

EXAMINING THE RELATIVE INFLUENCE OF PEER AND PARENTAL
ATTACHMENT ON SCHOOL VICTIMIZATION

A Dissertation
Submitted to
the Temple University Graduate Board

in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

by
Maureen Zdanis
May, 2011

Examining Committee Members:
Erin Rotheram-Fuller, Advising Chair, School Psychology
Catherine Fiorello, School Psychology
Tricia Jones, Adult Organizational Development
Joseph DuCette, Educational Psychology
Frank Farley, School Psychology

ABSTRACT

There is considerable evidence showing that attachment to parents and peers serves as a protective factor against adolescent anti-social behavior. However, less is known about whether the strength of these attachments serves as a protective factor against being victimized at school. Furthermore, no study has examined the relationship between primary language spoken at home and victimization experienced at school. In a sample of 1200 middle and high school students from an urban-fringe school district, the current investigation examined links between the strength of attachments to parents and peers and the frequency of victimization reported by students. Participants completed surveys in their classrooms as part of a random stratified sampling of classrooms from 6th-12th grades, which included self-report measures of the strength of attachment to primary caregivers and peers, frequency of victimization experienced at school, and primary language spoken in the home. Students who reported stronger attachments to parents and peers, reported less frequent victimization, though results appear to be clinically insignificant. Furthermore, students who reported speaking a language other than English in the home reported more frequent victimization, though attachment did not mediate this finding. These findings suggest the need for interventions which foster the development of strong attachments, and which address improving tolerance for students who speak languages other than and in addition to English.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Erin Rotheram-Fuller. Your guidance and encouragement were essential. Also a special thanks to Heidi Ramirez and Billie Gastic who enabled me this research opportunity. Thank you to all of my friends and family who have supported and encouraged me throughout my education and during this particular pursuit. I asked all of you for help and you all offered your help graciously. Thank you mom, dad, Karen, Larry, and Carolyn. Thanks to Jared, Kim, and Russell. Thank you Becky. Thank you Decoteau. Thanks to Jay, Krista, and Laura. Thanks Cristina. Thanks to Grandma and Aunt Dee. Thank you to the School Psychology faculty here at Temple University for a straightforward journey with integrity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
Adolescence	9
Attachment Theories	10
Attachment and Behavior	12
Attachment to Parents	13
Attachment in Early Childhood	15
Attachment in Middle Childhood	17
Attachment in Adolescence	18
Race, Culture, and Attachment	19
Peer Attachment	21
Measuring Attachment	24
Language Use and Attachment	25
Primary Language as a Measure of Acculturation	26
Language Use and Victimization	26
School Violence	28
Victimization as a Form of School Violence	29

Victimization and Ethnicity	29
Characteristics of Victims.....	30
Victimization at School: Prevention and Intervention.....	31
Victims’ Levels of Parental Attachment.....	32
Peer Attachment and Victimization.....	33
“Language spoken at home” and the Relationship between Peer and Parent Attachment and Victimization	34
III. METHODOLOGY	38
Participants and Selection Process.....	38
Procedure	40
Measures	43
Measuring Victimization	43
Measuring Attachment.....	45
Data Analysis	48
Variable Composites.....	49
IV. RESULTS	51
Descriptive Analyses	51
Internal Consistency Reliability Analyses.....	52
Preliminary Analyses of Key Variables.....	53
Analysis of Victimization	54
Exploratory Analyses.....	61

V. DISCUSSION	65
Research Question 1: Do parental and peer attachment levels correlate with school-related victimization?.....	67
Research Question 2: Does parental attachment or peer attachment account for more of the variance in victimization?.....	71
Research Question 3: Do differences in language spoken at home correlate with involvement in acts of school-related victimization? If so, does attachment mediate the relationship?	76
Limitations	81
Implications.....	85
Future Research	86
REFERENCES	88
APPENDICES	99
A. Measures	100
B. Table.....	111

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Table 1 The mean grade level of students in the population	39
2. Table 2 Ethnic breakdown of participating students.....	40
3. Table 3 PIML Parent Alienation Subscale.....	44
4. Table 4 PIML Peer Alienation Subscale.....	45
5. Table 5 Variables.....	47
6. Table 6 Demographic Characteristics of Sample.....	51
7. Table 7 Internal Consistency Reliability Coefficients.....	53
8. Table 8 Factor Loadings of Victimization Items.....	54
9. Table 9 Internal Reliability of Victimization Factor.....	54
10. Table 10 Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations between Victimization and Attachment Subscales.....	55
11. Table 11 Full-Scale Multiple Regression Analysis.....	56
12. Table 12 Full-Scale Multiple Regression Analysis with subscales.....	57
13. Table 13 Table of Means.....	58
14. Table 14 Manova Language Groups and Dependent Variables.....	58
15. Table 15 Manova for Language Group and Victimization Items.....	59
16. Table 16 Factor Loadings of the People In My Life Scale.....	61
17. Table 17 Internal Reliability of Observed Factors.....	63
18. Table 18 Correlations Between Attachment Subscales.....	63
19. Table 19 Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations Between Attachment Subscales.....	111

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Despite an overall steady decline in serious violence in the United States since 1993, the rates of violent behaviors for preadolescents and adolescents remain at very high levels (Ngwe, Liu, & Flay, 2004). Students engage in multiple violence-related behaviors including physical fighting, carrying weapons, making threats (with and without weapons), and cutting, stabbing and shooting people (Ngwe et al., 2004). Within the school-aged population in the U.S., inner city African American youth, especially males, are most vulnerable to injury or death due to violence-related causes (Ngwe et al., 2004). While these offenses present major problems to urban school districts, lower level offenses such as physical fighting, weapons possession, and bullying are pervasive and even more problematic when considering the day-to-day functioning of a school. The majority of violent incidents at schools are physical fights which affect many students (Devoe, et al., 2004). For example, in 2004, 22 out of every 1,000 students aged 12 to 18 reported being a victim of a violent crime at school (US Department of Education, 2007). Although youth victimization takes many forms, one of the most common and widespread types of victimization involves aggressive acts by peers. Peer victimization, in which children are teased, attacked, or bullied by one or more peers, occurs quite frequently at school.

Victimization at school is threatening the promise made in the No Child Left Behind Act that all children are entitled to a safe learning environment. “All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning”

(U.S.Government, 2001). Schools attempt to meet this requirement by continually revising their discipline policies to capture and remedy all possible offenses made by students. The cost of violence in society at large (i.e., purchases of security systems, carrying of guns, enrollment in self-defense classes, and avoidance of certain streets at certain times) is measured not only by actual harm, but by expenditures to avoid and prevent violence. Furthermore, students who spend time thinking about violence, and rearranging their lives to avoid violence, are expending mental and physical energy which could otherwise be spent on learning (Eccles, Mahoney, & Larson, 2005).

Through safe learning environments required by NCLB, students can thrive and develop pro-social behaviors. A broad goal of education is to assist students in developing pro-social behavior that leads to productive citizenship. A multitude of research demonstrates that the trajectory of pro-social behaviors across youth correlates with later life outcomes of adjustment and life satisfaction (Allen, Marsh, McFarland, McElhaney, & Land et al., 2002; Huebner, 2004; Laible, Carlo, & Rafaelli, 2000; Ridenour, Greenberg and Cook, 2006). Therefore, in an attempt to promote academic as well as social/emotional development, one must examine the conditions or characteristics that lead to optimal behavior and promote social development. We must determine the risk and protective factors associated with violent behavior in schools in order to develop methods of prevention and intervention.

Over time, school violence has expanded from concerns about events that threaten the safety of students (e.g. fire, intruder) to concerns about students initiating violence from within. Even in a somewhat controlled setting like school, students experience a great deal of victimization (Nofziger, 2009). Along with the understanding that students

present threats to each other, interventions have shifted from attention on facilities management and surveillance to pro-social behavior curricula that aim to improve student behavior. The Clinton and Bush administrations promoted and supported national anti-violence school programs. In particular, President Clinton supported the White House School Safety Conferences. Federal legislation has focused on drug-free and gun-free school zones, including the Safe Schools Act of 1994, School Safety Enhancement Act of 1999, and most recently the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

There is now a general consensus among researchers that being victimized by one's peers is associated with a range of negative psychosocial consequences (McKenney, Pepler, Craig & Connolly, 2006). For example, Juvonen and Graham (2001) found that youth who are bullied by their peers frequently experience loneliness, low self-esteem, depression and social anxiety. Furthermore, youth who are bullied tend to have an aversion to the school environment. As early as kindergarten, children who are nominated as victims by their peers via sociometric ratings are more likely to report that they dislike school (Juvonen & Graham, 2001).

The etiology of violent behavior in schools is complicated and not well understood (Bullis, Walker, & Sprague, 2001). Antisocial behavior, such as fighting at school, tends to correlate with (but is not limited to) students coming from families that experience poverty, ineffective parenting practices, drug use, inadequate schooling, failure at school, peer rejection, and attachments to antisocial individuals (Bullis et al., 2001). Because of their physical, cognitive, and psychosocial developmental levels, children are particularly vulnerable to being victimized (Boney-McCoy & Finkelhor, 1995).

However, exposure to these negative conditions does not always lead to antisocial behavior. Some individuals will succeed beyond expectations, demonstrating resiliency, while others will partake in antisocial behavior such as violence at school (Nofziger, 2009). Furthermore, even within schools with high rates of violence, most students do not become victims. Thus, individual factors that increase the risk of victimization should be further examined.

High levels of emotional regulation are associated with the ability to refrain from aggressive acts and find alternative approaches to resolve conflict (Chang, Schwartz, Dodge, McBride-Chang, 2003). Individual differences in emotional regulation have been attributed to both parental and peer influences (Chang et al., 2003). Researchers have made the link between attachment types of child-parent dyads and the development of emotional regulation (Cassidy, 1994). In a study that used an adult measure of attachment for adolescents, results revealed that high levels of attachment predicted increased social skills. Another key finding was that low levels of attachment predicted high levels of delinquency (Allen et al., 2002). It is unclear, however, whether attachment to parents and/or peers may be a protective factor against victimization in school.

Secondary to the relationship between victimization and attachment level, is how this relationship changes when considering students in American public schools who speak a language other than English in their home. In December of 2009, a public high school in Philadelphia experienced racial attacks on Asian students from African-American students. Seven Asian students were hospitalized as a result of these attacks (Mucha, 2009). Students were being harassed because of cultural barriers and their status as non-native English speakers. In response, fifty students and a community organizer

mobilized an all-week walkout, stating that the school was unsafe for Asian immigrants. Such incidents of cross cultural, interpersonal violence raise the question of whether certain minority groups are at a greater risk of victimization in schools. One aspect of this occurrence was that students were being harassed for their status as non-native English speakers. While the literature has explored ethnic and racial differences regarding victimization, the factor of primary language has not been fully explored (McKenney et al., 2006).

In the greater Philadelphia area, there has been an increase in the number of refugees, a population at risk for participation in violence (Zehr, 2001). Immigrants and refugees are an increasingly substantial subset of the U.S. population. Well over a million immigrants relocate to the United States each year, including 700,000 to 900,000 legal immigrants, 70,000 to 125,000 refugees and asylees, and at least 300,000 to 500,000 undocumented immigrants (Capps, Passel, Perez-Lopez, & Fix, 2003). According to the US Census, the foreign-born population in 2003 was 33.5 million people or 11.7% of the population. Projections suggest that these numbers of first and second generation U.S. residents will continue to rapidly expand. By 2050, the US Census estimates indicate that the foreign-born population will top 15%, a historic high (Capps et al., 2003). The growth rate of young immigrant populations is noteworthy because the population of children in immigrant families has grown nearly seven times faster than the population of children of U.S.-born parents (Capps et al., 2003).

While the present research study does not allow insight into specific circumstances of immigration or refugee status, it is known that districts in and around Philadelphia, PA have recently experienced an increase in the number of refugee students

from African countries such as Sudan, Sierre Leone, Liberia and Ethiopia (Zehr, 2001).

As a result of advocacy from the Congressional Black Caucus, the U.S. Department of State has tripled the number of refugees the United States accepts from Africa from 2001-2004. This at-risk group faces obstacles of acculturation and sometimes language acquisition. School administrators, teachers, principals, parent/community liaisons, and school social workers have reported that immigrant groups from respective areas have created gangs that bring violence into the schools. Acculturation research has also demonstrated that children whose primary language spoken at home is something other than English, are at a great risk for school adjustment and psycho-social problems (Yu, Huang, Schwalberg, Overpeck, & Kogan, 2003).

For immigrant families, school is the first sustained participation in an institution of the new society. It is in schools that immigrant children become closely acquainted with the majority culture; it is where they form perceptions of where they fit in to society. It is also at school where immigrants learn cultural idioms and codes from peers and adults (Suarez-Orozco, 2008). These relationships are critical to the process of development and acculturation.

While the experiences of first and second generation immigrants are different, both have foreign-born parents. First and second generation immigrants share challenges and stressors typically associated with lower status, high levels of poverty, ethnic and racial discrimination, community violence, and poor schools (Suarez-Orozco, 2008). Using a mixed method longitudinal design, Suarez-Orozco (2008) studied students from immigrant families and explored how the multiple influences from each student's academic, family and peer worlds interacted to shape experiences. The kinds of

relationships research participants were in played a significant role in their academic trajectory and their well-being (Suarez-Orozco, 2008).

Researchers have argued that efforts to prevent peer victimization should be guided by an understanding of high risk populations. In order to prevent such phenomenon from occurring, there must be a complete understanding of the dynamics of victimization. There is a complex interplay of individual and contextual factors that increase the likelihood of victimization occurring by peers at school (Hanish & Guerra, 2000).

In an attempt to identify predictors of victimization, this study explored the construct of attachment and how it relates to victimization. This study also examined whether the primary language spoken at home had an impact on the level of victimization reported by students. Specifically, this research examined:

- (1) Do parental and peer attachment levels correlate with school-related victimization?
- (2) Does parental attachment or peer attachment account for more of the variance in victimization?
- (3) Do differences in language spoken at home correlate with involvement in acts of school-related victimization?
 - (3a) If so, does attachment mediate the relationship?

Findings from this study are intended to inform intervention programs that target schools with high rates of student violence.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Several theories support the importance of peer and parent relationships in guiding children's and adolescent's behavioral choices. Attachment theory suggests that sound parental attachment can act as both a preventative influence against negative child behavior such as lying or fighting, as well as set the stage to establish strong bonds outside of the parent-child relationship. Conversely, violence has been associated with individuals who experience weak attachments to parents (Kierkus & Baer, 2002).

Several factors influence the likelihood of being a victim of violence at school. For example, Nofizger (2009) found that girls are more likely than boys to experience sexual victimization, while boys are more likely to witness violence or be physically assaulted. In this investigation, which drew data from the National Survey of Adolescents and measured victimization in three ways (indirect victimization, sexual assault, physical assault), it was found that Black respondents were significantly more likely to experience all forms of victimization at school; Hispanics were more likely to witness violence; and respondents who categorize themselves as "other racial group" were more likely than all other respondents to be victimized by a sexual assault (Nofizger, 2009).

While the link between poor attachment and negative outcomes has been rigorously studied for Caucasian, middle-class populations of high school students, there are understudied groups for whom this interaction has not been evaluated (Laible, Carlo, & Raffaelli, 2000; Ridenour, Greenberg, & Cook, 2006). Urban youth, early-adolescent

students, and students who come from homes where languages other than English are spoken are included within these under-represented groups. This study evaluates the constructs of attachment to parents and peers in relation to participation in school victimization among urban adolescent students, with special consideration of the potential effects of acculturation among students whose primary language spoken at home is not English.

Adolescence

Adolescence is a transitional period for cognitive, biological, and social changes that occur after childhood. The onset of adolescence varies from child to child and depends on individual levels of physical and emotional maturity, the influences of their peer groups, and the pressures of the environment. Children who grow up in fast-paced urban environments often develop more quickly than non-urban teenagers (Adolescent Health Committee, 2009). Adolescence essentially begins when puberty starts and ends when the person develops an adult identity and behavior. This period of development corresponds roughly to the period between the ages of 10 and 19 years for females and slightly later for males (Adolescent Health Committee, 2009). According to the U.S. Department of Education (2007), younger students (12-14) are twice as likely to be victimized as students who are 15-18 years old, and male students have substantially higher rates of violent victimization than female students (U.S. Department of Education, 2007).

Research indicates that adolescence is a period of heightened risk; rates of depression, conduct disorders, suicide and drug and alcohol use increase during this

period (Laible et al., 2000). Several factors may play a role in negatively affecting an adolescent's developmental trajectory. One important factor that distinguishes adolescents who successfully navigate the transition relative to those who do not, is the quality of the relationship that the adolescent has with parents and peers (Laible et al., 2000).

Attachment Theories

Attachment is “an affective bond that involves warmth, availability, trust, and responsiveness with at least one individual throughout the lifespan” and “has been shown to be important in promoting psychological adjustment” (Mac Donald, 1992, p. 89).

Researchers have long been interested in attachment as providing explanations for variability in individual behavior. John Bowlby (1969) laid the foundation for illuminating how relationship patterns are established during early infant-parent relationships through Attachment Theory. Bowlby developed the concept of internal working models; a manner of relating to others that is internalized during formative relationships and then generalized to all other relationships. According to attachment theory, individuals who experience strong attachment to caregivers and internalize such representations, then continue to interact with others in a similar pro-social manner, forming strong bonds throughout development (Bowlby, 1969). These strong bonds have been shown to correspond with positive outcomes in childhood, such as persistence and compliance (Sroufe, 1978). Studies have shown that secure attachments with parents in adolescence predict higher self-esteem, greater life satisfaction, better college adjustment, less psychological distress, and greater perceived social support (Armsden & Greenberg,

1987; Laible et al., 2000).

Attachment was originally defined as the strong affective bond established between the infant and primary caregiver (Bowlby, 1969). However, more recent understandings of attachment theory have been expanded to also include all significant relationships across the life span, such as those with friends and romantic partners (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). A central feature to attachment theory is the idea that children are constructing models of relationships out of interactions with early attachment figures. Attachment theory suggests that these relationship patterns continue into adolescence and adulthood, even if a new primary attachment figure replaces the parent (Ainsworth, 1989).

The level of attachment to peers may also play a role in an individual's likelihood of experiencing victimization from other students (Agnew, 2006). While past research has highlighted the importance of having a close bond with at least one adult, there is also evidence of the protective factor of friendships against being involved in violence. One construct that differentiates children who engage in antisocial behavior or become the victim of antisocial behavior from those who do not is the development of social skills (Bullis et al., 2001). However, there is also research incriminating delinquent peer groups as influencing individuals to commit deviant acts (Agnew, 2006). Therefore, friendships could take on a positive or negative role in regards to shielding an individual from becoming the victim of school violence.

Internal working models include expectations about the attachment figure's responsiveness and accessibility, as well as perceptions of one's deservingness of such care (Bowlby, 1969). For example, if a caregiver demonstrates responsiveness by

attending to an infant's needs for comfort, nourishment and interaction, the child learns to expect that such needs will be met. The child also learns to communicate satisfaction, pleasure, and other emotions that are reinforcing to social relationships. As the young child develops, he/she demonstrates this learned behavior by seeking positive reinforcement in social relationships.

Early research on attachment focused on the infant/mother bond and classified behavior as either secure or insecure (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978).

Caregivers who are available and responsive to their infant's needs establish a sense of security in the infant. The infant knows that the caregiver is dependable, which creates a secure base for the child to then explore the world. In separating, the securely attached child shows little distress since this child is assured that the caregiver is dependable and will return. However, children with insecure attachments will either be ambivalent or avoidant towards caregivers. When offered a choice, these children show no preference between a caregiver and a complete stranger. These patterns of behavior have been shown to be moderately stable over long periods of time when the type of care remains consistent (Fraley, Davis, & Shaver, 1997).

Attachment and Behavior

Hirschi's (1969) Social Control Theory, emanating from philosophy and the field of criminology, provides one explanation of the relationship between attachments and behavior. Social Control Theory proposes that people's relationships, commitments, values, norms, and beliefs encourage them not to break the law. According to Hirschi, social bonds become weak when a person fails to a) form positive attachments to

significant others, b) develop a stake in conformity to conventional norms, c) engage in conventional activities and/or d) believe in society's accepted norms (1969). According to this theory, if moral codes are internalized and individuals are connected to their wider community, they will voluntarily maintain normative social behavior. This theory attempts to explain reduced involvement in criminal acts by the processes of socialization and social learning. Social Control Theory implies that good parenting can lay the groundwork for social conformity by insulating children from deviant influences.

Attachment Theory, combined with Hirschi's Social Control Theory, creates a premise for beginning to understand non-conformist or delinquent behavior in adolescence. While attachment theory has been thoroughly studied in the years of infancy and adulthood, the adolescent years of development remain comparatively understudied. Additionally, the role of attachment has not been well explored among students with varying primary languages, nor with specific interest in the link between these relationships and victimization.

Attachment to Parents

Parental attachment can be operationalized by three behavioral/affective aspects: proximity seeking, separation protest, and secure base effect (Ainsworth, 1989; Freeman & Brown, 2001). Proximity seeking involves the degree to which the attachment figure (parent) is sought for emotional support (Ainsworth, 1989). High proximity seeking would involve frequent attempts to be close (physically and/or emotionally) to the caregiver. High proximity seeking occurs when the caregiver has demonstrated attentiveness to the needs of the infant and is associated with strong bonds. Low

proximity seeking behavior is associated with avoidance and aggression, which occurs if the caregiver has not demonstrated attention to needs of the child (Ainsworth, 1989).

Separation protest involves the degree to which physical separation from the attachment figure produces anxiety and parental seeking behaviors in the child (Ainsworth, 1989). Children react in protest because their security is based upon external sources—the presence of the caretaker—whose departure is a threat to this security. In this case, the caretaker has not fostered an internal working model within the child, for which the child is able to rely on attention and security (Ainsworth, 1989). Reactive behavior, similar to reaction protest, has been linked with externalizing problems in adolescence, including aggression (Pulkkinen, 1996).

The third aspect of attachment, the secure base effect, involves the degree to which the child feels confident to explore the environment. This confidence is derived from the child knowing that the attachment figure is committed and available to provide support when needed (Ainsworth, 1989; Bowlby, 1969). Secure base effect occurs when the child's needs have been attentively met and the infant-parent dyad has been physically and emotionally close. Children with high levels of attachment skillfully use the secure base over time, building confidence in the parent's availability and responsiveness as well as in their own agency in developing new relationships.

Attachment has been considered an important factor in social and psychological health (Sroufe, 1978). According to Attachment Theory, children, adolescents, and adults benefit greatly from having a principal source of emotional security, a “primary attachment figure” to count on no matter how difficult the environmental circumstances are (Ainsworth, 1989; Bowlby, 1969; Freeman & Brown, 2001). An affective bond that

involves warmth, availability, trust, and responsiveness with at least one individual throughout the lifespan has been shown to be important in promoting psychological adjustment (MacDonald, 1992). Furthermore, research has shown that this bond is necessary for resiliency. Studies have demonstrated that a secure attachment with parents in adolescence predicts higher self-esteem, greater life satisfaction, better college adjustment, less psychological distress, and greater perceived social support (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). The role of parental attachment, however, appears to change throughout the life span, and a closer look at the specific link between parental attachment and child behavior during adolescence needs further investigation.

Attachment in Early Childhood

Children's attachment to their primary caregiver is believed to set the mold for future close relationships. Secure versus insecure attachments are associated with the child's subsequent level of adaptive coping skills. Secure attachment involves children utilizing a secure base established by the parent as a hub from which to fearlessly explore the environment (Ainsworth, 1989).

Secure attachment has been found to set the groundwork for successful interpersonal skills and intimate relationships (Black & McCartney, 1997). One study showed that the security of the mother-child attachment impacts the quality of peer relationships by possibly enhancing emotional self-regulation and coping (Contreras, Kerns, Weimer, & Gentzler, 2000). In this study, constructive coping (i.e., emotional regulation, identifying alternative solutions, problem solving, explaining, and reconciliation) and peer competence were both found to be related to parental attachment.

This finding suggested that emotional regulation was one of the mechanisms that accounted for attachment-peer links.

Preschool children who have secure attachments with mothers are often able to use positive emotion to initiate, respond to, and sustain peer interaction. These children with strong attachment also display less negative emotions than do insecurely attached children when playing with peers (Sroufe, 1978). Securely attached preschoolers are more open about expressing sadness in appropriate situations (e.g., failing at completing task) than avoidant attached children.

The preschool age period specifically involves the development and use of social skills (i.e., negotiation, bargaining, and compromise), and these become incorporated into internal working models of social relationships to be used with other children and adults. As children move into the elementary school years, most develop a goal-corrected partnership with parents, in which children understand their parents' intentions, plans, goals, and needs. Incorporation of this type of partnership into the internal working model prepares the growing child for later, more mature friendships and relationships, in which the ability to perceive from others' perspectives is key to establishing and maintaining friendships.

When secure attachment to a primary caregiver is unavailable or weak, adverse effects may occur (Allen & Land, 1999). These effects include poor emotional regulation, reduced social skills, poor coping and even psychopathology (Allen & Land, 1999; Hubbard & Coie, 1994). Studies have linked emotional regulation to peer status and children's behavior pattern with peers (Hubbard & Coie, 1994). Emotional regulation skills are necessary for managing interpersonal situations (e.g., resolving

conflicts). The ability to manage these demands influences the extent to which children can achieve social goals in a socially appropriate and effective way. Non-constructive coping was associated with less competent social behavior (Hubbard & Coie, 1994) and children who form early insecure attachments are at a greater risk for experiencing psychopathology when they are older (Allen & Land, 1999).

Attachment problems in early childhood may look like poor behavioral control and/or emotional over-stimulation. Certain behaviors such as deviance (i.e., acting autonomously) can be a way to release pent-up energy and frustration. It is, therefore, expected that this lack of behavioral control may continue into later childhood with different deviant behaviors resulting (Agnew, 2006).

Attachment in Middle Childhood

Developmental psychology describes an increasing independence throughout childhood and into pre-adolescence and adolescence. According to Bowlby's Attachment Theory (1969), individuals without a secure attachment base from which to explore other relationships might experience increasing anxiety as the role of the parent becomes more distant and the life demands of the child necessitate autonomy. Children's quality of attachment to others is associated with emotional and behavioral well-being (Allen & Land, 1999). Some research indicates that developmental changes (i.e., neurodevelopment, physiological, and psychological) may impact a child's quality of attachment to mother, teachers, and peers (Lynch & Cicchetti, 1997). These complex changes involve interactions of family factors, child-rearing approaches, and quality of attachment (Kerns, Aspelmeier, Gentsler, & Grabill, 2001).

Unfortunately, the majority of studies on attachment do not focus on the middle childhood developmental period. While one study examined the development of delinquent behavior and social skills of 9th and 10th graders in relation to adolescent peer attachment type (Allen, Moore, Kupermic, & Bell, 1998), this study did not look at the period of pre-adolescence. The current study intends to extend this research to look at younger years, as well as adolescence, from ages 10-18.

Attachment in Adolescence

Research has aimed to specify the ideal type of parental attachment for positive social outcomes. Social support research shows that by early- to mid-adolescence, peers are valued as equal or greater sources of companionship and intimacy than parents (Freeman & Brown, 2001). However, it is unclear if a shift in attachment occurs during this time. Typically a person has more than one attachment figure. Some research proposes the idea of a hierarchy of attachment, with attachment behaviors usually directed towards a principal or primary attachment figure (Ainsworth, 1969). Despite growing reliance on peers for support, the majority of teens continue to rely on parents for emotional support and advice (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Adolescence is conceptualized as a period of both growing autonomy and connectedness to parents and other significant adults (Laible et al., 2000).

Stronger positive early attachment is associated with adolescents' ability to process and integrate their experiences in social relationships more accurately and with greater sophistication (Cassidy, Kirsh, Scolton, & Parke, 1996). Stronger attachment should thus allow the adolescent to better read the subtle emotional cues in interactions

with peers and adults so as to develop increasingly sophisticated social skills over time. Adolescents who score low on attachment to parents are more likely to misperceive or defensively exclude information about attachment experiences in their interview (Cassidy et al., 1996). This miscommunication in the study interviews reflects relationship patterns in real life. Miscommunication may lead to distorted judgments and negative expectations about others in social situations, which have been strongly linked to problems in social functioning (Cassidy et al., 1996).

The construct of attachment to parents has been shown to vary according to the child's age and developmental level. Some middle school students and adolescents report very high levels of attachment to parents, while others fall in the middle or low end of the continuum (Cassidy et al., 1996). During adolescence, symbolic communication by means of the Internet may replace physical approximate-seeking behavior in infancy and childhood. Adolescents might regard the Internet as their new attachment figure or may seek new attachment figures through the Internet (Lei & Yana, 2007).

Race, Culture, and Attachment

Research indicates that the construct of attachment does not change across cultures. The manner in which attachment develops between cross-racial and/or cross-cultural parent-child dyads may differ, but the level of attachment bonds are similar (Dekovic, Wissink, & Meijer, 2004). Studies have shown similarity across cultures in infant/parent attachment styles (Arbona & Power, 2003).

One study found that there was little difference in attachment to parents and peers among adolescents across different ethnicities (Dekovic et al., 2004). This study

examined the role of family and peer relationships in adolescent antisocial behavior. Dutch, Moroccan, Turkish, and Surinamese adolescents and their families were studied and compared across the following variables: antisocial behavior, the quality of parent-child relationship and involvement with deviant peers. Adolescents from these different ethnic groups showed similar levels of antisocial behavior. Results demonstrated that adolescents from varying cultural backgrounds are satisfied with their relationships with parents to a similar degree, disclose as much information to them, and do not differ in their involvement with deviant peers (Dekovic et al., 2004). The findings are relevant to understanding the relative value and profile of attachment across cultures, and the understanding that adolescents tend to report similar parent-child relationships across cultures.

Consistent with Dekovic and colleagues (2004), a study by Arbona and Power (2003) examined the relationship of mother and father attachment levels to self-esteem and antisocial behaviors among African American, European American, and Mexican American high school students. The attachment dimensions of anxiety and avoidance were examined. Findings indicated that adolescents from the three ethnic/racial groups did not differ greatly in their reported attachment levels to father and mother. Consistent with theoretical hypotheses, securely attached adolescents from the three ethnic groups had a more positive sense of self-esteem and reported less involvement in antisocial behaviors than their less securely attached peers (Arbona & Power, 2003). High levels of attachment (strong attachment) had clear implications in this study. If an adolescent had a stronger attachment, they also had better self-esteem and less deviant behavior than their peers with weaker attachment. This correlation remained the same across different

ethnic groups, indicating that the construct of attachment holds between cultures. The construct of attachment exists independent of cultural practices and represents an underlying construct of strength of attachment that holds from ethnic group to ethnic group.

However, less is known about attachment levels and their relation to victimization across levels of acculturation (Van Ijzendoorn & Kroonenberg, 1998). While differences across homogenous cultural groups may yield no differences in attachment levels, these studies have not explored the complexity of families who are crossing-cultures, developing bi-culturalism, and navigating the interplay of heritage cultures and new-world cultures.

Peer Attachment

While the construct of parental attachment is relatively well defined, peer attachment is more complex. There are different theories as to how parent and peer attachments are likely related. One theory suggests that aspects of attachment to parents shift to peers over mid-childhood and adolescence (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). However, this maturational process is not well understood. Alternatively, there is substantial research suggesting that parent attachment and peer attachment are two unique constructs (Ridenour et al., 2006). Researchers report correlations between parent and peer attachment to be less than .36, suggesting that they are separate but partially overlapping constructs (Ridenour et al., 2006).

Scholars have argued that peer relationships are distinctive since they are based on mutual reciprocity and cooperation, unlike parent-child relationships, which are based

on unilateral power and are more likely to involve obedience and conformity (Piaget, 1965). Piaget theorized much on this topic and suggested that peer interactions stimulate moral development since peers provide an open haven in which children can experiment with minimal risk to self-concept, and these relationships mostly involve co-constructions of reality and negotiation. Other theorists have instead noted that parent-child relationships are mixed relationships with varying aspects of interpersonal dynamics (Hazan & Shaver, 1994; Laible et al., 2000). Traditional attachment theory suggests that parents have an influence on the child's ability to develop peer relationships, as well as on the form those relationships take. Laible and colleagues (2000) argue that by adolescence, peers may have more influence over peer relationships than parents, and therefore may be more influential in promoting adolescent adjustment than parents. It is still not clear whether parents and peers play similar or unique roles in adolescent attachment. One possibility is that there is a strong process of reorienting aspects of attachment from parents to peers. Relationships formed initially with parents are mirrored in the development of relationships with peers. Then these peer relationships influence the acquisition of social skills, intellectual development, and the formation of social identity in adolescence, mirroring the way that parent attachments influenced these factors in early childhood (Laible et al., 2000)

Friendships serve as a critical vehicle for the development and fulfillment of certain psychosocial needs (e.g., intimacy, identity, etc.), and are therefore significant in children's and adolescent's development (Hartup & Stevens, 1997). According to Erikson, friendships play an integral role in helping the developing adolescent understand himself in relation to the larger world. Friendships impact levels of social adjustment and

these friendships can similarly impact adolescent behavior (Erikson, 1980).

In the past century, adolescence was viewed as a period of life in which the support of the peer group gradually usurped the influence of parents. However, research has not supported the idea that parents and peers engage in conflict over values and behaviors. Instead, research shows that there is much continuity in parent-child relationships across middle childhood and adolescence (Laible et al., 2000). Even though adolescents increase their reliance on peers for support, the majority of adolescents continue to rely on their parents for emotional support and advice. Thus, one sees that adolescence is a period of growing autonomy and possibly changing connectedness to both parents and others (Laible et al., 2000).

Research has shown that peer relationships do not replace relationships with parents, but instead fulfill some distinct and overlapping needs. Freeman and Brown (2001) classified teenagers into attachment groups by asking teenagers to nominate their primary attachment figures, and by completing a projective measure. Results showed that on average, parents and peers were equally likely to be identified as primary attachment figures, but individual preference was strongly tied to attachment style (i.e., secure or insecure). Secure adolescents significantly favored mothers over best friends, boy/girlfriends, and fathers, while insecure adolescents indicated a strong preference for boy/girlfriends and best friends as their primary attachment figure (Freeman & Brown, 2001). This means that teenagers with secure attachments, according to Attachment Theory, may rely on their primary caregiver relationship as their continued source of support, while those who are insecure find peer relationships to be more supportive. Therefore, this study will consider peer and parental attachment to be separate constructs

and measure them separately.

Measuring Attachment

The most recent research on attachment theory with adolescents has used the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment to measure the multiple aspects of attachment or its equivalent for students with a lower reading level, the People in My Life (PIML) Scale (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Ridenour et al., 2006). On these measures, attachment is defined as “parents or peers serving as sources of psychological security.” Three different constructs exist in this measure for both parent and peer attachment: degree of mutual trust, quality of communication, and extent of anger and alienation (Ridenour et al., 2006).

The underlying structure of the PIML is intended to assess behavioral and cognitive aspects of attachments. This instrument measures three broad dimensions of attachment: “1) the positive affective/cognitive experience of trust in the accessibility and responsiveness of attachment figures, 2) the communication between student and parent and 3) the negative affective/cognitive experiences of anger or hopelessness resulting from unresponsive or inconsistently responsive attachment figures” (Armsden & Greenberg, pg. 5, 1987). The PIML was selected for use in this study because of its reading level and sound psychometric properties (Ridenour et al., 2006). The PIML was written to be on a 5th or 6th reading grade level equivalency. Its psychometric properties include strong reliability and validity, which will be reviewed in the results section.

Language Use and Attachment

While aforementioned studies discounted differences in attachment across ethnic groups, it is unclear if there are differences based on the reporting of speaking a primary language other than English. Students who speak English as a Second Language (ESL) are the fastest growing population in U.S. public schools. Language barriers can impede adjustment to living in the U.S., and youth are often impacted by the language barrier. Escamilla (2000) explains that students who are not yet fluent in English sometimes remain silent, and can appear withdrawn, moody, and fearful in school (Escamilla, 2000). Therefore, this is a portion of the population who may be at risk for low peer attachment.

Another interesting aspect of students from families that speak languages other than English is that children often serve as a translator for their parents. This reliance on children can result in a reversal in dependence that can threaten parental authority (Baptiste, 1993). In line with both Attachment and Social Control Theory, parent attachment among children from homes where a language other than English is spoken might be weakened due to these additional stressors on the relationship. These additional stressors may then lead to increased risk for victimization. Children might be at a greater risk for turning away from their cultural heritage and rebelling due to strains on parent-child relationships (Baptiste, 1993).

Furthermore, as adolescents from homes where English is not the primary language begin to think and behave more independently, they increasingly depend and seek advice from non-family members, such as friends. (Suarez-Orozco, 2008) These differences are critical to understand and explore, as the influence that parental attachment may have on susceptibility to victimization might differ considerably for

students from English-speaking homes versus non-English speaking homes.

Primary Language as a Measure of Acculturation

Several studies have explored the relationship and reliability of using primary language as a measure of acculturation. One study explored the participants' language preference as a measure of acculturation (Lee, 2008). Many studies have used the Short Acculturation Scale (SAS), which consists of four items, all of which focus on language— “In general, what language do you read and speak?” “What language do you usually speak at home?” “In which language do you usually talk?” and “What language do you usually speak with your friends,” and found this to be a reliable measure of acculturation (Wallen, Feldman & Anliker, 2004). Furthermore, interview language was found to be the strongest indicator of acculturation compared to other measures (Lee, 2008). Several studies across multiple disciplines have successfully used primary language as the proxy for acculturation (Gowen, Hayward, Killen, Robinson, & Taylor, 1999; Sundquist & Winkelby, 2000); thus, it has been used in this study to better understand this unique subset of students who may be at higher risk for victimization.

Language Use and Victimization

Many new immigrants experience tension between the cultural norms from their home country and popular cultural norms in the United States. They find that traditional values and behaviors are often inconsistent with American ways. While immigrant children internalize these new cultural norms, language, and value system rather quickly in comparison to their parents, these differing rates of acculturation often become a

source of conflict in immigrant families (Velez & Ungemack, 1995). Acculturation has also been associated with adolescent health-risk behaviors. Over the past decade, there has been increased research on the relevance of acculturation/enculturation to psychosocial development, obesity, physical and mental health, and service utilization (Lee, Sobal & Frongillo, 2003). The association made between these multiple risk factors and students at different levels of acculturation suggests the need to examine how primary language might contribute to student's vulnerability to be a victim of peer aggression at school.

Yu and colleagues (2003) research has demonstrated that children whose primary language spoken at home is other than English, are at a greater risk for school adjustment and psycho-social factors than their English only speaking peers. In a study examining acculturation of health and well-being among U.S. immigrants, Yu and colleagues (2003) studied Hispanic and Asian adolescents and analyzed the American data from the World Health Organization study of health behaviors in school children. Using data from youth in grades 6-10, the authors used language spoken at home as a proxy measure of immigration status and acculturation. This study found that adolescents who primarily speak a language other than English at home are at higher risk for psychosocial factors such as bullying, alienation from classmates and feelings that their parents are unable or unwilling to help them (Yu et al., 2003).

Yu and colleagues (2003) also found that those who speak a combination of languages are also at risk for being bullied and for high parental expectations. Their results suggest that youth who did not speak English at home were 2.0-4.5 times more likely to be bullied because of their race or religion than were youth who only spoke

English at home. Specifically, Non-Hispanic blacks in the non-English and mixed language groups were more likely to report feeling helpless and experiencing low self-confidence. Hispanics were more likely to report difficulty making new friends if Spanish was spoken at home. In all of these cases, the risk among the mixed-language group fell between those of the English and the non-English groups (Yu et al., 2003). However, this study did not examine immigrants from Africa and other growing immigrant populations, whose cultures are vastly different from Asians or Hispanics. Furthermore, this study did not examine attachment to parent and peers.

School Violence

Violence frequently occurs at school. Unfortunately, one aspect of violence in schools, specifically peer victimization, is a universal experience (Ngwe et al., 2004). Rates of violence vary by school districts based upon socioeconomic status of the community, parental and school involvement, and educational climate and policy (Lehr, Johnson, Bremer, Cosio, & Thompson, 2004). Establishing a qualified list of risk factors for school violence may help target areas of need. Despite the lack of information on the etiology of school violence (Bullis et al., 2001), several interventions have been developed to address this problem. One aspect that may better guide future intervention development is obtaining better information about some factors that put children at increased risk of being victimized.

In 2004, students aged 12-18 were victims of approximately 583,000 violent crimes (Ngwe, et al., 2004). In 2005, 8% of students were threatened or injured with a weapon on school property in the previous 12 months (Nofziger & Kurtz, 2009).

Another study has estimated that up to 30% of 6th to 10th graders in the United States were involved in bullying as a bully, victim, or both (Nansel, Overpeck, & Haynie, 2001). Even with reductions in the overall rates of violence, this continued danger to children remains.

Victimization as a Form of School Violence

School violence has been broadly defined to include acts of violence (physical, verbal, emotional and psychological) and/or crimes occurring within an educational institution, and/or in transit between home and school. Violence includes carrying weapons and engaging in fights as well as more subtle offenses such as name-calling, teasing, offensive touching, racial, ethnic, cultural or sexual slurs, and bullying. In fact, violence is sometimes defined as any act that negatively impacts the internal school climate (Hernandez & Seem, 2004). In this study, victimization includes getting attacked without provocation (jumped), harassed (made fun of, shoved, tripped, or spit at), forced to do something one doesn't want to do by another student, having property destroyed by another student, and being excluded from an activity on purpose. For the purposes of this study it is imperative to clearly define the constructs under examination. There are current bodies of research on both victimization and bullying. Since there is considerable overlap between the two constructs, the relevant research regarding bullying and victimization will be reviewed.

Victimization and Ethnicity

The relationship between ethnicity and victimization of school-age children has not been completely explored and various inconclusive findings exist. Hanish and

Guerra (2000) found that risk for victimization varied by ethnicity and school context. The research found that attending ethnically integrated schools was associated with a significantly higher risk of victimization for White children and a slightly lower risk of victimization for African-American children and did not affect the risk of victimization for Hispanic children (Hanish & Guerra, 2000).

Characteristics of Victims

Children and adolescents who bully generate their power over others through their physical stature, age, gender, popularity, or awareness of another's vulnerability (McKenney et al., 2006). Another aspect of victimizing others is power dynamics between groups. Such victimization or marginalization can be based on sexual orientation, economic status, disability and racial or cultural background.

There are both contextual and individual factors that impact the likelihood of being a victim at school. Research that has explored victims through demographic data found that victims tend to be young, male, a racial minority, poor and live in disadvantaged or high-crime communities (Lauritsen & White, 2001). Also important is who the victim is in regular contact with and whether the individuals who are victimized are involved in deviant behavior themselves (Nofziger, 2009). The risk for victimization substantially increases through association with deviant peers (Nofziger & Kurtz, 2005). Those who engage in deviant behaviors tend to seek out targets that are easily accessible (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), thus making their own peers more susceptible to becoming victims (Barboza et al., 2009).

In addition to demographic risk factors, studies have revealed a number of

behavioral and social risk factors that work singly and in combination to influence the likelihood that children will be targeted for victimization. For instance, being physically weak (Olweus, 1993), displaying submissive behavior (Olweus, 1993; Schwartz, Dodge, & Coie, 1993), displaying aggressive behavior (Hanish & Guerra, 2000; Olweus, 1993;), having poor self-esteem (Graham & Juvonen, 1998), and being rejected by peers (Crick & Bigbee, 1998; Hanish & Guerra, 2000; Hodges, Malone, & Perry, 1997) have all been identified as risk factors for being victimized. Both aggressive behavior and being rejected by peers emerged as strong predictors of victimization, with aggressive behavior serving as a particularly strong predictor among younger children and rejection serving as a particularly strong predictor among older children (Hanish & Guerra, 2000).

Victimization at School: Prevention and Intervention

Researchers have argued that efforts to prevent peer victimization should be guided by an understanding of high risk populations (Nansel, Overpeck, & Haynie, 2003). In order to prevent such phenomenon from occurring, there must be a complete understanding of the dynamics of victimization. There is a complex interplay of individual and contextual factors that increase the likelihood of victimization occurring by peers at school (Hanish & Guerra, 2000).

A critical question involves, to what degree can peer victimization be prevented? Research indicates that interventions are more effective in the younger grades (Reinke & Herman, 2002). The most successful efforts have been put forth by teachers and other school personnel, such as counselors and social workers implementing school-wide behavior support programs (Berger, 2008). Despite early intervention being the optimal

period for outcomes, there is still a need for middle and high school interventions that target the characteristics that lead to students being victimized by others. This study aims to inform interventions that will reduce the likelihood of victimization for urban students with varying levels of attachment and English language use.

Victims' Levels of Parental Attachment

Existing research provides a rationale for the hypothesis that high levels of attachment to parents may correspond with lower levels of victimization in students (Laible & Carlo, 2004). However, conflicting findings also exist, making the overall picture less clear (Aseltine, 1996). More evidence is needed to understand the role of parent attachment on school violence, and other factors that might mediate this relationship. High level of attachment to parents is often considered a protective factor for adolescents (Laible & Carlo, 2004; Laible et al., 2000). High levels of perceived maternal support and low levels of maternal rigid control were related to adolescents' reports of sympathy, social competence, and self-worth. Support and warmth from parents continue to play an important role in fostering healthy socio-emotional development across adolescence, even when the support of peers becomes increasingly important (Laible et al., 2000; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Children are also presumed to acquire positive social bonds through positive relationships with parents. According to attachment theory, these emotional bonds then generalize to others (Putallaz & Heflin, 1990)

There is evidence that the families of victims are sometimes characterized by overly protective mothers who may discourage the development of independence and

self-confidence in their children as well as fathers who are distant and overly critical or permissive (Duncan, 2004). Furthermore parental maltreatment of children in the family, including physical, emotional, and sexual abuse, has been associated with both bullying and victimization behavior in adolescents (Shields & Cicchetti, 2001). Existing research provides strong rationale for the hypothesis that high levels of attachment to parents may correspond with lower levels of victimization and that social support systems mediate bullying behavior.

Peer Attachment and Victimization

There are conflicting findings regarding the roles that peer attachment plays during adolescence. Research on friendship and support indicates that close relationships with peers promotes healthy adolescent adjustment (Coie & Dodge, 1997). However, there is research that indicates the frequency and/or type of interaction with peers can increase the likelihood of experiencing some forms of victimization (Agnew, 2006; Barboza, 2009). Youth who associate with delinquent peers are more likely to become delinquent themselves (Agnew, 2006; Prinstein, Boergers, & Spirito, 2001).

Strong, inter-peer relationships have been linked with higher perceived self-worth, high levels of perspective taking and pro-social behavior, and decreased risk of emotional and behavioral problems (Coie & Dodge, 1997). In this study, children who experienced peer rejection were more likely to act aggressively, suggesting that children are more likely to participate in violence if they are socially rejected by their peers. Bergen, Karimpour, and Rodkin (2008) found that bullies and their victims are rejected

by their peers. Therefore, it is likely that students who have strong peer attachment and are not rejected by peers are less likely to be victimized. In the bully-victim dyad, bullies seek out vulnerable peers to be their victims while victims appear to make themselves available targets (Bergen, Karimpour & Rodkin, 2008).

Morrison, Furlong, and Smith (1994) found that having a high number of friends was related to lower rates of personal violence (i.e. being a victim of violence) and/or higher perceptions of safety (Morrison, Furlong, & Smith, 1994). This study also determined that peer support was significantly less available to victims of violence than to peers who had not been victimized. These studies suggest that higher peer support is related to higher rates of violence, whereas lower peer support is related to higher rates of being victimized.

“Language spoken at home” and the Relationship between Peer and Parent Attachment and Victimization

Students from cultures that differ from the dominant school culture will face more obstacles to forming secure peer attachments, regardless of the strength of the parental attachment. Even in cases where a child is fluent in English, there are other cultural aspects that differ from that of the dominant culture that may present challenges to students adjusting to a new school and/or society. Some of these variables include differing expectations of behavior, loss or reduction of effective coping resources, language inadequacy, lack of social and financial resources, stress and frustration associated with unemployment, feelings of not belonging to the popular culture, and a sense of anxious disorientation in response to the unfamiliar environment (Velez &

Ungemack, 1995). Also, the experience of being pulled by traditional values, norms, and customs and those in the larger society—parent-child conflict experienced by child's encounter with new culture through school further complicate interactions (Hovey, 2000). In many cultures, children are not expected to line up in straight lines, or hold pencils prior to attending school, and neither children nor parents are accustomed to formal school settings (Zehr, 2001). Social skills are highly correlated with adjustment, and since social skills are highly dependent upon learned behavior, which often occurs in school, those who have not been exposed to these behaviors are at a disadvantage.

Challenges for children from homes where language other than English is spoken include the following. Research shows that some individuals who are from homes where a language other than English is spoken experience acculturation stress (Hahm, Lahiff, & Guterman, 2003). This acculturation stress can include difficulty finding social support, having a non-hopeful outlook, and facing communication barriers. One study examined the degree of acculturation and parental attachment that predicted alcohol use among Asian-American adolescents, and showed that acculturation itself was not a risk factor unless it was accompanied by a low level of parental attachment (Hahm et al., 2003). The consequences that have been associated with refugee children are depression, somatic complaints, sleep disturbances, social withdrawal, violence and antisocial behavior (Kia-Keating & Ellis, 2007).

Parents reported that limited English had negatively impacted their ability to stay involved in their children's schooling (Wu, Robinson, Yang, Hart, Olsen & Porter, 2002). Children of immigrants often act as language translators for their parents and report conflicting feelings. While some students report feeling proud that they are able to help

their parents, others reported feelings of frustration (Valdes, 2002). In addition to a lack of communication and attachment to their parents, students in homes where language other than English is spoken often must choose between the values of their parents and those of the larger school culture.

Acculturated adolescents who feel more comfortable with English than their parents report frustration in expressing their thoughts and feelings to their parents (Takeuchi, Chung, Lin, Shen, Kurasaki, Chun, & Sue, 1998). Sometimes this lack of meaningful communication between parents and adolescents is perceived by adolescents as an absence of parental interest and involvement in their lives. According to Shen and Takeuchi, highly acculturated Chinese-Americans reported that they felt less understood by their mothers than unacculturated Chinese-Americans (Shen & Takeuchi, 2001).

Many immigrants attempt to recreate the strong social support systems, tight-knit communities, and extended family systems left behind in their countries of origin. These social networks can become a protective mechanism against social isolation, offering better education, community life and safety (Woolcook, 1998). On the other hand, social networks that are fragile and create excessive demand on individuals within the network can become detrimental to the health and well-being of its members. Immigrants who find themselves outside of these established immigrant communities and who are not fully integrated into their non-immigrant community of residence, often experience social isolation. Social isolation is a risk factor for mental health disorders and deviance (Yu et al., 2003). Lack of social support is a contributing factor to the higher rates of depression and alienation among immigrant youth of all racial and ethnic groups as compared to their native-born counter-parts (Yu et al., 2003).

Research focusing on immigrant families (Velez & Ungemack, 1995) found that for many immigrant youth, the gradual weakening of parental control and changes in family structure are often accompanied by increasing peer influences. Using social learning theory to interpret findings, they found that peer modeling was found to be the strongest predictor of Puerto Rican youth's drug involvement (Velez & Ungemack, 1995). Research also shows that immigrant youth are particularly vulnerable to peer pressure. Blake, Ledsky, Goodenow, and O'Donnell (2001), found that recent immigrant youth were more likely to have less parent support, experience more peer pressures to engage in risk-taking behaviors, even though they avoid risky behaviors. Recent immigrant youth also reported lack of confidence to refuse substances (Blake et al., 2001).

In another study, attachment to parents was inversely related to non-delinquent status among 12-17 year-old immigrants (Redondo, Martin, Fernandez, & Lopez, 1986, as cited by Armsden and Greenberg, 1987). While the current study did not explore a cross-cultural comparison of experiences with school violence or attachment, the impact of the primary language spoken in the home (used as a proxy for acculturation) on attachment and school violence will be examined.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Participants and Selection Process

This study was part of a larger project “Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative Evaluation” examining the impact of a multi-sourced federal grant that funds a comprehensive approach to Youth Violence Prevention. A total of 1277 students were anonymously surveyed in the fall of 2008. A stratified, random sampling procedure was used to select 84 first-period classrooms, from students in grades 6-12 in schools within an urban-fringe school district. This was approximately 50% of the total student enrollment. Schools included eight elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school with two campuses.

The participating district in this study reported high rates of harassment/bullying among students; approximately 35% of 6, 7, 8, and 10th graders report that harassment/bullying is often a problem at their school (Preliminary Evaluation Paper SAW, 2008). Physical fighting between students was extremely high; approximately 52% of elementary and middle school students reported that student fighting is often a problem. Fifty percent of students in the middle and high school reported that gang-related activity was sometimes or often a problem at their school. In the high school, 9% of students reported that they carried a handgun or weapon in the previous school year, while 8% of middle school students reported this offense.

Of the 1277 participants, 645 were females, and 632 were males. There were no

exclusionary criteria for classrooms. This study evaluated the middle school and high school grades, which include children from age 12 through 18. Of all teachers willing to participate, 84 were randomly selected through a stratified random sampling procedure. Approximately 50% of participating students received free or reduced lunch. Across the total sample, students were relatively evenly represented in each grade (each grade contributed between 8%-20% of the sample; see Table 1). Students were also representative of the diverse surrounding local community (see Table 2). The percentage of students whose primary home language was something other than English was 16%, while 84 % report English as the primary language spoken at home. A range of 15 identifiable languages other than English were listed in open-ended responses. A third variable of English and non-English was created, to separate students who report both languages as the “primary language spoken at home.”

Table 1: The mean grade level of students in the population ($m = 8.6$, $sd = 1.94$).

<i>Grade</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Sixth	257	19.8
Seventh	204	15.7
Eighth	169	13.0
Ninth	211	16.2
Tenth	194	14.9
Eleventh	154	11.9
Twelfth	110	8.5
Total	1299	100

In this study language was measured in an open-ended format. Students self-reported their primary languages spoken within the home. Because the primary interest within this study was not the difference among the sample due to specific languages, but rather due to differences from the norm, each participant was grouped by speaking

English only, another language only, or English and another language. There was considerable variety in the languages reported on the survey. Students identified Arabic, Jamaican (Patwa), French, Spanish, English / German, Chinese, French/Haitian, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Cantonese, Islamic, Creole, Patios, Muslim, Trinidadian, Laos, and a large number of African languages including Ga- Swahili, You ha (Housa-Nigerian native language), African, Elalahge, Ma damgo (Mandingo) Congo, Bassa, Kiswahili, Twi, Mende, Lorma, Haran, Nigerian, Yoruba, Liberian, Tre, Mada, Ethiopian, Eve, Susu, and Urdu.

Table 2 Ethnic breakdown of participating students

<i>Ethnicity</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
African-American	843	65.5%
Multiple	209	16.4%
Other	104	8.2%
Caucasian	38	3.0%
Native American /American	33	2.6%
Indian		
Latino/Hispanic	16	1.3%
Asian/Pacific Islander	14	1.1%

Procedure

Data for this study were collected as part of a larger wide-scale evaluation of a federal “Safe Schools/Healthy Students” (SS/HS) Initiative in the fall of 2008. The SS/HS federal program supported implementation of integrated, comprehensive, community-wide, and community-specific plans that addressed the SS/HS Initiative’s six programmatic elements. These elements included: safe school environment; alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use (ATOD) and violence prevention in early intervention programs; school and community mental health prevention and treatment intervention

services; early childhood psychosocial and emotional development programs; and supporting and connecting schools and communities.

Data were anonymously collected on students' perceptions of school and community environment, dangers of alcohol, tobacco and other drug use, and relationships with teachers, adults and peers. The survey also asked about school-based violent behaviors, mental health services received, and involvement in extracurricular activities in the school and community. Demographic information collected included gender, school, race/ethnicity, town, and primary language spoken at home.

As part of a larger study, the same survey was administered in both 2007 and 2008; however two measures were added in the 2008 version: (1) a measure targeting student perception of attachments with peer and parents, the People in My Life Scale (PIML) and (2) language spoken in the home, which was used as a proxy for acculturation. The current study uses data collected only in the fall of 2008 because the two added measures were essential to examine the proposed research questions.

A total of 84 classrooms participated in the survey, with approximately 20 students per class. Class size ranged from 4 to 30 students per class. The original 2008 sample included 1490 potential students, but only 1360 completed surveys were collected. Uncollected surveys were due to student absences and students choosing to opt-out of the survey (11 students opted-out of the survey). The classrooms sampled were from all 10 of the district's elementary (8), middle (1) and high school (1). All study procedures were overseen by the Temple University Institutional Review Board.

Letters were sent home to the parents of all participating students to provide information about the study and allowed parents to opt-out of their child's participation in

the survey. Parents were given the contact information of the Director of Pupil services if they wished to review the survey, or had any other study related questions. A total of two parents opted out of the survey prior to its administration. Students were also informed that completing the survey was optional, and were given the opportunity to decline. A total of 11 students chose not to participate, although they did not provide a reason for declining.

In order to collect the surveys, two graduate research assistants from Temple University organized and planned the survey administration with a representative from each school. The research assistant and school representative determined a date for survey administration, and sent out the parent letter one week prior to that date. The research assistant emailed instructions to teachers and also arranged for the school representative to place a hard copy of the directions in teacher's mailboxes one week before survey administration.

Research assistants arrived at each school the day of data collection and delivered labeled envelopes with copies of student surveys, pens, and instructions to each participating teacher. Teachers read instructions and passed out surveys and pens to each student in their class who did not have a parent request to have their child not participate. Research assistants were available to answer questions and aid in survey distribution. All surveys were completed anonymously and took approximately 35 minutes for students to complete. Research assistants then collected surveys in envelopes and recorded the number of completed surveys.

Measures

Measuring Victimization

In this study, students were asked to rate how often they were victims of violence in school. Relational as well as physical aggression was studied (see Table 3 for a list of all variables). These questions included rating how frequently students were (1) jumped, (2) harassed (i.e., a student made fun of you, shoved you, tripped you or spit on you), (3) forced to do something they didn't want to do by another student, (4) had property destroyed by another, (5) excluded from an activity on purpose. Items that ask students if they have been victimized by relational aggression look at harm caused through social relationships (e.g. purposefully being excluded from a social activity, having rumors spread about one; Prinstein et al., 2001). The items from the present study, which examined relation aggression included: (1) a student made fun of you, (2) a student spread rumors about you, and (3) a student excluded you from an activity on purpose.

The student survey designed for the larger Safe Schools / Health Students study was adapted from two existing measures; the Department of Labor's National Longitudinal Study of Youth Survey and the Youth Risk Behavior Survey, and was designed to measure Government Performance Results Act Indicators to meet the reporting requirements of the SS/HS grant evaluation. Eleven items asked for information on student participation in both school- and community-based extracurricular activities, perceptions of school safety and climate, and the frequency of participation in various risk-taking behaviors. The variable "getting jumped" is from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Bearman, Jones, & Udry, 1997). Items that captured being the victim of both overt and relational aggression were selected from the Youth Risk

Behavior Survey (Leary, 2003).

The Victimization Scale is an adopted measure from self-report scales that identify multiple subtypes of peer victimization. This scale includes indirect and relational victimization as well as more overt verbal and physical behaviors. One item on the scale tapped more violent victimization (“got jumped”). Thus, it was separated into a category of its own. Principal components analyses yielded single-factor solutions (based on an Eigenvalue greater than 1.0). These items were selected because, by representing both verbal and physical aspects of victimization, they best captured the overall nature of peer victimization.

Anger/emotional detachment from parents (Armsden & Greenberg, 1984) was captured by the PIML alienation subscale, since frequent and intense anger or detachment are seen as responses to caregiver neglect.

Table 3 PIML Parent Alienation Subscale

My parents don't understand what I am going through these days.

I get upset easily with my parents.

I feel angry with my parents.

It's hard for me to talk to my parents.

I feel scared in my home.

Table 4 PIML Peer Alienation Subscale

My friends don't understand what I am going through these days.

I get upset easily with my friends.

I feel angry with my friends.

It's hard for me to talk to my friends.

I feel scared with my friends.

I think my friends are a bad influence on me.

I wish I had more friends.

Measuring Attachment

A second measure, the People In My Life Scale (PIML), was adapted from the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA) developed by Armsden and Greenberg (1987) to measure adolescents' perceptions of their relationships with parents and peers. The PIML has high overall internal consistency (Parent, $r=.88$ and Peer $r=.90$; Ridenour, Cook, & Greenberg, 1995). The peer and parental attachment scales also have respective subscales including communication, trust, and alienation. Internal consistencies for the subscales were slightly lower, ranging from .65 (parental alienation) to .90 (peer trust). The PIML has been shown to have high validity correlating with established measures of behavioral and emotional illnesses and well-being (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987).

These measurement qualities hold true over a range of ages (i.e., through adolescence) and across ethnic groups. The PIML has high internal consistency (parent attachment $\alpha = .88$, peer attachment $\alpha = .90$). The PIML also has Convergent/Discriminant Validity with the following scales: *Reynolds Child Depression Scale*, *Health Resources Inventory*, *Delinquency Rating Scale for Self and Others*, *Child Behavior Checklist*. All of these measures were cross-validated. Correlations were in

hypothesized directions, yet small enough to support discriminant validity (Ridenour et al., 2006).

The PIML is designed to measure 10- to 12-year-old children's representations of their relationships with parents, peers, and teachers (Cook, Greenberg, & Kusche, 1995). The questions from the IPPA were adapted by Greenberg for the PIML in order to be understood by younger children. The PIML follows the model of the IPPA; however, some items were deleted or altered to be more easily comprehended by the target population. Students in the present studied school district comprise a large percentage of below-level readers. According to the 2007-2008 Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) Report Card, Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) results revealed that 77% of eleventh grade students were not on grade-level for reading, with 57% scoring at below basic and 20% scoring at basic. In the 7th and 8th grades, 43% of students were not reading at grade-level. There is also a population of 2% English-language learners within this district, as reported by the Director of Pupil Services. Therefore, it was decided to use this adapted measure to ensure better student comprehension and increase the likelihood of obtaining valid results. Furthermore, this study focuses on the middle school student, whose ages match the PIML norming population. Responses to this measure were made on a 4-point scale ranging from "almost never or never true" to "almost always or always true."

Table 5: Variables

Variable	Description	How it was measured.
Student Attachment to Parents	<u>Trust</u> : Global rating of how well student trusts parents and receives positive regard from parent.	A Likert-type scale (1-4) was used to assess student perception of parents' respect, acceptance, and caring (From Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree).
	<u>Communication</u> : Student perception of their own and their parents' communication style in regards to their mutual relationship as well as quality of relationship.	A Likert-type scale (1-4) was used to assess student perception of parents' awareness of child's feelings, capacity for communication, and approachability of parent by child (From Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree).
	<u>Alienation</u> : General feelings of anger and disconnect between student and parent.	A Likert-type scale (1-4) was used to assess student perception feelings of anger and disconnect associated with parent-child relationship (From Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree).
Student Attachment to Peers	<u>Trust</u> : Global rating of how well students trust peers and receives positive regard from peers.	A Likert-type scale (1-4) was used to assess student perception of peers' respect, acceptance, and caring (From Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree).
	<u>Communication</u> : Student perception of their own and their peers' communication style in regards to their mutual relationship.	A Likert-type scale (1-4) was used to assess student perception of peers' awareness of child's feelings, capacity for communication, and approachability of peer by student (From Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree).

Table 5: Variables, Continued

	<u>Alienation</u> : General feelings of anger and disconnect between student and peers.	A Likert-type scale (1-4) was used to assess student perception of their own feelings of anger and disconnect associated with peer relationships (From Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree).
Primary Language Spoken at Home	An open-ended question asking students the primary language spoken at their home.	English Only, Other, & Other and English.
Outcomes-Frequency of Victimization	A student made fun of you, called you names, or insulted you; A student spread rumors about you; A student threatened you; A student pushed you, shoved you, tripped you, or spit on you; A student tried to make you do things that you did not want to do; A student left you out of activities on purpose; A student took something of yours without your permission or destroyed something of yours on purpose.	A Likert-type scale of (1-3) was used to assess the frequency of victimization (Often, Sometimes, Never).

Data Analysis

Collected surveys were numbered and cleaned before scanning. Surveys were then scanned and transferred into a Statistics Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) database, and data were cleaned to ensure that all values were within appropriate response ranges. The data distributions were evaluated for missing data points. Surveys in which all key demographic data were missing (e.g. gender, grade or school) were eliminated from the sample, unless at least one of these variables was able to be determined. Missing variables could be determined due to nature of data collection (e.g.

surveys were collected from classrooms as whole, all of whose members are the same grade). After this operation was completed, the total usable surveys remaining were 1299. Prior to running analyses, all data were examined to ensure that distributions met with standard statistical assumptions. Demographic data were evaluated using descriptive statistics and frequencies.

The data analysis for this study included exploratory analyses as well as tests of research questions. Various measures in this study were selected composites from validated instruments. Factor analyses were conducted on the PIML scale as well as the violence items to determine salient factors. The variable of “language spoken at home” has been studied previously, revealing inconclusive findings. Thus, this variable was examined as a predictor of school victimization and/or attachment. Finally, although the literature does not suggest significant differences in relationships between attachment and victimization by gender, ethnicity, and grade level, these analyses were conducted in an exploratory manner.

Variable Composites

Independent Variables

Both measures of peer attachment (27 items) and parental attachment (20 items) were scored to determine an overall composite value for each, as designed on the PIML. This scale was scored by adding responses for trust and communication and subtracting alienation response values. Higher values reflect higher levels of attachment. Raw scores were used, as well as a transformation variable of these scores into high and low categories.

A factor analysis was conducted to determine if the constructs on the PIML were

reflected in the results of this study. An exploratory factor analysis was run and different factors emerged than those of the established PIML. Instead of four separate factors: parent trust, parent communication, peer trust, peer communication all loaded onto the first factor, followed by parent alienation and peer alienation. Preliminary analyses use the established PIML factor structure. The exploratory section of the results includes analyses using the observed factor structure (Table 16).

The primary language spoken at home was the only open-ended survey item. A dummy variable was created for the language variable: English = 0 and non-English = 1.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The present study examined the relative influence of peer and parental attachment, as well as the role of the language spoken at home on a student's reported victimization. The results are discussed in two sections. The first section includes results from descriptive analyses, such as demographic data of participants, and key variables of the study. The second section includes statistical analyses to answer the proposed research questions and psychometric properties of the instrument. It is important to note that this study entails a very large sample size and therefore there are more significant statistics than would be found in a smaller sample size. Therefore, the clinical (or practical) significance will be discussed as well as the statistical significance.

Descriptive Analyses

Table 6: Demographic Characteristics of Sample

Variable	Percentage of <i>N</i>
Grade	
Sixth	18.7
Seventh	15.9
Eight	13.2
Ninth	16.4
Tenth	14.9
Eleventh	12.2
Twelfth	8.8

Table 6: Demographic Characteristics of Sample, Continued

Gender	
Female	50.7
Male	49.3
Ethnicity	
African American	65.5
Multiple	16.4
Other	8.2
Caucasian	3.0
Native American or American Indian	2.6
Latino/Hispanic	1.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.1
English Only Language	84
English and Other Language	9.6
Language Other than English	6.7
Scale	<i>M (SD)</i>
Peer Trust	32.3 (11.1)
Parent Trust	37.0 (12.5)
Total Victimization	9.9 (3.2)
Got Jumped	1.1 (.35)

Note: $N = 1270$

Internal Consistency Reliability Analyses

To confirm the reliability of the instrument used in this study, each scale was examined for internal consistency. In general, internal consistencies of the measures were reliable and within acceptable limits. Cronbach's Alpha coefficients found in this study were comparable to ones reported in the instruments' technical manual or available literature (Ridenour & Greenberg, 2006). Table 7 outlines the reliability coefficients of those found within the present study and those reported by the test developers.

Table 7: Internal Consistency Reliability Coefficients

Scales and Subscales	Test Developer	Present Study
People In My Life Scale		
Parent Trust	.87	.92
Parent Communication	.76	.88
Parent Alienation	.65	.75
Table 7: Continued		
Peer Trust	.90	.94
Peer Communication	.80	.88
Peer Alienation	.70	.78
Peer Total	.90	.88
Parent Total	.88	.86
Victimization Items		
Including Item “Got Jumped”		.84
Not Including Item “Got Jumped”		.85

Preliminary Analyses of Key Variables

Prior to running any analyses, all variables were examined to ensure that they met with statistical assumptions of normality. There were some expectations that one variable would not be normally distributed due to the nature of the variable (i.e., getting jumped; it was anticipated that the occurrence of this item would be low due to the severity of its nature). A descriptive analysis and visual inspection of the distribution of scores were conducted to examine the degree of skewness and kurtosis. One item showed nonnormality: “Got jumped.” This variable was positively skewed with scores clustering to low occurrences of the incident (i.e., most students reported “rarely” or “never” to this item). Because data for this item violated assumptions of normality, it was decided to remove this item from the victimization scale and instead to analyze this item with non-parametric statistics.

Analysis of Victimization

Although the results of the exploratory factor analysis revealed that all items load on to one factor, there are theoretical and face validity issues that might indicate the need to analyze some of the particular items separately. First, relational and physical acts of aggression result in different forms of victimization. In this case, being jumped or pushed/shoved are qualitatively different from being made fun of, or excluded from an activity. Face validity also suggests that getting jumped might be a more severe form of victimization, capturing something quite different from the other items, when measured singly or in combination. Thus, for all subsequent analyses, the following item was removed from the overall victimization scale: “You got jumped on school property.” Table 8 reveals factor loadings of the victimization survey items. Table 9 reveals the internal reliability of the victimization factor; the internal reliability without including the extreme item “got jumped” is slightly higher than with the full scale.

Table 8: Factor Loadings of Victimization Items

Factor Item	Factor Loading
A student made fun of you, called you names, or insulted you.	.75
A student threatened you	.71
A student pushed you, shoved you, tripped you, or spit on you.	.77
A student tried to make you do things that you did not want to do.	.76
A student left you out of activities on purpose.	.63
A student took something of yours without your permission or destroyed something of yours on purpose.	.73

Table 9: Internal Reliability of Victimization Factor

Factor	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient Alpha
Victimization	10.9	3.30	.84
Without “Got Jumped”			.85

The first research question explored whether parental and peer attachment were related to victimization. Pearson correlations were computed to see if the constructs of peer attachment and parental attachment significantly correlated with the degree of reported victimization (see Table 10).

Table 10: Correlations between Victimization and Attachment Subscales Victimization

PIML Total Parent	-.21**
PIML Total Peer	-.13**
PIML Parent Trust	-.18**
PIML Parent Communication	-.13**
PIML Parent Alienation	.20**
PIML Peer Trust	-.10**
PIML Peer Communication	.02
PIML Peer Alienation	.20**

Results showed that all but one of the variables correlated with victimization. Specifically, communication with peers did not correlate significantly with the frequency of victimization at school.

Results showed that higher rates of victimization were correlated with lower trust of parents, ($r(1268) = -.18, p = .01$), lower trust of peers ($r(1268) = -.10, p = .01$), and lower levels of communication with parents ($r(1268) = -.13, p = .01$). Furthermore, if students experienced higher levels of peer alienation, they were more likely to report victimization in school ($r(1268) = .20, p = .01$). Overall, lower levels of attachment indicated higher reported frequency of victimization.

The second research question examined whether parental attachment or peer attachment accounted for more of the variance in victimization. A multiple regression analysis was conducted using the scales of total peer attachment and total parent

attachment as the predictors and the victimization composite score as the criterion. Diagnostics were run on all regressions, and the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was determined. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Full-Scale Multiple Regression Analysis

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE(B)</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>sr</i> ²
(Constant)	13.72	0.36		38.68	< .001	
PIML Total Parent	-0.05	0.01	-0.19	-6.66	< .001	.03
PIML Total Peer	-0.03	0.01	-0.09	-3.29	.001	.01

Note: $R^2 = .05, p < .01$.

Results indicated that both parent attachment and peer attachment were statistically significant predictors of victimization, although practical significance was low (Sun, Pan, & Wang, 2010). Parent Attachment accounts for 3% of the variance in reported victimization above and beyond the variation explained by peer attachment; similarly, peer attachment accounts independently for 1% of the variation in victimization. Controlling for collinearity between the composite predictors, parent attachment explains more variation in victimization than peer attachment. Again, however, the practical effect size is minimal.

Parent and peer attachments, examined together, predict 5% of the variation in reported victimization. Next, the particular contribution of subscales (i.e., trust, communication, and alienation) comprising both parent and peer attachment were examined to explore the relationship of each with victimization more closely. A multiple regression was run with the PIML subscale scores as predictors and the total

victimization score as the criterion variable (see Table 12). Again, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was determined.¹

Table 12: Full-Scale Multiple Regression Analysis

	<i>B</i>	<i>SE(B)</i>	β	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>sr</i> ²
(Constant)	11.17	.69		16.30	< .001	
PIML Parent Trust	-.05	.02	-.11	-2.45	.015	.03
PIML Parent Communication	.00	.03	.00	.00	.999	< .01
PIML Parent Alienation	.11	.03	.11	3.58	< .001	.01
PIML Peer Trust	-.08	.02	-.17	-3.92	< .001	.01
PIML Peer Communication	.15	.04	.16	3.71	< .001	.01
PIML Peer Alienation	.12	.02	.15	5.07	< .001	.02

Note: $R^2 = .09$, $p < .01$.

Due to collinearity, the variables of Parental Trust and Parental Communication are not contributing unique variance with the PIML model. Therefore, the Parental Trust and Parental Communication scales were found to be non-significant in the full scale multiple regression. Later analyses demonstrate the observed factor. All three subscales of attachment were significant predictors of victimization, with each subscale contributing separately and significantly, with the exception of Parental Trust and Parental Communication. Although they were statistically significant predictors of victimization, there was not clinical significance in the findings; very little of the variance was explained by these variables.

The third research question explored whether students who spoke different languages at home demonstrated different levels of victimization and/or attachment. To

¹ The diagnostics of the VIF indicated that one subscale was over the limit (3). Parent trust was 3.02, though results did not change when this factor was removed from the regression. Parent Trust and Parent Communication are highly correlated and may actually comprise one factor.

determine if reported rates of school-based victimization and attachment differed as a function of the language spoken within the home, a multivariate analysis of variance was conducted with victimization, parent attachment, and peer attachment as dependent variables, and language spoken at home as the independent variable. The results showed a significant effect for the dependent variables in relation to the student's language spoken at home ($\lambda(1188) = .97, p < .001$; see Table 2.0).

Table 13: Means and Standard Deviations by Language Groups

	Language	Mean	Std. Deviation
Victimization	English Only	10.78	3.12
	Other Only	11.69	3.53
	English and Other	12.11	4.08
Total Parent Attachment	English Only	37.33	12.43
	Other Only	35.50	13.33
	English and Other	37.04	13.76
Total Peer Attachment	English Only	32.66	10.95
	Other Only	29.43	11.98
	English and Other	34.16	10.51

Table 14: MANOVA for Language Groups and Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	<i>df</i> 1	<i>df</i> 2	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial Eta Squared</i>
Victimization	2	1185	10.82	< .001	.018
Total Parent Attachment	2	1185	0.8	.45	.001
Total Peer Attachment	2	1185	4.59	.01	.008

Note: Wilks' $\lambda = .97, p < .001$

The multivariate analysis of variance demonstrated a significant difference between language groups based on reported victimization ($F(2,1185) = 10.82, p < .001$), and peer attachment ($F(2,1185) = 4.59, p = .01$), but not based on parent attachment, ($F(2,1185) = 0.80, p = .45$). Tukey HSD post hoc analyses showed students who report speaking only English at home ($M = 10.78, SD = 3.12$) report significantly less

victimization than students who speak English *and* another language ($M = 12.11, SD = 4.08, p < .05$). However, there is no significant difference between speaking English at home or another language at home ($M = 11.69, SD = 3.53, p < .05$). Additionally, speaking only a language other than English at home ($M = 29.40, SD = 11.98$), compared with English speakers ($M = 32.70, SD = 10.95$) and multi-language speakers ($M = 34.20, SD = 10.51$), corresponds with lower levels of peer attachment, $p < .05$.

Students varied on their level of victimization according to their language group. Post hoc analyses were conducted to determine if such differences occurred across specific victimization items. Victimization was broken down by individual item and compared across the three language groups (see Table 15).

Table 15: MANOVA for Language Group and Victimization Items

Dependant Variable	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
A student made fun of you, called you names, or insulted you.	2.68	5.15	.006	.009
A student spread rumors about you.	.44	.86	.425	.001
A student threatened you.	.81	2.10	.123	.004
A student pushed you, shoved you, tripped you, or spit on you.	3.98	12.21	.000	.020
A student tried to make you do things that you did not want to do.	2.79	9.94	.000	.017

Table 15: MANOVA for Language Group and Victimization Items, Continued

A student left you out of activities on purpose.	2.98	9.64	.000	.016
A student took something of yours without your permission or destroyed something of yours on purpose.	3.78	9.56	.000	.016
	7.000	1179.000	.000	
	14.000	2358.000	.000	

There were significant differences between language groups on specific victimization items. Students that only spoke English at home reported significantly lower levels of victimization of the following types, “a student made fun of you, called you names or insulted you,” “a student pushed you, shoved you, tripped you, or spit on you,” “a student tried to make you do things that you did not want to do,” “a student left you out of activities on purpose,” “a student took something of yours without permission, or destroyed something of yours on purpose” (see Table 15).

The only victimization items on which English Only speakers reported no differences than other language groups was “a student threatened you” and “a student spread rumors about you.” The trend observed in the data was the English Only was the group that consistently rated the lowest level of each type of victimization. When there was a significant difference between the multi and other language group, multi-language usually reported a higher level of victimization than the group who spoke only another language in the home. English Only ($M=1.63$, $SD=.72$) is significantly less than than Multi-Language ($M=1.82$, $SD=.77$) on the “student made fun of you” variable. Multi-Language ($M=1.56$, $SD=.74$) was sig. higher than English Only and Other Only for “student pushed you” variable. English Only was significantly lower than Other Only and Multi-Language for “a student made you do something you did not want to do” variable. English Only was significantly lower than Other Only and Multi Language for “student left you out of something on purpose” variable. Finally English Only was significantly

lower than Multi Language for “someone destroyed something of yours on purpose” item.

Exploratory Analyses

Factor Analysis

The People in My Life Scale was originally developed as an extension of the Inventory on Parent and Peer Attachment, through a systematic piloting procedure (Ridenour et al., 2006) in which six factors were identified. A Principal Components exploratory factor analysis with a Varimax rotation was used to confirm the factors of parental and peer attachment (each composed of trust, communication, and alienation subscales), which emerged in previous research. For the current data, somewhat different factors emerged (see Table 16).

Table 16: Factor Loadings of the People in My Life Scale

Item	I	II	III
Trust and Communication			
My parents respect my feelings.	.61		
My parents listen to what I have to say.	.60		
My parents accept me as I am.	.60		
My parents care about me.	.53		
I trust my parents.	.60		
I can count on my parents to help me when I have a problem.	.60		
My parents can tell when I am upset about something.	.56		
I talk to my parents when I am having a problem.	.55		
If my parents know that something is bothering me, they ask me about it.	.59		
I share my thoughts and feelings with my parents.	.53		
When I am away from home, my parents know where I am and who I am with.	.48		
My home is a nice place to live.	.56		
My parents pay attention to me.	.64		
I get along well with my parents.	.52		
My parents are proud of the things I do.	.57		
My friends care about me.	.69		
My friends listen to what I have to say.	.65		

Table 16: Factor Loadings of the People in My Life Scale, Continued			
My friends accept me as I am.	.65		
My friends understand me.	.66		
My friends care about me.	.68		
I trust my friends.	.62		
I can count on my friends to help me when I have a problem.	.64		
My friends can tell when I am upset about something.	.54		
I talk to my friends when I am having a problem.	.56		
If my friends know that something is bothering me, they ask me about it.	.55		
I share my thoughts and feelings with my friends.	.53		
I like to be with my friends.	.59		
My friends pay attention to me.	.61		
My friends don't understand what I am going through these days.	.51		
I get along well with my friends.	.58		
My friends are proud of the things I do.	.60		
		.52	
Peer Alienation		.67	
My friends don't understand what I am going through these days.		.73	
I get upset easily with my friends.		.68	
I feel angry with my friends.		.62	
I feel scared with my friends.		.61	
It's hard for me to talk to my friends.			
I think my friends are a bad influence on me.			
Parent Alienation			
My parents don't understand what I am going through these days.			.52
I get upset easily with my parents.			.64
I feel angry with my parents.			.52
It's hard for me to talk to my parents.			.46

Two factors emerged that were largely similar to the established factors for the People in My Life Scale (Peer Alienation and Parent Alienation), but the third factor differed slightly. The subscales of parent trust, peer trust, parent communication, and peer communication emerged as separate constructs on the PIML; however, in the present study they loaded on the same factor (trust and communication), accounting for the most variance and encompassing these domains for both peers and parents. The factor structure of parent alienation is also somewhat different from the PIML parent alienation

item. The item “I feel scared in my home” established its own factor in the present analysis, though in the People in My Life Scale, this item loaded with other items. The internal reliability for each new factor was determined by calculating Cronbach’s alpha for each factor. Results are listed below in Table 17. Results indicate that the factors had satisfactory internal reliability.

Table 17: Internal Reliability of Observed Factors

Factor	Mean	Standard Deviation	Coefficient Alpha
Trust and Communication (Peers & Parents)	3.10	.56	.94
Peer Alienation	1.60	.58	.78
Parent Alienation	2.20	.75	.75

Table 18: Correlations Between Attachment Subscales

	Parent Communication	Peer Trust	Peer Communication
Parent Trust	.80	.30	.10
Parent Communication	-	.23	.20
Peer Trust		-	.27

Note: All correlations significant $p < .01$

Parent trust and communication were highly correlated (.80) and therefore shared approximately 64% of all variance with one another. A correlation of this magnitude suggests parent trust and communication may function better as one subscale than as separate subscales. This relationship was similarly suggested during exploratory factor analysis when many items from the trust and communication scales loaded onto the same factor (see Table 17). However, the data were analyzed using the established PIML

factors. Such a high degree of collinearity between parent trust and communication explains why parent communication can correlate significantly with victimization yet fail to achieve significance in a predictive model.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of peer and parental attachment with student victimization. In this chapter, an overview and discussion of the study findings will be presented, as well as the study's limitations and suggestions for future research in this area.

This study extended previous research by demonstrating that a student's attachment to parents and peers is significantly related to victimization. Overall findings suggest that strong attachment to parents and peers can be a resiliency factor. This may be explained by the role that parental attachment has in teaching social skills, which help promote peer relationships and protect individuals against victimization. In terms of peers, while results show significant effects, they are clinically insignificant in regards to the formation of interventions to reduce victimization in schools. Nonetheless, results do have clinical significance in regards to understanding if and how attachment may serve as a protective factor.

As Sun and colleagues (2010) pointed out, what constitutes a small or large effect size can vary based on the field of study. In the case of youth-related victimization, individual differences tend to carry the largest difference between any two people, and so effect sizes are most commonly of a small to medium magnitude by Cohen's standard (1994). An overall explanation of 5% variation in victimization is a medium effect size given current understanding of victimization's causes. However, 5% is not sufficient

variance to merit using it as the basis of an intervention.

This study demonstrated that parent attachment explains slightly more variance in victimization than peer attachment. Most interesting, was the finding that speaking a language in the home in addition to English was correlated with higher levels of victimization at school. Additionally, speaking a language other than English at home compared with English speakers and multi-language speakers, corresponded with lower levels of peer attachment. Suggested explanations for these findings will be presented below as each research question is addressed individually.

The factors for the attachment scales loaded differently for the current study sample, than for the original People In My Life (PIML) sample. The present sample was larger and more diverse than the sample on which the PIML was validated. The demographics of that sample were considerably different from the ethnic and linguistic background of the students in this study. The PIML was normed on 320 urban fifth and sixth graders and participants attended public school in Washington State. Seventy-four percent of eligible students participated in the study. The proportion of students with disabilities in the PIML's sample was greater than national estimates; however, this is not uncommon for a sample recruited from urban settings. The PIML was normed on a group in which 39% of the students represented minority populations, while the current study's demographic was: 67.5% of the population was African American; 16.4 % mixed, 8.2% other, 2.6% Native American or American Indian. Over 95% of the students in this sample represented minority populations, as opposed to 39%. When language is considered, 16% of the present sample reported speaking a language other than English, while the original PIML study did not report this data.

Results of the first research question demonstrated that both peer and parent attachment significantly predicted the frequency of victimization. Specifically, students who had stronger parental or peer attachment were at a significantly lower risk of being victimized. These results relate to attachment research dating back to the 1960s (Ainsworth, 1989; Allen et al., 2002; Bowlby, 1969; Cassidy, 1994; Stroufe, 1978) that have consistently demonstrated that strong attachments serve as an emotional protective factor in various aspects of development. The current research demonstrated that victimization is yet another factor that is significantly related to the mutual attachment between adolescents and parents as well as adolescents with their peers. Nonetheless, while the current study revealed such significant findings, all findings were clinically insignificant when effect size was taken into account. Therefore, while the current study explains a small part of variance, factors other than what the current study took into account may better explain why victimization occurs.

Attachment was comprised of the subscales trust, communication, and alienation. While students who reported lower levels of communication with parents reported higher rates of victimization, there was no such relationship regarding communication with peers. Of these subscales, parental trust had the strongest relationship with victimization. Students who reported high levels of trust with their parents reported being a victim less often than those who reported lower levels of trust with their parents. This suggests that the component of trust in overall attachment is most important in serving a protective role against peer victimization. However, it is imperative to keep in mind that the amount of variance explained is quite small. According to the results, parental trust and communication with parents were significant predictors of victimization. This implies

that an underlying perception of trust between parent and child serves a protective role against victimization. Children rely on parents for certain needs to be met and the ability to communicate openly most likely will lead to a more functional relationship in which needs can be expressed and potentially met.

Unlike parental communication protective factor, peer communication was not significantly related to the frequency of victimization. Since this is the only scale that did not demonstrate a relationship to the frequency of victimization, it raises new questions. Open interactions among peers could take the form of pro-social behavior, but could also take the form of anti-social behavior such as teasing, bullying, or relational aggression. Therefore, peer communication is not always a positive factor, which would explain why it was not a significant predictor of lower levels of victimization like the other attachment factors.

Relational aggression, such as teasing and spreading rumors can result in victimization. Peer communication items on the survey asked about how perceptive one's friends are of his or her internal state. Students were also asked about whether their friends communicate concern for and interest in their well being, how often they share their thoughts and feeling with their friends, and whether or not their friends can sense that they are having a problem. The underlying implication of these items is an authenticity and genuine caring quality of the relationship. While the peer communication subscale measures seemingly positive aspects of communication, it is possible that though perceived as positive, the actual communication could be used in an anti-social way. For example, someone who rates that "they always talk to their friends when they are having a problem" could hypothetically be a victim of rumors as a

consequence of their open communication, leading to potentially adverse outcomes.

The construct of open communication with parents is a separate construct from open communication with peers. Evolutionary psychology provides an explanation for why it is adaptive to trust family members more so than peers (Neyer & Lang, 2003). Therefore, openness with primary caregivers could be safer than open communication with a peer group. Since adolescents are still learning how to select friends and behaviors that lead towards relationships they value, adolescence is a period of trial and error and risk-taking in which many interactions may not result in strengthening attachment (Hartup & Stevens, 1997).

Finally, results also showed that when students experienced higher levels of peer alienation or parental alienation were more likely to report victimization in school. The experience of alienation may influence a student's behavior in such a way as to increase the likelihood of being bullied in school. Certain behaviors, particularly submissive and aggressive behaviors, make an individual more likely to be a victim (Hodges et al., 1997; Olweus, 1978; Perry, Williard, & Perry, 1990; Schwartz, Dodge, & Coie, 1993). The experience of alienation can cause one to react with externalizing behaviors. However, the experience of alienation has previously been significantly correlated with behaviors such as depression, and anxiety, which can often result in loneliness and/or peer rejection (Craig, 1998). Having low self-esteem also leads to victimization (Salmivalli, Kaukianen, Kaistaneimi, & Lagerspetz, 1999). One study showed that the security of the mother-child attachment impacted the quality of peer relationships by enhancing emotional self-regulation and coping (Contreras, Kerns, Weimer, & Gentzler, 2000). However, it is possible that emotional regulation was one of the mechanisms that

accounted for the inverse relationship between attachment and victimization.

Through the lens of Attachment Theory, the internal working model that an individual develops is based off the availability and responsiveness of the primary caregiver. If students experience frequent anger with their parents, or has the perception that they are not cared for by their parents, Attachment Theory would posit that they would not exhibit behaviors that reflect worthiness. These students may not demonstrate pro-social engagement with peers, as they have not learned and practiced these skills with their primary caregiver. Therefore, students who experience alienation from parents are at a higher risk for having weak peer attachments and therefore are more likely to be victimized.

Though the findings presented regarding attachment are statistically significant, they are not clinically significant. The relationship between attachment and reported victimization is not strong enough to be considered a large predictor in the likelihood of a student being a victim at school. To understand what makes a student a target of violence at school, we must look to other individual differences and environmental factors that affect the likelihood of being victimized.

There are individual and contextual factors victimization better than the construct of attachment. Individual factors that influence a student's level of victimization include body size, age, gender, self-esteem, personality, sexual orientation, intelligence level, physical traits, and race/ethnicity. Prior research examined physical aspects of individuals and demonstrated that being physically weak and/or small is a disadvantage and makes one more likely to be a victim (Hodges et al., 1997; Olweus, 1978). Lauritsen and White (2001) found that being young, male, a racial minority, and living in

disadvantaged or high-crime communities make individuals more susceptible to victimization. McKenney and colleagues (2006) found that children and adolescents who bully others generally intimidate others through their physical stature, age, gender, popularity, or awareness of another's vulnerability. Nofziger (2009) also found that children who are in regular contact with individuals involved in deviant behavior makes them more likely to be a victim of peer violence (see also Barboza et al., 2009). This research speaks largely to the concept of context as a significant explanatory variable in victimization. For example, a Finnish study found that 87% of total variation in victimization was due to individual differences and 13% was due to differences among classrooms (Karna, Voeten, Poskiparta, Salmivalli, 2010). The findings of this study suggests that bystanders' actions in bullying situations moderate the effects of individual and interpersonal risk factors for victimization (Karna et al., 2010).

Parent and peer attachment each contributed significantly to predicting victimization, however, when examining effect size, the clinical significance was small. Data from the literature show that parents tend to be more influential at younger ages, while peers tend to be more influential at older ages (Kandel, 1996). Furthermore, correlations in the literature between victimization and problematic internalizing/externalizing behaviors in students were minimized when children had many friends. When students had a protective friendship, aggression and withdrawal did not lead to victimization. However, when students did not have a protective friendship, there was a stronger relationship between victimization and problematic behaviors (Hodges, Boivin, Bukowski, & Vitaro, 1999). Because the literature has highlighted the significance of peer influence, it was initially predicted that peer attachment would

account for more of the variance in victimization than parent attachment (Agnew, 1991; Laible et al., 2000). However, results of the current study showed that parental attachment accounted for more variance than peer attachment. Again, while this difference is statistically significant, it is not clinically significant.

In reviewing a meta-analysis of peer versus parental influence, Kandel (1996) demonstrated how there has been an over-estimation of peer influence relative to parental influence in the interpretation of research studies. An overestimation of the impact of peers in the research was found, and it was claimed that most literature has ignored the impact of parents in the selection of peer group (Kandel, 1996). The literature mainly treats parents and peers as a separate construct without attributing at least some aspects of peer selection to parents themselves. There are aspects of parent child interactions (such as attachment) that facilitate the selection of friends (Aseltine, 1995). Parents have both direct and indirect influence over their children's behavior and peer associations. The indirect influence emerges from the quality of interaction a parent has with their child. For example, low parental participation, poor management, and lack of closeness are factors that can lead to children selecting friends who are deviant (Aseltine, 1995). Nevertheless, the difference found in the current study is slight and the overall variance explained is small.

Out of all of the subscales, peer alienation explained the most unique variance of the peer factors whereas parent trust explained the most unique variance of all the parent subscales. All subscales were significant contributors except for peer communication. This subscale was highly related to victimization, yet its contribution to the regression equation was statistically negligible. The likely reason is collinearity with one or more of

the other subscales.

The factor analysis in the current study suggested indicators from the parent communication and parent trust subscales loaded on the same factor. Ancillary regression analyses using the specific factor structure observed in this study provided essentially the same results.

When examining each component of parent and peer attachment with victimization; parent alienation, peer alienation, and parent trust contributed the most unique variance to the regression equation. These factors are likely the strongest predictors because alienation has been shown to be a powerful variable, especially alienation from parents and friends. Being highly alienated from one's parents and friends indicates that those people in life who a student is supposed to be closest to (primary caregivers and friends), are actually being experienced in a negative way, or are not experiencing much of a relationship at all with parents and peers. Items on the alienation subscales reflected anger, distrust, and lack of acceptance between the student and their close relations. Strong parental-adolescent attachment relationships allow adolescents to independently seek out and thrive in new situations (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). The inverse would mean that weak attachment (i.e. alienation) would deter such positive outcomes.

Among these significant predictors of victimization, alienation from parents was stronger than alienation from peers. One possible explanation for why parent alienation explains more victimization than peer alienation comes through the lens of Attachment Theory, where parent alienation has been shown to affect the quality of peer attachments (Bowlby, 1982; Cassidy, 1996). The strength of attachment one has with his or her

parent lays the foundation for building self-schemas, forming identity, and instilling values that will impact the internal working model of relationships and how that individual relates to others (Allen et al., 2002). Furthermore, strength of attachment to parents is related to self-esteem. Attachment relationships have been found to have positive effects of self-esteem (Cassidy, 1996) If students have higher self-esteem, they are less subject to negative peer influence (Laible & Carlo, 2004).

Attachment theory also helps to explain why children who have strong trust, open communication, and feelings of closeness to their parents were less victimized, whereas children without strong parental attachments could be at higher risk for victimization at school. Social skills are learned through the forming of attachments to parents, and these acquired social skills influence the formation of subsequent relationships (e.g., with friends; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Black & McCartney, 1997). In the case of the adolescent with high levels of support and warmth from parent, he or she is more likely, based on the foundational relationship, to develop strong social ties at school (Laible & Carlo, 2004). These strong peer attachments thereby make him or herself less of a target for social aggression of peers (Card, 2003, as cited by Smith ,2004). On the other hand, adolescents without strong parental attachments may not have had the opportunity to develop proper social skills. This maladaptation can affect their ability to form healthy bonds with others, leaving them more vulnerable to a peer's aggressive behaviors (Bullis, Walker, & Sprague, 2001). A lack of friendships with peers and/or having dysfunctional relationships with peers at school may leave an individual without a support system and thus a more likely target of victimization.

Another possible argument for the importance of parent attachment over peer

attachment is that peer relationships are more transient than parent relationships (Hartup & Stevens, 1997). Over the course of development, peer relationships fluctuate; suggesting that such relationships are possibly more superficial and less influential than the more lasting parental bond.

Although it was determined that parent attachment predicts victimization better than peer attachment, out of the peer attachment subscales peer alienation significantly predicts victimization. When examining the sub-factors as three separate constructs (i.e., trust, communication, and alienation) with the parent and peer domains combined for each factor, alienation was the most predictive subscale, perhaps making it a more salient sub-factor in attachment than trust or communication. The construct of alienation could tap into a deeper emotional or behavioral response than the constructs of trust and communication. For example, alienation is tapping into negative feelings of abandonment, distance, or neglect from parents and peers whereas the sub-factor of communication mostly asks about actions and behaviors which, while better operationalized, may not tap into the emotions connected to communication.

The current study lends further support to Attachment Theory, which emphasizes the importance of the primary caregiver-infant relationship (Bowlby, 1969). Attachment Theory suggests that the form and quality of relationships that develop with friends and peers is an extension of the form and quality of relationships that have developed within the family (Bowlby, 1969/1997). Rather than being in competition, satisfying relationships with parents and peers are seen as interrelated and complimentary. The construct captured by parent attachment may be more stable over time than the construct captured by peer attachment because parent attachment acts as the foundation for peer

attachment, and thus parent attachment is more of a protective factor.

The present study demonstrated that students who speak English Only experience less victimization than those who speak multiple languages at home. Additionally, this study determined that speaking only a language other than English at home compared with English Only speakers and multi-language speakers corresponded with lower levels of peer attachment. Overall, the effect sizes for language groups were not large.

Based on cultural psychology and sociology studies, marginalized groups face discrimination, including victimization (Berry, 2001). It was hypothesized that students who speak languages other than that of the dominant culture would be more susceptible to victimization by peers because speaking a language different from the majority peer group singles out a student in multiple ways (Lippi-Green, 1997). Students who speak a language other than English are often singled out because they may have an accent while conversing in English, they might have limited English proficiency, or they might not successfully communicate in social interactions (e.g. comprehension of slang or vernacular of the local culture; Lippi-Green, 1997). Being part of a social minority in schools and communities can further cause a student to stand out from the norm. Research shows that individuals who stand out from the norm are more likely to be victimized (Berry, 2001).

Those who reported speaking English Only reported significantly less frequent victimization than those who spoke English and another languages at home. However reported victimization did not differ between those who spoke English Only as compared to Other Only. The results of the present study suggest something about being from a home where both English and another language are spoken makes a student more likely

to report being victimized than being from a home where only one language is spoken. The results from this study are consistent with results from a study that found that females who spoke only Spanish were significantly less likely to experience dating violence than peers speaking both English and Spanish at home (Sanderson et al., 2004). It may be that students who are further along in the process of acculturation (speaking both English and Other languages) are at additional risk for victimization because they are more visible to the surrounding community. Those students who speak only other languages within the home may keep more to themselves and be more isolated from the population at large given this language barrier. This may serve as a protective buffer from victimization when they have less exposure to others.

In this study language was measured in an open-ended format; students self-reported their primary languages spoken at home. Because the primary interest was not in the specific language differences among the sample, but rather differences from the norm, each participant was grouped by speaking English Only, another language only, or English and another language. In Chapter 3, the specific languages reported by students are noted. Language spoken at home has often been used as a measure of acculturation (Gowen, Hayward, Killen, Robinson, & Taylor, 1999; Lee, 2008; Sundquist & Winkelby, 2000). Consideration of the language(s) spoken at home is one way to approximate where a given family is in terms of the acculturation process (Lee, 2008). For example, some families may be attempting to acculturate by using the English language during dinner conversations, while another family may speak their language of origin. Results for the third research question demonstrated that children who speak other languages at home are at risk for victimization when compared to English Only students.

This means that students who are from families with multi-languages might be facing issues that English Only families are not facing, such as language learning or acculturation stress. Based on what is known about the demographics of the population within this study, many families in the district from which the sample was collected were immigrants. Based on the many languages reported by students, it was clear that multiculturalism and multi-lingual households make up a substantial subset of the sample.

Students who are of a non-majority culture may be targeted based on membership in a minority group. Research shows that *some* individuals who are from homes where a language other than English is spoken experience acculturation stress (Hahm, Lahiff, & Guterman, 2003). This acculturation stress can include difficulty finding social support, having a non-hopeful outlook, and facing communication barriers. One study examined the degree of acculturation and parental attachment that predicted alcohol use among Asian-American adolescents, and showed that acculturation itself was not a risk factor unless it was accompanied by a low level of parental attachment (Hahm et al., 2003).

While not directly addressing nationality of family members, or how many generations have resided in the United States, the question asking for language spoken at home might capture immigrant status. Census data from the year 2000, as well as more recent approximations by the state indicate that the community that comprises the studied school district contains many immigrant groups. At the time of the 2000 Census data collection, 7.8% of the population of the boroughs was foreign born, with 8.3% speaking a language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000).

It is also possible that students/families are likely undergoing some form of acculturation stress, based on what the literature says about the stressors associated with navigating different cultures within one household. Homes in which multiple languages are spoken have different aged members, and different levels of linguistic proficiency and assimilation(Suarez-Orozco et. al, 2008).

Findings of the current study underscore a need in such cases to first identify the children most at risk for victimization. Given that students who spoke languages at home other than English were at a greater risk of being victimized, school-based initiatives designed to improve school climate should include interventions inclusive of individuals who speak languages besides English. Students who spoke English Only at home reported significantly lower rates of victimization than those who spoke Other Only or English and Other.

English Only and multi-lingual students reported significantly higher levels of attachment to their peers than did students who reported a language other than English as their primary language spoken at home. Students who reported speaking only another language at their home also reported lower attachment to peers. This could be interpreted in various ways. It could indicate that they have limited English proficiency. Limited English proficiency would likely create a communication barrier between students and their peers. Difficulties in communication could impact the strength of attachments to peers since it is difficult to form close bonds when there are communication barriers. It is also possible that aside from language barriers, the individuals with low levels of acculturation may also experience lower attachment to peers due to differing cultural beliefs, practices, and values.

Post hoc analyses demonstrated that students who reported speaking English Only at home reported significantly less victimization than students who speak another language at home, even in cases where the student's second language was English. Speaking only the dominant language of a community appears to have a significant protective effect on the level of victimization that a student reports. This finding is in line with Berry's findings (2001) that being part of a social minority can cause a student to stand out from the norm and those individuals who stand out from the norm are more likely to be victimized (Berry, 2001).

Research shows that some individuals from homes where languages other than English are spoken experience higher levels of acculturation stress (Hahm et al., 2003). Acculturation stress is defined as difficulty finding social support, usually including having a non-hopeful outlook and facing language barriers. These factors could help explain why students from homes where English is not the primary language are at greater risk of being victimized. If one does not have social support and feels hopeless regarding finding this support, they are more likely to be victimized.

Findings from the current study are also consistent with Findings from Yu and colleagues (2003) are possibly aligned with findings from the current study. Their research demonstrated that adolescents who primarily speak a language other than English at home are at higher risk for psychosocial problems such as bullying, alienation from classmates, and feelings that their parents are unable or unwilling to help them if a lack of acculturation was also accompanied by a low level of parental attachment (Yu et al., 2003).

Yu and colleagues (2003) studied Hispanic and Asian adolescents and found that

children whose primary language spoken at home was other than English were at a greater risk for school maladjustment (i.e., bullying, alienation from classmates, feelings that their parents were unable to help them). Their study found that youth who did not speak English at home were 2.0-4.5 times more likely to be bullied because of their race or religion than were youth who only spoke English at home (Yu et al., 2003).

The current study extends this previous research and found that both students who reported other language only and students that reported speaking both English and another language at home were at greater risk for being bullied. Interestingly, the current study demonstrated that students who spoke both languages at home were actually at a greater risk of being victimized, than participants who spoke English Only or only another language at home.

Language use plays a role in the factors that determine the likelihood of a student being victimized, but this study does not cannot explain why these students reported a greater level or victimization or hypothesize what factors may be leading to this finding. Future studies would be necessary to uncover those factors leading to greater victimization and their connections to language use within the home.

Limitations

The study sample included primarily students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds. The possibility exists that the socioeconomic backgrounds of this study's sample were polarized and make the results generalize less effectively to other samples and populations, especially among more advantaged students.

Similarly, the specific school contexts from which the sample was drawn may provide situational confounds. All participants were students in schools in a single, low

socio-economic school district. According to data collected by the district, at some of the schools sampled, rates of violence are higher than state and national averages

(http://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators/crimeindicators2010/ind_02.asp).

Disadvantaged schools often show higher rates of violence, and victimization, therefore, occurs more frequently than the average (Hanish & Guerra, 2000).

Another difficulty in this study was the unequal number of participants in each of the language categories. English Only speakers comprised 84% of the sample whereas non-English speakers only comprised 16%. Having larger groups of non-English or multi-lingual students would help improve the generalizability of results.

Students may report different experiences with ethnicity-driven victimization if they attended schools in which their specific cultures represented a higher or lower proportion of the student body. Hanish and Guerra (2000) found that White children were at significantly greater risk of victimization when attending predominantly non-White schools. Similar results may apply to any students who are part of an ethnic minority in school.

One potential confound in the measures of this study included the potential for inaccurate self-reporting of a student's language. One question measured the student's language spoken at home, and the lack of further indicators leaves the possibility of misreporting by participating students. Given the importance of the language item to Research Question 3, and the small sample of students identifying speaking languages other than English, even small numbers of inaccurate reports by students could significantly affect the results. For example, certain indicated that knowledge of the name and spelling of languages were not always known. One response was, "something

to do Africa”. Some students might not have attempted to write down a language they were unsure of.

Beyond the scope of the current study lie newer forms of victimization, such as cyber-bullying. Although the current study focused on victimization that occurs within the student’s school setting, many present forms of victimization happen in virtual worlds. Even an act as simple as sending repeated, unwanted emails to another student or ridiculing another student on social networking sites (e.g., Facebook) can affect one’s ability to create relationships. While school used to be the primary place for attachment, the Internet is emerging as a competing venue for socialization. The present study asked students, during a typical school day, to take the time to complete a survey that asked about their relationships with parents and peers, as well as gathering other information. The scale used to measure these attachments tapped into constructs of trust, communication, and alienation. These constructs, while operationalized by survey items, could conceivably be impacted by modern forms of interaction, such as socializing on the Internet. If school is no longer the primary place for peer relationships to develop, but instead the Internet is playing a large role in socialization, then it is possible a survey in the medium of their strongest (or most frequent) interactions should be considered for a future study. Over the past 10 years, Internet use has become an integral part of adolescent socialization (Gross, 2004). Teenagers use the Internet to communicate with known individuals as well as with strangers. While adolescents mainly use the Internet to maintain pre-existing friendships, some adolescents make close friendships online. They also create and encounter negativity online in the form of cyber bullying (Gross, 2004).

The factor structure of a measure in the present study poses another potential

limitation. The PIML's established factor structure differed from the factors which emerged in the present study. In Ridenour and colleagues (2006) analysis of the structure and validity of the PIML scale, confirmatory factor analysis revealed a model, which was the best fit of their data. This model was consistent with the PIML scoring scheme in that the two higher-order measures were indicated (Parent attachment and Peer attachment) with several subscales (trust, communication, alienation). The standardized factor loadings for this model showed that the PIML had a robust factor structure. The correlations between parent attachment and peer attachment was .478, a medium sized correlation (Cohen, 1988), which indicated that the two constructs were separate. However, in the present analysis of the factor structure, trust and communication (for parent and peer) loaded on to a single factor. Though analyses were conducted using both structures, this discrepant finding could imply that the original validity and reliability of the PIML were not applicable to the current study's population.

Although the PIML scale was originally normed on 10-12 year-old student populations, the present study used the scale on teenage students (12-18 year-olds) due to the population's overall low reading level. The PIML correlates highly with the IPPA scale, which was normed on adolescents through age 18. One limitation of this study may be that there are other variables captured within this scale that may affect validity with adolescent populations, and that factors other than the reading level of the sample may affect how students respond to the questions. The PIML scale may not be as valid when used for an extended age range.

Implications

Collectively, the results of this study confirm research findings from previous research that both parents and peers play a role in victimization. The results of this study showed that all variables except communication with peers correlated with victimization, and that parental attachment was more strongly predictive of victimization than peer attachment.

Data for the third research question on language use showed that children who speak languages other than English at home are at risk for victimization, especially those who speak multiple languages within the home. This could help explain the racial attacks in December 2009 in South Philadelphia High School, where students were targeted because of their race and in some occasions harassed about their language of origin (Graham K., & Hardy, D. 2009).

This finding further confirms the importance of the results of the first two research questions by suggesting that development of adaptive abilities and personality traits begin in the home environment and that the home environment has the potential to impact future relationships that students' experience with peers. School officials need to be aware of victimization and the potential for targeting students who speak multiple languages. Thus, possible interventions could begin at the level of school officials who are in the position to develop programs that accelerate language acquisition and biculturalism within the larger student population.

Based on the present study and review of pertinent literature, an intervention to target victimization would not focus primarily on attachment, but rather on more predictive risk factors of victims; although attachment could play a role in the

intervention. Hawkins, Pepler, and Craig (2001) have demonstrated successful peer interventions that mainly focus on the bystanders. The current study has demonstrated that speaking languages other than English at home is a risk factor for victimization. However, future studies are needed to more fully examine how the language spoken at home makes a student more of a target for victimization.

Future Research

In keeping with the findings regarding the relationships between parent attachment and peer attachment, and between these attachments and the likelihood of victimization, future interventions could potentially take one of two forms: one that improves parental relationships with the students, or one that addresses peer relationships and their potential role in victimization. The findings regarding parent attachment underscore a need to first identify the children most at risk for victimization. The next step would be to then work with parents on understanding the dynamics between their child and the child's peers, and to identify ways to reduce the student's potential attachment deficits with parents to improve safety outcomes.

In keeping with the findings regarding peer-to-peer attachment, interventions should incorporate programs that work with other students in addressing how to more fully integrate the school. Since parents and peers play a role in victimization, utilizing them in developing these interventions could be important.

As stated above, when studying peer relationships researchers need to be

cognizant of the medium through which peers form attachments. While school used to be the primary place for attachment, the Internet is emerging as a competing venue for socialization. The present study asked students (during a typical school day) to take the time to complete a survey that asked about their relationships with parents and peers, as well as gathering other information. During adolescence, symbolic communication by means of the Internet becomes increasingly more important than physical proximity-seeking behavior in infancy and childhood. Adolescents might regard the Internet as their new attachment figure or may seek new attachment figures through the Internet (Lei and Wu, 2007). The Internet may provide adolescents with another means of establishing identity, and therefore should be asked about in future research targeting peer victimization.

REFERENCES

- Adolescent Health Committee (2009), Age limits and adolescents, *Pediatrics & Child Health*, 8(9), 577.
- Agnew, R. (1991), The interactive effects of peer variables on delinquency, *Criminology*, 29(1), 47-72.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1969) Individual differences in strange-situational behavior of one-year-olds London: Academic Press. Schaffer, H.R.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Attachments beyond infancy. *American Psychologist*, 44, 709-716.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Allen, J. P., Moore, C. M., & Kuperminc, G.P. (1997). Developmental approaches to understanding adolescent deviance. In, S. S. Luthar, J. A. Burack, D. Cicchetti, & J. Weisz (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: perspectives on risk and disorder* (pp. 548-567). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Allen, Moore, Kupermic, & Bell (1998). Attachment and adolescent psychosocial Functioning, *Child Development*.
- Allen, J. P. & Land, D. (1999). Attachment in adolescence. J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of Attachment Theory and Research*, (pp.319-335). New York: Guilford.
- Allen, J. P., Marsh, P., McFarland, C., McElhaney, K. B., Land, D. J., & Jodl, K (2002). Attachment and autonomy as predictors of the development of social skills and delinquency during mid-adolescence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 70, 56-55.
- Arbona, C., & Power, T. G. (2003). Parental attachment, self-esteem, and antisocial behaviors among African American, European American, and Mexican American adolescents. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 40-51.
- Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The inventory of parent and peer attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 16, 427-454.

- Aseltine Jr., R. H. (1995) A Reconsideration of Parental and Peer Influences on Adolescent Deviance. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36(2), 103-121.
- Baptiste, D.A. (1993). Immigrant families, adolescents and acculturation: Insights for therapists." *Marriage and Family Review*, 19, 341-363.
- Barboza, G. E., Schiamberg, L. B., Oehmke, J., Korzeniewski, S. J., Post, L. A., & Heraux, C. G. (2009). Individual characteristics and the multiple contexts of adolescent bullying: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38, 101-121.
- Bearman, P., Jones, J., and Udry J., (1997) The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health: Research Design: Available at <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth/>.1997.
- Berger C., Karimpour R., & Rodkin, P. C. (2008). Bullies and victims at school. *School Violence and Primary Prevention*, II, 295-322.
- Berry, J. (1997) Immigration, acculturation and adaptation. *Applied Psychology*, 46(1), 5-68.
- Black, K. A., & McCartney, K. (1997). Adolescent females' security with parents predicts the quality of peer interactions, *Social Development*, 6, 91-100.
- Blake, Ledsy, Goodenow, & O'Donnell (2001). Recency of immigration, substance use, and sexual behavior among adolescent immigrants in Massachusetts. *Journal of Public Health*, 91, 794-799.
- Boney-McCoy, S. & Finkelhor, D. (1995) Psychosocial sequelae of violent victimization in a national youth sample, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 63 (5), 726-736.
- Bowlby, J. (1969/1982). *Attachment and Loss, Volume 1, Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brener N., Collins J, Kann L, Warren C., Williams B, (1995). Reliability of the youth risk behavior survey questionnaire. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 141:675-80.
- Brook, J.S., Whiteman, M., Finch, S. & Cohen, P. (1998). Mutual attachment, personality, and drug use: pathways from childhood to young adulthood. Genetic, social, and general psychology monographs. 124 (4) 492-510
- Brown, B., & Benedict, W.R. (2004). Bullets, blades, and being afraid in Hispanic high schools: An exploratory study of the presence of weapons and fear of weapons-

- related victimization among high school students in a border town. *Crime and Delinquency*, 50, 372-394.
- Buote, E., Wood, M., & Pratt (2009). Exploring similarities and differences between online and offline friendships: The role of attachment style, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25, 560-567.
- Bullis, M., Walker, H. M., & Sprague, J. R. (2001). A promise unfulfilled: Social skills training with at-risk and antisocial children and youth. *Exceptionality*, 9, 67-90.
- Capps, R., Passel, J.S., Perez-Lopez, D., & Fix, M.E., (2003). The new neighbors: A User's Guide to Data on Immigrants in US Communities, *The Urban Institute*, available at: <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=310844>.
- Card, N. A. (2003). Victims of peer aggression: A meta-analytic review. Presented at Society for Research in Child Development biennial meeting, Tampa, USA, April. (as cited by Smith, 2004)
- Cassidy, J. (1994). Emotion regulation: Influences of attachment relationships. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*. 59(2-3) 228-49
- Cassidy, Kirsh, Scolton, & Parke (1996) Attachment and representations of peer relationships, *Developmental Psychology*, 6, 354-371.
- Chang, Schwartz, Dodge & McBride-Chang (2003). Harsh parenting in relation to child emotion regulation and aggression, *Journal of Family Psychology*, 17(4) 598-606.
- Chittooran., M.M., & Hoening, G.A. (2005) Mediating a better solution. *Principal Leadership (Middle School Ed.)* 5 (7): 11-15.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Coie & Dodge (1997) Children's friends and behavioral similarity in two social contexts *Social Development*, 6, 224-236.
- Contreras, Kerns, Weimer, & Gentzler (2000). Emotion regulation as a mediator of associations between mother-child attachment and peer, *Journal of Family Psychology*, 14, 111-124.
- Cook, Greenberg, & Kusche (1995) Promoting emotional competence in school-aged children: The effects of the PATHS curriculum, *Development and Psychopathology*, 7, 117-136.
- Craig, W.M (1998) The relationship among bullying, victimization, depression, anxiety, and aggression in elementary school children. *Personality and Individual*

Differences, 24, 123-130.

Crick & Bigbee (1998) Relational and overt forms of peer victimization: a multiformant approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66 (2), 337-347.

Cuellar, I., Nyberg, B., Maldonado, R. E., & Roberts, R. E. (1997). Ethnic identity and acculturation in a young adult Mexican-origin population. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 25, 535-549.

Decker, M.R., Raj, A., & Silverman, J.G. (2007). Sexual violence against adolescent girls: Influences of immigration and acculturation. *Violence against women*, 13, 498-513.

Devoe, J., Peter, K., Noonan, M., Snyder, T., Baum, K., Kaufman, P. et al. (2004). Indicators of School Crime and Safety. (NCES 2005-002/NCJ 205290). U.S. Department of Education and Justice. Washington, DC. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Dekovic, M., Wissink, I. B., & Meijer, A. M. (2004). The role of family and peer relations in adolescent antisocial behavior: Comparison of four ethnic groups, *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 29, 405-425.

Duncan, R.D. (2004). The impact of family relationships on school bullies and their victims, *Bullying in American Schools*, 227-244.

Eccles, Mahoney, & Larson (2005). *Organized activities as contexts of development: Extracurricular activities, after-school, and community programs*. MA; Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc. Inc.

Erikson, 1980. *Identity and the Life Cycle* Norton (New York 191 p Escamilla, K. (2000) Teaching Literacy in Spanish. In R. DeVillar & J. Tinajero (eds.), *The Power of Two Languages 2000*. New York: McMillan/McGraw-Hill, 126-141.

Escamilla, K. (2000) Teaching literacy in spanish. In R. DeVillar & J. Tinajero (eds.), *The Power of Two Languages 2000*. New York: McMillan/McGraw-Hill, 126-141.

Espelage, D. & Swearer, S. (2004) *Bullying in american schools: a social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, N.J.

Farrell & Danish (1993). Peer drug associations and emotional restraint: causes or consequences of adolescents' drug use? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61, 327-334.

Forrest, K. Y., Zychowski, A. K., Stuhldreher, W. L., & Ryan, W. J. (2000). Weapon carrying in school: Prevalence and association with other violent behaviors.

American Journal of Health Studies, 16, 133-140.

- Fraley, Davis, & Shaver (1997). Dismissing-avoidance and the defensive organization of emotion, cognition, and behavior. *Attachment theory and close relationships. Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 249-279). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Freeman, H., & Brown, B. B. (2001). Primary attachment to parents and peers during adolescence: Differences by attachment style, *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 30 (6), 653-674.
- Furlong, M. (1995) Who are the victims of school violence? A comparison of student non-victims and multi-victims, *Education and Treatment of Children*, 18 (3), 282-298.
- Gowen, L. K., Hayward, C., & Gowen, L. K. (1999). *Acculturation and eating disorder symptoms in adolescent girls*, Guilford, NY, NY.
- K. Graham and D. Hardy, "School safety has not improved, PA says," Philadelphia Inquirer, December 4, 2009.
- Gross, E.F., (2004) Adolescent internet use: What we expect, what teens report, *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 25(6), 633-649.
- Hahm, H.C., Lahiff, M., & Guterman, M.B. (2003) Acculturation and parental attachment in asian-american adolescents' alcohol use, *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 33, 119-129.
- Hanish and Guerra (2000) The roles of ethnicity and school context in predicting children's victimization by peers, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 28, 201-233.
- Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1997). Friendships and adaptation in the life course. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121, 355-370.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5, 1.
- Hernandez, T. J., & Seem (2004). A safe school climate: A systemic approach and the school counselor, *Professional School Counseling*, 7 (4), 256.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency* (Transaction Publishers 2002 edition ed.) Berkeley: University of California Press. 309
- Hodges, Boivin, Vitaro (1999) The power of friendship: protection against an escalating cycle of peer victimization, *Developmental Psychology*, 35, (1), 94.

- Hodges, Malone, & Perry (1997) Individual risk and social risk as interacting determinants of victimization in the peer group, *Parenting, Family Processes, and Peer Relations*, 33 (6), 1032-1039.
- Hovey, J. (2000) Acculturative stress, depression, and suicidal ideation among central american immigrants, *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 30 (2), 125-139.
- Hubbard & Coie (1994) Emotional correlates of social competence in children's peer relationships, *Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 40 (1), 1-20.
- Ingram, J. R., Patchin, J. W., Huebner, B. M., McCluskey, J. D., & Bynum, T. S. (2007). Parents, friends, and serious delinquency: An examination of direct and indirect effects among at-risk early adolescents. *Criminal Justice Review*, 32, 380-400.
- Juvonen, J. & Graham, S. (2001). *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized*. The Guildford Press: New York, NY.
- Kandel, D.B. (1996) The parental and peer contexts of adolescent deviance; an algebra of interpersonal influences. *Journal of Drug Issues*, Vol. 26(2), 289-315.
- Karna, Voeten, Poskiparta, Salmivalli, (2010) Vulnerable Children in Varying Classroom Contexts: Bystanders' Behaviors Moderate the Effects of Risk Factors on Victimization *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* - 56, (3),pp. 261-282.
- Kataoka S., Langley, A. Stein, B. et al (2009) Violence exposure and PTSD: the role of English language fluency in Latino youth. *Journal of Child Family Studies*, 18; 334-41.
- Kerns, K. A., Aspelmeier, J. E., Gentzler, A. L., Grabill, C. M., (2001). Parent—child attachment and monitoring in middle childhood, *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15, 69-81.
- Kia-Keating, M, & Ellis, B., (2007) Belonging and connection to school in resettlement: young refugees, school belonging, and psychosocial adjustment, *Clinical and Child Psychology*, 12 (1), 29-43.
- Kierkus, C.A. & Baer, D. (2002) A social control explanation of the relationship between family structure and delinquent behavior, *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 44.
- Laible, Carlo, & Raffaelli (2000). The differential relations of parent and peer attachment to adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 29, 45-59.
- Laible, D. J., & Carlo, G. (2004). The differential relations of maternal and paternal

- support and control to adolescent social competence, self-worth, and sympathy. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19, 759-782.
- Lauritsen, & White (2001). Putting violence in its place: The influence of race, ethnicity, gender, and place on the risk for violence. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 1(1) 37-60.
- Leary, M. R., Kowalski, R. M., Smith, L., & Phillips, S. (2003). Teasing, rejection, and violence: case studies of the school shootings, *Aggressive Behavior*, 29(3), 202-214.
- Lee, S. (2008). Interview language: A proxy measure for acculturation among Asian Americans in a population-based survey. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 13 (2), 244-252.
- Lee, Sobal, & Frongillo (2003). Comparison of models of acculturation, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34, 282-298.
- Lehr, C., Johnson, D., Bremer C., Cosio, A., & Thompson, M. (2004). Increasing rates of school completion: Moving from policy and research to practice. *A Manual for Policymakers, Administrators, and Educators*.
- Lei, L. & Wu, Y., (2007). Adolescents' paternal attachment and internet use. *Cyber Psychology & Behavior*, 10, 633-639.
- Lippy-Green, R. (1997). English with an accent: language, ideology, and discriminations in the United States. NY: Routledge.
- Liu, L., Benner A, Lau, A., et al. (2009) Mother-adolescent language proficiency and adolescent academic and emotional adjustment among Chinese American families, *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 38: 572-86.
- Liu, L., Lau, A., Chia-Chen A. et al. (2009) The influence of maternal acculturation, neighborhood disadvantage, and parenting on Chinese American adolescents' conduct problems: testing the segmented assimilation hypothesis. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 38, 691-702.
- Lynch, M., & Cicchetti, D. (1997). Children's relationships with adults and peers: An examination of elementary and junior high school students. *Journal of School Psychology*, 35, 81-99.
- Maccoby, & Martin (1993). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. *Handbook of child psychology*. New York; Wiley.
- MacDonald, K.B. (1992). Warmth as a developmental construct: An evolutionary analysis. *Child Development*, 63, 753-773.

- McKenney, Pepler, Craig, & Connolly (2006) Peer victimization and psychosocial adjustment: the experiences of Canadian immigrant youth, *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 4 (2), 239-264.
- Merrow, J. (2004). The 3 kinds of school safety since 9/11. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review*, 70, 4.
- Morrison, Furlong, & Smith (1994) Factors associated with the experience of school violence among general education, leadership class, opportunity class, and special day class pupils. *Education and Treatment of Children*. 17: 356-369.
- Mucha, P. (2009). Rights Commission, officials meet on S. Philly High. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*. Retrieved December 15, 2009, from <http://www.philly.com/philly/news/breaking/79218127.html>.
- Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M. D., & Haynie, D. L. (2001/2003). Relationships between bullying and violence among US youth. *Pediatric Adolescence Medicine*, 157, 348-353.
- Neyer, F., Lang, R. (2003) Blood is thicker than water: kinship orientation across adulthood, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84 (2), 310-321.
- Ngwe, J. E., Liu, L. C., & Flay, B. R. (2004). Violence prevention among african-american adolescent males, *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 38.
- Nofziger, & Kurtz (2005). Violent lives: A lifestyle model linking exposure to violence to juvenile violent offending. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42, 3-26.
- Nofziger, S. (2009). Deviant lifestyles and violent victimization at school. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24, 1494-1517.
- Olweus (1978/1993). *Bullying at school*. Blackwell Publishing; New York, NY.
- Piaget, J. (1965, c1959). *The language and thought of the child*. (3rd ed. rev. and enl). London : Routledge & Kegan Paul; New York : Humanities Press.
LB1139 .L3 P5 1965X
- Perren, Hornung, (2005). Bullying and delinquency in adolescence: Victims' and perpetrators' family and peer relations. *Swiss Journal of Psychology*, 64(1) 51-64.
- Perry, Williard, & Perry (1990) Peers' perceptions of the consequences that victimized children provide aggressors, *Child Development*, 61, 1310-1325.

- Prinstein, M, Boergers, J., & Spirito, A., (2001) Adolescents's and their friends' health-risk behavior: factors that alter or add to peer influence, *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 26 (5), 287-298.
- Pulkkinen, L. (1996). Proactive and reactive aggression in early adolescence as precursors to anti- and prosocial behavior in young adults. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22, 241-257.
- Redondo, L. M., Martin, A. L., Fernandez, J.S., & Lopez, J. M. (1986). An examination of the relationship between family environment and juvenile delinquency. Unpublished manuscript, University of Santiago, Chile. (as cited by Armsden and Greenberg, 1987)
- Reinke, W. M., & Herman, K. C., (2002). Creating school environments that deter antisocial behaviors in youth. *Psychology in the Schools*, 39(5) 549-559.
- Ridenour T. A. ,Greenberg M. T., & Cook E. T. (2006). The structure and validity of the people in my life: a self-report measure of attachment in late childhood. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 35, 1037-1053.
- Rothe, E, Tzuang, D, & Pumariega, A. (2010) Acculturation, development, and adaptation, *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 19 (4), 681-696.
- Salmivalli, C., Kaukianen, A., Kaistaneimi, L., Lagerspetz, K., (1999) Self-evaluated self-esteem, peer-evaluated self esteem, and defesvie egostism as predictors of adolescents' participation in bullying situations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol 25(10).
- Samaniego, R.Y., & Gonzales, N.A. (1999). Multiple mediators of the effects of acculturation status on delinquency for Mexican American adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 27, 189-210.
- Sanderson, M., Coker, A.L., Roberts, R.E., Tortolero, S.R., & Reininger, B.M. (2004). *Acculturation, ethnic identity, and dating violence among Latino ninth-grade students. Preventative Medicine*, 39, 373-383.
- Schwartz, Dodge, Coie (1993) The emergence of chronic peer victimization in boys' play groups, *Child Development*, 64 (6), 1755-1772.
- Schwartz, Dodge, Coie, Hubbard, Cillessen, Lemerise, & Bateman (1995). Social-Cognitive and Behavioral Correlates of Aggression and Victimization in Boys' Play Groups. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 26, 431-440.
- Seals, D., & Young, J. (2003). Bullying victimization: prevalence and relationship to

- gender, grade level, ethnicity, self-esteem, and depression. *Adolescence*, 38, 735–747.
- Selfridge (2004). RCCP School Environment. The Resolving Conflict Creatively Program: How we know it works theory into practice. 43, 59-67.
- Shen, B.J., & Takeuchi, D.T. (2001) A structural model of acculturation and mental health status among Chinese Americans, *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 29 (3), 387-418.
- Shields, & Cicchetti (2001). Parental maltreatment and emotion dysregulation as risk factors for bullying and victimization in middle childhood. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 30, 349-363.
- Smith & Brain (2000). Bullying in schools: Lessons from two decades of research. *Aggressive Behavior*. 26, 1-9.
- Smith (2004). Child and adolescent mental health. *Bullying Recent Developments*, 9, 98-103,
- Smith, H. & Thomas, S.P. (2000). Violent and nonviolent girls: Contrasting perceptions of anger experiences, school, and relationships. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 21, 547-575.
- Suarez-Orozco, C., Suarez-Orozco, M.M, Todorova, I. (2008) Learning a new land: immigrant students in american society, the Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2008.
- Sundquist, M., & Winkleby, J., (2000). Country of birth, acculturation status and abdominal obesity in a national sample of Mexican–American women and men. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 29.
- Sun, S. Pan, W., & Wang, L., (2010) A comprehensive review of effect size reporting and interpreting practices in academic journals in education and psychology. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 4, 989-1004.
- Sroufe, L.A. (1978). Attachment and the roots of competence. *Human Nature*, 1, 50-57.
- Takeuchi, Chung, Lin, Shen Kurasaki, Chun & Sue (1998). Lifetime and twelve-month prevalence rates of major depressive episodes and dysthymia among Chinese-Americans in Los Angeles. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 155, 1407-1414.
- Tillyer, M.S, Tillyer, R., Miller, H.V., & Pangrac, R. (2010) Reexamining the correlates of adolescent violent victimization: the importance of exposure, guardianship, and target characteristics, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-21.

- U.S. Census Bureau. (2005-2009) American Fact Finder Community Survey, Darby, Delaware County, P.A. Retrieved: January 28, 2011 from:
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFacts?_event=ChangeGeoContext&geo_id=06000US4204518160&_geoContext=01000US%7C04000US36%7C05000US36003&_street=&_county=Darby&_cityTown=Darby&_state=04000US42&_zip=&_lang=en&_sse=on&ActiveGeoDiv=geoSelect&_useEV=&pctxt=fph&pgsl=010&_submenuId=factsheet_1&ds_name=DEC_2000_SAFF&_ci_nbr=null&qr_name=null®=null%3Anull&_keyword=&_industry=
- U.S. Government, (2001) *No Child Left Behind* A report for nationwide education reform entitled, “No Child Left Behind”) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government.
- Van Ijzendoorn, M. H., & Kroonenberg, P. M. (1998). Cross-cultural patterns of attachment: A meta-analysis of the strange situation. *Child Development, 59*, 147-156.
- Velez, C. N., & Ungemack, J. A. (1995). Psychosocial correlates of drug use among Puerto-Rican youth: generational status differences. *Social Science & Medicine, 40*.
- Wallen, Feldman, & Anliker (2004). Acculturation level and postpartum depression in Hispanic mothers. *American Journal of Maternal Child Nursing, 30*, 299-304.
- Woolcook, M. (1998) 'Social Capital and Economic Development: Towards a theoretical synthesis and policy framework', *Theory and Society*, Vol. 27, pp 151-208.
- Wu, P., Robinson, C., Yang, C, Hart, C. Olsen S., & Porter, C. (2002), Similarities and differences in mothers' parenting of preschoolers in China and the United States, *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 26* (6) 481-491.
- Yu, Huang, Schwalberg, Overpeck, & Kogan (2003). Acculturation and the health and well-being of U.S. immigrant adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health Volume, 33*, 479-488.
- Zehr, M. (2001). Out of Africa. *Education Week, 20*, 30.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

**Local Evaluation of the William Penn School District's
Safe, Smart and Well (SAW) Initiative, part of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative**

Survey for Students (Grades 6-12)

This survey asks your opinions about this school only, not about the district overall. Answer the following statements by marking the box that best corresponds to your opinion. For all questions, only mark one answer, unless otherwise instructed. Please answer all questions.

1. It is true that... *(Fill in only ONE box for each)*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I am happy to be at this school. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
I feel close to people at this school. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
I feel like I am a part of this school. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
I feel safe at school. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Teachers and other adults at the school treat me with respect. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
I understand my school's rules (code of conduct). <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
The school rules are fair. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
The school rules are applied the same way no matter who you are. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Drinking alcohol is harmful. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Smoking <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	

cigarettes or using other tobacco products (e.g., chewing tobacco, snuff or dip) is harmful. <input type="checkbox"/>			
Using marijuana (pot) or other illegal drugs is harmful. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

2. There is a teacher or another adult at this school who... (Fill in only ONE box for each)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
cares about me. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
believes that I can succeed. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
wants me to do my best. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
notices when I'm not at school. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I can talk to about a personal problem. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
I can talk to about an academic problem. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
I can talk to about feeling unsafe or afraid at school. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	

3. How often do you feel unsafe or threatened in the following places? (Fill in only ONE box for each)

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely or <input type="checkbox"/> Never
In the classroom <u>with</u> a teacher or other adult present <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
In the classroom <u>without</u> a teacher or other adult present <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	

In the hallways <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
In the stairways <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
In the locker room <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
During lunch or recess <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
On your way to or from school (i.e., route that you walk or on the bus, trolley or subway) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
At school or on school property <u>during</u> school hours <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
At school or on school property <u>after</u> school hours <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

4. In the previous school year (2007-08), how often did you notice these problems at your school? (Fill in only ONE box for each)

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely or Never
student alcohol use <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
student drug use <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
student tobacco use <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
harassment or bullying among students <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
physical fighting between students <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
verbal (disrespect), sassing, or physical abuse of school staff by students <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
cutting or being late to class <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
gang-related activity <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Often	Sometimes	Rarely or Never
weapons possession <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
vandalism (including	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	

graffiti) <input type="checkbox"/>		
theft <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

5. In the previous school year (2007-08), how often did the following happen at school or on school property? (Fill in only ONE box for each)

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely or Never
You cut class. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
You were more than five minutes late to class. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
You were involved in a physical fight at school. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
You started a physical fight. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
You got jumped on school property. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
You brought a weapon to school. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You were offered, sold or given an illegal drug. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
A student made fun of you, called you names, or insulted you. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
A student spread rumors about you. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
A student threatened you. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
A student pushed you, shoved you, tripped you, or spit on you. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
A student tried to make you do things that you did not want to do. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
A student left you out of activities on purpose. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
A student took something of yours without your	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	

permission or destroyed something of yours on purpose.		
--	--	--

6. In the previous school year (2007-08), how often did the following happen?
(Fill in only ONE box for each)

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely or Never
You drank alcohol. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You smoked a cigarette or used other tobacco products, such as chewing tobacco, snuff or dip. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You used marijuana (pot) or other illegal drugs. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You talked to a guidance counselor or school nurse.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You carried a handgun or other weapon. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You received psychological or emotional counseling. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You attended a drug abuse or alcohol abuse treatment program. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You received help with an eating disorder. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You received help with stress management. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You received help with anger management. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Did you participate in any of the following extracurricular activities at school during the previous (2007-08) school year?
(Fill in only ONE box for each)

	Yes	No	Not Offered in My
--	------------	-----------	--------------------------

			School
Sports or athletic teams <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Arts or music clubs (such as dance, choir, drama or band) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Academic clubs (such as math or English club or debate team) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student government <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Newspaper, yearbook or literary magazines <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other school clubs or school activities <input type="checkbox"/> Please specify: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Did you participate in any of the following extracurricular activities in your neighborhood during the previous (2007-08) school year?

(Fill in only ONE box for each)

	Yes	No	Not Offered in My Neighborhood
Sports or athletic teams <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Youth organizations (such as Police Athletic League) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	No	Not Offered in My Neighborhood
Community service clubs/volunteer organizations <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Church or religious organizations (not including worship services) <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other community-based organizations <input type="checkbox"/> Please specify: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. This portion asks about your relationships with important people in your life - your caretaker and your close friends.

(Fill in only ONE box for each)

	Almost Always <input type="checkbox"/> or Always True	Often <input type="checkbox"/> True	Sometimes True	Almost Never or Never True
My parents respect my feelings. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parents listen to what I have to say. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parents accept me as I am. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parents care about me. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I trust my parents. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can count on my parents to help me when I have a problem. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parents can tell when I'm upset about something. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I talk to my parents when I am having a problem. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If my parents know that something is bothering me, they ask me about it. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I share my thoughts and feelings with my parents. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

When I am away from home, my parents know where I am and who I am with. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My home is a nice place to live. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parents pay attention to me. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parents don't understand what I am going through these days. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Almost Always <input type="checkbox"/> or Always True	Often <input type="checkbox"/> True	Sometimes True	Almost Never or Never True
I get upset easily with my parents. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel angry with my parents. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It's hard for me to talk to my parents. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel scared in my home. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I get along well with my parents <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parents are proud of the things I do. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This part asks about your feelings about your relationships with your close friends. Please read each statement and fill in only ONE box that tells how true the statement is for you now.

	Almost Always <input type="checkbox"/> or Always True	Often <input type="checkbox"/> True	Sometimes True	Almost Never or Never True
My friends care about me. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

My friends listen to what I have to say. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My friends accept me as I am. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My friends understand me. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My friends care about me. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I trust my friends. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I can count on my friends to help me when I have a problem. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My friends can tell when I am upset about something. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I talk to my friends when I am having a problem. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If my friends know that something is bothering me, they ask me about it. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I share my thoughts and feelings with my friends. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I like to be with my friends. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My friends pay attention to me. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Almost Always <input type="checkbox"/> or Always True	Often <input type="checkbox"/> True	Sometimes True	Almost Never or Never True
My friends don't understand what I am going	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

through these days. <input type="checkbox"/>				
I get upset easily with my friends. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel angry with my friends. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel scared with my friends. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
It's hard for me to talk to my friends. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I get along well with my friends. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My friends are proud of the things I do. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think my friends are a bad influence on me. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I wish I had more friends. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If one of my friends asked me to skip school, I would do it. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If I were at a party and one of my friends offered me some beer, I would drink it. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If a friend asked to copy my test, I would let him or her do it. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Doing well at school is important to my friends. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My parents like and approve of my friends. <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Appendix B

Table 19: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations between Victimization and Attachment Subscales

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Victimization	-	-.21**	-.13**	-.18**	-.13**	.20**	-.10**	0.02	.197**
2. PIML Total									
Parent		-	.21**	.94**	.89**	-.57**	.23**	.10**	-.083**
3. PIML Total Peer			-	.17**	-.09**	-.09**	.92**	.81**	-.456**
4. PIML Parent									
Trust				-	.79**	-.34**	.27**	.11**	-0.03
5. PIML Parent									
Communication					-	-.31**	.21**	.16**	0.034
6. PIML Parent									
Alienation						-	-0.01	.08**	.288**
7. PIML Peer Trust							-	.76**	-.132**
8. PIML Peer									
Communication								-	-0.038
9. PIML Peer									
Alienation									-
M	9.90	37.01	32.26	32.65	14.33	9.96	31.88	11.79	11.41
SD	3.18	12.5	11.09	7.07	4.42	3.39	6.98	3.54	3.99

** significant at the p<.05