

THE RISK OF ADOLESCENT VICTIMIZATION: ASSESSING ELEMENTS OF THE
SOCIAL BOND THEORY

by

Jaime Antonio Negrete



A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Criminal Justice
Boise State University

May 2022

© 2022

Jaime Antonio Negrete

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COLLEGE

DEFENSE COMMITTEE AND FINAL READING APPROVALS

of the thesis submitted by

Jaime Antonio Negrete

Thesis Title: The Risk of Adolescent Victimization: Assessing Elements of the Social Bond Theory

Date of Final Oral Examination: 13 December 2021

The following individuals read and discussed the thesis submitted by student Jaime Antonio Negrete, and they evaluated his presentation and response to questions during the final oral examination. They found that the student passed the final oral examination.

Jessica Wells, Ph.D. Chair, Supervisory Committee

Shaun M. Gann, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

Cody Jorgensen, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

The final reading approval of the thesis was granted by Jessica Wells, Ph.D., Chair of the Supervisory Committee. The thesis was approved by the Graduate College.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents.

While writing the entirety of this paper, there was times where I felt that it was going to be an impossible journey to accomplish. Through the times of stress, sleepless nights, and uncertainties, my parents Martha and Jaime Negrete's words of encouragement came to mind; "you are capable of accomplishing anything and everything you set your mind to. Whenever there is self-doubt, always remember the words, 'I can do it.' We are here for you every step of the way regardless of the time, day, or distance. We love you." These words my parents constantly repeated to me throughout my entire educational career, gave me the strength to push forward and continue pursuing a career in the criminal justice field. I promised myself that I will make them proud and not disappoint them by giving up even when times get tough. With the accomplishment of yet another milestone, I did just that. This paper is a dedication to them and their miraculous job of being supportive, caring, and loving parents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to acknowledge the large role my thesis chair, Dr. Jessica Wells, played in guiding me not only throughout the process of writing this thesis, but also in my entire graduate career. Dr. Wells has seen my growth from start to end of my graduate career and I am very grateful that she has taken this journey with me. Dr. Wells is and will continue to be a role model for me and I am thankful I had the opportunity to work with her. I would also like to acknowledge the support that was given by my committee members Dr. Shaun Gann and Dr. Cody Jorgensen. Without their knowledge, special areas of expertise, and guidance, this thesis paper would not have been possible.

Lastly, I would like to thank my parents, brothers, and boyfriend for the continuous support and encouragement throughout this journey. Thanks to them, I was able to be successful and be able to accomplish this journey. To my parents Martha and Jaime, thank you for always believing, encouraging, supporting, and showing me unconditional love when I needed it the most. To my brothers Manuel, Miguel, Jonathan, and Brian, thank you for the support, love, and the much needed laughs when things got tough.

A special thanks to my boyfriend Elias, for showing me that I can be a better version of myself. Thank you for your unconditional love, support, words of encouragement, and believing in me. You've shown me how to be a stronger individual and how to believe in myself when the times got tough. You were my rock this entire

process and I thank you for that. Lastly, thank you for all the late night conversations, laughs, and assurance that kept me going. I love you all, unconditionally.

ABSTRACT

Travis Hirschi's social bond theory holds that the social bonds (attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief) individuals have with parents, friends, extracurricular activities, work, and school can affect an individual's life choices. When social bonds are weakened, broken, or nonexistent, the lack of these bonds can explain why crime and delinquency occur. Therefore, Hirschi believed that asking why offenders "do it" when it comes to crime is irrelevant. Rather, we should be asking "why don't we do it" when it comes to crime and delinquency, which lead Hirschi to believe that the answer to that question could be answered by the bonds individual have with others. To better understand this relationship, this study will analyze how a lack of social bonds can either increase or decrease the chances of a youth being victimized through a victim's perspective rather than the criminal's.

Using Hirschi's (1969) theory on social bonds, it was hypothesized that adolescents with stronger attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief bonds decreases their likelihood of victimization. Using secondary data from the National Youth Survey Data (Elliot, 1987), analyzing 1,725 participants, and calculating descriptive statistics, logistic regression models were used to determine whether or not strong social bonds decreased adolescent victimization. Results suggested the opposite. Results showed that 1 of the 4 bond types (involvement), increased the chances of victimization. Meaning that as involvement increased, victimization increased as well.

This thesis concludes with a discussion of the methodology, major findings, limitations, and future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Research Question and Hypotheses	2
Review of Literature	3
Control Theories and Delinquency	3
Social Bond Theory.....	6
Attachment Bond.....	9
Commitment Bond	13
Involvement Bond	16
Belief Bond	18
Current Study.....	20
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY	21
Dependent Variable.....	22
Independent Variables.....	23
Attachment.....	23

Commitment	24
Involvement	24
Belief	25
Control Variables	25
Type of Testing Model	26
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS	28
Descriptive Statistics	28
Correlation Matrix Results	30
Bond Type Results	33
Control Variable Results	37
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION	38
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION	42
Limitations	42
Future Studies	43
REFERENCES	44
APPENDIX	48

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Descriptive Statistics	29
Table 2.	Correlation Matrix.....	32
Table 3.	Attachment Bond Model.....	33
Table 4.	Commitment Bond Model	34
Table 5.	Involvement Bond Model	35
Table 6.	Belief Bond Model	36
Table 7.	Logistic Regression All Bond Types.....	37
Table A.1	Attachment Coded.....	49
Table A.2	Commitment Coded.....	50
Table A.3	Involvement Coded	51
Table A.4	Belief Coded	51
Table A.5	Victimization Coded.....	53

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

NYS	National Youth Survey
NYSD	National Youth Survey Data
OR	Odds Ratio

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

A youth's dependency on social relationships begins at an early stage in life and continues on through his or her teenage years. Social relationships can include bonds with parents, friends, extracurricular activities, work, and school. These activities are crucial in a youth's development because they help to develop important skills (e.g., how to communicate, interaction with prosocial relationships, respect, relationship management, conflict resolution, etc.), as they enter adulthood. Schroeder, Giordano, and Cernkovich (2010), state that "late childhood and early adolescence is understandable, as late childhood and adolescence is a period in which people accumulate the vast majority of the human, social, and cultural capital that shapes their lives, and events during these life stages have been shown to strongly influence numerous life course outcomes including criminal offending" (p. 563). For example, some of these skills include social and intellectual skills. Positive social relationships help deter individuals from a life of crime and victimization. Research, in fact, has found that individuals who lack social relationships increases likelihood of being involved in crime (Schroeder, Giordano, and Cernkovich 2010, p. 563). Thus, social bonds play an important role in a youth's development that can influence whether or not they will indulge in any criminogenic behaviors.

Social bond theory was introduced by Travis Hirschi in 1969. Hirschi's theory holds that the social bonds (attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief) individuals have with parents, friends, extracurricular activities, work, and school can

affect an individual's life choices. When social bonds are weakened, broken, or nonexistent, the lack of these bonds can explain why crime and delinquency occur. For example, adolescents that have weak social bonds with school and parents are more likely to get involved with a delinquent lifestyle because the costs of transgressions are lower (Felson and Staff, 2006, p. 301). Thus, when individuals have less attachment to parents and teachers, they are less concerned about getting into trouble, the costs of punishment decrease, and the risks of engaging in criminogenic behaviors and actions increase leading to a higher risk of one being a victim of crime. Additionally, having a higher risk of engaging or being around delinquency can increase the chances of a youth becoming a victim. To better understand this relationship, this study will analyze how a lack of social bonds can either increase or decrease the chances of a youth being victimized through a victim's perspective rather than the criminal's.

Research Question and Hypotheses

This study will focus on answering the following research question: "Is a lack of social bonds associated with variation in adolescent victimization?" The research question is important to decrease adolescent victimization in a crucial life point within their life course. Below is a summary of the hypotheses in which this study will focus on testing how the social bonds will affect adolescent victimization.

Hypothesis 1: Having a strong attachment social bond will decrease the chances of a youth being victimized.

Hypothesis 2: Having a strong involvement social bond will decrease the chances of a youth being victimized.

Hypothesis 3: Having a strong commitment social bond will decrease the chances of a youth being victimized.

Hypothesis 4: Having a strong belief social bond will decrease the chances of a youth being victimized.

Review of Literature

Criminological theorists have examined why delinquency occurs in multiple ways. A specific approach that theorists have tried testing delinquency is through the power of control. Control is a powerful ability that can influence the behavior of certain individuals or groups of people. The act of control can be used in distinct ways. Criminal justice theorists have tested different approaches of how control can be used as an explanation of criminogenic actions, behaviors, or justifications for individuals engaging in crime. In general, the control theory assumes that individuals make the decision to commit crime without thinking or any motivation to do so. Additionally, the control theory assumes that this urge to commit crime is defied due to the costs that comes with committing crime. The cost of crime can be influential because the individual may think about how committing these criminal acts can possibly tarnish their relationship with friends, family, or other institutions that they care for. By having the control to avoid crime, this can lead an individual to maintain strong bonds and reduce the likelihood of tarnishing or weakening these bonds.

Control Theories and Delinquency

The theoretical framework of the modern control tradition dates back to the 1940s beginning with early control theorists Albert J. Reiss, F. Ivan Nye, and Walter Reckless. These theorists introduced theoretical frameworks that explain control and delinquency.

Albert J. Reiss introduced his ideas on personal and social control theories. In 1949, Reiss' concepts of personal and social control developed an explanation that predicted why juvenile delinquency occurs. According to Reiss (1949), “*personal control* is the ability of the individual abstaining from meeting the necessary needs in ways that will conflict with the norms and rules of mainstream society. *Social control* is the capability of social groups or institutions to making rules and norms more effective” (Omoyibo and Obaro, 2012, p. 1028). Thus, delinquency occurs when individuals or social groups do not internalize the social norms of society or that the laws are not being taught to them and made available for them to understand. This results in individuals or groups not conforming to legal norms constructed by mainstream society.

In 1958, early control theorist F. Ivan Nye introduced the idea of a family-focused theory of social control. Nye’s research focused on adolescents and how their families acted as important sources of social control over them. Nye proposed four different sources of control in regards to how the family aspect could contribute to having social control over adolescents. The four types of control are termed as the following: direct control (which is enforced through higher authorities such as parents, teachers, or law enforcement), internalized control (an individual regulates their selves through their “conscience” or superego), indirect control (one integrates their selves through affection and identification with authority figures), and lastly, one can control their selves through alternate means of satisfaction needs (Omoyibo and Obaro, 2012, p. 1029). These four controls allow adolescents to have some preparation to conform to the norms of mainstream society and help them achieve other prosocial goals rather than getting involved with criminogenic behaviors.

Walter C. Reckless' theory focused on containment. Reckless' containment theory was established when searching for “self-factors” that explained why individuals engage in criminal behaviors: social pressures. Lilly, Cullen, and Ball (2014), described containment theory as “the great social transformation from life in fairly simple, integrated, agrarian societies to life in complex, technological, sophisticated, highly industrialized urban environments placed a different set of pressures on the individual and the social order” (p. 102). The theory attempts to explain which controls work best to regulate the conduct needed to lower crime and delinquency, aside from the social pressure one can encounter. Reckless includes the concepts of *pushes* and *pulls* and outer and inner containment. Reckless explained *pushes* as an impulse that causes an individual to commit a crime. For example, poverty, stress, and many other factors can *push* someone toward a lifestyle of crime and delinquency. *Pushes* may lead an individual to encounter other environmental conditions such as having minority group status, fewer opportunities for success, and the inability to conform to cultural goals and institutionalized means (Kennedy, 2015, p. 51). *Pulls*, on the other hand, are the attraction that interests individuals into a life of crime (Kennedy, 2015, p. 51). For example, making money easily by engaging in robbing a bank when not having a job or needing the money right away. The attraction in this scenario is easily making money by engaging in a crime that can get an individual the money they need quickly.

Additionally, Reckless discusses two different types of containment; outer and inner containment. First, outer containment states that social environmental structures can help control crime and delinquency. Lilly et. al. (2014), state that “*concentrating on the external containment model for modern, urban, industrial, mobile society, he stressed (1)*

reasonable limits (2) meaningful rules and activities (3) several complementary variables such as reinforcement by groups and significant supportive relationships, acceptance [and] the creation of a sense of belonging and identity” (p. 104). Thus, outer containment focuses on regulation and integration with an individual’s family, organization, and/or community.

Second, inner containment focuses on an individual’s perception of criminal behavior. Inner containment controls the individual to a certain extent regardless of how environmental forces have changed. To do so, Reckless identified four additional factors: (1) *self-concept*, in which one sees their selves as law abiding citizens, keeping them conformed (2) *goal orientation*, in which one stays on the right pathway to conformity since a goal-oriented dynamic was provided (3) *frustration tolerance*, in which one has the self-control to deal with problems and failures of life and (4) *norm retention*, in which one accepts the institutionalized means and cultural objectives of society. The following paragraph will get into the discussion of what is the social bond theory.

Social Bond Theory

Social bond theory was introduced by Travis Hirschi in 1969. The theory holds that the relationships between the individual and the bond they create with others can help reduce antisocial or deviant behavior. Hirschi’s intent in introducing the theory began with an opposite premise than previous criminological theories. As cited by Hirschi, “virtually all existing criminological theories began with a faulty fundamental premise: that criminal behavior requires, in some form, the creation of criminal motivation” (Pratt, Gau, and Franklin, 2011, p. 57). Additionally, Hirschi believed that beginning at birth, everyone was born with a drive toward self-gratification, and that

selfishness and aggression leads to criminal behaviors. These behaviors are part of our natural human nature and a majority of people can control this natural urge, because of these strong social bonds one creates with prosocial individuals or institutions.

Therefore, Hirschi believed that asking why offenders engage in crime is irrelevant. Rather, Hirschi's theoretical perspective developed from asking the question why refrain from crime and delinquent behavior (Pratt et. al., 2011). Hirschi believed that the answer to that question could be answered by the bonds one has with prosocial relationships, values, and institutions. Social bond theory includes four bond types: attachment, involvement, commitment, and belief. Hirschi argues that delinquent acts result when an individual's bonds to society are weak or broken; the result of such will lead one to delinquent behavior. Social bond theory focuses on explaining how personal relationships among individuals are important to decrease the likelihood of one engaging in criminal (or antisocial) activities. When an individual has a prosocial relationship within their society, the more likely they will believe in prosocial values and engage with prosocial institutions. These prosocial values and bonds will lead to a decrease in becoming involved in criminogenic activities. Thus, when social bonds are tarnished, nonexistent, or weakened, the chances of one engaging in criminogenic activities increases.

When social bonds are weakened, one may begin to engage in criminogenic activities. In turn, weakened bonds may increase the risk of one engaging in antisocial behaviors. Hirschi (1969), states that "the more weakened groups to which [the individual] belongs, the less he depends on them, the more he consequently depends only on himself and recognizes no other rules of conduct that what are founded in his private

interests” (p. 16). This can lead an individual to engage in antisocial behaviors that include violence, and other criminogenic activities. For example, when a youth is being raised with parents with whom they do not have strong social bonds, it is common that the youth finds themselves seeking a relationship elsewhere and build the conventional bonds as proposed by Hirschi. When a youth is lacking these bonds with parents, family activities, school, or extracurricular activities, the chances of offending and finding delinquent relationships may increase. Schroeder et. al. (2010) state that “a lack of social control that results from inconsistent and harsh discipline and poor supervision has been shown to be a good explanation of juvenile offending” (p. 563).

As stated above, social bond theory is an important theoretical explanation that helps understand variation in criminogenic behaviors. Social bond theory focuses on an individual’s self rather than an entire group. By securing strong bonds with positive conventional ties, youth develop self-esteem, confidence, and trust. These bonds, in turn, can help decrease a youth’s engagement in criminogenic behaviors and future delinquency. This is important when attaining other social ties outside of the family environment. By having positive conventional ties within the home and outside the home, a child’s risk of engaging in criminogenic behaviors or delinquency reduces. Thus, each of the social bonds can increase the chances for capable guardianship to increase and make a suitable target less attractive for a motivated offender.

In addition to the importance of the social bond theory as it applies to delinquency, it is also important to discuss how the social bond theory applies to victimization as social bonds may not only impact the presence of a potential offender, but also the potential for the youth to be viewed as a potential victim. Victimization

occurs when an offender takes action to abuse, harass, or intentionally cause harm to another individual or to an individual's property. For example, types of victimization include rape, stalking, theft, physical assault/battery, sexual misconduct/harassment/touching, and domestic violence. By maintaining these strong social bonds to conventional others or institutions, the youth's chances of becoming engaged in criminogenic behaviors/activities will reduce. In turn, this may reduce their chances of experiencing victimization because their protection may be enriched. Conger (1976), stated that "the attachment to traditional beings, would decrease the likelihood of victimization" (p. 21). Additionally, when a youth has weak social bonds, the chances of criminal offending and having deviant friendships increases. In turn, a youth may become engaged in criminogenic activities that can then increase their chances for experiencing victimization.

What is currently unknown is how social bonds will affect adolescent victimization. Social bond theory may help provide answers as to how conventional and non-conventional ties can affect variation in adolescent victimization. By looking at each social bond individually, it brings an important outlook at how each social bond affects victimization solely rather than as a whole.

Social bond theory focuses on four primary key components that make up what society needs to prevent crime from occurring (attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief). The following sections will go in-depth about the meaning of each bond type.

Attachment Bond

The attachment bond in social bond theory proposes that one can become emotionally invested in someone or something that is prosocial. Stewart (2003), defines

attachment as “the affective ties formed to significant others, or the extent to which one cares about the opinions and expectations of people who are personally important” (p. 577). Hirschi, on the other hand, states that it is a psychological component in which an individual shows affection for their prosocial relationships and/or institutions. The two main relationships that Hirschi referred to as crucial within the attachment bond are parents and school. In particular, Hirschi focused on youth’s attachments to parents and school. Hirschi believed that youths who have these close bonds will have higher levels of social control. For example, one can become invested in an individual in which they can confide in and allow them to guide them into making prosocial choices. Wright, Caspi, Moffit, and Silva (1999), state that “having these strong attachments ties with society, allows for individuals to conform to the social norms and follow as they are written (p. 495). As such, individuals will conform to the social norms in society in their everyday life.

Conversely, if one has weak attachment bonds with prosocial others, they are more likely to engage in deviant behavior since they have not established relationships that will deter them away from deviant behaviors. Consequently, weakened social bonds have been found to predict general delinquency (Intravia, Pelletier, Wolff, and Baglivio, 2017). Nielson (2019) adds to the literature by stating that poor attachment, in general, is significantly associated to delinquency ($p > 0.001$). Attachment is an important factor which determines which route one will take; either the straight narrow road as a law-abiding citizen or one who becomes involved in criminogenic activities that can increase their risk for victimization.

Additional studies have supported Hirschi's tenet in regards to the importance of a youth's attachment to either prosocial parents or institutions and the effects they may have on social control. Lee, Gerber, and Cochran (2020) state that "these delinquent behaviors, in turn, increase the likelihood of weaker attachment of children to their parents" (p. 34). A 2006 study by Felson and Staff focused on the relationship between delinquency and academic performance. The study found that adolescents who have strong attachments to a parent or a teacher have lower levels of delinquency. Along the same lines, Stewart (2003) focused on analyzing school climate, school social bonds, and the effects they have on adolescent misbehaviors. The study results suggested that the greater the time students spent surrounded by their teachers and administrators in school, the lower the levels of misbehavior a youth will have.

A study by Nielson in 2019 focused on parental social bonds and adolescents' convictions. The study suggested that although attachment can fluctuate within itself, the attachment will remain important for delinquency throughout the adolescence time frame. Subsequent research has also found that attachment continues to be of importance for delinquency through the adolescence stage (Ensminger, Juon, and Fothergill, 2001; Gault-Sherman, 2012; Jenkins, 2020; Rowe, 1985; Schroeder, Giordano and Cernkovich, 2010; and Stewart, 2003). Flanagan, Auty, and Farrington (2019), stated that "poor parental supervision is a risk factor for later offending, possibly because it prevents the formation of prosocial bonds and attachment bonds between children and their parents" (p. 215). This shows that a parental bond between children and a parent is nonexistent when a youth lacks parental supervision.

Further additional research has also found that a lack of parental supervision occurs because there is a weak parental bond (Gault-Sherman, 2012; Jenkins, 2020; Kerpelman and Smith-Adcock, 2005; Schroeder, Giordano, and Cernkovich, 2010; Salvatore and Taniguchi, 2012; and Cusick, Havlicek, and Courtney, 2012). By not having a strong bond to a parent, the youth does not have guidance to conform to the morals of the law and institutions of mainstream society. The lack of a parental bond also increases the chances for a youth to find guidance elsewhere (e.g., with delinquent peers or institutions). Therefore, having strong parental bonds is important to decrease the chances of delinquency. Additional research by Craig (2016) discusses the varying strength of parental bonds on adolescent delinquency over time. Specifically, the study focused on which bond type matters more. The study results suggested that modest parenting skills lead to delinquency because the attachment to delinquent peers will increase. Thus, those youth who lack attachment with prosocial friendships will get themselves involved with antisocial friendship. In sum, many studies focus their attention on how lacking a prosocial attachment to parents or institutions leads to delinquency. By not having the emotional attachment to conventional others, a youth is more likely to seek this emotional attachment elsewhere. At times, the youth can seek this relationship to non-conventional peers or institutions.

Lacking attachment to prosocial others can influence a youth to conform to criminogenic others that lead them to criminogenic activities. This lack of attachments to prosocial relationships can lure a youth to look for other relationships in which they can have a strong bond. At times, a youth may easily get attached to delinquent individuals or

institutions. This can, in turn, lead an individual to make themselves more vulnerable to being attacked, hurt, and increase their chances to being victimized.

Commitment Bond

The commitment bond, according to literature, states that an individual will feel obligated to invest their time in prosocial activities and institutions. Commitments include being devoted to a job, a school, a marriage, family, or friendships. Stewart (2003) states that, “*commitment* refers to one's level of investment in conventional aspirations and to acceptance of the legitimate means of achieving these goals, such as valuing educational achievement and working hard in school—an investment in conventional behavior that one risks losing if they become delinquent” (p.577). Hirschi on the other hand states that the commitment bond includes the importance of the social relationship one values in which they would not want to jeopardize by getting involved in any criminal or deviant behaviors. Also, Hirschi believes that an individual will be less likely to get involved in criminal or deviant behaviors/acts when they know that they hold something that they can lose (e.g., friendship, trust, marriage, etc.).

As such, losing a valuable relationship can be a greater cost than the benefit of participating in crime and delinquency. For example, Hirschi (1969), states that the “person invests time, energy, himself in a certain line of activity—say, getting an education, building up a business, acquiring a reputation for virtue. When or whenever he considers deviant behavior, he must consider, the costs of this deviant behavior, the risk he runs of losing the investment he has made in conventional behavior” (p. 20). This bond is important for juveniles when they do not want to look bad in front of people they value (e.g., family, friends, teachers) if they decide to engage in criminal or delinquent

behavior. Not only can the bond be impactful among juveniles, it can also be important for adults. Adults who have strong commitments would refrain from committing criminal or delinquent behaviors if they know that they can lose something in which they value. For example, valuable relationships that adults can lose can include marriage, employment, or relationships with their children.

Strong commitment bonds allow delinquent behaviors to become less appealing. As cited in Hirschi, “the concept of commitment assumes that the organization of society is such that the interest of most persons would be endangered if they were to engage in criminal acts...living in an organized society acquired goods, reputations, prospects that people are not willing to risk losing... it is an insurance society places upon an individual so all rules are followed” (Pratt, Gau, and Franklin, 2011, p. 57). Commitments are not just devotedness to conventional behaviors. Some individuals become devoted to delinquent behaviors when the absence of positive conventional behaviors are present. For example, adolescents can engage in drinking, smoking, and other behaviors that are immediately gratifying. These behaviors can increase the chances for a youth to become involved in delinquent behaviors in the long run. Weak commitment bonds to conventional behaviors allow for delinquent behaviors to become more appealing to an individual which will make it more attractive for one to become committed and involved in crime.

Additional studies have supported Hirschi’s views in regards to the importance of a youth’s commitment to prosocial relationships and not jeopardizing them by getting involved in any criminal or deviant behaviors/acts. Felson and Staff (2006) studied the relationship between school performance and delinquency. The commitment bond in

particular was measured in the form of getting good grades. Research found that the more a student is committed to school, the less likely they engage in crime. Along the same lines, Stewart (2003) also examined the relationship between social bonds and school misbehaviors. It was hypothesized in the study that having high levels of school commitment will be significantly associated with lower levels of school misbehaviors. As expected, being committed to the school atmosphere (e.g., school work, school rules, etc.), the youth did not engage in school delinquent behaviors.

Jenkins (2020) also measured school delinquency and social bonds. In this study, the commitment was measured by examining how a youth values educational goals. The school commitment in this study was not as significant alone. When being measured along with school attachment and school belief, the three bonds were the strongest in predicting why some youth participate in school delinquency more than others. Wiley, Slocum, and Esbensen (2013) focused their attention on examining the relationship between social bonds and labeling mechanisms when one comes into contact with the police. Having some sort of contact with the police can lead to subsequent delinquency. Commitment in the study was measured by viewing one's commitment to the school and their commitment to their peers. The results suggested that when one comes into contact with the police, the more likely they do not commit to school, have bad grades, and are less committed to having prosocial relationships. These results show that commitment reduces their chances of involvement with deviant peers and criminal acts/behaviors.

Lastly, Chriss in 2007 examined the functions of the social bond and how it is likely for one not to deviate if they have a strong commitment bond to prosocial society. The results suggested that the commitment and involvement bond together are associated

with higher levels of self-control and lower levels of delinquent behavior. Commitment in this study was not measured by itself, but alongside another bond. The commitment bond in this study would not have been significant if it did not have support from the involvement bond. This type of support that the commitment bond needs was also seen in Jenkins (2020) mentioned above. In sum, there are not many studies that focus their attention on the commitment bond. In the studies mentioned above, about half of the studies that look at commitment are involved with another bond, but it is not measured alone and could be further tested.

Lacking the commitment bond can lead for a youth to experience some type of victimization. If a youth does not invest in conforming to society, the more likely the youth is to invest their time in engaging and conforming with criminogenic behaviors or actions. This can then lead them to become committed to criminogenic activities that can lead to an increase of them experiencing victimization. Thus, a lack of commitment increases their chances of victimization since they are not invested in something that is worth losing (e.g. a marriage or friendship).

Involvement Bond

Involvement is the third social bond type which Hirschi proposes in his social bond theory. Pratt et. al. (2010) describe involvement as “the opportunity costs associated with how people spend their time” (p. 58). Hirschi believed that if an individual spends their time involved with conventional activities or spend their time with prosocial individuals, the less time one will have to commit a crime or engage with criminal acts. According to Pratt et. al. (2010) “Hirschi tapped into the old philosophy that ‘idle hands are the devil’s workshop’ in that if people are spending their time engaged in some form

of prosocial activity, then they are not, by definition, spending their time engaged in antisocial activity” (p. 58).

Examples of the type of involvements include setting and meeting goals, being involved in school extracurricular activities (e.g., school or community sports, school band, school drama, etc.), being devoted and involved in work functions, and spending extra hours at a job setting. Thus, involvement allows one to be busy and stay busy. By staying busy, individuals will not have the time to be involved in delinquent behaviors since they are preoccupied with other conventional activities. “Involvement or engrossment in conventional activities is thus often part of a control theory... a person may be simply too busy doing conventional things to find the time to engage in deviant behavior. Additionally, people may be too busy following through their commitments that they tend to get captivated and not even contemplate criminal acts” (Hirschi, 1969, p. 22). Thus, not all individuals may engage or be involved in activities in which keep them away from being involved in criminal behaviors that can increase the risk of being victimized.

When measuring the involvement bond, there are not many studies that focus on this bond type alone. There is one study that supported Hirschi's perspective on the involvement bond. Wong (2005) focused on adolescent activities in delinquency through an involvement approach and how it may reduce delinquency. The results of the study suggested that involvement in certain activities increase the likelihood of one engaging in delinquency. For example, a youth being involved in sports may have their chances of delinquency increased versus a student who studies or does homework. Wong's study also found that dating and spending time with friends also increases the likelihood of one

engaging in crime. Subsequent research has also found that certain activities increase the likelihood of adolescents engaging in delinquent behaviors (Ford, 2005(b); Valdez, Nowotny, Zhao, and Cepeda, 2018; Chui and Chan, 2012; Craig, 2015; Craig, Baglivio, Wolff, Piquero, and Epps, 2016; and Galliher, Evans, and Weiser, 2007). Valdez et. al. (2018) research focused on adolescent youth males and their participation in gangs. The results of the study suggested that involvement in certain criminal activities like drug use, builds a barrier for an individual to bond and fulfill their responsibilities. Eventually this may lead an individual to continue engaging in criminal (or antisocial) activities and behaviors.

In sum, lacking the involvement bond can increase a youth's chances of experiencing victimization. By not engaging in prosocial activities, youth will have more time to engage in criminal activities. The less time a youth spends being involved in any prosocial activity, the more likely they will have more time to commit crime and increase their chances to being victimized. By engaging in criminal activities, an individual can place him or herself in places that can potentially get them hurt or attacked.

Belief Bond

The fourth social bond, belief holds that the individual has to be certain that the values associated with the behaviors conforming to laws are assumed to be true. Such conformity includes accepting and believing the criminal behaviors have costs associated with these behaviors. For example, the belief that if one wants to commit a crime, the crime will have a consequence that will follow the action of the crime made. Hirschi (1969), "assumes the existence of a common value system within the society or group whose norms are being violated" (p. 23). Additionally, Stewart (2003), states that

whether one endorses the moral validity of social rules and has accepted these codes of conduct as just and valid... individuals who accept social rules as valid are less likely to break rules than are those who are less constrained by rules (p. 578). Individuals must believe that the rules are legitimate in order for one to abide by and obey the law. Hirschi suggests that the belief bond refers to the degree one conforms to the values associated with conforming to the laws. Therefore, an individual who believes that these values are important is less likely to engage in criminal or deviant behavior. Subsequent research has also found that individuals who believe that social rules are less likely to break them (Celik and Keith, 2016; Chriss, 2007; Stewart, 2003; Jenkins, 1997; Salvatore and Taniguchi, 2012; and Kerpelman and Smith-Adcock, 2005).

Additionally, when the belief bond is associated with a deviant youth or criminals, it currently suggests that these youth do not take their “beliefs” seriously. Instead, these youth tend to live by their own rules because they are lacking a structure of prosocial moralities. Subsequent research has also found that individuals do have beliefs that are structured morally and are not taken seriously and tend to live by their own rules (Stewart, 2003; Celik and Keith, 2016; Wiley, Slocum, and Esbensen, 2013; Kerpelman and Smith-Adcock, 2005; Fontaine, Brendgen, Vitaro, and Tremblay, 2016; and Chriss, 2007). Hirschi (1969), states “the control theory assumes the existence of a common value system within the society or group whose norms are being violated” (p. 57). Therefore, the deviant is being involved in antisocial groups. These groups see these prosocial beliefs or rules as just verbiage in writing that do not seem significant to them. They are not fully invested or believe in conventional behaviors that would help reduce their chances of becoming a victim of crime.

Additionally, these individuals are more likely to make excuses for their actions and viewing them as positive. Continuing to engage in delinquent behavior may increase the chances of individuals to become a victim of crime. Thus, since the belief bond refers to the youth accepting the traditional norms and values of mainstream society and incorporating them into their everyday lives, the stronger they believe in them, the less likely the youth will engage in criminal activity. The weaker belief a youth has with these norms and values, the more likely they are to engage in criminogenic behaviors. This can then lead them to become engaged in criminogenic activities that can lead to an increase of experiencing victimization.

Current Study

Although social bond theory has been tested and used to explain variation in delinquency, the contribution of social bond theory in explaining victimization is lacking. According to Hirschi's perspective, the elements of social bonds help in reducing criminogenic behaviors among individuals. As mentioned above, previous research suggested that individuals who have strong social bonds are less likely to be involved with criminal activity. However, there are no studies showing how each social bond type affects the chances of a youth being victimized. The current study explored how each bond type is associated with the chances of one becoming a victim of crime. Specifically, the current study explored the impact of attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief on victimization among a sample of young adults.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

This study used data from Wave VII of the National Youth Survey (NYS). The NYS is a longitudinal study that took place between 1976 and 1987 in the United States. The original study was funded by the United States Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health, and the National Institute of Mental Health. Beginning in 1976, researchers developed this study to get a better understanding of associations between deviant behavior and multiple experiences of adolescents. An example of these experiences included: social integration, aspirations, normlessness, labeling by parents, perceived disapproval, attitudes towards deviance, exposure to delinquent peers, self-reported delinquency, substance abuse, victimization, spousal abuse, interaction with law enforcement, sexual activity, and a respondent's health.

The data at the beginning of the study included 1,725 participants from which was collected through interviews with youth that were between the ages of 11 and 17 and at least one of their parents or guardians. Interviews were gathered through an area probability sampling method that represented young people across the United States. An area probability sampling method is a sampling method that consists of random selection in which all participants have an equally fair chance of being chosen to participate in the study. Specifically, researchers involve sampling from a map that is equally divided so that participants can be chosen at random. Once the participants were identified, interviews were conducted and lasted around an hour and a half. Once the interviews were completed, each participant was given a \$20 incentive for their participation.

For the current study, Wave VII of the National Youth Survey Data was used to test the hypotheses mentioned above. Wave VII specifically focused on young adults between the ages of 20 to 29 years old ($n = 1,725$). Participants were interviewed in early 1987 in the United States. Researchers continued this study to get a better understanding of conventional and deviant behavior on multiple topics that individuals experienced throughout their adolescence and leading into their adulthood. The participants in Wave VII whom were interviewed were the same participants that participated in Waves I through VI. These same participants were asked to participate in the study for over a decade. Yet, not all participants continued to be a part of the longitudinal study. A little over 300 participants did drop out of the study and were no longer included in the final Wave. The difference that Wave VII of the National Youth Survey Data has in comparison to the waves prior is that it focused on the participants as adults and focused on their life events as they entered adulthood.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in the study is victimization. Several variables were compiled that measured the different types of victimization. For example, the type of variables included in the study are the following: things taken from you, sexually attacked, and attacked with a weapon. The response categories of the variables were originally measured through a Likert Scale in which participants were asked a question and they were to respond based on the category specified in each section (e.g., great deal, quite a bite, some, not too much, and very little). Since the victimization variable responses were in various categories, the variables were dichotomized in the study as in in “yes” and “no” responses due to a lack of variation. Having a lack in variation within

the dependent variables, made it harder to describe how the data set would vary and to make a comparison with the other variables included in this study. In order to make the analysis in the study easier to conduct, the victimization variables were condensed into a single dichotomous: those participants that had one or more victimization incident (coded as “0”) and the second group as those participants that had no victimization (coded as “1”).

Independent Variables

The independent variables that were included in the current study were the bonds that were introduced by Hirschi in 1969. To reiterate, these bonds were: attachment, commitment, involvement and belief. Each of the bonds were measured with multiple variables. Such variables are explained in the next few paragraphs. Each variable was computed by first standardizing responses, then adding them together. These items can be found in the Appendix.

Attachment

Several variables were compiled to measure attachment. For example, the types of variables included in the study that will be measured from the National Youth Survey Data are if the participant had a particular group of friends and if the participant had a job or jobs. The number of variables that were used to run the analysis in this study were a total of two. Since the variables in the NYSD were measured differently (several were measured using a Likert Scale and others in a “yes” and “no” categories), meant that some of the measures had a larger score. Therefore, these variables had to be standardized in order for them to be measured the same scale. The variable was recoded as Attachment Bond Standardization.

Commitment

Several variables were compiled to measure commitment. For example, the types of variables included in the study that will be measured from the National Youth Survey Data are: life events (e.g., whether the participants was married or not), employment (e.g., how committed was the participant to have a job), future aspirations (e.g., how committed is the participant to graduate from college) (see Appendix for a complete list of variables). The number of variables that were used to run the analysis in this study was a total of four. Since the variables in the NYSD were measured differently (several were measured using a Likert Scale and others in a “yes” and “no” categories), meant that some of the measures had a larger score. Therefore, these variables had to be standardized in order for them to be measured the same scale. The variable was recoded as Commitment Bond Standardization.

Involvement

Several variables were compiled to measure involvement. For example, the types of variables included in the study that will be measured from the National Youth Survey Data are: time spent with friends (e.g., how many days of the week did the participant spend their time with friends outside of work), self-reported delinquency (e.g., stole money from parents or deliberately injured their spouse), and interaction with law enforcement (e.g., was the participant ever arrested by the police) (see Appendix for a complete list of variables). The number of variables that were used to run the analysis in this study were a total of five. Since the variables in the NYSD were measured differently (several were measured using a Likert Scale and others in a “yes” and “no” categories), meant that some of the measures had a larger score. Therefore, these

variables had to be standardized in order for them to be measured the same scale. The variable was recoded as Involvement Bond Standardization.

Belief

Several variables were compiled to measure of belief. For example, the types of variables included in the study that will be measured from the National Youth Survey Data are: the importance of being included in activities with friends, the importance of religion, the importance of education (e.g., how important education and attaining a higher education was to the participant), and guilt/remorse/personal discomfort for acts (e.g., the participants perception on how wrong it is injure or threat somebody). The number of variables that were used to run the analysis in this study were a total of five. Since the variables in the NYSD were measured differently (several were measured using a Likert Scale and others in a “yes” and “no” categories), meant that some of the measures had a larger score. Therefore, these variables had to be standardized in order for them to be measured the same scale. The variable was recoded as Belief Bond Standardization.

Control Variables

In the current research, in order to properly measure the relationship between the dependent and independent variables, certain variables were controlled so that the results will be valid. The following variables were controlled: sex, ethnicity, and education. Sex was measured by the interviewer’s observations. Interviewers were asked to report the sex of the respondent which was either male (N = 918) or female (N = 807). These variables were then coded as “0” for males and “1” for females. Ethnicity response choices included Anglo (N = 1,361), Black (N = 260), Hispanic (N = 76), American

Indian (N = 8), Asian (N = 17), and Other (N = 6). The question to determine ethnicity was asked only if the interviewer could not visually determine to which group the participant belonged to. Since this variable had many categories, race was categorized as 1 = Anglo-Saxon, and 0 = all other race/ethnicity.

Education of attainment included the following: 5th grade (N = 0), 6th grade (N = 4), 7th grade (N = 4), 8th grade (N = 9), 9th grade (N = 39), 10th grade (N = 67), 11th grade (N = 57), 12th grade (N = 515), 1st college (N = 88), 2nd college (N = 116), 3rd college (N = 36), 4th college (N = 120), 1st grad school (N = 18). Since there were many categories incorporated into this single variable, the variable was recoded as either high school was not completed (coded as “0”) and attained a high school diploma or received a higher education (coded as “1”). The question of what was the highest grade complete was directly asked to the participant at the time of the interview. Throughout the process of the current study, some of the control variables were measured on different scales. Therefore, the control variables were standardized in order to make the scores easier to compare and keep them measured on the same scale. Since the variables in the NYSD were measured differently (several were measured using a Likert Scale and others in a “yes” and “no” categories), meant that some of the measures had a larger score. Therefore, these variables had to be standardized in order for them to be measured the same scale. The variable was recoded as Attachment Bond Standardization.

Type of Testing Model

The type of model that was used to test the above hypotheses was a logistic regression model. A logistic regression model was used because the dependent variable is dichotomous. Since the dependent variable contains a significant proportion of 0's, all

individuals that had experienced victimization were coded as “1.” The logistic regression model is used to describe the relationship between the dependent dichotomous variable with various independent variables. Models will include direct tests of the association of each bond type with victimization, accounting for relevant control variables, as well as the cumulative impact of social bonds on victimization.

CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. Table 1 also shows the mean value for each of the bond types. The attachment variable shows a mean score of 7.14. The commitment variable shows a mean score of 14.40. The involvement variable shows a mean score of 16.34. Lastly, The belief variable shows a mean score of 17.38. Additionally, these data show that 47 percent of the entire sample population was female. Of the sample, 24 percent of the participants had an education that was higher than a high school diploma, 14 percent of the sample did experience one or more victimization experience in their life time. Of the entire sample, 35 percent of the population were married. The majority of the sample identified themselves as Anglo (79 percent), 15 percent of the sample identified as Black, and 4 percent identified as Hispanic, with the remaining 2 percent identified as either Asian, Other, or American Indian.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Male	0.47	0.00	0.00	0.50	0.00	1.00
Education	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.00	1.00
Victimization	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.00	1.00
Marriage	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.48	0.00	1.00
Attachment	7.14	8.00	8.00	1.33	3.00	8.00
Commitment	14.40	14.00	16.00	2.18	7.00	18.00
Involvement	16.34	16.00	15.00	1.75	15.00	27.00
Belief	17.38	18.00	19.00	2.27	10.00	22.00
Anglo	0.79	1.00	1.00	0.41	0.00	1.00
Black	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.00	1.00
Hispanic	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.21	0.00	1.00
Asian	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.00	1.00
American Indian	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.00	1.00

Correlation Matrix Results

According to the correlation matrix table (see table 2), there were several associations that were found to be statistically significant. Commitment was negatively statistically significantly associated with attachment ($r=-0.104$; $p<0.001$). There was a positive correlation between involvement and victimization that reached statistical significance ($r=0.161$; $p<0.001$). There was a positive correlation between involvement and attachment that reached statistical significance ($r=0.077$; $p<0.001$). Involvement was negatively statistically significantly associated with commitment ($r=-0.089$; $p<0.001$). There was a positive correlation between belief and commitment that reached statistical significance ($r=0.199$; $p<0.001$). Belief was negatively statistically significantly associated with involvement ($r=-0.212$; $p<0.001$). Sex was negatively statistically significantly when associated with victimization ($r=-0.088$; $p<0.001$). There was a positive correlation between sex and commitment that reached statistical significance ($r=0.002$; $p<0.001$). Sex was negatively statistically significantly associated with involvement ($r=-0.197$; $p<0.001$).

There was a positive correlation between sex and belief that reached statistical significance ($r=0.111$; $p<0.001$). There was a positive correlation between education and victimization that reached statistical significance ($r=0.048$; $p<0.05$). There was a positive correlation between education and victimization that reached statistical significance ($r=0.160$; $p<0.001$). There was a positive correlation between Anglo and commitment that reached statistical significance ($r=0.037$; $p<0.001$). Anglo was negatively statistically significantly associated with belief ($r=0.089$; $p<0.001$). There was a positive correlation between Anglo and sex that reached statistical significance ($r=-0.029$; $p<0.001$). Black

was negatively statistically significantly associated with commitment ($r=-0.032$; $p<0.001$). There was a positive correlation between Black and belief that reached statistical significance ($r=0.100$; $p<0.001$). Black was negatively statistically significantly associated with sex ($r=-0.041$; $p<0.001$). Black was negatively statistically significantly associated with education ($r=-0.083$; $p<0.001$). There was a positive correlation between American Indian and involvement that reached statistical significance ($r=-0.415$; $p<0.001$).

Table 2. Correlation Matrix

	Victimizations	Attachments	Commitments	Involvements	Beliefs	Sexs	Educations	Anglos	Blacks	Hispanics	Asians	Others	Indians
Victimizations	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α
Attachments	0.035α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α
Commitments	-0.37α	0.104***α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α
Involvements	0.161***α	0.077***α	-0.089***α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α
Beliefs	-0.012α	-0.2α	0.199***α	-0.212***α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α
Sexs	-0.088---α	-0.123α	0.002***α	-0.197***α	0.111***α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α
Educations	0.048*α	0.142α	0.160***α	0.084α	-0.008α	-0.02α	α	α	α	α	α	α	α
Anglos	0.008α	0.17α	0.037***α	-0.089***α	-0.089***α	0.029***α	0.077α	α	α	α	α	α	α
Blacks	0.012α	-0.164α	-0.032***α	0.100***α	0.100α	-0.041***α	-0.083***α	0.815***α	α	α	α	α	α
Hispanics	-0.014α	-0.05α	-0.014α	0.02α	0.008α	0.008α	-0.029α	0.415***α	-0.090***α	α	α	α	α
Asians	-0.23α	-0.01α	0.008α	0.02α	-0.013α	0.012α	0.053α	0.192***α	-0.042α	-0.012α	α	α	α
Other	-0.017α	0.025α	0.028α	-0.007α	0.019α	-0.011α	0.009α	0.080***α	-0.018α	-0.009α	-0.004α	α	α
American-Indians	-0.028α	-0.015α	-0.043α	0.094***α	-0.011α	0.004α	-0.019α	0.131***α	-0.029α	-0.015α	-0.007α	-0.003α	α

Bond Type Results

A logistic regression model was estimated using the bonds as individual variables. For the attachment bond (see Table 3), the statistical values slightly changed when the bond type was ran alone rather than as a whole. The standard error scores remained the same. The beta score had a slight decrease change of .01 ($b = 0.06$) when ran alone in comparison when ran with all three bonds ($b = 0.07$). The significance p-value, had an increase of .11 ($p = 0.34$) when ran alone in comparison when ran with all three bonds ($p = 0.23$). Additionally, the exponentiation of the b coefficient also had an increase of .04 ($\text{Exp}(B) = 1.10$) when ran alone in comparison when ran with all three bonds ($\text{Exp}(B) = 1.06$). According to the $\text{Exp}(b)$, also called the odds ratio (OR), this represents a 10% increase/decrease in the likelihood of victimization. Thus, the OR for sex is 0.50, which means that females are 50% less likely to be victimized when compared to males.

Table 3. Attachment Bond Model

	b	S.E.	p	Exp (B)
Attachment Bond				
Standardization	0.06	0.06	0.34	1.10
Male	-0.70	0.15	0.00	0.50
Anglo	-0.11	0.18	0.54	0.90
Education	-0.11	0.16	0.50	0.90

Table 4 shows the commitment bond standardization variable logistic regression statistics when ran by itself. For the commitment bond standardization, the beta score and the B coefficient remained the same. Although, according to the OR, the results indicate that the likelihood is equal to not being victimized regardless of the independent variable. Thus, the OR for sex is 0.53, which means that females are 47% less likely to be victimized when compared to males. The standard errors had a slight decrease change of .03 ($b = 0.03$) when ran alone in comparison when ran with all three bonds ($b = 0.03$). The significance p-value, had an increase of .03 ($p = 0.19$) when ran alone in comparison when ran with all three bonds ($p = 0.23$).

Table 4. Commitment Bond Model

	b	S.E.	p	Exp (B)
Commitment Bond Standardization	-0.04	0.03	0.19	1.00
Male	-0.60	0.15	0.00	0.53
Anglo	-0.10	0.18	0.70	1.00
Education	-0.05	0.16	0.80	1.00

Table 5 shows the involvement bond standardization variable logistic regression statistics when ran by itself. For the involvement bond standardization, the statistical values slightly changed. The standard error score and the significant level (p-value), remained the same. As far as the Beta score, the statistical value increased by 0.07 ($b = 0.20$) when ran alone in comparison when ran with all three bonds ($B = 0.13$). Additionally, the exponentiation of the b coefficient also had a decrease of .01 ($\text{Exp (B)} = 1.20$) when ran alone in comparison to the bond ran with all three bonds ($\text{Exp (B)} = 1.21$). According OR, this represents a 21% increase/decrease in the likelihood of victimization.

The involvement bond OR is 1.21, which interprets that there is a one unit increase in the involvement variable. Which leads to a 21% increase in the odds of a youth being victimized. Similarly, the OR for sex is 0.60, which means that females are 40% less likely to be victimized when compared to males. Since this association was positive, it means that when involvement increases, victimization also increases.

Table 5. Involvement Bond Model

	b	S.E.	p	Exp (B)
Involvement Bond Standardization	0.20	0.04	0.00	1.20
Male	-0.54	0.15	0.00	0.60
Anglo	-0.06	0.18	0.74	0.90
Education	-0.13	0.16	0.41	0.00

Table 6 shows the belief bond standardization variable logistic regression statistics when ran by itself. For the belief bond standardization, the statistical values slightly changed. The standard error remained the same. The Beta score, the statistical value decreased by 0.06 ($b = -0.01$) when ran alone in comparison when ran with all three bonds ($b = 0.05$). The significance p-value (which was the only model with the highest increase) increase by .88 ($p = 1.00$) when ran alone in comparison when ran with all three bonds ($p = 0.12$). Additionally, the exponentiation of the b coefficient had a decrease of .05 ($\text{Exp (B)} = 1.00$) when ran alone in comparison when ran with all three bonds ($\text{Exp (B)} = 1.05$). Although, according to the OR, the results indicate that the likelihood is equal to not being victimized regardless of the independent variable. Thus, the OR for sex is 0.56, which means that females are 44% less likely to be victimized when compared to

males. This variable alone had the most changes when ran alone in comparison to the other three variables.

Table 6. Belief Bond Model

	b	S.E.	p	Exp (B)
Belief Bond Standardization	-0.01	0.03	1.00	1.00
Male	-0.70	0.15	0.00	0.56
Anglo	-0.01	0.18	0.62	0.91
Education	-0.01	0.16	0.64	0.93

According to the logistic regression analysis (see Table 7), one of the four hypotheses were supported. According to the logistic regression model, the attachment bond variable was not associated with victimization ($b = .07$, $S.E. = .06$, $p = 0.23$). The commitment bond variable was not supported to be statistically significant when associating the bond with victimization ($b = -.04$, $S.E. = .04$, $p = 0.23$). The belief bond variable was not associated victimization ($b = .05$, $S.E. = .03$, $p = .12$). The involvement bond variable was statistically significantly associated with victimization ($b = .19$, $S.E. = .04$, $p < 0.00$). According OR, this represents a 21% increase in the likelihood of victimization. The involvement bond OR is 1.21, which interprets that there is a one unit increase in the involvement variable. Which leads to a 21% increase in the odds of a youth being victimized. Similarly, the OR for sex is 0.60, which means that females are 40% less likely to be victimized when compared to males. Since this association was positive, it means that when involvement increases, victimization also increases.

Table 7. Logistic Regression All Bond Types

	b	S.E.	p	Exp (B)
Attachment Bond Standardization	0.07	0.06	0.23	1.06
Commitment Bond Standardization	-0.04	0.04	0.23	1.00
Involvement Bond Standardization	0.19	0.04	< 0.00	1.21
Belief Bond Standardization	0.05	0.03	0.12	1.05
Male	-0.51	0.16	< 0.00	0.60
Education	-0.11	0.16	0.50	0.90
Anglo	-0.07	0.17	0.70	0.93

Control Variable Results

When running the logistic regression analysis, sex, education, and Anglo were controlled. When controlling for education, the results suggested that education was not statistically significant ($b = -.11$, $S.E. = .16$, $p = 0.49$). When controlling for Anglo, the results suggested that race/ethnicity was not statistically significant ($b = -.07$, $S.E. = .19$, $p = 0.70$). Lastly, when controlling for sex, sex was the only control variable that was supported to be statistically significant ($b = -.51$, $S.E. = .15$, $p = < 0.00$). Since this association was positive, it means that males are more likely to be victimized.

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION

Results of the current study found that only the involvement bond was significantly associated with victimization [$b = .19$, S.E., = .04, $p = < 0.00$]. Since this association was positive, it means that when involvement increases, victimization also increases. Hirschi (1969), described the involvement bond as a philosophical explanation that if individuals maintained engaged in prosocial activities, then the less time they will have engaging in antisocial activities. According to the literature, being involved in conventional activities whether it be extracurricular activities, studying, or volunteering, should keep an individual from engaging a criminal activity. This should, in turn, lead to a reduction of coming into contact with someone who may cause some sort of victimization towards them. Hirschi (1969), did state that a person may be too busy chasing and accomplishing their commitments rather than engage in other criminal activities (p. 22). With the limited prior research this study hypothesized that being involved in many activities would keep one away from being victimized. Results suggested the opposite.

Despite this, there are few studies that discuss what may occur when one engages in antisocial activities that lead them to some sort of victimization. From the literature there was one study that focused on how the involvement bond can lead an individual to take part of criminal activity and end up being victimized. Wong (2005), discusses how certain activities can increase the chances of one to engage in crime. In the study, Wong discusses how sports can increase the chances of victimization more than those

individuals who spend their time studying. The reason this may be is due to the physical and aggressive contact one can gain from being too competitive or for them to win.

Another possibility is the stress one can experience from attaining their goals within the sports may lead to other methods to release this stress. For example, a youth who stresses in meeting their goals, may get involved with drugs to release some of the stress they are going through. This may lead a youth to hanging out with the antisocial peers.

Subsequent research has also found that certain activities increase the likelihood of adolescents engaging in delinquent behaviors such as drinking, hanging out in the streets with the wrong crowd, and so forth (Ford, 2005; Valdez, Nowotny, Zhao, and Cepeda, 2018; Chui and Chan, 2012; Craig, 2015; Craig, Baglivio, Wolff, Piquero, and Epps, 2016; and Galliher, Evans, and Weiser, 2007).

As for the other three bond types, attachment, commitment, and belief results failed to find associations with victimization. Thus, hypothesis 1, 3, and 4 were rejected. To begin with, hypothesis 1, attachment, was rejected. The association between victimization and the attachment bond variable was not found statistically significant when associating the bond with victimization ($b = .07$, $S.E. = .06$, $p = 0.23$). The attachment bond is the ties one forms with significant others which makes the individual care about the opinion of those whom they are disappointing. Therefore, when an individual has a strong attachment bond with prosocial relationships and/or institutions, they were predicted to be less likely to engage with antisocial behaviors that may lead them to be victimized. Specifically, the literature states those who have strong relationships with parents and school are more likely to be engaged in prosocial activities. In addition, individuals with prosocial ties with their parents are more likely to be open

and having good communication to discuss any issues or problems they may encounter. Also, Hirschi (1969), states that youth with strong attachments have higher levels of social control. This was predicted to lead them to have the positive guidance to make pro-social choices. This was not supported.

The association between victimization and the commitment bond variable was not supported ($b = -.04$, $S.E. = .04$, $p = 0.23$). The commitment bond was defined as individuals feeling the obligation to invest their time with prosocial activities and other institutions. This may include bonds with marriage, school, work, family, or friendships. Thus, individuals were protected to value such relationships such that they will do their best not jeopardized and tarnish these relationships by getting involved in criminal or deviant behaviors. Felson and Staff (2006), found that those committed to school and have good grade are less likely to engage in criminal activities. In comparison to the current study's results, it is likely that the hypothesis was rejected since over 20 percent of the sample were educated and had at least a high school diploma. Subsequent research has also found that being involved in school, decreases the chances of being involved in crime that may lead one to being victimized (Jenkins, 2020; Wiley, Slocum, and Esbensen, 2013; Jenkins, 2020; and Chriss, 2007).

The association between victimization and the belief bond variable was not supported ($b = .05$, $S.E. = .03$, $p = .12$). The belief bond means that an individual has to be certain that the values associated with the behaviors conforming to laws are assumed to be true. This means that an individual needs to conform, accepting and believing that being involved in criminogenic behaviors have costs associated with them. Thus, the individual believes that if a crime is committed, there will be consequences for their

actions. In comparison to the study at hand, more than 50 percent of the participants had something they believed in that was worth losing. For example, the participants had beliefs in their friendships, religion, and their thoughts on victimization. This may have led to the lack of association with victimization.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Throughout the entire analysis of the study at hand, there were two interesting conclusions. First, only one of the four hypotheses was supported. The social bonds when they are studied or discussed in literature, are often studied as a whole. Collapsing all bond types may suggest that they rely on one another to be successful predictors. When they are looked at as individual factors, the results differ. Here, only one of the four hypotheses was supported: involvement. As mentioned above, sports are a leading activity that cause individuals to engage in antisocial behaviors. One would predict that being involved and busy with sports would lure them to become less involved in crime as their devotedness and dedication can keep them busy and away from the likelihood of being victimized

Limitations

While conducting the study, there were multiple limitations that were present. The first limitation was the National Youth Survey data itself. The data were gathered between the mid-seventies and was concluded in the mid-eighties. The data today can be outdated. Therefore, the data may not represent the developments in history that occurred. Many movements have evolved and shaped the views of individuals since this time. For example, the Women's Rights Movement, Gay Rights Movement, and the Black Lives Matter Movement. Thus, these different changes could limit the results in the National Youth Survey data.

A second limitation is the characteristics of the participants. Taking into consideration that this was a longitudinal study, a few hundred participants did end up dropping out of the study before it was completed. A few hundred participants dropping out along the way changed some of the data's results in Wave VII when compared to the first Wave of the study. When these participants dropped out of the study, many of the questions were left unanswered; such as, marital status, employment, involvement in delinquency, and the participants belief in having friendships. Thus, the results could have been different if these participants continued on with the study all the way through Wave VII.

Future Studies

While important results were found in this study, there is still a lack of research on the topic at hand. There is very limited research that has examined social bonds' association with victimization. The lack of research makes firm conclusions based on this study's findings. Thus, for future studies, the current study could be used as a start to further examine this. Such research would help future scholars whom take upon the same interest in victimization and the social bond theory. Additionally, such research could possibly help explain why victimization occurs through the lens of the social bond theory. Lastly, knowing more as to how we can strengthen social bonds at a young age, can help reduce and deter crime and criminals; in other words, crime prevention. In turn, this can help make a guide to determine which policies can be put into play in a youth's upbringing, school, or community so that it may help reduce delinquency that leads to some sort of victimization.

REFERENCES

- Cecen-Celik, H., & Keith, S. (2016). Analyzing predictors of bullying victimization with routine activity and social bond perspectives. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 34*(18), 3807-3832.
- Chriss, J. J. (2007). The functions of the social bond. *Sociological Quarterly, 48*(4), 689-712.
- Chui, W. Hong., & Chan H. O. (2012). Criminal Recidivism among hong kong male juvenile probationers. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 21*, 857-868.
- Conger, R. D. (1976). Social control and social learning models of delinquent behavior. *Criminology, 14*(1), 17-40.
- Craig, J. M., (2016). Which bond matters more? Assessing the differential strengths of parental bonding measures on adolescent delinquency over time. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 14*(3), 225-242.
- Craig, J. M., Baglivio, M. T., Wolff, K. T., Piquero, A. R., & Epps, N. (2017). Do social bonds buffer the impact of adverse childhood experiences on reoffending? *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 15*(1), 2-20.
- Cusick, G. R., Havlicek, J. R., & Courtney, M. E. (2012). Risk for arrest: The role of social bonds in protecting foster youth making the transition to adulthood. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 82*(1), 19-31.
- Elliot, Delbert S. National Youth Survey Data [United States]: Wave II, 1987. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2009-04-01.
- Ensminger, M. E., Juon, H. S., & Fothergill, K. E. (2001). Childhood and adolescent substance use in adulthood. *Addiction, 97*, 833-844.

- Felson, R. B., & Staff, J. (2006). Explaining the academic performance-delinquency relationship. *Criminology*, *44*(2), 299-319.
- Flanagan, I. M. L., Auty, K. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2019). Parental supervision and later offending: A systematic review of longitudinal studies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *47*, 215–229.
- Fontaine, N. M.G., Brendgen, M., Vitaro, F., & Tremblay, R. E. (2016). Compensatory and protective factors against violent delinquency in late adolescence: Results from the Montreal longitudinal and experimental study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *45*, 54-62.
- Ford, J. A. (2005). Substance use, the social bond, and delinquency. *Sociological Inquiry*, *75*(1), 109-128.
- Ford, J. A. (2005) The connection between heavy drinking and juvenile delinquency during adolescence. *Sociological Spectrum*, *25*(6), 629-650.
- Galliher, R. V., Evans, C. M., & Weiser, D. (2007). Social and individual predictors of substance use for native American youth. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse*, *16*(3), 1–16.
- Gault-Sherman, M. (2012). It's a two-way street: The bidirectional relationship between parenting and delinquency. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, *41*(2), 121-145.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Intravia, J., Pelletier, E., Wolff, K. T., & Baglivio, M. T. (2017). Community disadvantage, prosocial bonds, and juvenile reoffending: A multilevel mediation analysis. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *15*(3), 240-263.
- Jenkins, P. H. (1997). School delinquency and the school social bond. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *34*(3), 337-367.
- Jenkins, P. H. (2020). School delinquency and the school social bond. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *34*(3), 337-367.
- Kennedy, J. P. (2015). Losing control: A test of containment theory and ethical decision making. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, *10*(1), 48-64.

- Kerpelman, J. L., & Smith-Adcock, S. (2005). Female adolescents' delinquent activity: The intersection of bonds to parents and reputation enhancement. *Youth and Society, 37* (2), 176-200.
- Lee, B., Gerber, J., & Cochran, J. (2020). Parenting styles and children's delinquency reconsidered: An empirical assessment. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 71*(2), 33-59.
- Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (2014). *Criminological theory: context and consequences* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Nielson, A. A. (2019). Parental social bonds and adolescents' convictions. *Deviant Behavior, 40*(1), 1-18.
- Omoyibo, K. U. & Obaro, O. A. (2012). Applications of social control theory: Criminality and governmentality. *International Journal of Asian Social Science 2*(7), 1026-1032.
- Pratt, T. C., Gau, J. M., & Franklin, T. W. (2011). *Key ideas in criminology and criminal justice*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Rowe, D. C. (1985). Sibling interaction and self-reported delinquent behavior: A study of 265 twin pairs. *Criminology, 23*(2), 223-240.
- Salvatore, C., & Taniguchi, T. A. (2012). Do social bonds matter for emerging adults? *Deviant Behavior, 33*(9), 738-756.
- Schroeder, R. D., Giordano, P. C., & Cernkovich, S. A. (2010). Adult child-parent bonds and life course criminality. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*(4), 562-571.
- Stewart, E. A. (2003). School social bonds, school, climate, and school misbehavior: a multilevel analysis. *Justice Quarterly, 20*(3), 575-604.
- Valdez, A., Nowotny, K. M., Zhao, Q., & Cepeda, A. (2018). Interpersonal partner relationships, bond to children, and informal social control among persistent male offenders. *Social Problems, 66*(3), 468-883.

- Wiley, S. A., Slocum, L. A., & Esbensen F. (2013). The unintended consequences of being stopped or arrested: An exploration of the labeling mechanisms through which police contact leads to subsequent delinquency. *Criminology*, 51(4), 927-966.
- Wong, S. K. (2005). The effects of adolescent activities on delinquency: A differential involvement Approach. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 34(4), 321–333.
- Wright, B. R., Caspi, A., Moffit, T. E., & SILVA, P. A. (1999). Low self-control, social bonds, and crime: Social causation, or both? *Criminology*, 37(3), 479-514.

APPENDIX

Table A.1 Attachment Coded

NYSD Question	NYSD Variable	NYSD Response Category
Between Christmas a year ago and the Christmas just past... Was there a particular group of friends that you ran around with	Y7_75	1 No 2 Yes
Between Christmas a year ago and the Christmas just past... Have you had a job or jobs? (Include any job for pay including military but not "allowance")	Y7_107	1 No 2 Yes

Table A.2 Commitment Coded

NYSD Question	NYSD Variable	NYSD Response Category
What is your present marital status?	Y7_12Marriage	Single Married Divorced Separated Widowed
How important is it to you... to have a good job or career?	Y7_333	Not important at all Somewhat important Very important
How important is it to you... to graduate from college?	Y7_335	Not important at all Somewhat important Very important
How important is it to you... to have a long term intimate relationship with a person of the opposite sex?	Y7_339	Not important at all Somewhat important Very important

Table A.3 Involvement Coded

NYSD Question	NYSD Variable	NYSD Response Category
On the average, how many weekday afternoons, Monday through Friday, from 5:00 p.m. or the end of work to dinner, have you spent with your friends?	Y7_79Timespentwithfriends	> than once aftn/weekday one aftn/weekday two aftn/weekday three aftn/weekday four aftn/weekday five aftn/weekday
How many times in the Last Year have you... Stolen money or other things from your parents or other members of your family?	Y7_482	Mean = .048 Std Dev = 1.092 Variance = 1.192
Have you ever in your lifetime... Stolen something worth more than \$50?	Y7_946	1 No 2 Yes
Have you ever in your lifetime... Deliberately injured your spouse/girlfriend/boyfriend, e.g., hit, knocked down, choked, beat or cut them?	Y7_964	1 No 2 Yes
Since January of 1984 have you ever been arrested by the police for anything other than a minor traffic offense?	Y7_1030	0 1 2 3 4 12

Table A.4 Belief Coded

NYSD Question	NYSD Variable	NYSD Response Category
---------------	---------------	------------------------

How important is it to you to have a group of friends and be included in their activities?	Y7_77Importanceofhavingfriends	Not important at all Not too important Somewhat important Pretty important Very important
How important has religion been in your life?	Y7_326	Not important at all Not too important Somewhat important Pretty important Very important
How wrong is it for someone your age to... hit or threaten to hit someone without any reason?	Y7_424	Not wrong at all A little bit wrong Wrong Very wrong
How wrong is it for someone your age to... deliberately hit and injure their spouse/boyfriend/girlfriend?	Y7_435	Not wrong at all A little bit wrong Wrong Very wrong
How important is your educational experience to you? and How important has your school/college work been to you? (Combined in SPSS)	beliefq2	Not important at all Not too important Somewhat important Pretty important Very important

Table A.5 Victimization Coded

NYSD Question	NYSD Variable	NYSD Response Category
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1118) Did this attack (any of these attacks) involve an attempt to force sex on you?	Y7_1119	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF YES TO Y7_1119) During the most recent attack which involved an attempt to force sex on you, were you... threatened or injured by a weapon?	Y7_1120	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF YES TO Y7_1119) During the most recent attack which involved an attempt to force sex on you, were you... seriously injured?	Y7_1121	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF YES TO Y7_1119) During the most recent attack which involved an attempt to force sex on you, were you...seriously injured?	Y7_1122	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1123) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... brother?	Y7_1125	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1123) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... sister?	Y7_1126	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1123) Was this attack (were	Y7_1127	1 No 2 Yes Missing

any of these attacks) by a... teacher?		
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1123)Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a....spouse?	Y7_1128	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1123) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a...student?	Y7_1129	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1123) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a...gang?	Y7_1130	1 No 2 Yes Missing 1
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1123) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by an... other adult?	Y7_1131	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1123) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... boyfriend/girlfriend?	Y7_1132	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1123) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by an... other youth?	Y7_1133	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1123) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by an... other (SPECIFY)?	Y7_1134	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1123) Did this attack (any of these attacks) involve	Y7_1135	1 No 2 Yes Missing

an attempt to force sex on you?		
During the most recent attack which involved an attempt to force sex on you were you... threatened or injured by a weapon?	Y7_1136	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF YES TO Y7_1135) During the most recent attack which involved an attempt to force sex on you were you... seriously injured?	Y7_1137	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF YES TO Y7_1135) During the most recent attack which involved an attempt to force sex on you were you... forced to have sexual relations?	Y7_1138	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1139) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... brother?	Y7_1140	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1139) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... sister?	Y7_1141	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1139) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... teacher?	Y7_1142	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1139) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... spouse?	Y7_1143	1 No 2 Yes Missing

(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1139) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... student?	Y7_1144	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1139) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... gang?	Y7_1145	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1139) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by an... other adult?	Y7_1146	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1139) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... boyfriend/girlfriend?	Y7_1147	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1139) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by an... other youth?	Y7_1148	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1139) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by an... other (SPECIFY)?	Y7_1149	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1139) Did this attack (any of these attacks) involve an attempt to force sex on you?	Y7_1150	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF YES TO Y7_1150) During the most recent attack which involved an attempt to force sex on you, were you... threatened or injured by a weapon?	Y7_1151	1 No 2 Yes Missing

(IF YES TO Y7_1150) During the most recent attack which involved an attempt to force sex on you, were you... seriously injured?	Y7_1152	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF YES TO Y7_1150) During the most recent attack which involved an attempt to force sex on you, were you... forced to have sexual relations?	Y7_1153	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... brother?	Y7_1157	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a...sister?	Y7_1158	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a...teacher?	Y7_1159	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a...spouse?	Y7_1160	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a...student?	Y7_1161	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a...gang?	Y7_1162	1 No 2 Yes Missing

(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by an...other adult?	Y7_1163	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by a... boyfriend/girlfriend?	Y7_1164	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by an... other youth?	Y7_1165	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) Was this attack (were any of these attacks) by an... other (SPECIFY)?	Y7_1166	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) During the most recent event, were you... threatened or injured by a weapon?	Y7_1167	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) During the most recent event, were you... seriously injured?	Y7_1168	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1156) During the most recent event, were you... forced to have sexual relations?	Y7_1169	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1172) During the most recent event, were you... threatened or injured by a weapon?	Y7_1173	1 No 2 Yes Missing

(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1172) During the most recent event, were you... seriously injured?	Y7_1174	1 No 2 Yes Missing
(IF ONE OR MORE TIMES TO Y7_1175) During the most recent event, were you... forced to have sexual relations?	Y7_1175	1 No 2 Yes Missing
Did the respondent report any sexual assaults in more than one boxed item? (Items Y7_1119, Y7_1135, Y7_1150, Y7_1156, and Y7_1172) (IF NO, SKIP TO Y7_1180)	Y7_1176	1 No 2 Yes Missing