

REFERENCES

- Arthur, M. W., Briney, J. S., Hawkins, J. D., Abbott, R. D., Brooke-Weiss, B. L., & Catalano, R. F. (2007). Measuring risk and protection in communities using the Communities That Care youth survey. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 30, 197-211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2007.01.009>
- Arthur, M. W., Hawkins, J. D., Pollard, J., Catalano, R. F., & Baglioni, A. J. (2002). Measuring risk and protective factors for substance use, delinquency, and other adolescent problem behaviors: The Communities That Care youth survey. *Evaluation Review*, 26, 575-601. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X0202600601>
- Brave Heart, M. Y. H., Chase, J., Elkins, J., & Altschul, D. B. (2011). Historical trauma among Indigenous Peoples of the Americas: Concepts, research, and clinical considerations. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 43(4), 282-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02791072.2011.628913>
- Brown, R. A., Dickerson, D. L., & D'Amico, E. J. (2016). Cultural identity among urban American Indian/Alaska Native youth: Implications for alcohol and drug use. *Prevention Science*, 17(7), 852-861. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-016-0680-1>
- Corenblum, B. (2014). Relationships between racial-ethnic identity, self-esteem and in-group attitudes among First Nation children. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43(3), 387-404. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-013-0081-8>
- Costello, E. J., Compton, S. N., Keeler, G., & Angold, A. (2003). Relationships between poverty and psychopathology: A natural experiment. *JAMA*, 290(15), 2023-2029. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.290.15.2023>
- del Veccio, P. (2012). SAMHSA's Working Definition of Recovery Updated. <https://store.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/d7/priv/pep12-recdef.pdf>
- Duffy, P., & Baldwin, H. (2013). Recovery post treatment: Plans, barriers, and motivators. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, & Policy*, 8(6). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1747-597X-8-6>
- Duran, E. (2006). *Healing the soul wound: Counseling with American Indians and other native peoples*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Eaton, D. K., Kann, L., Kinchen, S., Shanklin, S., Ross, J., Hawkins, J., Harris, W. A., Lowry, R., McManus, T., Chyen, D. Lim, C. Whittle, L., Brener, N. D., & Wechsler, H. (2010). Youth risk behavior surveillance - United States, 2009. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 59(5), 1-142. <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/ss5905a1.htm>
- Etz, K. E., Arroyo, J. A., Crump, A. D., Rosa, C. L., & Scott, M. S. (2012). Advancing American Indian and Alaska Native substance abuse research: Current science and future directions. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 38(5), 372-375. <https://doi.org/10.3109/00952990.2012.712173>
- Freed, C. R. (2012). Historical perspectives on addiction. In H. J. Shaffer, D. A. LaPlante, & S. E. Nelson (Eds.), *Addiction Syndrome Handbook: Volume I* (pp. pp. 27-47). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Friese, B., Grube, J. W., Seninger, S., Paschall, M. J., & Moore, R. S. (2011). Drinking behavior and sources of alcohol: Differences between Native American and White youths. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 72(1), 53-60. <https://doi.org/10.15288/jsad.2011.72.53>
- Geana, M. V., Daley, C. M., Nazir, N., Cully, L., Etheridge, J., Bledowski, C., Choi, W. S., & Greiner, K. A. (2012). Use of online health information resources by American Indians and Alaska Natives. *Journal of Health Communication*, 17(7), 820-835. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2011.650831>
- Gonzales, R., Anglin, M. D., Beattie, R., Ong, C. A., & Glik, D. C. (2012). Understanding recovery barriers: Youth perceptions about substance use relapse. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 36, 602-614. <https://doi.org/10.5993/AJHB.36.5.3>
- Guttmanova, K., Wheeler, M. J., Hill, K. G., Evans-Campbell, T. A., Hartigan, L. A., Jones, T. M., Hawkins, J. D., & Catalano, R. F. (2017). Assessment of risk and protection in Native American youth: Steps toward conducting culturally relevant, sustainable prevention in Indian country. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 45, 346-362. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21852>
- Harris, L. T., & Fiske, S. T. (2006). Dehumanizing the lowest of the low: Neuroimaging responses to extreme out-groups. *Psychological Science*, 17(10), 847-853. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01793.x>
- Hawkins, E. H., Cummins, L. H., & Marlatt, G. A. (2004). Preventing substance abuse in American Indian and Alaska native youth: Promising strategies for healthier communities. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(2), 304-323. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.2.304>

- Indian Health Service. (2013). Indian Health Disparities. *Fact Sheets*. http://www.ihs.gov/newsroom/includes/themes/newihstheme/display_objects/documents/factsheets/Disparities_2013.pdf
- Jackson, N., Denny, S., Sheridan, J., Zhao, J., & Ameratunga, S. (2016). The role of neighborhood disadvantage, physical disorder, and collective efficacy in adolescent alcohol use: A multilevel path analysis. *Health Place, 41*, 24-33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2016.07.005>
- Libby, A. M., Orton, H. D., Beals, J., Buchwald, D., Manson, S. M., & AI-SUPERPPF Team. (2008). Childhood abuse and later parenting outcomes in two American Indian tribes. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 32*(2), 17-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2007.07.006>
- Mennis, J., Stahler, G. J., & Mason, M. J. (2016). Risky substance use environments and addiction: A new frontier for environmental justice research. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 13*(6), 607. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13060607>
- Spear, S. F., Ciesla, J. R., & Skala, S. Y. (1999). Relapse patterns among adolescents treated for chemical dependency. *Substance Use & Misuse, 34*, 1795–1815. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10826089909039427>
- Thomas, L. R., Rosa, C., Forcehimes, A., & Donovan, D. M. (2011). Research partnerships between academic institutions and American Indian and Alaska Native tribes and organizations: Effective strategies and lessons learned in a multisite CTN study. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 37*, 333-338. <https://doi.org/10.3109/00952990.2011.596976>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (USDHHS). (2011). *HHS Action Plan to Reduce Racial and Ethnic Disparities: A Nation Free of Disparities in Health and Health Care*. http://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/npa/files/Plans/HHS/HHS_Plan_complete.pdf
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (USDHHS), & Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA). (2007). Communities That Care Youth Survey Normative Database, Public Use Data File. Retrieved August 2017, from Center for Substance Abuse Prevention
- Vaughn, L. M., & Lohmueller, M. (2014). Calling all stakeholders: Group-level assessment (GLA) - A qualitative and participatory method for large groups. *Evaluation Review, 38*(4), 336-355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X14544903>

- Whitesell, N. R., Beals, J., Crow, C. B., Mitchell, C. M., & Novins, D. K. (2012). Epidemiology and etiology of substance use among American Indians and Alaska Natives: Risk, protection, and implications for prevention. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 38*(5), 376-382. <https://doi.org/10.3109/00952990.2012.694527>
- Whitesell, N. R., Beals, J., Mitchell, C. M., Keane, E. M., Spicer, P., Turner, R. J., & AI-SUPERPPF Team. (2007). The relationship of cumulative and proximal adversity to onset of substance dependence symptoms in two American Indian communities. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 91*(2-3), 279-288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2007.06.008>
- Winderowd, C., Montgomery, D., Stumblingbear, G., Harless, D., & Hicks, K. (2008). Development of the "American Indian Enculturation Scale" to assist counseling practice. *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research, 15*(2), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.5820/aian.1502.2008.1>

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Dr. Debi A. LaPlante is Director of the Division on Addiction at Cambridge Health Alliance and an assistant professor in the Department of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School in Boston, MA. Dr. Martina Whelshula is a research consultant at the Healing Lodge of the Seven Nations in Spokane, WA. Dr. Heather M. Gray is Director of Academic Affairs of the Division on Addiction at Cambridge Health Alliance and an instructor in the Department of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School in Boston, MA. Dr. Sarah E. Nelson is Director of Research of the Division on Addiction at Cambridge Health Alliance and an assistant professor in the Department of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School in Boston, MA.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With gratitude, we would like to recognize the following individuals for their contributions to the development and execution of this important project. Without their generous attention, wisdom, and contributions this research would not be possible.

We are grateful to the American Indian youth Healing Lodge of the Seven Nations residents who enthusiastically supported this research.

The CIRCLE-NARCH past and present Working Group members: The Honorable Andy Joseph, Jr. (Colville), The Honorable Nancy Johnson (Colville), Dr. Alison Ball (Colville), The

Honorable Sam Penney (Nez Perce), Lindsey Holt (Nez Perce), Jackie McArthur (Nez Perce), The Honorable Carol Evans (Spokane), The Honorable David Browneagle (Spokane), Elima Bird (Spokane), The Honorable Greg Abrahamson (Spokane), Lisa Guzman (Kalispel), Ladonna Boyd (Kalispel), Jenni Jones (Kalispel), The Honorable Velma Bahe (Kootenai), The Honorable Woodrow Starr (Umatilla), Roberta Kipp (Umatilla), Darrel Kipp (Umatilla), The Honorable Bob Shippentower (Umatilla), The Honorable Margaret SiJohn (Coeur d'Alene), The Honorable Charlotte Nilson (Coeur d'Alene), Chiarpah Matheson (Coeur d'Alene), and The Honorable Marquette Hendrickx (Coeur d'Alene).

Healing Lodge of the Seven Nations past and present staff members: Rebecca Crocker, Jim Walde, Danielle Stensgar, Dolores Brockie, Cassie Anderson, and Brad Meyers. Division on Addiction staff members: Tasha Chandler, Vanessa Graham, Howard Shaffer, & Pradeep Singh.

Education liaisons: Barbara Aston, Deirdre Almeida, Robbie Paul, and Wendy Thompson.

Service Learning Student Researchers: Crystal Andrews and LeeAndria Witcraft of Eastern Washington University.

We thank Richard F. Catalano, Ph.D. of the University of Washington for directing us to the CTC comparison data and providing helpful background information about the use of this instrument among Native communities.

FUNDING INFORMATION

This manuscript was supported by a Native American Research Centers for Health (NARCH) grant award (Promoting Cultures of Recovery, #U261IHS0090-03-01) issued to the Healing Lodge of the Seven Nations by the National Institutes of Health's National Institute of General Medical Sciences and National Institute on Drug Abuse, as well as Indian Health Services.

The Division on Addiction currently receives funding from EPIC Risk Management; Foundation for Advancing Alcohol Responsibility; Entain; Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Bureau of Substance Addiction Services via St. Francis House; Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Office of Problem Gambling Services via Health Resources in Action; MGM Resorts International via the University of Nevada, Las Vegas; National Institutes of Health (National Institute of General Medical Sciences and National Institute on Drug Abuse) via The Healing Lodge of the Seven Nations; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration via the Addiction Treatment Center of New England; and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration via the Gavin Foundation.

During the past 5 years, the Division on Addiction has also received funding from ABMRF/The Foundation for Alcohol Research; Danish Council for Independent Research via Aarhus University Hospital; the David H. Bor Library Fund, Cambridge Health Alliance; DraftKings, Inc.; Fenway Community Health Center, Inc.; Integrated Centre on Addiction Prevention and Treatment of the Tung Wah Group of Hospitals, Hong Kong; Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Bureau of Substance Addiction Services; Massachusetts Gaming Commission, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

APPENDIX

Table A1

Correlations between Community Risk & Protective Factors & Family, School, & Peer-Individual Factors & Outcomes (N = 37-40)

	COMMUNITY RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS							
	Low Neighborhood Attachment	Community Disorgani- zation	Transitions / Mobility	Laws & Norms Favorable to Drug Use	Drug Availability	Gun Availability	Opportunities for Prosocial Behavior	Rewards for Prosocial Behavior
COMMUNITY RISK FACTORS								
Low Neighborhood Attachment	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Community Disorganization	.42	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--
Transitions / Mobility	.11	-.03	1.00	--	--	--	--	--
Laws & Norms Favorable to Drug Use	.22	.40	.14	1.00	--	--	--	--
Drug Availability	-.24	-.17	.01	.45	1.00	--	--	--
Gun Availability	-.08	.31	.09	.36	.37	1.00	--	--
COMMUNITY PROTECTIVE FACTORS								
Opportunities for Prosocial Behavior	-.52	-.24	-.26	-.10	.21	-.01	1.00	--
Rewards for Prosocial Behavior	-.44	-.25	-.26	-.14	.15	-.20	.67*	1.00
FAMILY RISK FACTORS								
Poor Family Management	.25	.44	.19	.52	.18	.35	-.28	-.34
High Family Conflict	.01	.37	.02	.22	.25	.20	.03	-.12
Antisocial History	.04	.20	.28	.37	.58*	.33	.08	-.12
Parent Attitudes Favor Drug Use	.31	.35	.01	.33	-.08	.10	-.08	-.18
Parent Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior	.32	.50	.07	.26	-.21	-.04	.12	.04
FAMILY PROTECTIVE FACTORS								
Family Attachment	.01	-.03	-.16	-.03	.01	.04	.08	.24
Opportunities for Prosocial Behavior	-.07	-.09	-.29	-.14	-.08	.08	.34	.18
Rewards for Prosocial Behavior	.03	-.06	-.22	-.03	.07	-.03	.19	.18
SCHOOL RISK FACTORS								
Academic Failure	.12	.11	-.03	.24	.02	.25	-.09	-.27
Low School Commitment	.15	.40	.17	.52	.19	.24	-.13	-.19
SCHOOL PROTECTIVE FACTORS								
Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement	-.31	-.22	-.06	-.27	-.11	-.33	.26	.30
Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	-.36	-.20	-.26	-.34	-.18	-.37	.29	.37

continued on next page

Table A1 continued
Correlations between Community Risk & Protective Factors & Family, School, & Peer-Individual Factors & Outcomes (N = 37-40)

	COMMUNITY RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS							
	Low Neighborhood Attachment	Community Disorgani- zation	Transitions / Mobility	Laws & Norms Favorable to Drug Use	Drug Availability	Gun Availability	Opportunities for Prosocial Behavior	Rewards for Prosocial Behavior
PEER-INDIVIDUAL RISK FACTORS								
Rebelliousness	.03	.25	-.03	.27	.39	.45	-.16	-.08
Gang Involvement	.16	.30	.15	.10	-.04	.46	-.04	-.04
Low Perceived Risk of Drug Use	.03	.34	-.14	.43	.16	.15	.07	.09
Early Initiation of Drug Use	.09	.13	.04	.45	.41	.39	.07	.07
Early Initiation of Antisocial Behavior	.14	.50	-.07	.31	.22	.55*	.06	-.11
Attitudes Favor Drug Use	.11	.02	-.06	.32	.40	.15	-.13	-.07
Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior	.28	.27	.19	.35	.36	.34	-.14	.12
Rewards for Antisocial Behavior	-.16	.09	.03	.04	.32	.33	.06	-.20
Peer Drug Use	.14	-.04	-.04	.47	.79*	.31	-.08	-.18
Antisocial Peers	.15	.36	.07	.55*	.61*	.63*	-.03	-.17
Intentions to Use Drugs	.24	.40	.21	.52	-.01	.30	-.14	.01
PEER-INDIVIDUAL PROTECTIVE FACTORS								
Prosocial Peers	-.28	-.20	-.16	-.13	-.05	-.08	.50	.17
Belief in a Moral Order	-.31	-.53	-.03	-.49	-.25	-.30	.18	.32
Social Skills	-.33	-.39	-.29	-.57*	-.34	-.21	.29	.29
Religiosity	-.32	.01	-.17	-.05	.17	.44	-.14	-.24
AGE OF INITIATION								
Age 1 st Used Marijuana	.19	-.01	-.14	-.34	-.44	-.23	-.21	-.28
Age 1 st Smoked Cigarettes	-.18	-.02	.04	-.40	-.40	-.19	.01	.02
Age 1 st Drank	-.31	-.28	-.08	-.45	-.28	-.36	.18	.11
Age 1 st Drank Regularly	.03	-.13	.04	-.30	-.25	-.54*	-.19	-.11
Age 1 st Suspended from School	-.01	-.30	.09	-.33	-.29	-.19	.01	.03
Age 1 st Arrested	-.29	-.30	.13	-.23	-.14	-.24	.11	.15
Age 1 st Carried a Gun	.21	-.25	-.09	-.19	-.14	-.58*	-.07	-.08
Age 1 st Attacked Someone	-.26	-.49	.17	-.23	-.17	-.41	-.09	.14
Age 1 st Belonged to Gang	-.12	-.33	-.10	-.01	.20	-.49	.04	.06

* $p < .001$.

Note. Bonferroni corrections yielded a $p < .001$ significance level. 0s recoded to 18 to reflect "never have" for age of initiation questions.

Table A2
Correlations between Family Risk & Protective Factors & School, & Peer-Individual Factors & Outcomes

	FAMILY RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS							
	Poor Family Management	High Family Conflict	Antisocial History	Parent Attitudes Favor Drug Use	Parent Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior	Family Attachment	Opportunities for Prosocial Behavior	Rewards for Prosocial Behavior
FAMILY RISK FACTORS								
Poor Family Management	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
High Family Conflict	.23	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--
Antisocial History	.05	.38	1.00	--	--	--	--	--
Parent Attitudes Favor Drug Use	.34	.28	.09	1.00	--	--	--	--
Parent Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior	.28	.08	.03	.09	1.00	--	--	--
FAMILY PROTECTIVE FACTORS								
Family Attachment	-.59*	-.09	.24	-.02	-.01	1.00	--	--
Opportunities for Prosocial Behavior	-.58*	-.01	.06	-.15	-.14	.82*	1.00	--
Rewards for Prosocial Behavior	-.60*	-.03	.21	-.09	-.10	.84*	.72*	1.00
SCHOOL RISK FACTORS								
Academic Failure	.35	.22	-.01	.35	.19	-.11	-.17	-.08
Low School Commitment	.46	.36	.15	.31	.25	-.23	-.40	-.24
SCHOOL PROTECTIVE FACTORS								
Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement	-.31	-.01	-.13	-.23	-.14	-.02	.14	.03
Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	-.40	-.13	-.23	-.38	-.27	.12	.30	.19
PEER-INDIVIDUAL RISK FACTORS								
Rebelliousness	.28	.34	.25	-.12	-.24	-.24	-.24	-.15
Gang Involvement	.03	-.02	.19	.38	.47	.23	.18	.06
Low Perceived Risk of Drug Use	.27	.30	.21	.39	.16	.07	.06	.07
Early Initiation of Drug Use	.32	.16	.18	.36	.36	-.13	-.20	-.14
Early Initiation of Antisocial Behavior	.36	.16	.30	.25	.41	-.20	-.29	-.18
Attitudes Favor Drug Use	.31	.24	.22	.31	-.10	-.32	-.35	-.30

continued on next page

Table A2 continued
Correlations between Family Risk & Protective Factors & School, & Peer-Individual Factors & Outcomes

	FAMILY RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS							
	Poor Family Management	High Family Conflict	Antisocial History	Parent Attitudes Favor Drug Use	Parent Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior	Family Attachment	Opportunities for Prosocial Behavior	Rewards for Prosocial Behavior
PEER-INDIVIDUAL RISK FACTORS								
Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior	.33	.25	.30	.22	.20	-.08	-.15	-.01
Rewards for Antisocial Behavior	-.09	.24	.29	-.21	-.24	.12	.13	.12
Peer Drug Use	.15	.26	.47	-.06	-.24	.10	.03	.18
Antisocial Peers	.40	.21	.49	.05	-.01	-.09	-.11	.01
Intentions to Use Drugs	.29	.25	.21	.40	.33	.05	-.01	-.10
PEER-INDIVIDUAL PROTECTIVE FACTORS								
Prosocial Peers	-.27	-.02	.04	-.05	.13	.36	.38	.26
Belief in a Moral Order	-.44	-.38	-.31	-.23	-.18	.13	.20	.11
Social Skills	-.59*	-.23	-.35	-.32	-.14	.31	.52	.36
Religiosity	.21	.33	.16	-.11	-.30	-.28	-.27	-.31
AGE OF INITIATION								
Age 1 st Used Marijuana	-.16	-.26	-.35	-.15	-.30	.12	.25	.09
Age 1 st Smoked Cigarettes	-.30	-.12	-.24	-.27	-.33	.06	.20	.08
Age 1 st Drank	-.35	-.08	-.04	-.17	-.36	.15	.20	.16
Age 1 st Drank Regularly	-.24	-.10	.02	-.26	-.23	.12	.03	.14
Age 1 st Suspended from School	-.26	-.27	-.09	-.21	-.34	.14	.32	.21
Age 1 st Arrested	-.44	-.16	.03	-.27	-.32	.39	.37	.29
Age 1 st Carried a Gun	-.21	.02	-.23	-.09	-.21	.20	.21	.24
Age 1 st Attacked Someone	-.26	-.14	-.44	-.23	-.29	-.02	.05	-.05
Age 1 st Belonged to Gang	.02	.07	-.09	-.29	-.43	-.17	-.14	-.02

* $p < .001$.

Note. Bonferroni corrections yielded a $p < .001$ significance level. 0s recoded to 18 to reflect "never have" for age of initiation questions.

Table A3
Correlations between School Risk & Protective Factors & Peer-Individual Factors & Outcomes

	SCHOOL RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS			
	Academic Failure	Low School Commitment	Opportunities for Prosocial Behavior	Rewards for Prosocial Behavior
SCHOOL RISK FACTORS				
Academic Failure	1.00	--	--	--
Low School Commitment	.59*	1.00	--	--
SCHOOL PROTECTIVE FACTORS				
Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement	-.51	-.47	1.00	--
Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	-.41	-.55*	.63*	1.00
PEER-INDIVIDUAL RISK FACTORS				
Rebelliousness	.17	.39	-.24	-.38
Gang Involvement	.00	.03	-.02	-.11
Low Perceived Risk of Drug Use	.15	.28	-.08	-.19
Early Initiation of Drug Use	.15	.31	-.21	-.38
Early Initiation of Antisocial Behavior	.26	.40	-.27	-.30
Attitudes Favor Drug Use	.06	.19	-.02	-.16
Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior	.23	.21	-.14	-.24
Rewards for Antisocial Behavior	-.03	.13	.17	.14
Peer Drug Use	.13	.27	-.16	-.32
Antisocial Peers	.17	.35	-.31	-.42
PEER-INDIVIDUAL PROTECTIVE FACTORS				
Prosocial Peers	-.16	-.49	.14	.34
Belief in a Moral Order	-.09	-.55*	.34	.39
Social Skills	-.24	-.57*	.32	.44
Religiosity	.14	.17	-.08	-.21
AGE OF INITIATION				
Age 1 st Used Marijuana	-.08	-.31	.04	.21
Age 1 st Smoked Cigarettes	-.17	-.24	.17	.35
Age 1 st Drank	-.20	-.31	.28	.33
Age 1 st Drank Regularly	-.08	-.20	.22	.36
Age 1 st Suspended from School	-.37	-.45	.25	.37
Age 1 st Arrested	-.08	-.24	.25	.27
Age 1 st Carried a Gun	-.30	-.31	.14	.18
Age 1 st Attacked Someone	-.16	-.26	.22	.14
Age 1 st Belonged to Gang	-.03	.01	-.02	.05

* $p < .001$.

Note. Bonferroni corrections yielded a $p < .001$ significance level. 0s recoded to 18 to reflect "never have" for age of initiation questions.

Table A4
Correlations between Peer-Individual Risk & Protective Factors & Peer-Individual Outcomes

	PEER-INDIVIDUAL RISK & PROTECTIVE FACTORS														
	Rebelliousness	Gang Involv	Percvd Drug Use Risk	Early Drug Use	Early Anti-social Behav	Favor Drug Use	Favor Anti-social Behav	Rewards for Anti-social	Friend Drug Use	Anti-social Peers	Intent-ions to Use	Pro-social Peers	Belief in Moral Order	Social Skills	Religi-osity
PEER-INDIVIDUAL RISK FACTORS															
Rebelliousness	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gang Involvement	-.03	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Low Perceived Risk of Drug Use	.16	.07	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Early Initiation of Drug Use	.28	.30	.13	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Early Initiation of Antisocial Behavior	.34	.50	.18	.68*	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Attitudes Favor Drug Use	.29	-.13	.13	.17	.10	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Attitudes Favor Antisocial Behavior	.40	.37	.04	.27	.19	.42	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Rewards for Antisocial Behavior	.39	.21	-.12	.07	.24	-.03	.04	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Peer Drug Use	.47	.02	.14	.38	.28	.34	.31	.37	1.00	--	--	--	--	--	--
Antisocial Peers	.57*	.24	.16	.36	.44	.25	.46	.38	.69*	1.00	--	--	--	--	--
Intentions to Use Drugs	.15	.41	.47	.30	.32	.18	.37	-.10	-.01	.14	1.00	--	--	--	--
PEER-INDIVIDUAL PROTECTIVE FACTORS															
Prosocial Peers	-.28	-.03	-.21	-.11	-.07	-.21	-.20	-.05	-.15	-.28	-.20	1.00	--	--	--
Belief in a Moral Order	-.40	-.08	-.54*	-.24	-.41	-.28	-.14	-.12	-.30	-.43	-.45	.39	1.00	--	--
Social Skills	-.38	-.10	-.46	-.31	-.38	-.44	-.35	-.08	-.36	-.42	-.44	.45	.60*	1.00	--
Religiosity	.42	-.11	-.07	.17	.32	.23	-.05	.20	.04	.05	-.13	-.10	-.17	-.10	1.00
AGE OF INITIATION															
Age 1 st Used Marijuana	-.18	-.19	-.09	-.80*	-.52	-.09	-.20	-.12	-.25	-.24	-.26	.01	.13	.19	-.23
Age 1 st Smoked Cigarettes	-.20	-.15	-.14	-.88*	-.51	-.18	-.21	.01	-.41	-.26	-.20	.13	.15	.30	-.10
Age 1 st Drank	-.25	-.34	-.02	-.85*	-.71*	-.07	-.28	-.07	-.38	-.32	-.31	.14	.25	.35	-.07
Age 1 st Drank Regularly	-.32	-.33	-.16	-.81*	-.59*	-.23	-.24	-.07	-.24	-.38	-.25	.10	.26	.21	-.21
Age 1 st Suspended from School	-.33	-.14	-.13	-.63*	-.59*	-.04	-.20	-.08	-.32	-.20	-.25	-.03	.08	.32	-.24
Age 1 st Arrested	-.06	-.20	-.16	-.64*	-.65*	-.20	-.07	.05	-.16	-.26	-.18	.21	.35	.39	-.21
Age 1 st Carried a Gun	-.30	-.53*	-.08	-.39	-.73*	-.07	-.27	-.27	-.07	-.40	-.32	.13	.14	.15	-.23
Age 1 st Attacked Someone	-.21	-.40	-.27	-.31	-.78*	-.10	-.11	-.18	-.25	-.36	-.20	.04	.48	.28	-.20
Age 1 st Belonged to Gang	.06	-.91*	-.10	-.27	-.62*	.14	-.19	-.12	.15	-.09	-.46	-.02	.10	.06	-.02

* $p < .001$.

Note. Bonferroni corrections yielded a $p < .001$ significance level. 0s recoded to 18 to reflect "never have" for age of initiation questions.