aspect of gang participation is usually associated with capital gain through narcotic sales. Mao, Pih, Rosa, and Rugh (2008) explain that an individual who is involved in gangs, will more than likely obtain quicker capital advancement through illegitimate activities, whereas with legitimate activities the individual will not find the same advancement. To better understand reasons why gang members become involved in gangs through economic incentives, Seals’ (2009) research suggests gang participation on economic incentives reveal that the local unemployment rate’s effect on gang participation is “statistically significant” when applied to gang involved individuals who are legally able to work. In most states the legal age for employment is sixteen. The research was limited, in that gang members whom were not of legal age, were not applicable when applied to the local unemployment rate’s effect on gang participation (Seals, 2009). Also due to unemployment and/or poverty, Latino gang members from San Antonio, Texas also reported that their parents had turned to selling drug as a result of economic hardship (Valdez, 2005). Specifically, “economic restructuring and limited job opportunity in the inner-city areas were offered as the most prominent explanation”
and to this, of the seventy-six Latino respondents, they agreed this observation was true to their extended gang membership (Mao et al., 2008, p.487).

**Acculturation**

The National Youth Gang Center (2009) estimated approximately 788,000 gang members in the United States by the year 2007. Gang membership by ethnicity is 49 percent Hispanic/Latino, 35 %, African American, 9 % white and 7 % of other ethnicities. Moreover, it estimated that there are more than 27,000 gangs identified in the United States. Therefore, when examining the possible causes for the larger number of Latino gang members, when compared to other ethnic gangs, De Genova (2008) suggests that the large number of Latino gang membership can be linked to the result of acculturating into gangs through the exposure to the culture of gangs. Acculturation in relations to gang involvement is defined as “the process by which people’s attitudes and behaviors from one culture are changed as a result of their contact with another culture” (Forman & Moyerman, 1992; Flannery & Fridrich, 1995).

Flannery and Fridrich (1995) studied the acculturation influence of Latino gang members through the relationship between parental monitoring, susceptibility and antisocial peer pressure, and delinquency. The sample group of Flannery’s and Fridrich’s (1995) research consisted primarily of Caucasian (68%) and Mexican-American (24%) early adolescents.

Research participants of Mexican-American heritages were categorized as acculturated, unacculturated by choice, and recent immigrants; the study uncovered that all acculturated Mexican-Americans displayed the most significant delinquent behaviors
(Flannery & Fridrich, 1995). As stated earlier, delinquent behaviors are closely linked to gang involvement, suggesting that all acculturated Mexican-Americans are at higher risk to affiliate themselves with gangs. Flannery and Fridrich (1995) also suggest that the unacculterated Mexican-American home, values parental monitoring more so than the acculturated Mexican-American home, due to their ability to control in an unfamiliar environment. Vigil’s (2003) view on multiple marginalities brings into focus the difficulties acculturating to Anglo culture which support that increase in gang membership among Latinos can be relevant to second generation Latino youth.

Peer Influence

Interviews with ex-gang members revealed that they have felt inadequately supported by their family, by feeling alienated and isolated, which had lead them to seek out peer groups that were supportive (Craig, Gagon, Tremblay, & Vitero, 2002). Mason and Pantin (1997) investigated the interplay of family support and gang involvement among middle school and high school students. The research support that a significant number of youth involved in gangs and deviant behaviors were related to poor family support, however, the research did not suggest that the lack of family relationship was directly related to gang involvement (Mason & Pantin, 1997). As research reveals no evidence that poor family relationship and support is directly caused to gang involvement, it is safe to suggest that poor family support is an additional factor for youth’s association to gangs and gang related activities.

Craig and Walker-Barnes (2001) explore the relative influence of peer and parenting behavior on changing adolescent gang involvement through the risk factor of
peer relationship which is the stronger influences on an individual’s path to gangs. Arguing that gang involvement is not due to lack of family support, as previously thought, because there are many gang members whom have reported having a close knit family (Craig & Walker-Barnes, 2001). Insisting that the ethnic difference in the effective parenting on adolescent behavior focused on authoritarian parenting or related constructs (Craig & Walker Barnes, 2001). Krohn and Smith (1995) report the negative emotional relationship between parents and child are a link to gang involvement, especially among Latino gang members where family values and close relationships are a part of Latino cultural values. The research collected information from 300 ethnically diverse middle school students, 54% Hispanic, 25% Black and 21% White and other ethnicities found that the difference of parenting among ethnic groups did not hold true to Latino, instead peer relationships hold greater influence (Craig & Walker-Barnes, 2001).

Family

Researchers, Hoyt, Whitebeck and Yoder (2009), conducted a research examining gang involvement among 602 homeless and runaway youth, which documented the extent of gang involvement and gang membership. The research found that among the 602 homeless and runaway youth, a significant number of these youth were gang members (15.4% of the sample) or gang-involved (32.2% of the sample) (Hoyt et al., 2009). Another important finding from this research was that of the reported gang members and/or gang-involved youth, they reported having more family legal problems and of the reported gang members, they reported having less parental monitoring (Hoyt et al., 2009). The outcome of the research suggests that homeless and runaway youth with
shared family dysfunctional characteristics such as: low socioeconomic status, lack of parenting (monitoring, warmth, and rejection), family neglect and abuse, and a history of family legal problem are at a significantly higher risk of gang membership and/or gang-involvement (Hoyt et al., 2009).

Due to the fact that family dysfunction has often been the identified motivation for adolescent to seek out alternative family systems, Ruble and Turner (2000) suggest that “families must acknowledge the impact that abuse and/or neglect has had on the family system and on the adolescent who has suffered and/or witnessed the family violence.” Through the use of family therapy, addressing the “family’s dynamics, roles, rules, and means for resolving family conflicts” will help understand the gang member’s emotional responses to family traumas and provide better understanding of their gang participation (Ruble & Turner, 2000). Ruble and Turner (2000) believes that understanding these concepts will provide a window into the “thoughts emotions, and behaviors” that may have been learned from the adolescent’s family of origin, which later leads to the adolescent’s involvement in gangs. The research suggest that through the use of family therapy, it allows the adolescent to “express the anger, hurt, resentment, and sense of rejection at those in the family who may have abused, neglected, or failed to protect the youth” (Belitz & Valdez, 1994; Ruble & Turner, 2000).

*Individual Characteristics, Antisocial Behavior*

Gangs are mainly made up of male adolescents and youth who grew up together in the same neighborhood and participates in both, conventional and antisocial behaviors (Vigil, 2003). Young gang members often rely on older gang members as role models as
they are guided through gang culture (Vigil, 2003). Previous studies have shown that boys with antisocial activity and behaviors are more likely to become gang members (Gordon, Lahey, Kawai, Loeber, Stouthamer-loeber & Farrington, 2004). Particularly, in Mexican-American homes, parents place more emphasis on emotional control and are less authoritative when compared to Caucasian parent, suggesting that less parental monitoring and/or allowing more unsupervised time, is link to antisocial peer pressure (Flannery & Fridrich, 1995).

*Anger Replacement Training*

Juvenile delinquency has increased over the years, as a result several intervention models have been used to attempt to decrease juvenile delinquency. When attempting to use a model of intervention, it is very important to identify and understand the areas in which the improvement needs to occur. After identifying those areas, an appropriate intervention model should be selected to focus on those needs. When working with juvenile delinquents, specifically gang involved youth, it is important to consider aggression and social skills. Therefore, an evidence based intervention model in this area should be considered to address aggression and social skills. Researchers, Goldstein, Nensen, Daleflod and Kalt (2004), stated that many criminal justice agencies want the services they provide to be based on theory and evidence that would influence offending behavior, and which would be effectively addressed in the intervention programs used to decrease the problem. Therefore, it is imperative to understand the validity of an evidence based model in today’s practice. Moreover, how to effectively use an intervention program to treat offenders (Flores, Russell, Latessa & Travis III, 2005).
Roberts and Yeager (2004), as well as other researchers, (e.g., Sackett, Richardson, Rosenberg, & Hayness, 1997; Rosenberg, & Proctor, 2002) have defined evidence based practice as: “the conscientious, explicit, and judicious use of the best available scientific evidence in professional decision making” (p. 5). In simpler words, evidence based practice is the use of treatments and programs in which there is enough persuasive evidence to support their effectiveness in attaining the desired outcomes. Flores et al., (2005) recommend in their study, that effective intervention programs are based “on the fundamental of risks, need, treatment, and responsibility” (p 10). In addition, the core elements in effective intervention programs must include: structured and behavioral nature, have services to match the offender risk level to services, provide services that address individual characteristics, address criminogenic needs, have contingencies which are enforced in a firm but kind way, employ trained staff that relate to the offenders in a positive way and provide after care, as well as, community based relapse strategies (Flores et al., 2005 p. 10). The researchers concurred with the elements presented by Flores et al., (2005) and believes that in order for a program to be effective other components need to be included in the programs. This includes the importance of having bi-literate, bicultural and bilingual staff in a program or someone who relates to the culture of those who the program serves.

Aggression Replacement Training (ART) is evidence based practice model used to reduce aggression in juveniles. McGinnis (2003), suggests that evidence based models such as ART would produce positive and durable results for aggressive youth. Aggression Replacement Training used for the purpose of this project will guide youth,
as well as, their parents in the acquisition of skills to improve their ability to make
effective choices, improve interpersonal communication, learn to manage their anger and
improve their communication with each other.

Aggression Replacement Training (ART) Overview

Aggression Replacement Training (ART) is a multimodal approach to working
with aggressive offenders. Hollin (2003), referenced in her work that Goldstein was a
firm believer that aggression is a primary learned behavior, learned by observation and
imitation, as well as direct experience and rehearsal (p.132). ART has been applied in a
variety of environments, including but not limited to schools, community programs, gang
intervention programs, group homes, and correctional facilities (McGinnis, 2003). ART
has been proved to be an evidence based model and effective method to reduce
aggressive behavior, improve interpersonal communication, address value systems,
acquiring skills and improving the ability to make better choices (Goldstein et al., 2004).
We believe that the success of ART is due to a multimodal approach using three
components concurrently skillstreaming, anger control training and moral reasoning
training.

Skillstreaming is the first component of ART and it is considered to be the
behavioral component which was designed to improve pro-social skill levels in
participants. The skillstreaming process involves the teaching of skills that serve to
change the aggressive and destructive behaviors with prosocial and constructive
behaviors (Goldstein et al., 2004; Goldstein, Glick & Gibbs, 1998; Goldstein & Glick,
1994; Glick & Goldstein, 1987; Calame & Parker, 2003). It has emerged from the
literature that cognitive behavioral based programs show positive treatment effects and effectiveness (Flores et al., 2005). The skillstreaming component in ART teaches constructive social skills to manage key social situations (e.g. negotiating, making a claim). During this component, core skills are modeled by the group facilitators and practiced by the participants. Flores et al., (2005) found that cognitive behavior based therapies that use modeling, interpersonal skills training, role playing, reinforcement and problem solving skills are more effective at reducing criminal behaviors. The skillstreaming component of ART uses in great detail the cognitive behavioral skills by having a curriculum from where we can choose from over 50 skills recommended to address the issues and bring change to a targeted group. (Goldstein et al., 1994, 1998, 1987; Glick & Goldstein, 1987).

Anger Control Training (ACT) is the second component of ART and is considered to be the emotion oriented component which teaches the participants different alternatives to aggression (Goldstein et al., 1998, p. 34). Anger control training uses the Antecedent-Behavior-Consequence (A-B-C) sequences to determine the triggers for anger. In addition, youth is trained to respond to provocation with alternatives methods, other than aggression. After recognizing the triggers, ACT also uses anger management techniques by improving self awareness of internal cues (e.g. relaxations, deep breathing, reflection, skills training, teaching coping strategies and social problem solving skills. (Glick & Goldstein, 1987; Goldsein et al., 1998, 2004).

Moral Reasoning Training is the third and final component of ART and it is considered to be the ethical component of ART. In his work, Goldstein references
Kohlberg (1964, 1978) in arguing that moral reasoning develops in a sequential manner. In addition Kohlberg describes different levels of moral development (Goldstein et al., 1998, 2004; Amendola & Oliver, 2003; McGinnis, 2003). Palmer (2005) suggests that moral reasoning training is used to address the moral development moral reasoning and the egocentric bias. This component seeks to improve the participants’ moral reasoning skills and expand their social perspective taking (Goldstein et al., 2004). These skills are achieved by the participants through skills training, a guided peer group, social decision making group meetings, social problem solving and through self-instruction training. (Goldstein et al., 1987, 1998, 2004).

**Anger Replacement Training with Youth**

There have been several studies and ample evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of ART when working with youth (Goldstein et al., 1987, 1998, 2004; McGinnis, 2003). Earlier studies reinforce ART effectiveness while working with offenders who are considered to be at medium to medium-high risk. The literature suggests that ART has been applied in different settings and with different groups of youth addressing aggressive behaviors (McGinnis, 2003).

The first ART was designed, developed and implemented at Annsville Youth Center, which is a New York State Division for youth facility in central New York. On this initial evaluation, sixty youth were included, most of them incarcerated for crimes including robbery, drug offenses and burglary. In the study, 24 youths were offered ART and another 24 were assigned to a no-ART but offered brief instruction control group. Finally, the other twelve clients were assigned to neither ART nor a brief instruction
control group. During the initial ART Goldstein’s et al., (1987, 1994, 1998, 2004) goal was to examine the effectiveness of ART in skill acquisition, minimal skill transfer, extended skill transfer, anger control improvement and impulse reduction.

The data gathered for this previously mentioned study revealed that youth enrolled in ART, compared with those in both control groups, acquired and transferred 4 out of the 10 skillstreaming skills. After completion of the first ART groups, new groups were formed. In a one year period from the initiation of ART in this facility (Annsville), 54 youth were released, 17 had received ART and 37 not. Global measurements were collected and the results revealed that in the four of the six areas of home, family, legal and peer, overall, the youth who had received ART were rated significantly higher with regards to community functioning than those who did not receive ART. In terms of employment and academics there were no significant differences among the participants. (Goldstein, 1987, 1998, 2004).

Another evaluation of ART that we believe is important to include in this literature review is the ART evaluation of the Gang Intervention Project. We believe it is very important to include this study because it pertains to our study of improving the criminogenic need of increasing communication between gang involved youth and their family members. This project was conducted in two Brooklyn, New York youth care agencies, and in which each agency conducted 3-4 month ART sessions with members of the same gang. A control group was constituted for each sequence whose members were also from the same gang but from a gang different that the one to which the ART participants belonged. Within the two agencies, 12 different gangs participated, six
received ART and six did not, but all of them received the same educational, vocational and recreational services. This project revealed significant interaction effect favoring ART participants for each of the seven skills offered. Moreover, the study also revealed that months after the ART participation, the majority of the ART participants left their gang and were employed in retail business (Goldstein et al., 1994, 1998, 2004). In addition, the study also shows a decrease in the recidivism rate for the youth participating in the first 2 sequences. The study revealed that 13% (5 out of 38) ART participants were arrested in comparison to 52% (14 out of the 27) of the participants that only participated in the control group were arrested during an eight month follow up period, (Goldstein et al., 1994, 1998, 2004). Once again, this second evaluation shows the effectiveness of the ART program while working with juvenile offenders and in this case with gang involved youth.

Literature has restated that programs that are based on theoretical models are five times more effective at reducing recidivism than those that are not (Flores et al., 2005). ART studies have not really identified their participants by their cultural background, however, it does pay great importance at cultural compatibility. Goldstein (1998) stated that in order for ART to be meaningful it has to be viewed in a multicultural context and practice in a manner that is responsive to such context. In addition, that ART is most effective when is delivered in a manner that is appreciative and responsive to cultural relevant notions. Goldstein (1998) as well as other researchers, (e.g. Cartledge & Johnson, 1997), believed that cultural difference may cause children from different background to respond in a different non productive way and cause their actions to be
misunderstood by others that do not belong to the same culture. Therefore, cultural compatibility is crucial for the effectiveness of Aggression Replacement Training.

**Aggression Replacement Training with Families**

In order to be effective with gang involved youth, it is essential to get the parents involved. Having the parents play an active role in their adolescent’s lives makes a great impact in the success of their adolescent. Malec (2003) states that family involvement is very important in the life of a youth who is gang involved. Similarly, Grekul and Laboucane-Benson (2008), suggest that family dysfunction and search for identity can lead youth to gang involvement. For that reason, it is imperative that the family ties are strong and that we work to improve the relationship and communication with parents and youth.

Therefore, just like implementing evidence based practice for the adolescent it is imperative to find an evidence based practice model to use with the parents. Research has shown that Aggression Replacement training can be used with different situations, just as it can be used with adolescents to deal with aggression (McGinnis, 2003). It can also be used to build better relationships between the adolescent and parents, Aggression Replacement Training can provide the parents with different skills to build better relationships. Walker-Barnes and Mason (2001) found that among Latino families the quality of relationships within the family is more valued, leading for parenting to emphasize in parent-child involvement. Goldstein et al., (1998) suggests that ART becomes more effective by involving families and peers in ART training. Similar to Goldstein, we believe it is very important to include the family while the adolescents are
working in their aggression. Calame and Parker (2003) state that despite family problems between the parents and the adolescent, the parents remain the experts on their own youth. The researchers believe that Aggression Replacement Training would be great to use with the families because of the variety of ways the curriculum can be implemented to meet the criminogenic needs of the youth and families. Therefore, if the parents and adolescent are simultaneously learning similar skills, they would be able to improve their communication and social skills. Calame and Parker (2003) state that we need parents to develop into coaches to assists and encourage their children in transferring their classroom ART skills into real life.

In a study conducted by Calame and Parker, they recommend to implement an 8 week program in conjunction with a 10 week ART program for youth. Goldstein (2004) also recommends a 10 week ART program for the youth. The parent training stated by Calame and Parker (2003) takes place during the first three weeks of the family ART and then moves to include the child and their parents in family training for the last five weeks. In this program the groups are divided in two groups. The first group is to bring the families to the level of their youth in terms of their skills and the family training is to get the families working together using the ART curriculum. Having the opportunity to work with the parents and youth separately at the beginning of the program is perfect because they are simultaneously developing their skills, then at the second stage of the group they come together to put in practice the skills learned as a family. Calame and Parker (2003) indicate that in the parent training, the skillstreaming component is the major focus of the group, but that anger control and moral reasoning are covered
throughout the group and especially during the first sessions of Family ART. The skillstreaming skills are taught to the parents and clients by the use of role playing. The skills used with the parents have to be used carefully depending on the issues that the group wants to address. Calame and Parker (2003) recommend that in week 7 and 8 of the Family ART, the focus should be mainly in three types of skills; be attentive to and understanding another’s point of view, the expression of one’s point of view and working to resolve differences. In addition, the importance of combining these three skills is because they are very effective for making fast and important changes in the functioning of the youth and family context (Calame & Parker, 2003). The skills from the ART curriculum that focus on the above three mentioned areas are making a complaint, listening and understanding the feelings of others and negotiating. (Goldstein et al., 1998, 2004). Whenever a program is implemented it is always imperative that the participants understand the relevance and significance of what they are learning. Therefore, the parents and youth participating in the ART, they should see the significance of what they are learning (Calame & Parker, 2003).

Supporting data from the previous study shows the effectiveness of having family participation concurrently to youth engaged in ART in preventing recidivism (Calame & Parker, 2003; Goldstein et al., 2004). In this study three areas were measured: youth and parents both participating ART, youth participating in ART without their parents and youth not participating in ART. Out of 55 participants, 13 participants and their parents, were participating concurrently in ART. 15 % (2 out of 13) of the participants were rearrested. In addition, 20% (6 out of 20) of the youth who received ART without their
parents were rearrested. Finally, the study revealed that 43% (14 out of 32) of the youth who were not involved in ART in any level were rearrested. Therefore, the results of this study show the effectiveness of Aggression Replacement Training using it with the youth as well as with their parents (Goldstein et al., 1998, p. 201). The previous study reinforces the efficacy in skills acquisition for the family members and the improvement of the relationship with their youth (Calame & Parker, 2003). Therefore, our program would be slightly different in regards to what we are trying to study however the program design will be identical.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the literature relevant to this project was reviewed and analyzed. The content of this literature review was divided and organized in three major headings. The first major heading discussed in this chapter included the social environment’s (i.e. ecological, socioeconomic, sociocultural, and sociopsychological) linkage to gang formation and the second major heading discussed the activities (i.e. economic gain, school, peers, family, and individual characteristic) that influences the youth into gangs. Finally, in the third heading the literature introduced the intervention model, Anger Replacement Training, which aims to help improve communication among the gang involved youth and their parent/caretaker. In the following chapter of this project, the methodology used to conduct this study will be described.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter provides a description of the procedures utilized for this project. Included in this are the sections describing the project’s purpose, design, subject population, and instrumentation used to collect data information. In addition, this chapter will include a description of the data collection instruments and a plan for analyzing the data. This chapter concludes by describing the precautions that were taken in order to protect the human subjects.

Research Question

This project investigated whether or not the intervention, Aggression Replacement Training (ART), when delivered concurrently with gang involved youth and their parents/caretakers in class has improved the criminogenic need of increasing communication among family members.

Research Design

In order to investigate the proceeding question, a quantitative design was chosen. The researchers are reviewing secondary data and obtained a written letter of consent and support from The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship (The Center) granting limited access to their data (see Appendix A).

The Center secured written consent from each program participant and their parents/caretakers for participation in any program elements, including the questionnaires utilized in this project. Each participant received a verbal explanation of the consent
from followed up with a written explanation of all aspects of the program, including the purpose and use of questionnaires. Participant (including parents/caretakers) signatures are required and indicate their consent (see Appendix B).

The researchers reviewed existing data, questionnaire responses, gathered by the program coordinators at the time of intake and at the conclusion of the program (see Appendix C). The researchers examined questionnaire responses of 30 participants. The participants were divided into two separate groups, one group consisted of 15 youth and the other group consisted of 15 parents/caretakers.

All the information provided to the researchers is kept in the collaborating agency’s facility. Office space in the facility is available to the researcher, Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez, where he can review the data. In the case that data is allowed for researcher, Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez, to take home, the data is stored in a lock cabinet in the researcher’s place of residency and is kept in his custody. Researcher, Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez, is the only researcher with access to the file cabinet where the data is kept. The raw data was returned to the collaborating agency at the conclusion of the project.

Study Population

The participants for this research consisted of Latino gang involved youth and their parents/caretakers who are currently involved in the Sonoma County Juvenile Justice System and are participating in a gang intervention program, Aggression Replacement Training, offered through The Center.
Sample Population

The researchers included subjects who are currently participating in ART and/or had participated through ART offered through The Center.

Data Gathering Procedures

The researchers reviewed existing data gathered by the program coordinators at the time of intake and at the conclusion of the program. The Center provided Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez (researcher) with office space to review the questionnaires. Researcher, Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez, matched the questionnaire at the time of intake with the questionnaire at the conclusion of the program based on the participant’s unique number assignment. Researcher, Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez, compared each answer from the questionnaires and note any change in the participant’s responses from the time of intake and at the conclusion of the program.

Researcher, Cindy Yang, entered each question from the questionnaires into the computer software, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), and researcher, Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez, entered the data from the questionnaire responses into SPSS.

Data Analysis

The screened data was processed and manipulated through SPSS. Descriptive statistics, inferential statistics, content analysis, and statistical analysis were all employed to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics were used to capture the demographic characteristics of the study population (i.e. adolescent living with mother or other female caretaker and adolescent living with father or other male caregiver). Inferential statistics were used to determine generalization about the study population (i.e. positive and
negative communication skills). Tables and charts were used to provide a graphical
summary of this quantitative analysis.

Protection of Human Subjects

Due to the sensitive nature of the questionnaire, confidentiality of the participants
was protected at all times. The questionnaire responses gathered by The Center at the
time of intake and at the conclusion of the program have no identifying information (i.e.
name). Given the longitudinal nature of the project, however, it was necessary to link
data at time of intake and at the conclusion of the program. Therefore, at the initial data
collection, The Center assigned each participant with a number that was used on both
questionnaires. Each participant’s number was unique in that no other participant in the
ART program was able to use the same number. The participant’s unique numbers are
kept by The Center’s administrators. At no time were the numbers linked to the
researchers, therefore, all data were essentially anonymous in that it was impossible to
connect any individual with any questionnaire.

Summary

This chapter has explained the study design, population sampling, data collection
method, data analysis, and protection of human subjects. The purpose for this project
was to explore and analyze if the intervention, Aggression Replacement Training (ART),
is effective in improving the criminogenic need of increasing communication among
family members.
Chapter 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the data generated by the questionnaire in order to identify and analyze whether or not the intervention, Aggression Replacement Training (ART), when delivered concurrently with gang involved youth and their parents/caretakers in class has improved the criminogenic need of increasing communication among family members. The communication scale “assesses specific positive and negative communication skills [such as] interrupting, blaming, monopolizing the conversation, arguments, listening, understanding, [and] having consideration for each other’s feelings” (Robin, Koepke, Moye, & Gerhardstein, 2009, p. 26). Specific questions of the questionnaire are identified to measure communication. Of the parent/caretaker questionnaire, question numbers: 2, 12, 22, 32, 42, 52, 62, 72, 82 and 89 measures positive and negative communication skills. Of the adolescent questionnaire, question numbers: 73, 76, 79, 82, 85, 88, 91, 94, 97, 100, 103, 106, 109, 112, 115, and 118 measures positive and negative communication skills. Descriptive statistics were used to capture the demographic characteristics of the study population (i.e. adolescent living with mother or other female caretaker and adolescent living with father or other male caretaker). Frequency distribution tables and charts were used to capture the number of times participant responses occurred for each question.
**Demographics**

The 15 adolescent participants reported living with their mother and/or other female caretaker (n=15) and completed section 3 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.1). The 15 adolescent participants reported living with their father and/or other male caretaker (n=15) and completed section 4 of the questionnaire (see Table 4.2). 100% of the 15 adolescent participants reported to come from a two-parent/caretaker household.

**Table 4.1**

*If you are living with your mother and/or other female caretaker*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Section 3 of PARQ</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2**

*If you are living with your father and/or other male caretaker*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed Section 4 of PARQ</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parent/Caretaker Questionnaire Responses**

The majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 2, my teenager listens to me even when we argue, at intake reported false (86.7%, n=13), while just 2 (13.3%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.3). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 2, reported true (80%, n=12), while 3 (20%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.4). An
estimated average of 66.7% increase in communication among parent/caretaker and their adolescent. This data shows that even though the parent/caretaker and the adolescent are arguing, the parent/caretaker felt that the adolescent continues to exercise their communication skill of listening.

Table 4.3
*Pre-test: My teenager listens to me even when we argue*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4
*Post-test: My teenager listens to me even when we argue*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 12, my teenager and I are able to have good talk, at intake reported false (60%, n=9), while 6 (40%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.5). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 12, reported true (86.7%, n=13), while 2 (13.3%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.6). An estimated average of 46.7% increase in communication among parent/caretaker and their adolescent. This data shows that the parent/caretaker felt that they are able to have
positive communication with their adolescent and measures their conversations as “having good talks.”

Table 4.5
Pre-test: My teenager and I are able to have good talks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6
Post-test: My teenager and I are able to have good talks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 22, my teenager provokes me into an argument, at intake reported false (73.3%, n=11), while 4 (26.7%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.7). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 22, reported true (73.3%, n=11), while 4 (26.7%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.8). An estimated average of 46.6% increase in communication among parent/caretaker and their adolescent. This data shows that even though the adolescent provokes the parent/caretaker into an argument, the parent/caretaker and adolescent are in
communication with each other. This data also shows the negative communication skill of argument, however, this data continues to indicate that there is an exchange of ideas.

Table 4.7
Pre-test: My teenager provokes me into an argument at least twice a week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8
Post-test: My teenager provokes me into an argument at least twice a week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 32, my teenager admits when he/she is wrong about something, at intake reported false (66.7%, n=10), while 5 (33.3%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.9). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 32, reported true (73.3%, n=11), while 4 (26.7%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.10). An estimated average of 40% increase in communication among parent/caretaker and their adolescent. This data reveals that the adolescents are able to exercise communication skill of understanding with their parent/caretaker. This data also
shows that the parent/caretaker felt the adolescent is able to demonstrate ownership when they have made a mistake.

Table 4.9
*Pre-test: My teenager admits when he/she is wrong about something*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10
*Post-test: My teenager admits when he/she is wrong about something*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 42, my teenager usually listens to what I tell him/her, at intake reported false (86.7%, n=13), while 2 (13.3%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.11). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 42, reported true (80%, n=12), while 3 (20%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.12). An estimated average of 66.7% increase in communication among parent/caretaker and their adolescent. This data shows the positive communication skills of listening. The data also bring to light that the parent/caretaker felt that after the
intervention the adolescent are listening to what they have to say. This data illustrates positive communication.

Table 4.11  
*Pre-test: My teenager usually listens to what I tell him/her*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 52, my teenager makes it easy for me to talk to him/her, at intake reported false (73.3%, n=11), while 4 (26.7%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.13). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 52, reported true (66.7%, n=10), while 5 (33.3%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.14). An estimated average of 40% increase in communication among parent/caretaker and their adolescent. This data show that the parent/caretaker finds it less difficult to communicate with their adolescent after completing the ART program.
This data also reveals that the parent/caretaker felt less challenging to talk with their adolescent. Revealing that the intervention has made communication more unforced.

Table 4.13
Pre-test: My teenager makes it easy for me to talk to him/her

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14
Post-test: My teenager makes it easy for me to talk to him/her

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 63, my teenager my teenager says I have no consideration for his/her feelings, at intake reported false (73.3%, n=11), while 4 (26.7%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.15). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 63, reported true (93.3%, n=14), while 1 (6.7%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.16). An estimated average of 66.6% increase in communication among parent/caretaker and their adolescent. This data shows the positive communication skill of having consideration for each other’s feelings. Post intervention
reveals that the parent/caretaker are acknowledging the adolescent’s feelings when compared to pre-intervention, therefore, communication is present.

Table 4.15
Pre-test: My teenager says I have no consideration for his/her feelings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16
Post-test: My teenager says I have no consideration for his/her feelings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 72, when my teenager and I talk, I can tell he/she understands me, at intake reported false (93.3%, n=14), while 1 (6.7%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.17). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 72, reported true (73.3%, n=11), while 4 (26.7%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.18). An estimated average of 66.6% increase in communication among parent/caretaker and their adolescent. This data show the positive communication skill of understanding between the parent/caretaker and their adolescent. This data reveals
significant increase in the parent’s/caretaker’s feelings of being understood by their adolescent.

Table 4.17
*Pre-test: When my teenager and I talk, I can tell he/she understands me*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18
*Post-test: When my teenager and I talk, I can tell he/she understands me*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 82, the talks I have with my teenager are frustrating, at intake reported false (66.7%, n=10), while 5 (33.3%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.19). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 82, reported true (66.7%, n=10), while 5 (33.3%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.20). An estimated average of 33.4% increase in communication among parent/caretaker and their adolescent. This data show the negative communication skill of frustration when communicating, however, the acknowledgement of the frustration shows that there is communication present. This data reveals that the parent/caretaker, when attempting to
talk with their adolescent, is acknowledging that the present communication is frustrating.

Table 4.19
*Pre-test: The talks I have with my teenager are frustrating*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20
*Post-test: The talks I have with my teenager are frustrating*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 89, for the most part my teenager likes to talk to me, at intake reported false (53.3%, n=8), while 7 (46.7%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.21). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the parent/caretaker responses for question 89, reported true (80%, n=12), while 3 (20%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.22). An estimated average of 33.3% increase in communication among parent/caretaker and their adolescent. This data shows the positive communication skills of understanding and having consideration for each other’s feelings. This data exposes the parent/caretaker recognizing the adolescent’s enjoyment of speaking to them.
Table 4.21
*Pre-test: For the most part, my teenager likes to talk to me*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22
*Post-test: For the most part, my teenager likes to talk to me*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Caretaker Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adolescent Questionnaire Responses

The majority of the adolescent responses for question 73, my mom almost never understand my side of the argument, at intake reported false (73.3%, n=11), while 4 (26.7%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.23). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 73, reported true (66.7%, n=10), while 5 (33.3%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.24). An estimated average of 40% increase in communication among adolescent and their mother and/or female caretaker. This data reveals that there is some communication among the adolescent and their mother and/or female caretaker, even though the adolescent
responses were of negative communication, the positive note is that the result demonstrate that communication is present.

Table 4.23
*Pre-test: My mom almost never understands my side of the argument*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.24
*Post-test: My mom almost never understands my side of the argument*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the adolescent responses for question 76, when my mother talks to me, I can tell she understands me, at intake reported false (86.7%, n=13), while 2 (13.3%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.25). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 76, reported true (66.7%, n=10), while 5 (33.3%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.26). An estimated average of 53.4% increase in communication among adolescent and their mother and/or female caretaker. This data reveals the positive communication skill of understanding.
Table 4.25

_Pre-test: When my mother talks to me, I can tell she understands me_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.26

_Post-test: When my mother talks to me, I can tell she understands me_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the adolescent responses for question 79, my mother is bossy when talking to me, at intake reported true (53.3%, n=8), while 7 (46.7%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.27). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 79, reported false (53.3%, n=8), while 7 (46.7%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.28). An estimated average of 6.6% increase in communication among adolescent and their mother and/or female caretaker. This data show a decrease of negative communication skill, monopolizing the conversation.

Table 4.27

_Pre-test: My mother is bossy when talking to me_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the adolescent responses for question 82, when I try to tell my mother something, she doesn’t let me finish, at intake reported true (60%, n=9), while 6 (40%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.29). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 82, reported true (73.3%, n=11), while 4 (26.7%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.30). An estimated average of 13.3% increase in communication among adolescent and their mother and/or female caretaker. Although, this data shows an increase in negative communication skill, the data reveals that there is communication present.

### Table 4.28

*Post-test: My mother is bossy when talking to me*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.29

*Pre-test: When I try to tell my mother something, she doesn’t let me finish*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.30
*Post-test: When I try to tell my mother something, she doesn’t let me finish*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the adolescent responses for question 85, my mom brings up a lot of my faults when we argue, at intake reported false (60%, n=9), while 6 (40%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.31). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 85, reported true (66.7%, n=10), while 5 (33.3%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.32). An estimated average of 26.7% increase in communication among adolescent and their mother and/or female caretaker. This data shows the negative communication skill of blaming, however, the data supports that communication remains present between the adolescent and their mother and/or female caretaker.

Table 4.31
*Pre-test: My mom brings up a lot of my faults when we argue*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.32
*Post-test: My mom brings up a lot of my faults when we argue*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the adolescent responses for question 88, my mom listens to me even when we argue, at intake reported false (53.3%, n=8), while 7 (46.7%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.33). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 88, reported true (93.3%, n=14), while 1 (6.7%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.34). An estimated average of 46.6% increase in communication among adolescent and their mother and/or female caretaker. This data shows the positive communication skill of listening.

Table 4.33
*Pre-test: My mom listens to me even when we argue*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.34
*Post-test: My mom listens to me even when we argue*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the adolescent responses for question 91, my mother makes it easy to talk to her, at intake reported false (73.3%, n=11), while 4 (26.7%) reported true
to the question posed (see Table 4.35). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 91, reported false (100%, n=15), while zero (0.0%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.36). An estimated average of 26.7% increase in communication among adolescent and their mother and/or female caretaker. This data show that there is communication, however, the adolescent feels that talking to mom and/or other female caretaker is difficult at time, but that communication is still attempted.

Table 4.35
*Pre-test: My mother makes it easy to talk to her*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.36
*Post-test: My mother makes it easy to talk to her*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the adolescent responses for question 94, my mother screams a lot, at intake reported false (53.3%, n=8), while 7 (46.7%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.37). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 94, reported true (73.3%, n=11), while 4 (26.7%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.38). An estimated average of 26.6%
increase in communication among adolescent and their mother and/or female caretaker. This data reveals the negative communication skill exercised by mom and/or female caretaker however, communication present.

Table 4.37
*Pre-test: My mother screams a lot*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.38
*Post-test: My mother screams a lot*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the adolescent responses for question 97, my dad almost never understands my side of the argument, at intake reported false (80%, n=12), while 3 (20%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.39). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 97, reported true (66.7%, n=10), while 5 (33.3%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.40). An estimated average of 46.7% increase in communication among adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker. This data reveals that there is some communication among the adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker, even though the adolescent responses where negative, the positive result shows that there is communication present.
Table 4.39
Pre-test: My dad almost never understands my side of the argument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.40
Post-test: My dad almost never understands my side of the argument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the adolescent responses for question 100, my father makes it easy to talk to him, at intake reported false (73.3%, n=11), while 4 (26.7%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.41). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 100, reported true (53.3%, n=8), while 7 (46.7%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.42). An estimated average of 26.6% increase in communication among adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker. This data shows that the adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker are more able to approach communication among each other.

Table 4.41
Pre-test: My father makes it easy to talk to him

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the adolescent responses for question 103, my father is bossy when talking to me, at intake reported false (80%, n=12), while 3 (20%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.43). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 103, reported true (60%, n=9), while 6 (40%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.44). An estimated average of 40% increase in communication among adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker. Although, this data shows increase in negative communication skill of monopolizing the conversation, communication continues to be present.

Table 4.42
*Post-test: My father makes it easy to talk to him*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.43
*Pre-test: My father is bossy when talking to me*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.44

Post-test: My father is bossy when talking to me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the adolescent responses for question 106, my dad and I try to understand each other’s feelings, at intake reported true (60%, n=9), while 6 (40%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.45). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 106, reported true (80%, n=12), while 3 (20.7%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.46). An estimated average of 20% increase in communication among adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker. This data reveals an increase in positive communication skill of understanding.

Table 4.45

Pre-test: My dad and I try to understand each other’s feelings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.46

Post-test: My dad and I try to understand each other’s feelings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the adolescent responses for question 109, when I try to tell my father something, he doesn’t let me finish, at intake reported false (60%, n=9), while 6 (40%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.47). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 109, reported true (66.7%, n=10), while 5 (33.3%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.48). An estimated average of 26.7% increase in communication among adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker. Even though this data shows an increase in negative communication, the data continues to show that there is communication and exchange of ideas.

Table 4.47
Pre-test: When I try to tell my father something, he doesn’t let me finish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.48
Post-test: When I try to tell my father something, he doesn’t let me finish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the adolescent responses for question 112, when my father talks to me, I can tell he understands me, at intake reported false (60%, n=9), while 6 (40%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.49). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 112, reported true (66.7%, n=10), while 5 (33.3%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.50). An estimated average of 26.7% increase in communication among adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker. This data shows the positive communication skill of understanding among the adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker.

Table 4.49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the adolescent responses for question 115, my dad listens to me even when we argue, at intake reported false (66.7%, n=10), while 5 (33.3%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.51). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 115, reported true (53.3%, n=8),
while 7 (46.7%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.52). An estimated average of 20% increase in communication among adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker. Even though the communication exchanged is a negative communication skill of arguments, the finding show that communication remains present.

Table 4.51
Pre-test: My dad listens to me even when we argue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.52
Post-test: My dad listens to me even when we argue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the adolescent responses for question 118, my father listens to me when I need someone to talk to, at intake reported false (53.3%, n=8), while 7 (46.7%) reported true to the question posed (see Table 4.53). At the conclusion of the program (post-test) the majority of the adolescent responses for question 118, reported true (80%, n=12), while 3 (20%) reported false to the question posed (see Table 4.54). An estimated average of 33.3% increase in communication among adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker. This data show the positive communication skill of listening between the adolescent and their father and/or male caretaker.
Table 4.53

*Pre-test: My father listens to me when I need someone to talk to*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.54

*Post-test: My father listens to me when I need someone to talk to*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescent Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

The findings of this study indicate that Aggression Replacement Training does increase the criminogenic need of communication among Latino family members. Although, the study is limited in its finding to Latino adolescents from a two-parent/caretaker house hold, the findings does support the research question for this sample group. Furthermore, the study suggests that although the questions may reveal an increase in negative communication skills (i.e. question 73, my mother almost never understand my side of the argument). It is important to note that even though the adolescent may not feel understood by their parent/caretaker, communication is not lacking. Therefore, due to the existence of not being understood, the adolescent and their parent/caretaker are in communication of each other.
Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

Introduction

This chapter discusses the conclusions of the study and its implications on various aspects of social work for example recommendations and implementation of social work practice and future studies. The purpose of this study was based on the assumption that Aggression Replacement Training (ART) will improve the criminogenic need of increasing communication among family members of Latino gang involved youth and their parents/caretakers.

Moreover, this chapter will also discuss the limitations in the study and the limitations of analyzing the data. The researchers are hopeful that the reader will gain a richer understanding of the issues pertaining to gang involvement among Latino youth and the use of the intervention, Aggression Replacement Training (ART), as it improves the criminogenic need of increasing communication among Latino youth and their parent/caretaker.

Research Results

The findings of this study revealed that ART does increase the criminogenic need of communication among Latino family members. Although, the study is limited in its finding to Latino adolescents from a two-parent/caretaker house hold, the findings indeed supported the assumptions from the researchers. The findings support the literature which stated that parents/caretakers of gang involved youth benefit from interventions like Anger Replacement Training (Goldstein et al., 1987, 1998, 2004; McGinnis, 2003).
Goldstein et al., (1998) suggested that ART becomes more effective by involving families in ART training; therefore, the findings of this study supported the research statement that ART becomes more effective when the family is involved (Goldstein et al., 1998).

In this study a communication scale was used to “assesses specific positive and negative communication skills [for example] interrupting, blaming, monopolizing the conversation, arguments, listening, understanding, [and] having consideration for each other’s feelings” (Robin, Koepke, Moye & Gerhardstein, 2009, p. 26). The importance of this study was to focus on the parent’s/caretaker’s communication with their adolescent and adolescent’s communication with their parent/caretaker. Therefore, by the use of questionnaires at intake and at the conclusion of the intervention, the researchers were able to identify and demonstrate that ART increased communication among family members. The study also revealed that by comparing the pre and post scores from the questionnaires, parent/caretaker reported more positive communication, whereas, the adolescents reported more negative communication and minimum positive communication.

The study revealed that Aggression Replacement Training used with parents and their adolescents improved communication in different ways (i.e. after completing the ART program the parents found it less difficult to communicate with their adolescents). Furthermore, it was revealed that after the participation and completion of ART the adolescents found it easier to communicate with their parents. The study revealed that there was an increase of communication among the parents and youth ranging from
33.4% to 66.7% as shown by the parent’s/caretaker’s post-test results. Furthermore, it also revealed that there was an increase of positive communication between the adolescent and their parent/caretaker that ranged from 26.7% to 53.4% as reported by the adolescents.

Even though the findings reveal negative communication from the adolescent's questionnaire, it is important for social work practitioners and future studies to acknowledge that the goal of increasing communication is present. The ART intervention model is to increase communication, whether it is positive communication or negative communication, it was important to note the change in the participants’ answer. As the participants acknowledge the change from pre-test to post-test the intervention was successful. To have the change in responses reveals that ART has begun to encourage adolescents and their parent/caretaker in the direction of communicating among each other. Therefore, this data show that the parent/caretaker found it less difficult to communicate with their adolescent after completing the ART program.

Implementation

The purpose of this project was to investigate whether or not the intervention, Aggression Replacement Training (ART), when delivered concurrently with gang involved youth and their parents/caretakers improved the criminogenic need of increasing communication among family members. In addition, that the three components of ART: skillstreaming, anger control training, and moral reasoning are the key components to reduce aggression in aggressive adolescents and helping them as well as their parents obtain the skills needed to improve their communication. The researchers
found that parents/caretaker reported more positive improvement in their communication with their adolescents, while their adolescents reported more negative communication.

In order to improve the study, the researchers believe it is important to increase the sample size which would improve the validity of the study. Furthermore, the researchers would like to have participants from other ethnic backgrounds participate and not to limited only to Latino participants. Moreover, the study can be improved by the use and interpretation of a shorter questionnaire. The questionnaire given to the participants was too lengthy and only selected sections from the questionnaire were used to measure the communication among parents/caretakers and adolescents. Finally, the study can be better improved by including single parent/caretaker or adolescent from a single parent/caretaker household. 100% of the adolescents that participated in the current study reported to come from a two-parent/caretaker household. Therefore, having single parent/caretaker in the study will bring better validity to the findings.

Implication for Social Work

This study is to attempt to educate social workers on the alarming increase of gang involvement among youth. In addition, this study anticipates the use of evidence based models as an intervention and to take notice of its success in helping adolescents and their parents/caretaker in improving communication, obtaining skills, and helping youth steer away from gangs. Furthermore, this study is of a great importance to the field of social work as it attempts to educate social workers and other practitioners who are working with aggressive adolescents and/or gang involved youth about the identified risk factors and effective interventions. In addition, it is also imperative for social workers to
understand how to provide services to gang involved youth and their families. This study also attempts to educate social workers about the use of evidence based practice models when dealing with intervention programs for gang involved youth.

Finally, the researchers hope that this study will help social workers to become more competent when working with the Latino populations. It is essential for social workers to become more educated on the dynamics of gang involved youth and their families in order for social workers better support them. As service providers, we need to be aware of the impact gang involvement can have on the youth, their families, and their communities.

**Recommendation for Future Research**

The findings of this study and the review of literature stresses the need of conducting more in depth studies in regards to gang involvement among youths and its impact to their families. It is the researchers’ recommendation that a longitudinal research study would be more informative when measuring communication between gang involved youth and their parent/caretaker. Furthermore, the researchers recommend that this study be expanded to include parents/caretakers and youth from diverse backgrounds to further the validity of the research study. The researchers recommend this study be taken as a pilot program and to continue to expand over the years in order to collect more data. Therefore, increasing the sample size would improve the validity of the study. It is the researchers’ recommendation that if evidence confirms the validity of this study, once it has been implemented to families of diverse backgrounds, that this program can be taken as an intervention model in other counties. It is also the researchers’
recommendation that once the study as included families from diverse background and as been proven to be valid, that it can be applied in different environments like schools, community programs, gang intervention programs, group homes, and correctional facilities where ART has been proven to be effective (McGinnis, 2003).

Summary

The researchers believe that this study revealed accurate results in ART used for the purpose of guiding youth, as well as, their parents/caretakers in the acquisition of skills to improve their ability to make effective choices, improve interpersonal communication and improve their communication with each other. The importance of this study was to focus on the parent and youth communication which has been identified as a criminogenic need that influences adolescent’s delinquency. The use of evidence based practice models as an intervention to work with gang involved youth and their family is imperative in order to help adolescents reframe from gang activity and involvement.

Literature gives insight the social environment’s (i.e. ecological, socioeconomic, sociocultural, and sociopsychological) linkage to gang formation, the activities (i.e. economic gain, school, peers, family, and individual characteristic) that influences youths into gangs, and the intervention model, ART, which was used to help improve interpersonal communication, improve their ability to make effective choices and improve the communication among the gang involved youth and their parent/caretaker.

The findings of this study recognizes the importance of using evidence based models like ART to help gang involved adolescents and their parents/caretakers to
improve their communication and to acquire skills needed to help their youth to reframe from the gang life style. The findings of this study reinforce the notion that having the parents/caretaker take an active part in their adolescent’s lives can make a great impact in the adolescents’ life choices. Family involvement is very important in the life of a youth who is gang involved.

The researchers believe that the transfer of skills were reflected in the participants’ responses at the completion of ART which revealed increase in communication. This study reinforced that among Latino families the quality of relationships within the family is valued, leading for parenting to emphasize in parent-child involvement. Finally, the study confirmed that ART improved the criminogenic need of increasing communication among Latino family members.
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APPENDIX A

Written Letter of Consent and Support

January 25, 2010

With this letter I give my consent for Researcher, Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez to analyze data collected by our Agency's program staff from specific program participants. To ensure confidentiality is maintained, Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez will not have any direct knowledge of or contact with program participants. Each program participant has been duly informed of the purpose of the information to be gathered and has, along with his/her parent or guardian signed their consent. The information to be shared with Mr. Ruiz is limited to ensure anonymity of participants.

Yours truly,

Nancy Lesa, Ph.D.
Executive Director
APPENDIX B

Parent or Guardian Informed Consent Form

Purpose
The purpose of this study is to assess whether the intervention Aggression Replacement Training concurrently delivered to you and your youth in separate classes would improve the criminogenic need of increasing communication among family members.

Procedures
Participants will be asked to complete a short questionnaire. This questionnaire will describe thoughts, feelings, and beliefs that may be related to you and your family. The questionnaire will take about 10–15 minutes. The questionnaire will be given to you during intake of the groups. At the end of your participation in your group you will be asked to fill out the questionnaire again.

CONFIDENTIALITY
All information gathered will be kept confidential and will be used solely for the purpose of this research study. The consent forms will be kept separately from the information gathered from the participating youth and will be kept by the Program Coordinators and The Center Administrators. Any information gathered from your child will be identifiable by code numbers only. After a period of one year the original data will be disposed of. If the results of this study are subsequently published in a scholarly journal, no identification will be made of individual participants.

RISKS AND BENEFITS
Your child’s participation in this study involves no physical risk. And it is unlikely that your child will experience any psychological distress as a result of participating in this study. The child has the right to terminate their participation at any time during the course of the study.

If you feel any concern relating to giving consent for this study, or if your child indicates to you that they feel upset as a result of participating, you may call the Program Coordinators at (707) 838-6641 or the researcher Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez at (707) 236-0675.

FEEDBACK
If you wish, you can receive a written summary regarding group results of the study. No individual results will be available. Your consent and your child’s participation in this study are completely voluntary. Either you or your child are free to withdraw from the study at any time, for any reason. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please call the Program Coordinator at (707) 838-6641 or the researcher Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez at (707) 236-0675.

YOUR SIGNATURE BELOW INDICATES THAT YOU HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD THE ABOVE DESCRIPTION, THAT ANY QUESTIONS YOU HAD REGARDING THE STUDY HAVE BEEN ANSWERED TO YOUR SATISFACTION.
AND THAT YOU GIVE YOUR INFORMED CONSENT TO HAVE YOUR CHILD VOLUNTEER TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY.

__________________________________  _________________________
Signature      Date

If you would like to receive a group summary of the results of this study, please leave an address where you can be reached by mail within the next 5 months.

Name

Relationship to Child

Address
APPENDIX C

Participant Informed Consent

PURPOSE
The purpose of this study is to assess whether the intervention Aggression Replacement Training concurrently delivered to you and your parent/guardian in separate classes would improve the criminogenic need of increasing communication among family members.

PROCEDURES
You will be asked to fill out a questionnaire. This questionnaire will describe thoughts, feelings, and beliefs that may be related to you and your family. The questionnaire will take about 10–15 minutes. The questionnaire will be given to you during intake of the groups. At the end of your participation in groups you will be asked to fill out the questionnaire again. The data obtained in these questionnaires will be explored and analyze by Researcher Bernardo Ruiz Gonzalez from Sacramento State University.

CONFIDENTIALITY
All information on the forms will be kept private and not shared with your parents or other study participants.

RISKS AND BENEFITS
It is unlikely that participating in this research study will be harmful in any way and you have the right to leave the study at any time.

FEEDBACK
If you wish, you can receive a written summary regarding the group results of the study. No individual results will be available.

YOUR SIGNATURE BELOW INDICATES THAT YOU HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD THE ABOVE DESCRIPTION, THAT ANY QUESTIONS YOU HAD REGARDING THE STUDY HAVE BEEN ANSWERED TO YOUR SATISFACTION AND THAT YOU GIVE YOUR INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY.

__________________________________  _________________________
Signature      Date
APPENDIX D

PARQ Parent Questionnaire

Arthur L. Robin, PhD, Thomas Koepke, PhD
and Ann W. Moye, PhD

SECTION 1:

Please read all instructions carefully before beginning. Do NOT mark on this booklet. Mark your answers on the Answer Sheet in the PARQ Adolescent Response Booklet.

This questionnaire describes thoughts, feelings, and beliefs that may be related to you and your family. Please circle the one answer that best indicates your thoughts, feelings, and beliefs.

Please do not leave any items blank. If you are unsure of an answer, please use your best judgment to complete it. Circle T on the Answer Sheet if the statement is TRUE. Circle F on the Answer Sheet if the statement is FALSE.

1. I think my teenager and I need help.
2. My teenager listens to me even when we argue.
3. When my teenager and I argue, we often get stuck without finding any solutions.
4. When somebody gets upset in our family, we all try to be supportive.
5. When I offer to help my teenager with schoolwork, we end up arguing.
6. There is nothing I would like to change about my teenager’s behavior.
7. My teenager and I argue about food.
8. Adolescents who get low grades are trying to get their parents mad.
9. Teenagers must get straight A’s to excel and prepare for productive adulthood years.
10. Teenagers who get involved with undesirable friends end up ruining their future.
11. There could be a lot less conflict between my adolescent and me.
12. My teenager and I are able to have good talks.
13. Because my teenager understands me, he/she had good ideas for solving our problems.
14. Family members rarely spend their free time at home.
15. My teenager complains that I put too much pressure on him/her to get high grades.
16. My teenager is always responsible about schoolwork.
17. There is a great deal of family tension during mealtimes.
18. Adolescents misbehave on purpose to annoy parents.
19. Responsible youth should be neat, tidy, and take proper care of their possessions.
20. My adolescent is unable to handle a lot of freedom without getting into serious trouble.
21. I am generally satisfied with my relationship with my teenager.
22. My teenager provokes me into an argument at least twice a week.
23. My teenager is rarely willing to try my ideas.
24. Our family has problems thinking of thing to do together.
25. My teenager and I do not argue over teachers.
26. There are some things about my family that I do not like.
27. We do not have family conflicts over eating.
28. A teenager wants to make a parent worry when he/she stays out past curfew without calling.
29. I always expect my adolescent to make the right choices about sex.
30. Parents who give teenagers a lot of freedom are asking for serious trouble.
31. I would like to change the way my teenager gets along with me.
32. My teenager admits when he/she is wrong about something.
33. My teenager and I usually reach an agreement.
34. We usually know what everybody in our family is doing.
35. My adolescent rarely lies about school.
36. Our family members understand each other completely.
37. I am generally satisfied with my teenager’s eating.
38. Adolescents try to shock parents by acting sexually immoral.
39. I find it intolerable if my teenager makes poor choices of friends.
40. If my teenager gets involved with sex, this could ruin his/her life.
41. In all honesty, my teenager and I have a great relationship.
42. My teenager usually listens to what I tell him/her.
43. When my teenager and I have a problem, we usually can figure out how to deal with it.
44. In our family we do a lot of things together.
45. My adolescent complains that I criticize him/her for not doing as well in school as others.
46. My teenager sometimes changes the topic to avoid problems during our talks.
47. The talks I have with my teenager about dieting and food are frustrating.
48. When I punish my adolescent, he/she gets even by misbehaving.
49. Adolescents should know how to behave without being reminded by parents.
50. A youth who is lazy and fails to do chores at home will grow up to be irresponsible.
51. There is a lot of fighting between my teenager and me.
52. My teenager makes it easy for me to talk to him/her.
53. My teenager does not live up to our agreements.
54. We feel a very strong sense of loyalty to each other in our family.
55. When my teenager brings home a low test score, we have a fight.
56. My adolescent and I understand each other totally.
57. When my teenager has a problem concerning eating, we can figure out how to handle it.
58. My teenager often tries to drive me crazy.
59. It is a sign of great weakness when teenagers make mistakes.
60. If I grant too much freedom, my teenager could ruin his/her future.
61. My adolescent and I do not get along well.
62. My teenager says I have con consideration for his/her feelings.
63. My teenager and I discuss the pros and cons of our ideas before making decisions.
64. There is little feelings of togetherness in our family.
65. My adolescent and I fight when I ask to see his/her assignments.
66. My teenager sometimes talks to me disrespectfully.
67. My teenager often gets hostile when I bring up food or related topics.
68. Teenagers fail to complete their chores just to infuriate their parents.
69. My adolescent should do what is right without having to hear about it from me.
70. If my teenager does poorly at school, he/she will grow up to be nonproductive human being.
71. There are some major disagreements that need to be worked out between my teenager and me.
72. When my teenager and I talk, I can tell he/she understands me.
73. My teenager makes impulsive decisions with considering the consequences.
74. There is a lot of group spirit in our family.
75. I am happy with my teenager’s attitude about school.
76. There are no problems to be solved between my adolescent and me.
77. Quite honestly, I feel helpless about how to help my teenager with eating/weight problems.
78. Teenagers who act irresponsible don’t care about their parents.
79. It is very difficult for me to overlook imperfections in my adolescent without taking corrective action.
80. Adolescents who are undisciplined and slovenly will grow up to be irresponsible.
81. My adolescent and I often get angry at each other.
82. The talks I have with my teenager are frustrating.
83. My teenager talks to me when he/she feels that we have a disagreement.
84. In our family, people feel alienated from each other.
85. I frequently have to tell my teenager when, where, or how to study.
86. My adolescent and I sometimes have conflicts over school.
87. My teenager usually listens to what I say about exercising and eating.
88. I have often considered taking my adolescent for family counseling.
89. For the most part, my teenager likes to talk to me.
90. My teenager doesn’t ask for my ideas for solving problems.
91. We are an extremely close-knit family.
92. I can’t make my teenager realize the importance of school success.
93. I don’t’ think any family could be happier than ours.
94. My teenager is rarely willing to try my ideas about eating.

SECTION 2:

Please complete this section if you have more than one child or adolescent living with you.

This section of the questionnaire describes thoughts, feelings, and beliefs that may or may not be true of the relationship between your children. Please circle the one answer that best indicates your thoughts, feelings, and beliefs.

If you do NOT have more than one child or adolescent living with you, please skip to Section 2.

95. My children fight too much
96. My children are good friends.
97. My children have trusting relationship with each other.
98. My children are very different from each other but still get along.
99. My children are frequently jealous of each other.
100. My children frequently put each other down.
101. My children can share things without a fight.
102. The kids often tattle on each other.
103. When my children try to do things together, they end up in a big fight.
104. my children can settle their own disputes without my help.

SECTION 3:

Please complete this section if your spouse/significant other is living with you.

This section of the questionnaire describes thoughts, feelings, and beliefs that may or may not be true of the relationship between you, your spouse/significant other, and your adolescent. Please circle the one answer that best indicates your thoughts, feelings, and beliefs.

If your spouse/significant other is NOT living with you, stop here. You are finished with the PARQ.
105. Our teenager can win arguments by getting my spouse and me mad at each other.
106. It’s hard for me to stay out of disagreements between my spouse and teenager.
107. My spouse is often “caught in the middle” when my teenager and I disagree.
108. I support my spouse when he/she disciplines our adolescent.
109. My spouse and teenager make up rules without including me.
110. When my spouse tries to discipline our adolescent, I support our teenager.
111. When I punish our teenager and my spouse disagree, my spouse tells our teenager to ignore the punishment.
112. When my spouse makes up a rule my adolescent dislikes, my adolescent tries to get me to change it.
113. When I punish our teenager, the teenager tries to get my spouse to soften the punishment.
114. My spouse and I ignore our teenager’s ideas.
115. Quite honestly, my spouse an teenager pay very little attention to me.
116. my teenager and I make up rules without including my spouse.
117. It’s hard for our teenager to stay out of disagreements between my spouse and me.
118. I am often “caught in the middle” when my spouse and teenager disagree.
119. My spouse can get our adolescent and me to stop fighting with each other.
120. Our teenager frequently attempts to sabotage plans that my spouse and I make.
121. When I try to discipline our adolescent, my spouse supports our teenager.
122. Quite honestly, my teenager and I pay very little attention to my spouse.
123. Our teenager is often “caught in the middle” when my spouse and I disagree.
124. I am confused about whose side to take when my spouse and adolescent disagree.
125. My teenager and I stop fighting and arguing when my spouse is having problems.
126. my spouse and I make up rules without including our teenager.
127. By getting our teenager to take sides against me, my spouse can usually get his/her way.
128. I get rules change by enlisting my teenager’s help against my spouse.
129. When my spouse and I get caught up in an argument about disciple, our teenager gets off easier.
130. When my souse and teenager have an argument, they try to get me to take sides.
131. When I make up a rule my adolescent dislike, the adolescent tries to get my spouse to change it.
132. my spouse and I change rules by enlisting each other’s support.
133. My teenager can get rules changed by enlisting my souse’s help against me.
134. My spouse frequently attempts to sabotage plans that my teenager and I make.
135. Our teenager tries to make peace between my spouse and me when we fight.
136. When my spouse punishes our teenager, the teen tries to get me to soften the punishment.
137. My spouse tries to make peace between our teenager and me when we fight.
138. My spouse and I often take unified front against our teenager.
139. My teenager and spouse ignore my ideas.
140. My adolescent and I have a special relationship that excludes my spouse.
141. Our teenager tries to take both of our sides when my spouse and I have a disagreement.
142. I try to make peace between my spouse and teenage when they fight.
143. It’s hard for my spouse to stay out of disagreements between my teenager and e.
144. My spouse and I keep secrets from our teenager.
145. My spouse and teenager keep secrets from me.
146. My teenager and I often gang up against my spouse.
147. Our adolescent appears confused about whose side to take when my spouse and I disagree.
148. I try to take bother my spouse’s and my teenager’s side when they disagree.
149. My spouse tries to take both or our sides when my teenager and I disagree.
150. My spouse and I have relationship which excludes our teenager.
151. My spouse and teenager frequently accuse me of sabotaging their plans.
152. My teenager and keep secrets from my spouse.
APPENDIX E
PARQ Adolescent Questionnaire
Arthur L. Robin, PhD, Thomas Koepke, PhD
and Ann W. Moye, PhD

SECTION 1:
Please read all instructions carefully before beginning. Do NOT mark on this booklet. Mark your answers on the Answer Sheet in the PARQ Adolescent Response Booklet.

This questionnaire describes thoughts, feelings, and beliefs that may be related to you and your family. Please circle the one answer that best indicates your thoughts, feelings, and beliefs.

Please do not leave any items blank. If you are unsure of an answer, please use your best judgment to complete it. Circle T on the Answer Sheet if the statement is TRUE. Circle F on the Answer Sheet if the statement is FALSE.

1. We are an extremely close-knit family.
2. My parents and I argue about food.
3. There are many things I would like to change about the way my parents and I get along.
4. My parents put too many restrictions on me.
5. When my parents get tough with me, they make me miss out on all the fun things in life.
7. There are no problems to be solved between my parents and me.
8. There is not much feeling of togetherness in our family.
9. There is a great deal of family tension during mealtimes.
10. In all honesty, my parents and I have a great relationship.
11. Teenagers should be able to decide all of their own rules.
12. If I listened to my parents’ old-fashioned ideas about sex, I would end up without any boyfriends/girlfriends.
13. It is a serious injustice for parents to put a lot of restrictions on teenagers.
14. There are some things about my family that I don’t like.
15. Our family has problems thinking of things to do together.
16. We do not have family conflicts over eating.
17. In general, I don’t think we get along very well.
18. Teenagers should be able to decide for themselves how much work to do around the house.
19. Parents can ruin a teenager’s life.
20. Parents often treat adolescents unfairly.
21. My parents and I completely agree on the “rules” for me.
22. In our family, we do a lot of things together.
23. I cannot talk to my parents about my fears of getting fat and eating.
24. My parents are easy to get along with.
25. My parents should not challenge my decision about sex.
26. My parents make up strict rules that go too far and mess up everything for me.
27. Parents act very unfairly when they restrict their adolescents from seeking certain friends.
28. There is nothing I would like to change about my appearance.
29. I have gone several days without spending time with my entire family.
30. The talks I have with my parents about dieting and food are frustrating.
31. There is a lot of fighting between my parents and me.
32. Parents should permit teenagers to do whatever the teenagers wish.
33. My parents make me do so much homework that I never have time for seeing my friends.
34. My parents treat me very unfairly when it comes to rules about dating or seeing friends.
35. My parents and I understood each other totally.
36. We usually know what everybody is doing in our family.
37. My parents often hurt my feelings when we discuss eating.
38. There are some major disagreements that need to be worked out between my parents and me.
39. My parents should let me do whatever I wish with any of my friends.
40. If parents don’t let teenagers do what their friends do, the teenagers will end up without any friends.
41. My parents are not at all fair in the way they act toward me.
42. Family members never take sides against each other.
43. I rarely have any idea what others in this family are thinking.
44. My parents are rarely willing to try my ideas about eating.
45. I am generally satisfied with my relationship with my parents.
46. I am capable of making up all the rules for myself without any interference from my parents.
47. If parents restrict teenagers, the teenagers will miss out on all kinds of fun activities.
48. I can’t get a fair deal in my family.
49. There is nothing I would like to change about the way my parents and I get along.
50. At home we go out of our way to do things for each other.
51. I dread mealtimes with my parents.
52. My parents and I often get angry at each other.
53. Adolescents should be given complete freedom to take care of school work without parents butting in.
54. If a teenager keeps his room as neat as parents demand, parents will soon start demanding that the teenager do many extra chores.
55. It is terribly unfair for parents to make adolescents do a lot of homework.
56. My parents and I sometimes have conflicts over school.
57. We have a very strong sense of loyalty to each other in our family.
58. My parents and I cannot agree on matters concerning eating.
59. I am very happy when I am with my parents.
60. Our home is the center of family activities.
61. I get annoyed when parents talk to me about my weight.
62. I enjoy being with my parents.

SECTION 2:

Please complete this section if a sibling or other child or adolescent is living with you.

This section of the questionnaire describes thoughts, feelings, and beliefs that may or may not be true of the relationship between you and the other children or adolescents you live with. Please circle the one answer that best indicates your thoughts, feeling, and beliefs.

If there are NO other children or adolescents living with you, please skip to Section 3.

63. I wish I were an only child.
64. I consider my brothers and sisters good friends.
65. I do not trust my brothers and sisters.
66. I hate at least on of my brothers or sisters.
67. My parents usually take my brothers’ or sisters’ side against me.
68. When my brothers, sisters, and I try to do things together, we end up in a big fight.
69. My brothers or sisters often accuse me of tattling on them.
70. My brothers or sisters frequently put me down.
71. My parents buy my brothers or sisters more clothes, records, and other things than they buy me.
72. My brothers, sisters, and I fight a lot.
SECTION 3:

Please complete this section if you are living with your mother (or other female caregiver) OR if you are living with two parents (or two caregivers).

This section of the questionnaire describes thoughts, feelings, and beliefs that may or may not be true of the relationship between you and your mother (or other female caregiver). Please circle the one answer that best indicates your thoughts, feelings, and beliefs.

If you do NOT live with your mother (or other females caregiver), please skip to Section 4.

73. My mom almost never understands my side of the argument.
74. My mom is unwilling to meet me halfway to end arguments.
75. My school achievement is more important to my mom than to me.
76. When my mother talks to me, I can tell she understands me.
77. My mom and I can usually reach an agreement.
78. My mother nags me about where, when, or how to study.
79. My mother is bossy when talking to me.
80. My mom always has to win arguments.
81. My mother criticizes me for not doing as well in school as others.
82. When I try to tell my mother something, she doesn’t let me finish.
83. My mom encourages me to tell my side of the argument.
84. My mother punishes me for bad grades.
85. My mom brings up a lot of my faults when we argue.
86. My mom collects all the facts before making decisions.
87. Even when I try very hard in school, my mother tells me I could do better.
88. My mom listens to me even when we argue.
89. My mother and I discuss the pros and cons of our ideas before making decisions.
90. My mom and I argue when she demands to see my assignments.
91. My mother makes it easy to talk to her.
92. When my mom and I argue, we often get stuck without finding any solutions.

93. My mom often accuses me of lying about school.

94. My mother screams a lot.

95. My mom is rarely willing to try my ideas.

96. When I bring home a low test score, my mom and I have an argument.

SECTION 4:

Please complete this section if you are living with your father (or other male caregiver) OR if you are living two parents (or two caregivers).

This section of the questionnaire describes thoughts, feelings, and beliefs that may or may not be true of the relationship between you and your father (or other male caregiver). Please circle the one answer that best indicates your thoughts, feelings, and beliefs.

If you do NOT live with your father (or other male caregiver), stop here. You are finish with the PARQ.

97. My dad almost never understands my side of the argument.

98. My dad is rarely willing to try my ideas.

99. My school achievement is more important to Dad than to me.

100. My father makes it easy to talk to him.

101. My father and I discuss the pros and cons of our ideas before making decisions.

102. My father nags me about where, when, or how to study.

103. My father is bossy when talking to me.

104. My dad is unwilling to meet me halfway to end arguments.

105. My father criticizes me for not doing as well in school as others.

106. My dad and I try to understand each other’s feelings.

107. My dad collects all the facts before making decisions.

108. My father doesn’t take it personally if I do poorly in school.

109. When I try to tell my father something, he doesn’t let me finish.
110. My dad doesn’t ask for my ideas for solving arguments.
111. My dad punishes me for bad grades.
112. When my father talks to me, I can tell he understands me.
113. My dad always has to win arguments.
114. My father and I do not argue a lot over school work.
115. My dad listens to me even when we argue.
116. My dad encourages me to tell my side of the argument.
117. Even when I try hard in school, my father tells me I could do better.
118. My father listens to me when I need someone to talk to.
119. When my dad and I argue, we often get stuck without finding any solutions.
120. When I bring home a low test score, my dad and I have an argument.

SECTION 5:

Please complete this section if you are living with two parents (or two caregivers).

This section of the questionnaire describes thoughts, feelings, and beliefs that may or may not be true of the relationship between you and your parents (or caregivers). Please circle the one answer that best indicates your thoughts, feelings, and beliefs.

Please note that if you complete Section 5, you also should have completed Section 3 (living with mother or other female caregiver) and 4 (living with father or other male caregiver).

If you do NOT live with two parents (or two caregivers), stop here. You are finished with the PARQ.

121. I often fell “caught in the middle” when my parents disagree.
122. My dad doesn’t know whose side to take when my mom and I disagree.
123. When my father punishes me, I try to get my mother to soften the punishment.
124. Quite honestly, my dad and I pay very little attention to my mom.
125. My mom and I ignore Dad’s ideas.
126. My mother can get her way by getting my father’s help against me.
127. When my parents get into an argument about discipline, I get off easier.
128. When my mom punishes me, I try to get my dad to soften the punishment.
129. My mom often gets “caught in the middle” when my dad and I disagree.
130. My dad and I ignore Mom’s ideas.
131. I can get my way by getting my mother’s help against my father.
132. My mom and dad keep secrets from me.
133. I have trouble following rules when my mom and dad disagree about them
134. My dad physically stands between my mom and me when we fight.
135. It’s hard for Mom to stay out of arguments between Dad and me.
136. My dad and I often gang up on Mom.
137. When my dad is critical, my mom sticks up for me.
138. My mother and father often gang up on me.
139. I physically stand between my parents when they fight.
140. It’s hard for Dad to stay out of arguments between Mom and me.
141. My dad and I stop fighting when my mom has problems.
142. Mom frequently sabotages plans that Dad and I make.
143. My mom and I keep secrets from Dad.
144. My mom and dad make up rules without including me.
145. My parents try to get me to take sides when they have an argument.
146. When my mom makes up a rule I don’t like, I try to get my dad to change it.
147. When my dad and I argue, we try to get Mom to take sides.
148. My dad and I make the rules without including my mother.
149. My mom and I often gang up on Dad.
150. When my parents are critical, no one sticks up for me.
151. I can win arguments by getting my parents made at each other.
152. My dad often gets “caught in the middle” when my mom and I disagree.
153. My mom tries to make peace between my dad and me.
154. My dad and I keep secrets from Mom.
155. My mom and I have a special relationship that excludes Dad.
156. My parents have a special relationship that excludes me.
157. It’s hard for me to stay out of disagreements between my parents.
158. When my mom and I argue, we try to get Dad to take sides.
159. My mom doesn’t know whose side to take when my dad and I disagree.
160. I can get my way by getting my father’s help against my mother.
161. My mom and I make up rules without including my father.
162. My mom and dad ignore my ideas.
163. When my mother makes up a rule that my dad thinks is unfair, he tells me I don’t have to follow it.
164. My dad can make Mom and me stop yelling at each other.
165. When my dad makes up a rule I don’t like, I try to get my mother to change it.
166. My father can usually get his way in an argument by getting me to take sides against my mom.
167. Quite honestly, my mom and I pay very little attention to my father.
168. Quite honestly, my mother and father pay very little attention to me.
APPENDIX F

PARQ Parent Answer Sheet

Name_______________ ID number ____________
Today’s date ___/___/___ Date of birth ___/___/___
Gender □ M □ F  Age _________ Grade_________

Section 1: Everyone should complete this section. Circle T if the statement is TRUE or F if the statement is FALSE.

|   | T | F |   | T | F |   | T | F |   | T | F |   | T | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | T | F | 13 | T | F | 25 | T | F | 37 | T | F | 49 | T | F |
| 2 | T | F | 14 | T | F | 26 | T | F | 38 | T | F | 50 | T | F |
| 3 | T | F | 15 | T | F | 27 | T | F | 39 | T | F | 51 | T | F |
| 4 | T | F | 16 | T | F | 28 | T | F | 40 | T | F | 52 | T | F |
| 5 | T | F | 17 | T | F | 29 | T | F | 41 | T | F | 53 | T | F |
| 6 | T | F | 18 | T | F | 30 | T | F | 42 | T | F | 54 | T | F |
| 7 | T | F | 19 | T | F | 31 | T | F | 43 | T | F | 55 | T | F |
| 8 | T | F | 20 | T | F | 32 | T | F | 44 | T | F | 56 | T | F |
| 9 | T | F | 21 | T | F | 33 | T | F | 45 | T | F | 57 | T | F |
| 10| T | F | 22 | T | F | 34 | T | F | 46 | T | F | 58 | T | F |
| 11| T | F | 23 | T | F | 35 | T | F | 47 | T | F | 59 | T | F |
| 12| T | F | 24 | T | F | 36 | T | F | 48 | T | F | 60 | T | F |

Section 2: Complete if you have more than one child or adolescent living with you. Circle T if the statement is TRUE or F if the statement is FALSE. If there are NOT have more than one child or adolescent living with you, please skip to Section 3.

|   | T | F |   | T | F |   | T | F |   | T | F |   | T | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 95| T | F | 97 | T | F | 99 | T | F | 101| T | F | 103| T | F |
| 96| T | F | 98 | T | F | 100| T | F | 102| T | F | 104| T | F |

Section 3: Complete if your spouse/significant other is living with you. Circle T if the statement is TRUE or F if the statement is FALSE. If your spouse/significant other is NOT living with you, stop here. You are finished with the PARQ.

|   | T | F |   | T | F |   | T | F |   | T | F |   | T | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 105| T | F | 111| T | F | 117| T | F | 123| T | F | 129| T | F |
| 106| T | F | 112| T | F | 118| T | F | 124| T | F | 130| T | F |
| 107| T | F | 113| T | F | 119| T | F | 125| T | F | 131| T | F |
| 108| T | F | 114| T | F | 120| T | F | 126| T | F | 132| T | F |
| 109| T | F | 115| T | F | 121| T | F | 127| T | F | 133| T | F |
| 110| T | F | 116| T | F | 122| T | F | 128| T | F | 134| T | F |
| 111| T | F | 117| T | F | 123| T | F | 129| T | F | 135| T | F |
| 112| T | F | 118| T | F | 124| T | F | 130| T | F | 136| T | F |
| 113| T | F | 119| T | F | 125| T | F | 131| T | F | 137| T | F |
| 114| T | F | 120| T | F | 126| T | F | 132| T | F | 138| T | F |
| 115| T | F | 121| T | F | 127| T | F | 133| T | F | 139| T | F |
| 116| T | F | 122| T | F | 128| T | F | 134| T | F | 140| T | F |
| 117| T | F | 123| T | F | 129| T | F | 135| T | F | 141| T | F | 147| T | F |
APPENDIX G

PARQ Adolescent Answer Sheet

Name_________________ ID number ___________
Today’s date ___/___/___ Date of birth___/___/___
Gender □ M □ F  Age __________ Grade________

If you live with your mother only (or other female caregiver only), please complete Section 1 and 3.
If you live with your father only (or other male caregiver only), please complete Section 1 and 4.
If you live with both your mother and father (or two caregivers), please complete Section 1, 3, 4, and 5.
If you also live with a sibling (or other child or adolescent), please complete Section 2.

Section 1: Everyone should complete this section. Circle T if the statement is TRUE or F if the statement is FALSE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 T F</th>
<th>9 T F</th>
<th>17 T F</th>
<th>25 T F</th>
<th>33 T F</th>
<th>41 T F</th>
<th>49 T F</th>
<th>57 T F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 T F</td>
<td>10 T F</td>
<td>18 T F</td>
<td>26 T F</td>
<td>34 T F</td>
<td>42 T F</td>
<td>50 T F</td>
<td>58 T F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 T F</td>
<td>11 T F</td>
<td>19 T F</td>
<td>27 T F</td>
<td>35 T F</td>
<td>43 T F</td>
<td>51 T F</td>
<td>59 T F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 T F</td>
<td>12 T F</td>
<td>20 T F</td>
<td>28 T F</td>
<td>36 T F</td>
<td>44 T F</td>
<td>52 T F</td>
<td>60 T F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 T F</td>
<td>13 T F</td>
<td>21 T F</td>
<td>29 T F</td>
<td>37 T F</td>
<td>45 T F</td>
<td>53 T F</td>
<td>61 T F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 T F</td>
<td>14 T F</td>
<td>22 T F</td>
<td>30 T F</td>
<td>38 T F</td>
<td>46 T F</td>
<td>54 T F</td>
<td>62 T F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 T F</td>
<td>15 T F</td>
<td>23 T F</td>
<td>31 T F</td>
<td>39 T F</td>
<td>47 T F</td>
<td>55 T F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 T F</td>
<td>16 T F</td>
<td>24 T F</td>
<td>32 T F</td>
<td>40 T F</td>
<td>48 T F</td>
<td>56 T F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2: Complete if a sibling or other child or adolescent is living with you. Circle T if the statement is TRUE or F if the statement is FALSE. If there are NO other children or adolescents living with you, please skip to Section 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>63 T F</th>
<th>65 T F</th>
<th>67 T F</th>
<th>69 T F</th>
<th>71 T F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64 T F</td>
<td>66 T F</td>
<td>68 T F</td>
<td>70 T F</td>
<td>72 T F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3: Complete if you are living with your mother (or other female caregiver) OR if you are living with two parents (or two caregivers). Circle T if the statement is TRUE or F if the statement is FALSE. If you do NOT live with your mother (or other female caregiver), please skip to Section 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>73 T F</th>
<th>76 T F</th>
<th>79 T F</th>
<th>82 T F</th>
<th>85 T F</th>
<th>88 T F</th>
<th>91 T F</th>
<th>94 T F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74 T F</td>
<td>77 T F</td>
<td>80 T F</td>
<td>83 T F</td>
<td>86 T F</td>
<td>89 T F</td>
<td>92 T F</td>
<td>95 T F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 T F</td>
<td>78 T F</td>
<td>81 T F</td>
<td>84 T F</td>
<td>87 T F</td>
<td>90 T F</td>
<td>93 T F</td>
<td>96 T F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4: Complete if you are living with your father (or other male caregiver) OR if you are living with two parents (or two caregivers). Circle T if the
statement is **TRUE** or **F** if the statement is **FALSE. If you do NOT live with your father (or other male caregiver), stop here. You are finished with the PARQ.**

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 5:** Complete if you are living with two parents (or two caregivers). Circle **T** if the statement is **TRUE** or **F** if the statement is **FALSE.** If you complete Section 5, you also should have completed Section 3 and 4. **If you do NOT live with two parents (or two caregivers), stop here. You are finished with the PARQ.**

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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