



Report to Congress on

**Juvenile
Violence
Research**

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) was established by the President and Congress through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, Public Law 93–415, as amended. Located within the Office of Justice Programs of the U.S. Department of Justice, OJJDP’s goal is to provide national leadership in addressing the issues of juvenile delinquency and improving juvenile justice.

OJJDP sponsors a broad array of research, program, and training initiatives to improve the juvenile justice system as a whole, as well as to benefit individual youth-serving agencies. These initiatives are carried out by seven components within OJJDP, described below.

Research and Program Development Division develops knowledge on national trends in juvenile delinquency; supports a program for data collection and information sharing that incorporates elements of statistical and systems development; identifies how delinquency develops and the best methods for its prevention, intervention, and treatment; and analyzes practices and trends in the juvenile justice system.

Training and Technical Assistance Division provides juvenile justice training and technical assistance to Federal, State, and local governments; law enforcement, judiciary, and corrections personnel; and private agencies, educational institutions, and community organizations.

Special Emphasis Division provides discretionary funds to public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals to replicate tested approaches to delinquency prevention, treatment, and control in such pertinent areas as chronic juvenile offenders, community-based sanctions, and the disproportionate representation of minorities in the juvenile justice system.

State Relations and Assistance Division supports collaborative efforts by States to carry out the mandates of the JJDP Act by providing formula grant funds to States; furnishing technical assistance to States, local governments, and private agencies; and monitoring State compliance with the JJDP Act.

Information Dissemination Unit informs individuals and organizations of OJJDP initiatives; disseminates information on juvenile justice, delinquency prevention, and missing children; and coordinates program planning efforts within OJJDP. The unit’s activities include publishing research and statistical reports, bulletins, and other documents, as well as overseeing the operations of the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse.

Concentration of Federal Efforts Program promotes interagency cooperation and coordination among Federal agencies with responsibilities in the area of juvenile justice. The program primarily carries out this responsibility through the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, an independent body within the executive branch that was established by Congress through the JJDP Act.

Missing and Exploited Children’s Program seeks to promote effective policies and procedures for addressing the problem of missing and exploited children. Established by the Missing Children’s Assistance Act of 1984, the program provides funds for a variety of activities to support and coordinate a network of resources such as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children; training and technical assistance to a network of 47 State clearinghouses, nonprofit organizations, law enforcement personnel, and attorneys; and research and demonstration programs.

The mission of OJJDP is to provide national leadership, coordination, and resources to prevent juvenile victimization and respond appropriately to juvenile delinquency. This is accomplished through developing and implementing prevention programs and a juvenile justice system that protects the public safety, holds juvenile offenders accountable, and provides treatment and rehabilitative services based on the needs of each individual juvenile.

Report to Congress on Juvenile Violence Research

Report



Shay Bilchik, Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

July 1999

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531

Janet Reno
Attorney General

Raymond C. Fisher
Associate Attorney General

Laurie Robinson
Assistant Attorney General

Shay Bilchik
Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

Foreword

Although the violent juvenile crime rate has been decreasing dramatically since 1994, high-profile incidents such as school shootings serve to keep the problem of juvenile violence at the forefront of national attention. It is part of the mission of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to be continually engaged in efforts to understand juvenile violence and to identify policies and programs that will help to prevent or reduce it. Since its inception in 1974, OJJDP has funded numerous research and evaluation studies that have provided important and useful information to guide States and local communities in addressing the problems associated with juvenile violence.

In 1992, as the juvenile violent crime rate was on the rise, Congress directed the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to fund additional research examining violence committed by or against juveniles in urban and rural areas. Among the objectives of the research were to examine characteristics of juveniles involved in violence, to determine the context in which juvenile violence tends to occur, and to make recommendations for the prevention and control of violence by or against juveniles.

This *Report to Congress on Juvenile Violence Research* presents the collective results of the studies funded under the congressional directive. In many ways, the studies confirm what we already knew—that young African-American males are disproportionately involved as offenders and as victims of violence, that firearms play a large role in juvenile violence, and that gang members are frequently involved in violence. The studies also remind us of something very important—although many violent juvenile offenders live in impoverished and high-crime areas, the majority of youth who live in such environments are not involved in serious delinquency.

The recommendations of these studies emphasize four major areas of intervention—gangs, guns, high-risk juveniles, and locations and times of highest risk for juvenile violence—and provide examples of programs that address each. My hope is that this Report will serve as a useful resource for communities as they strive to further reduce the incidence of juvenile violence.

Shay Bilchik

Administrator

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Acknowledgments

This Report is the product of a collaborative effort involving researchers in the field and staff of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice. Within OJJDP, Charlotte Kerr, Deputy Director of the Research and Program Development Division, directed the overall development of the report. Katharine Browning compiled the findings and wrote the report. While responsibility for the report's final content rests with OJJDP, the report was shaped by discussions with and draft reports from a number of individuals and agencies.

OJJDP would like to thank all the researchers involved in the Juvenile Violence Research Studies. These projects required a number of individuals to collect data, conduct data analyses, and prepare the final reports that were submitted to OJJDP. We would especially like to thank the following individuals from each of the sites for their hard work and leadership on the projects and for their assistance in reviewing a draft of this report:

- ◆ Tom McEwen of the Institute for Law and Justice, Jeffrey Roth of The Urban Institute, and Marcia Chaiken of LINC for the District of Columbia studies.
- ◆ Cheryl Maxson and Malcolm Klein of the Social Sciences Research Institute at the University of Southern California for the Los Angeles studies.
- ◆ Susan Limber of the Institute for Families in Society at the University of South Carolina for the South Carolina studies.
- ◆ Harold Rose and Anthony Maggiore of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for the Milwaukee study.
- ◆ David Huizinga of the University of Colorado-Boulder for the Denver Youth Survey.
- ◆ Rolf Loeber of the University of Pittsburgh for the Pittsburgh Youth Study.
- ◆ Terence P. Thornberry of the University at Albany, State University of New York, for the Rochester Youth Development Study.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Foreword | iii |
| Acknowledgments | v |
| Executive Summary | ix |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Characteristics and Patterns of At-Risk Juveniles and Factors That Contribute to Violence Committed By or Against Juveniles | 5 |
| Accessibility of Firearms and the Use of Firearms By or Against Juveniles | 11 |
| Conditions Associated With an Increase in Violence Committed By or Against Juveniles | 13 |
| Recommendations for Prevention and Control of Juvenile Violence | 17 |
| Conclusion | 21 |
| References | 23 |
| Appendix | 27 |

Executive Summary

In 1992, Congress directed the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to conduct a study of the incidence of violence committed by or against juveniles in urban and rural areas in the United States. The four major objectives of the study were:

- ◆ To identify characteristics and patterns of at-risk juveniles and factors that contribute to violence committed by or against juveniles.
- ◆ To determine the accessibility of firearms and the use of firearms by or against juveniles.
- ◆ To determine the conditions associated with an increase in violence committed by or against juveniles.
- ◆ To develop recommendations for prevention and control of juvenile violence.

In response to this legislation, OJJDP funded four new violence studies and continued funding for three existing research projects examining the causes and correlates of serious and violent juvenile offending. The four new studies funded by OJJDP include (1) Studies of Violence Committed By or Against Juveniles in Washington, DC; (2) Juvenile Violence in Los Angeles; (3) Violence Among Rural Youth; and (4) The Milwaukee Homicide Study. The existing studies OJJDP continued funding include three coordinated longitudinal projects, known collectively as the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency. This program, initiated in 1986, includes the following individual projects:

- ◆ A Longitudinal Multidisciplinary Study of Developmental Patterns, the University of Colorado (Denver Youth Survey).
- ◆ Progressions in Antisocial and Delinquent Child Behavior, the University of Pittsburgh (Pittsburgh Youth Study).
- ◆ A Panel Study of a Reciprocal Causal Model of Delinquency, The Research Foundation of State University of New York (SUNY), University at Albany, SUNY (Rochester Youth Development Study).

This summary provides a brief overview of the findings from all the juvenile violence studies. Specific results can be found in the body of this report.

Characteristics and Patterns of At-Risk Juveniles and Factors That Contribute to Violence Committed By or Against Juveniles

The risk that an adolescent will become involved in violent offending and/or be a victim of violence varies based on a number of different factors, including individual characteristics, family characteristics, peer and school factors, neighborhood environment, and daily activities. The focus of most of the juvenile violence studies was on individual characteristics and neighborhood factors associated with an increased risk of involvement in juvenile violence, either as offenders or victims.

Overall, the results from the juvenile violence studies show that violent offenses are overwhelmingly committed by males and that the majority of juvenile victims of violence are male. However, females appear to be getting more involved in violent behavior, with one study finding that, at age 13, females reported slightly higher rates of violent behavior than males. Results from these studies indicate that many juveniles who become involved in violent behavior begin doing so by age 15. The studies also found that African-American males were disproportionately involved as offenders and as victims of violence.

An examination of neighborhood factors indicates that many violent juvenile offenders live in impoverished neighborhoods. However, the majority of youth who live in such environments are not involved in serious delinquency. In surveys of adolescent males living in high-risk neighborhoods in the District of Columbia and Los Angeles, the studies found that there is a small group of offenders responsible for a large percentage of violent crime but that the majority of youth in these neighborhoods are not involved in violent offending.

Accessibility of Firearms and the Use of Firearms By or Against Juveniles

The studies in this report overwhelmingly confirm that firearms play a large role in juvenile violence that is serious enough to come to police attention. Firearms were involved in 80% or more of the violent incidents in each of the studies reporting on this topic. More specifically, firearms were used in 85% of juvenile homicide victimizations in the DC juvenile violence study and 91% of the homicide incidents involving a juvenile in the Los Angeles homicide study. Further, 83% of the juvenile homicide offenders in the Milwaukee homicide study used a firearm to murder their victim.

The survey of adolescent males living in high-risk neighborhoods in Los Angeles found that 40% either had, at some point, possessed a gun or had a close friend who owned a gun, indicating that guns are fairly accessible to these youth. Accessibility in rural areas appears to be somewhat comparable. However, it appears that not all juvenile gun owners are equally dangerous. Two of the studies identified high-risk and low-risk gun owners and found an association between high-risk gun ownership and antisocial behavior.

Conditions Associated With an Increase in Violence Committed By or Against Juveniles

Certain situational conditions appear to be associated with an increase in juvenile violent offending, such as location, time of day, and the presence of gangs. Several studies examined these situational conditions and found that patterns of juvenile violence are not consistent across cities. In Washington, DC, much of the violence occurred either on or near school premises and frequently in the afterschool hours. In 1993, almost half of all juvenile homicide victimizations in DC occurred between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. However, the DC juvenile violence study found that juvenile victimization patterns for all violent crimes during the school year were different from victimization patterns during the summer. During the school year, victimizations peaked at 3 p.m., whereas during the summer, victimizations were highest at 10 p.m. and peaked again at 1 a.m. In contrast to the findings on juvenile homicide victimizations in DC, homicides involving juveniles as victims or perpetrators in Los Angeles occurred more often late at night, in public places, and frequently involved gang members. It is not known why such different patterns exist. Two possible factors may be the difference in weather patterns between the two cities and the existence of year-round schools in Los Angeles, which means that some unsupervised youth are out of school year-round.

Consistent with prior research, the juvenile violence studies found that gang members had higher rates of delinquency than nongang members. Although the majority of youth in high-risk neighborhoods are not involved in gangs, the Los Angeles survey of adolescent males in high-risk areas found that the majority of these youth

are very aware of gang activity in their neighborhoods. In fact, 36% reported that there was pressure on neighborhood youth to join gangs. Those youth who had been a gang member at some time reported that they first hung out with gang members, on average, at age 12, and became a full member at age 13.

Overall, these findings suggest that juvenile violence frequently occurs in the context of unsupervised groups of adolescents. The DC survey of adolescent males living in high-risk neighborhoods found that almost half (48%) were in settings where the absence of an adult prevailed every day after school. The relatively few youth who were in a supervised setting after every school day tended to be less delinquent than those with fewer afterschool hours supervised by adults. A more important factor than actual adult supervision may be the knowledge by a primary caretaker of where his/her children are after school. Less than 10% of nondelinquent youth in the DC survey reported that their primary caretaker rarely or never knew where they were after school; in comparison, 15% to 33% of youth involved in serious delinquent behavior reported their caretakers rarely or never knew where they were. Further compounding the lack of parental supervision of youth in the DC survey is the fact that many of the youth, including nondelinquent youth, have been suspended from school at least once. This indicates that teachers and schools are experiencing difficulties providing constructive guidance to these youth. Although suspensions and expulsions may be justified from the school authorities' point of view, simply releasing adolescents into the community, unsupervised by adults during school hours, only compounds the problems.

Recommendations for Prevention and Control of Juvenile Violence

As a whole, the recommendations from the juvenile violence studies suggest that interventions should target four general areas: gangs, guns, high-risk juveniles, and locations and times of highest risk for juvenile violence. It is important to consider that the recommendations from this group of studies focus on issues that arose from their particular findings. Thus, this Report is not intended to present a comprehensive set of recommendations for the prevention and control of juvenile violence in all communities.

Gangs

The findings of the juvenile violence studies illustrate the importance of establishing effective intervention programs for gang-involved youth. A number of antigang prevention, intervention, and/or suppression programs have had positive results in terms of reducing youth involvement in gangs and in reducing the harm inflicted on society by gang members. The most promising and cost-effective antigang strategy appears to be preventing youth from joining gangs. The Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program, implemented by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, is an example of a school-based gang prevention curriculum that has shown positive preliminary results. One evaluation found that students who completed the G.R.E.A.T. program reported lower levels of gang affiliation and self-reported delinquency. At the community level, a number of national youth organizations are engaged in gang outreach and in providing adolescents with alternatives to gang involvement.

There is general recognition by gang experts that the most effective strategies are likely to be comprehensive, multipronged approaches that incorporate prevention, intervention, and suppression activities. An example of this approach is the Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression Program, an OJJDP demonstration initiative currently being implemented and evaluated in five jurisdictions. The strategies in this model consist of a combination of community mobilization, social intervention and outreach, provision of social and economic opportunities for youth, suppression, and organizational change and development.

Guns

Results from the violence studies indicate that guns play a major role in juvenile violence. In light of this, the studies emphasized the need to find ways to reduce the accessibility of guns to juveniles by closing down the main suppliers of guns to youth. There is a need for impact evaluations of promising programs for closing down sources supplying youth with guns and for further experiments on techniques for discouraging youth from carrying guns. An example of a promising program is Operation Ceasefire, a component program of the well-known Boston Gun Project, which engages multiple law enforcement and criminal justice agencies in targeted deterrence activities.

High-Risk Juveniles

The juvenile violence studies confirm that there is a small group of youth who are responsible for a large proportion of serious and violent delinquency. These youth need to be identified and sanctioned immediately when they commit violent acts. Teachers, police, and others who are mandated to control the youths' behavior are likely to know who these youth are. It is possible that a concerted juvenile and criminal justice system response, working closely with the community, could effectively focus on and control the behavior of these youth.

Locations and Times Associated With Highest Risk of Juvenile Violent Offending

Juvenile violence prevention activities should be implemented where and when youth violence is most likely to occur. Although exact patterns may vary in different regions, a great deal of juvenile violence takes place in the afterschool hours and occurs in and around schools. Thus, schools are prime targets for proactive police problem-solving, truancy and dropout prevention, and other activities designed to reduce youth violence. One promising approach for reducing violence in the schools is bullying prevention. In addition, school- and community-based programs are needed to address juvenile violence occurring in the late afternoon and early evening hours and in high-risk neighborhoods.

Conclusion

The findings from these studies provide additional evidence that violence is taking an alarming toll on minority communities, particularly urban African-American and Hispanic communities. Recent research indicates that the disproportionate level of violence many urban areas are experiencing stems from a combination of macro-level risk factors, such as poverty and joblessness, and individual-level risk factors, particularly family disruption (Hawkins et al., 1998). Consequently, there is a need for concentrated prevention efforts in those inner-city neighborhoods that experience the highest levels of juvenile violence. In addition to some of the programs and strategies suggested in this report, it is important to consider strategies that work with families and impact neighborhood disorder whenever possible.

A recent OJJDP Bulletin, *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders* (1998), identifies a number of early intervention programs that have been found to be effective in mediating risk factors associated with serious and violent juvenile offenders. The Bulletin suggests that the most successful early intervention programs involve simultaneous interventions in multiple domains—home, school, and community. However, there is a continuing need for further research to determine the effectiveness of these programs on a widespread basis and the combinations of programs that work best.

The overriding message from these studies is that there is a need for a balanced and comprehensive approach in addressing the problem of juvenile violence. Communities must work with the juvenile justice system to prevent the development of violent behavior and to intervene with violent youth in effective ways. OJJDP's

Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders (1995) provides a framework for strategic responses at the community, city, State, and national levels designed to target the problem of juvenile violence. In 1996, the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention released *Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan (Action Plan)*, an eight-point statement of objectives and strategies designed to strengthen State and local initiatives to address juvenile violence and delinquency. The *Action Plan* provides model program examples that communities can draw from to address several of the problem areas identified by the Juvenile Violence Research Studies.

Introduction

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is pleased to submit this report on OJJDP's Juvenile Violence Research Studies to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. This report responds to Section 248(b)(6) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended by the JJDP Amendments of 1992 (Public Law 102-586, November 8, 1992).

Section 248(b)(6)

Section 248(b)(6) provides that:

(6)(A) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall begin to conduct a study and continue any pending study of the incidence of violence committed by or against juveniles in urban and rural areas in the United States.

(B) The urban areas shall include—

- (i) the District of Columbia;
- (ii) Los Angeles, California;
- (iii) Milwaukee, Wisconsin;
- (iv) Denver, Colorado;
- (v) Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania;
- (vi) Rochester, New York;
- (vii) Columbia, South Carolina; and
- (viii) such other cities as the Administrator determines to be appropriate.

- (C) At least one rural area shall be included.
- (D) With respect to each urban and rural area included in the study, the objectives of the study shall be—
 - (i) to identify characteristics and patterns of behavior of juveniles who are at risk of becoming violent or victims of homicide;
 - (ii) to identify factors particularly indigenous to such areas that contribute to violence committed by or against juveniles;
 - (iii) to determine the accessibility of firearms, and the use of firearms by or against juveniles;
 - (iv) to determine the conditions that cause any increase in violence committed by or against juveniles;
 - (v) to identify existing and new diversion, prevention, and control programs to ameliorate such conditions;
 - (vi) to improve current systems to prevent and control violence by or against juveniles; and
 - (vii) to develop a plan to assist State and local governments to establish viable ways to reduce homicide committed by or against juveniles.
- (E) Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administration shall submit a report to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of

the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate detailing the results of the study, addressing each objective specified in subparagraph (D).

In response to this congressional direction, OJJDP funded four new violence studies and continued funding for three existing research projects examining the causes and correlates of serious and violent juvenile offending. Because of the breadth of the legislation, the researchers saw the need to select specific objectives upon which they would focus. The complexity of the research also required a longer timeframe to complete the research than the 3 years provided for the completion of the report. Extending the timeframe allowed OJJDP and the researchers to use the combined results of these studies to provide a wealth of information on each of the objectives.

It is important to recognize that the 1992 Amendments were enacted at a time when juvenile violence was increasing. As reported in two OJJDP publications, *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence* (Sickmund, Snyder, and Poe-Yamagata, 1997) and *Juvenile Arrests 1997* (Snyder, 1998), the juvenile violent crime rate increased consistently from 1985 to 1994 and then decreased 12% from 1994 to 1996. Similarly, arrests of juveniles for homicide increased substantially between 1988 and 1993 but declined 39% between 1993 and 1997. Several of the funded studies examined violent juvenile offending at some point between 1992 and 1995. During the course of time required to complete these analyses, violent crime arrest rates have declined. Thus, the individual study findings regarding the level and prevalence of violence are not reflective of current downward trends in juvenile violent crime arrests. However, they provide descriptions of community initiatives and other relevant information that communities can draw on to further reduce the rate of juvenile offending. This report focuses on the issues of juvenile violence emphasized in the congressional directive, which addressed violence related to the substantial increase in juvenile violent crime in the early 1990's. Therefore, child abuse was not a focus of this report.

The Juvenile Violence Research Studies

The four new studies funded by OJJDP are described below.

Studies of Violence Committed By or Against Juveniles, Institute for Law and Justice, Washington, DC

The Institute for Law and Justice (ILJ), in partnership with LINC in Alexandria, VA, and The Urban Institute in Washington, DC, conducted a study of juvenile violence in the District of Columbia. There were two major components of the ILJ study, each focusing on specific objectives laid out in Section 248(b)(6)(D). First, ILJ directed the survey of 213 African-American males, ages 13 to 17, randomly selected from 3 of the highest crime areas in the District. These interviews provided a wealth of information about the attitudes, victimization patterns, and offending behavior of these adolescents. Second, The Urban Institute examined court records of juvenile cases and juvenile victimization records from the Metropolitan Police Department for the 3-year period from 1993 to 1995 to identify trends in juvenile offending and victimization, with a particular focus on violent offenses committed by or against juveniles. Additional information was obtained from two 1997 ILJ-sponsored focus groups that brought together community residents, community agency representatives, and community leaders for the purpose of discussing ways to reduce violent crimes committed by and against young people in the District of Columbia.

Juvenile Violence in Los Angeles: Collecting Juvenile Violence Data for Juvenile Violence Reduction, Social Sciences Research Institute, University of Southern California

Researchers at the Social Sciences Research Institute at the University of Southern California examined juvenile violence in the Los Angeles area, with special emphasis on gang violence. Using police department records, they looked at homicide incidents involving 12- to 17-year-old victims and/or

offenders occurring in 1993 and 1994 to identify the participants and the circumstances of conflicts surrounding the incidents. In addition, they conducted interviews with youth from neighborhoods with high rates of juvenile violence to identify the characteristics and patterns of adolescent violence.

Violence Among Rural Youth, Institute for Families in Society, University of South Carolina

The Institute for Families in Society at the University of South Carolina conducted research on juvenile violence in rural areas. The research focused on five main issues: homicides committed by juveniles, patterns of gun ownership among nonmetropolitan middle school students, community factors affecting violence among rural youth, bullying and antisocial behavior among middle school students, and bullying prevention. The five studies were conducted between 1994 and 1997. The goal of this group of studies was to expand knowledge about the prevalence and nature of violence among youth in rural and nonmetropolitan communities, community-level predictors of youth violence, and the effectiveness of violence prevention strategies in rural communities.

The Milwaukee Homicide Study, University Board of Regents, University of Wisconsin System

The Milwaukee Homicide Study examined homicides involving juveniles and young adults that occurred in Milwaukee in 1992 and 1993, a period during which homicides were peaking in that city. The objectives of the study were to identify characteristics and patterns of behavior of youth involved in violence, identify factors associated with increased youth violence, and examine the role of firearms in youth violence. The study used life history information obtained from incarcerated offenders and next of kin of victims, plus official record data, to analyze differences across types of homicides and differences between victims and offenders. An analysis of the spatial distribution of Milwaukee homicides that occurred over the course of a longer period, from 1989 to 1993, was also undertaken.

In addition to these four studies, OJJDP continued its support of research examining the causes and correlates of delinquent behavior. The Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency (hereinafter Causes and Correlates), initiated in 1986, includes three coordinated longitudinal projects designed to improve the understanding of serious delinquency, violence, and drug use through the examination of how individual youth develop within the context of family, school, peers, and community. The three Causes and Correlates projects employ similar methodologies and collect both self-report and official record data. Samples were carefully drawn to capture inner-city youth considered to be at high risk for involvement in delinquency and drug abuse. The studies include the following individual projects:

- ◆ A Longitudinal Multidisciplinary Study of Developmental Patterns, the University of Colorado (Denver Youth Survey).
- ◆ Progressions in Antisocial and Delinquent Child Behavior, the University of Pittsburgh (Pittsburgh Youth Study).
- ◆ A Panel Study of a Reciprocal Causal Model of Delinquency, The Research Foundation of SUNY, University at Albany, SUNY (Rochester Youth Development Study).

The table on page 4 provides a list of the individual components of the studies that are included in this report and a very brief description of the sample(s) used in each component. More detailed information on the methodology of each study can be found in the appendix.

The remainder of this report is divided into sections based on the objectives set forth in Section 248(b)(6). Each section includes a brief discussion of the background literature provided by the individual reports and presents the findings of the various studies that are related to that objective.

Juvenile Violence Research Studies

| Studies of Violence Committed By or Against Juveniles – Institute for Law and Justice (ILJ) | |
|--|---|
| DC Juvenile Violence | Juveniles ages 12 to 17 charged with violent offenses in 1993–95 in DC ($n=2,686$); juvenile homicide victimizations in 1993–95 ($n=128$), and nonfatal juvenile violent victimizations in 1993–94 in DC ($n=2,971$) |
| DC Survey | Survey of 213 African-American males ages 13 to 17 randomly selected from 3 of the highest crime areas in DC in 1996 |
| Juvenile Violence in Los Angeles – University of Southern California | |
| Los Angeles Homicide | Random sample of 311 homicide incidents involving 12- to 17-year-olds occurring in 1993–94 from 3 jurisdictions in Los Angeles County |
| Los Angeles Survey | Survey of 349 males ages 12 to 17 randomly sampled from 8 high-crime Los Angeles County neighborhoods |
| Violence Among Rural Youth – University of South Carolina | |
| SC Homicide | Three categories of male juvenile offenders ages 17 and under who committed serious offenses between 1992 and 1994 in the State of South Carolina: (1) homicide ($n=86$); (2) assault and battery with intent to kill ($n=77$); (3) other serious offenses ($n=87$) |
| SC Gun | Survey of 6,263 students in 36 middle schools in nonmetropolitan counties conducted in March 1996 |
| SC Community | Arrest rates for juvenile violence in 264 nonmetropolitan counties in 4 States (FL, GA, SC, NE) from 1989 through 1993 |
| SC Bullying | Survey of all fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students from 6 nonmetropolitan school districts in SC conducted in March 1995 ($n=6,389$) |
| SC Bullying Prevention | Evaluation of the bullying prevention program implemented in SC schools, conducted March 1995 through March 1997 |
| The Milwaukee Homicide Study – University of Wisconsin | |
| Milwaukee Homicide | Homicide incidents involving adolescent (13–17) and young adult offenders (18–24) in Milwaukee in 1992 and 1993; interviews with 86 offenders and 57 next of kin of homicide victims |
| The Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency | |
| Denver Youth Survey | Household sample of 1,527 Denver males and females who were 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15 years old in 1988; ongoing longitudinal survey |
| Pittsburgh Youth Study | Random sample of 1,517 males who were in first, fourth, and seventh grades in 1987 in Pittsburgh public schools; ongoing longitudinal survey |
| Rochester Youth | Random sample of 1,000 males and females from Development Study seventh and eighth graders in 1987 from Rochester public schools; ongoing longitudinal survey |

Characteristics and Patterns of At-Risk Juveniles and Factors That Contribute to Violence Committed By or Against Juveniles

The risk that an adolescent will become involved in violent offending and/or be a victim of violence varies based on a variety of factors, including individual characteristics, family characteristics, peer and school influences, neighborhood environment, and daily activities. Although there is no formula for determining exactly who will become violent (or a victim of violence), it is clear that some individuals are at greater risk than others. This section identifies those factors that are associated with an individual's increased risk for involvement in juvenile violence. For purposes of this report, a juvenile is defined as an individual less than 18 years of age.

Individual Factors

Individual factors refers to the broad range of individual characteristics that may be related to behavioral patterns in a variety of ways. These factors include demographic characteristics, such as gender, race, and age, and physiological and psychological characteristics. The focus of this section is on demographic predictors of violent behavior.

Juveniles At Risk of Becoming Violent

In general, the most powerful demographic predictors of individual violent criminality are gender and age. Boys in late adolescence and young men are much more likely to be serious high-rate offenders than girls or older men (Chaiken, 1998b). Further, studies using official record data have consistently found greater involvement of African-Americans in violent offending than of Caucasians (LaFree, 1995). Overall, the research findings from the projects included in this report confirm these patterns.

Gender. Violent offenses are overwhelmingly committed by males. In the DC study of juvenile violence, of the 2,686 juveniles charged with the 4 most serious person offenses (homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault), 82% were males. The SC homicide study found that 88% of the juveniles who committed homicide between 1992 and 1994 were male. Not surprisingly, males were also more likely to display early signs of aggressive behavior, specifically in the form of bullying. The SC bullying study reveals that males were significantly more likely than females to report bullying their peers and twice as likely as females to engage in physical actions to bully others.

The Causes and Correlates research findings indicate that, in general, a greater percentage of males are involved in serious violence than females (Tatem-Kelley et al., 1997). This is consistent with past research findings indicating that violence is more prevalent in males. However, females reported considerable involvement in serious violence. In the Denver sample, the prevalence of serious violence among females ages 13 to 15 was more than half that of males the same age. The difference was even less in the Rochester sample. In fact, at age 13, 18% of females reported the commission of serious violence compared with 16% of males. Thus, females appeared to be increasingly involved in violent behavior.

Age. Results from the violence studies indicate that many juveniles involved in violent behavior begin this behavior by age 15. In the DC juvenile violence study, of the 2,686 juveniles charged with the 4 most serious person offenses,¹ almost 40% were 15 or younger. In the SC homicide study, the mean age at the instant offense of youth in the homicide group

¹ Includes homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

was 15.8. Youth in the assault and battery group averaged 15.6 years and youth in the other serious offenses group averaged 15.1 years.

Past research has generally indicated that rates of violence among males tend to peak at ages 15 to 17 and then decline (Tatem-Kelley et al., 1997). The Causes and Correlates research has not documented a decline in males' self-reported involvement in serious violence in late adolescence. However, females did show an expected age curve with prevalence rates peaking in midadolescence and declining thereafter.

Race. Both the DC juvenile violence study and the SC homicide study found that African-Americans were disproportionately arrested for violent offenses. African-Americans account for approximately 65% of the total population in the District of Columbia, yet the DC juvenile violence study found that, of the 2,686 juveniles charged with the 4 most serious person offenses, 98% were African-American. Whereas the total population in the State of South Carolina is approximately 30% African-American, the SC homicide study found that 82% of the juvenile homicide offenders referred to the State solicitor were African-American, 16% were Caucasian, and 2% were other races. African-Americans were somewhat overrepresented in the homicide and assault and battery groups compared with the other serious offender group.

In the Causes and Correlates study, prevalence rates were examined by age and ethnicity. In Denver and Rochester, three ethnic groups were included: Caucasians, African-Americans, and Hispanics. Because there were virtually no Hispanics in the Pittsburgh sample, only Caucasians and African-Americans were studied in that sample. With only one exception (18-year-olds in Rochester), prevalence rates were higher among minority groups than among Caucasians at each age and site.

Juveniles At Risk of Becoming Victims of Homicide/Violence

Most commonly, studies have revealed that juvenile homicide victims are of the same race and gender as their perpetrators and that the most likely victims of juvenile homicide are acquaintances, followed by strangers, and then family members (Melton et al.,

1998). The most recent national data indicate that in 1995, 54% of victims were acquaintances, 36% were strangers, and 10% were family members (Sickmund et al., 1997).

In terms of gender, the DC juvenile violence study found that between 1993 and 1995, 88% of juvenile homicide victims were male. The results further show that in 1993, 57% of juvenile assault victims were male and in 1994, 59% were male. Regarding the age of juvenile victims, between 1993 and 1995, 10% of juvenile homicide victims in DC were 11 years of age or younger. Nearly 69% were 16- or 17-year-olds.

The DC juvenile violence study found that the majority of juvenile victims of violence are African-American. All but one of the juvenile homicide victims between 1993 and 1995 were African-American. The DC juvenile violence study also found that during 1993, 95% of youth victims of all nonfatal violent crimes were African-American—1,476 as compared with 79 Caucasian youth. In 1994, 94% were African-American.

Demographic Characteristics of Participants in Homicide Incidents Involving Juveniles

Unlike the DC juvenile violence and SC homicide studies, which focused on juvenile offenders and juvenile victims as exclusive categories, the Los Angeles homicide study looked at victims and offenders of homicide incidents involving juveniles as one group. Thus, the Los Angeles sample includes both juveniles and adults. Of the 311 homicide incidents, 30% involved a juvenile victim but only adult suspects, 46% involved only adult victims but a juvenile suspect, and 24% involved juveniles as both victims and suspects. This finding is interesting because it indicates that adults are frequently involved in violence by and against juveniles. Slightly less than one-quarter (24%) of the homicide incidents involving juveniles were “kids against kids.”

The Los Angeles homicide study found that of the 1,248 individuals designated by law enforcement as victims or suspects in 311 homicide incidents involving juveniles, 92% were males and 96% were minority (58% Hispanic and 28% African-American).

Thus, in terms of gender and race, the Los Angeles homicide study echoes results from the other studies showing substantial involvement of minority males in juvenile violence. The mean age of all victims was approximately 23 years and the mean age for offenders was approximately 18.5; median ages for victims and offenders were 17 and 18, respectively.

Additional Individual Factors

A number of additional individual-level factors beyond the demographic characteristics of gender, race, and age are linked with subsequent violent activity (Hawkins et al., 1998). These factors include hyperactivity and risk-taking behavior, aggressiveness, early initiation of violence (by age 12–13), and involvement in other forms of antisocial behavior. These factors are beyond the scope of most of the present studies.² However, some did look at criminal history factors.

Criminal History Factors

Research on the careers of serious and violent offenders suggests that early onset of delinquency and violent behavior predicts more serious and chronic violence among youth (Hawkins et al., 1998; Thornberry, Huizinga, and Loeber, 1995). The Causes and Correlates projects in Denver, Pittsburgh, and Rochester examined the ages of onset of serious delinquency³ for juvenile offenders in urban areas and found that most males who eventually became persistent serious offenders had committed their first serious nonviolent offense by age 14—85% in Pittsburgh, approximately 65% in both Denver and Rochester (Stouthamer-Loeber et al., 1997). The average age of first referral in the SC homicide study was 14 years for youth in the homicide group, 14.2 years for youth in the assault and battery group, and 14.1 years for youth in the other serious assault group.

Relatively few studies have examined patterns of delinquent and criminal activity among juvenile

² The Causes and Correlates studies have examined these factors in great detail. Information on these results can be found in the book *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions* (Loeber and Farrington, eds., 1998).

³ Includes aggravated assault, robbery, rape, gang fights, burglary, theft over \$50, arson, auto theft, fencing, forgery, and fraud.

homicide offenders in particular; most focus on violent offenders as a whole. The SC homicide study compared juvenile homicide offenders with other serious juvenile offenders on the offense type of first referral to the State solicitor. For youth in the homicide group, their first referral most typically was for an offense against persons (33%). In every instance, this offense against persons was the target homicide offense. The next most frequent type of referral was an offense against the public order (31%) (e.g., driving under the influence), followed by property offenses (17%), other offenses (11%) (e.g., blackmail or extortion, driving with a suspended license), and status offenses (8%).

In comparison with the homicide group, the most frequent first referral for youth in the assault and battery group was also for an offense against persons (40%, all of which were the target offense of assault and battery with intent to kill), followed by property offenses (22%), other offenses (17%), public order offenses (15%), and status offenses (7%). The other serious offense group differed, however, in that the most frequent first referral was for a property offense (32%), followed by offenses against persons (28%), public order offenses (27%), other offenses (8%), and status offenses (5%). For the majority of the group, their first referral was for the target offense.

These findings suggest that juveniles who are referred for homicide and those who are referred for assault and battery with intent to kill are similar in that both groups lack official juvenile justice records that could be used to identify them before they are involved in fatal or near-fatal offending. However, this does not eliminate the possibility that they display other problem behaviors that could be detected in other systems (e.g., schools, social services).

Neighborhood Factors

In addition to individual factors, contextual factors contribute to an adolescent's risk of violence. Such contextual factors include family, school, peers, and community and neighborhood factors (Hawkins et al., 1998). Several studies cited in this report examined neighborhood factors associated with juvenile violence.

The DC juvenile violence study found that one census tract, the Douglas neighborhood of Southeast DC, emerged as a high-risk zone for the three non-fatal violent crimes. It was the highest risk tract for rape and assault of juveniles in 1993 and 1994 and for juvenile robbery victimizations in 1993. The tract has a poverty rate of 41%, compared with 17% for the District as a whole. In addition, 86% of households were single-parent (female-headed) households.

The SC study of community social disorganization and crime examined rates of juvenile violence in 264 rural counties (in 4 States) with total populations ranging from 560 to 98,000. The juvenile populations included in the analyses ranged from 50 to 11,000. The study found that juvenile violence was consistently associated with rates of family disruption, ethnic heterogeneity, and poverty. Juvenile arrest rates for violent crimes displayed a curvilinear relationship to population size such that per capita arrest rates went up with increases in juvenile population in the range from 50 to 4,000. Beyond this level, increasing juvenile population had little impact on arrest rates for violent offenses other than robbery.

The Milwaukee homicide study examined the spatial distribution of homicide victimization, both adult and juvenile, in census tracts of Milwaukee. The researchers found that the majority of victimizations from 1989 to 1993 were concentrated in the most deprived census tracts of the city, labeled “dangerous neighborhoods.” Homicides of juveniles ages 13 to 17 were even more concentrated. Eighty-five percent of the 34 juvenile victimizations during this time period occurred in 19 “dangerous neighborhoods,” with more than half taking place in just 4 neighborhoods. Three of these neighborhoods were among the most disadvantaged in the city’s African-American community, as measured by neighborhood stress levels and economic opportunity scores.

Additional analyses using life history information obtained on the juveniles interviewed in the Milwaukee homicide study revealed that all 11 of the juvenile gang-related offenders resided in extreme poverty areas, 10 lived in single-parent households, and 6 experienced serious household violence. Over-

all, out of 29 juvenile homicide offenders (including 4 groups—gang-related, drug-related, robbery-related, and other) interviewed, 90% lived in a single-parent household and 45% reported serious incidents of household violence. These findings indicate the extent to which juvenile homicide offenders live in disadvantaged homes and neighborhoods.

Prevalence of Violence Among Youth in High-Risk Neighborhoods

Twenty years of research repeatedly has shown that in any city or neighborhood a small percentage of offenders are responsible for committing a large proportion of the crime that occurs there (Chaiken, 1998b). Two violence studies, the DC survey and the Los Angeles survey, specifically explored the prevalence of violence among adolescent males in high-risk neighborhoods.

The data collected in the DC survey support prior research findings that a small group of offenders are responsible for a large percentage of violent crime. Among all boys interviewed, 7% were responsible for committing 36% of all the reported delinquent acts. This small number of youth committed close to one-fourth (21%) of all juvenile assaults, close to half (44%) of all drug deals, and close to half (44%) of all property crimes committed by the entire group of boys in the 6 months prior to this study.⁴

A substantial number of studies also demonstrate that few youth make it through adolescence without doing something that could get them into trouble, but most are not seriously involved in crime. Relatively few of the boys (22%) interviewed in these DC neighborhoods failed to self-report any acts that would be considered criminal. But even these “good kids,” in the 6 months before the study, committed,

⁴ Analysis of the DC survey data identified six varieties of criminal behavior among the adolescents interviewed: (1) “good kids” who committed no criminal acts (22%), (2) “fighters” who committed only assaults (19%), (3) drug dealers who sold drugs and committed occasional assaults (5%), (4) property offenders who do not commit robbery or drug dealing (32%), (5) property/dealers who commit property offenses and drug dealing but not robbery (16%), and (6) robbery offenders, the 7% of boys responsible for committing 36% of all the reported delinquent acts.

on average, more than one act that could be considered a juvenile offense, such as running away or underage drinking.

The Los Angeles survey found that 30% of the boys interviewed from high-risk neighborhoods reported committing at least one violent offense in the 6 months prior to the interview. The most common offenses were throwing bottles or rocks at people (15%), being in a gang fight (9%), and hitting someone with the intent to hurt them (13%). With regard to victimization, the Los Angeles survey found that 34% reported at least one violent victimization within the 6 months prior to the interview. The most common types of victimization were having objects thrown at them (21%) and being hit (13%). Eight percent of the youth reported being attacked with a weapon. As the Los Angeles survey shows, some youth were both offenders and victims (19%). Only 11% were offenders but not victims and 15% were victims but not offenders. The majority (55%) were neither victims nor offenders.

Summary

Although the results of these studies cannot be generalized to the total population of juveniles, these individual snapshots appear to be consistent with findings from past research. Overall, juvenile violence is committed primarily by males and often occurs intraracially among minority males. While some younger adolescents do commit violent offenses, the majority of juvenile offenders and victims are 16- and 17-year-olds. An examination of neighborhood factors indicates that many violent juvenile offenders live in disruptive and disorganized families and communities. However, as the surveys with the children living in high-risk neighborhoods show, the majority of youth who live in such environments are not involved in serious delinquency.

Accessibility of Firearms and the Use of Firearms By or Against Juveniles

In studies conducted in the United States, researchers consistently find that the most common weapons used in cases of juvenile homicides are firearms, especially handguns (Cornell, 1993; Loper and Cornell, 1996). For example, in their analysis of Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Supplemental Homicide Report data from 1995, Sickmund and colleagues (1997) observed that 79% of victims of juvenile homicide offenders were slain with a firearm.

The violence studies in this report overwhelmingly confirm that firearms play a large role in juvenile violence that is serious enough to come to police attention. Approximately 85% of juvenile homicide victims in the DC juvenile violence study were murdered with a firearm, while 7% were stabbed. The Los Angeles homicide study found that firearms were used in 91% of the homicide incidents involving a juvenile (85% of all incidents involved a handgun); victims had firearms in only 13% of incidents. The Milwaukee homicide study found that 40 out of 48 juvenile homicide offenders (83%) used a gun to murder their victims.

The Los Angeles survey found that 10% of interviewed youth from high-risk neighborhoods responded that they had, at some point, owned or possessed a gun and that 30% had been close friends with someone who owned a gun. Of those youth reporting gun ownership, 70% indicated that they had obtained the gun from a friend. In terms of accessibility, 25% of the youth interviewed in the Los Angeles survey reported that they knew where to get a gun in their neighborhood and that they knew, by name, an average of four places where they could go to get a gun. Seven percent reported that they could acquire a gun in less than 1 hour. The most frequent reasons for gun ownership in the Los Angeles survey were protection or self-defense, hunting

or target shooting, “for fun” or “just to have it,” and a feeling of importance.

Prior research on reasons for owning guns suggests that, for both adults and adolescents, reasons for gun ownership are significantly related to involvement in antisocial and/or criminal behaviors (Lizotte and Bordua, 1980; Lizotte et al., 1994). Lizotte and Bordua (1980) identified two groups of adult firearm owners: low-risk and high-risk owners. The low-risk group owned their guns legally for protection and sport and posed no serious criminal threat, whereas the high-risk owners used their guns for criminal activity and posed a substantial criminal threat. Using data from the Rochester Youth Development Study, Lizotte et al. (1994) found a similar pattern of low-risk and high-risk ownership among urban adolescents. Low-risk adolescent gun owners were more likely than high-risk owners to own long guns, less likely to engage in criminal behavior, and less likely to carry guns regularly. High-risk adolescent gun owners were more likely than low-risk owners to own guns for protection, associate with peers who owned guns for protection, own handguns and sawed-off long guns, use guns in an assortment of dangerous and illegal activities, and carry guns regularly.

The SC gun study examined patterns and correlates of gun ownership among rural students. The researchers found that 14% of the students reported owning a rifle or shotgun and 9% reported owning a pistol or handgun. This rate is commensurate with rates observed in metropolitan samples of somewhat older children. Gun ownership and reasons for gun ownership were linked with rates of antisocial behavior and bullying. High-risk gun owners (those who owned guns to gain respect or to frighten others) reported significantly higher rates of antisocial

behavior and bullying than did low-risk gun owners (those who owned guns to feel safe or for sporting purposes). Low-risk gun owners reported slightly higher rates of antisocial behavior and bullying than did students who did not own guns. The most powerful correlates of high-risk gun ownership in youth were high-risk gun ownership by family members or by peers.

Summary

Firearms were involved in no less than 80% of the incidents in each of the violence studies reporting on this topic. The Los Angeles survey of adolescent

males living in high-risk neighborhoods found that 40% had, at some point, either possessed a gun (10%) or had a close friend who owned a gun (30%), indicating that guns are fairly accessible to these youth. Accessibility in rural areas appears to be somewhat comparable, with 23% of the students in the SC gun study reporting that they owned some type of gun. However, it appears that not all gun owners are equally dangerous. Two of the studies identified high-risk and low-risk gun owners. Although their measures differed, both studies found an association between high-risk gun ownership and antisocial behavior.

Conditions Associated With an Increase in Violence Committed By or Against Juveniles

There are certain situational conditions that appear to be associated with an increase in juvenile violent offending. For example, incidents of juvenile violence occur more frequently in certain locations and at certain times of the day. Further, the existence of gangs in a community may influence the level of, and be a significant factor in the motivation for committing, violent crimes.

Location

Few researchers have examined the specific locations of homicides committed by juveniles. In one previous study conducted in metropolitan Detroit, Goetting (1989) observed that 19% of juvenile homicides took place in the residence of the victim, 17% occurred in the home of the offender, and 15% occurred in another residence. Thus, about 50% occurred in a place other than a private residence. The locations of victimizations (juvenile violence) in DC showed a clear association with schools. That is, a disproportionate share of juvenile victimizations occurred in or near schools. The Los Angeles homicide study found that 73% of homicide incidents involving a juvenile took place in a public place: street (47%), vehicle (19%), or parking lot (7%). Twenty-three percent were drive-by shootings.

Time of Day

Several studies looked at the time of day during which juvenile violence occurs. In 1993, almost half of all juvenile homicide victimizations in DC occurred between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m.; only 22% occurred between 10 p.m. and 2 a.m. The DC juvenile violence study found that the victimization patterns for all violent crimes during the school year were different from the victimization patterns during the summer break. During the school year, victimiza-

tions peaked at 3 p.m., whereas during the summer, victimizations were highest at 10 p.m. and peaked again at 1 a.m. In the Milwaukee study, 28 out of 35 juvenile homicide victimizations (80%) occurred between 4 p.m. and midnight. In contrast to the findings on juvenile homicide victimization in DC, homicides involving juveniles as victims or perpetrators in Los Angeles most frequently occurred late at night, with the peak hour being from 10 p.m. to 11 p.m. Almost half (46%) of these incidents occurred between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m.

These findings suggest that juvenile violence frequently occurs during times when juveniles are less likely to be supervised (e.g., after school or late at night). The DC survey found that the vast majority of boys (75%) spent the afterschool hours unsupervised by any adult for 1 or more days each week. Almost half (48%) were in settings where the absence of an adult prevailed every day after school. The relatively few youth who were in a supervised setting after every school day reported lower rates of delinquency than those youth with fewer afterschool hours supervised by adults (40% of “good kids” were with some adult every day after school, compared with 20% of robbery offenders).

A more important factor than actual adult supervision may be the mere knowledge by a caretaker of where his/her children are after school. The DC survey found that only 9% of the “good kids” reported that their primary caregiver rarely or never knew where they were after school, compared with 15% of the “fighters,” 18% of property offenders/drug dealers, 22% of property offenders, 30% of drug dealers, and 33% of robbery offenders.

Further compounding the lack of parental supervision of the boys in the three DC neighborhoods is the fact that teachers and other school staff appear

to have given up trying to provide constructive guidance. The vast majority (76%) of boys had been suspended from school at least once; more than half (57%) of the “good kids” had been suspended at least one time. Furthermore, the schools expelled more than 20% of all boys in the three neighborhoods. Although suspensions and expulsions may be justified from the school authorities’ point of view, common sense would indicate that simply releasing large numbers of adolescents out into the community, unsupervised during school hours, is likely to raise the number of delinquent acts committed.

In fact, boys who reported being suspended also reported committing, on average, more than three times the number of delinquent acts in the past 6 months as boys who reported no suspensions. The few who at the time of the interview said that they were not in school reported committing, on average, more than four times as many delinquent acts in the prior 6 months as those who said they were attending school at the time of the interview. However, the high level of delinquent activity could simply be an effect of being suspended, since there is more time to get in trouble.

Gangs

Research on gangs and gang crime is complicated by the fact that vast differences exist in how local and State agencies define gangs and gang membership and how crimes are classified as gang crimes. Moreover, no national-level data exist on the juvenile proportion of gang members or the volume of gang crime (Snyder and Sickmund, 1995). However, some studies have begun to examine the issue of juvenile gang violence at the local level, including several of the juvenile violence studies.

The Los Angeles homicide study found that gangs played a role in almost 80% of the adolescent homicide incidents examined. Two general dimensions of gang involvement, gang member participation and gang motivations, were used to determine the role of gangs in these homicides. Out of 302 incidents in which the motive (or possible motive) for the homicide could be determined, 34% involved at least one current gang member and a clear gang motive. An additional 45% involved at least one current gang

member and had either a possible gang motive or other type of motive.

Prior research demonstrates that adolescents who join street gangs are more involved in delinquent behavior than are adolescents who are not involved in gangs. This is especially true for serious and violent offenders (Thornberry and Burch, 1997). The Rochester Youth Development Study (RYDS) examined the proportion of delinquent acts that gang members committed. The RYDS sample was divided into two groups: (1) gang members—youth who reported being in a gang at some point prior to the end of high school, and (2) nonmembers—youth who reported no involvement in gangs prior to the end of high school. Although only 30% of the RYDS sample were gang members, the results indicated that gang members were responsible for 65% of the delinquent acts, twice as many acts as one would expect, given their share in the population. Even more striking is the fact that gang members accounted for 86% of all the self-reported serious delinquent acts and 69% of all the violent acts.

The Los Angeles survey of youth living in high-risk areas found that a surprisingly low number of interviewed youth (8%) said they had been gang members at some point in their lives. However, the majority reported at least one of the following: being warned by parents about gangs in the neighborhood, frequent talk about gangs around the neighborhood, or frequent gang activity, and/or gang rivalries close by. In the Los Angeles survey, 36% of youth reported that there was pressure on neighborhood youth to join gangs. Of those who reported current or previous gang membership, 52% described themselves as a leader or one of the top people in the gang. This group reported that their first sustained contact with gang members was, on average, at the age of 12 and that they had become full members at the age of 13. Despite the low level of gang membership reported by the Los Angeles sample, 36% of the most recent violent offenses committed by these youth were against gang members, and 51% of the most recent victimizations experienced by the overall sample were committed by gang members.

Similarly, the DC survey found that only 15% of boys in the high-crime-rate neighborhoods had ever joined a gang. There was some greater proclivity to associate

with gangs among more delinquent boys. Less than 9% of “good kids” and “fighters” had ever joined a gang while one-third of the robbery offenders said they had joined a gang. In addition, 30% of the drug dealers reported membership in a gang, at some point. However, as previous research found in other cities, gang membership in these DC neighborhoods was temporary and relatively short, with the typical interval of gang membership being 1 to 2 years.

Motivation Underlying Juvenile Homicides

Previous studies have examined the motives of juvenile perpetrators of homicides and have recognized a distinction between homicides related to crime and homicides related to conflict (Bailey, 1996; Cornell, 1990; Cornell, 1993; Loper and Cornell, 1996). For example, Loper and Cornell (1996) analyzed the FBI Supplemental Homicide Reports for 1984 and 1993 and observed that 59% of the homicides were committed by boys in the course of another criminal act (such as robbery or rape); 43% were committed in the course of conflict. Research by Cornell and colleagues indicated that juvenile males were more likely than both females and adult males to commit homicides in the course of another criminal act (Cornell, 1993; Loper and Cornell, 1996). Additionally, crime-related homicides appeared to be committed more often by youth having an extensive history of delinquent activity (Cornell, 1990).

Two of the OJJDP violence studies examined the motives behind juvenile homicides. The Milwaukee homicide study examined four primary types of homicide: gang-related, drug-related, robbery-related, and other argument-related. Of the 29 juvenile homicide offenders interviewed, 11 were involved in gang-related incidents, 5 in drug-related incidents, 7 in robbery-related incidents, and 6 in other argument-related incidents.

The Los Angeles homicide study examined the circumstances surrounding the homicide incidents involving juveniles, specifically the motives underlying the offenses. This study found that gang rivalry was the reported motive in 33% of the incidents and was the probable motive in an additional 15% of the incidents. Commission of another crime was reported as

the motive in 14% of the incidents. A drug-related motive was reported in only 6% of incidents.

The study further examined the circumstances surrounding those homicides having different types of motives (e.g., gangs, drugs, other crimes, arguments, and other motives) to identify variation, if any, in the nature of the homicides. The results showed that gang-motivated homicides were distinctively different from homicides having other motives, in several ways. First, gang-motivated homicides were slightly more likely to occur during the late hours of the night. Second, gang-motivated homicides were more likely to take place in an open setting than were homicides having other motives. Third, nearly all gang-motivated homicides (and all drug-motivated homicides) involved firearms.

The Los Angeles homicide study found that 25% of the incidents involved an altercation that escalated in intensity. This suggests that there was direct victim involvement in the conflict in at least one-fourth of the incidents.

Summary

The pattern of juvenile violence appears to differ in DC and Los Angeles. In DC, most of the violence occurred in association with school, either on or near school premises, and usually in the afterschool hours. However, homicides involving juveniles in Los Angeles often occurred late at night, in a public place, and with the involvement of gang members. It is not known why such different patterns exist. The pattern of homicides involving juveniles in Los Angeles resembles the pattern of juvenile violence found in DC during the summer months—with violence frequently occurring late at night rather than after school. Two possible factors may be the difference in weather patterns between the two cities and the existence of year-round schools in Los Angeles, which means that some unsupervised youth are out of school year-round.

Although few boys surveyed in high-risk neighborhoods in DC and Los Angeles were involved in gangs, the existence of gangs was well-known to the youth interviewed in both cities. Consistent with prior research, gang members in these communities self-reported higher levels of delinquency than nongang members.

Recommendations for Prevention and Control of Juvenile Violence

As a whole, the juvenile violence studies recommended that interventions to prevent and control juvenile violence should consider four problems/issues: gangs, guns, high-risk juveniles, and locations and times of highest risk for juvenile violence. It is important to consider that the recommendations from this group of studies focus on issues that arose from their particular findings. Thus, this section is not intended to present a comprehensive set of recommendations for the prevention and control of juvenile violence in all communities.

Gangs

The findings of the violence studies suggest the importance of establishing effective intervention programs for gang-involved youth. An extensive body of literature on the offending profiles of gang members shows that gang members are more frequently involved in violence than similarly situated nongang youth (Thornberry, 1998). Gang members are also more violent during periods of gang membership than prior to joining or after leaving gangs (Thornberry et al., 1993). Clearly, successful efforts to reduce gang membership will also produce reductions in juvenile violence. Although many programs have difficulty meeting the challenge posed by youth street gangs, there are some promising strategies. These strategies tend to fall into at least one of three categories: prevention, intervention, and suppression.

The most promising and cost-effective antigang strategy is preventing youth from joining gangs in the first place (Howell, 1998). One example of this type of program is the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program, a school-based gang prevention curriculum implemented by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms that has shown positive preliminary results. Students who

completed the G.R.E.A.T. program reported lower levels of gang affiliation and self-reported delinquency (Esbensen and Osgood, 1997).

On a community level, there are a number of national youth organizations engaged in gang outreach that provide neutral territory for productive afterschool activities, thus providing youth with alternatives to gang involvement (Chaiken, 1998a). The Boys & Girls Clubs of America's Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach program is one example. This program serves as a referral network to link local clubs with courts, police departments, schools, social service agencies, and other organizations. The goal of the network is to recruit youth who are at risk for gang involvement to participate in club programs without the attachment of stigma. Preliminary findings have been encouraging. Other youth organizations serving youth who are at risk for gang involvement include the Girls Incorporated Centers, Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) of the United States of America, and Boy Scouts of America (Chaiken, 1998a).

Although prevention may be the most cost-effective antigang strategy, programs that target youth who are already involved in gang activity are critical. Some youth organizations already engaged in gang prevention activities also reach out to current gang members. However, gang suppression efforts, as opposed to prevention and intervention, tend to be the predominant strategy used by many jurisdictions to reduce gang activity. For example, the Tri-Agency Resource Gang Enforcement Team (TARGET) in California is a comprehensive strategy combining gang interdiction, apprehension, and prosecution (Capizzi, Cook, and Schumacher, 1995). A Gang Incident Tracking System (GITS) is used to track gang members. Information from

GITS is used by the TARGET program to select appropriate gang members and gangs for intervention. While these intervention and suppression efforts are generally considered promising, there is a need for more evaluation of these strategies.

There is general recognition among gang experts that the most effective strategies to deter gang involvement are likely to be comprehensive, multi-pronged approaches that incorporate prevention, intervention, and suppression activities, while encouraging collaboration among various community agencies. The Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression Program is an OJJDP demonstration initiative that is currently being implemented in five jurisdictions (Thornberry and Burch, 1997). This is a multiyear effort to implement and test a comprehensive model developed by Dr. Irving Spergel at the University of Chicago. The strategies in this model consist of a combination of community mobilization, social intervention and outreach, provision of social and economic opportunities for youth, suppression, and organizational change and development. The demonstrations are currently being evaluated.

Findings from the Los Angeles homicide study emphasize the high rate of involvement of gang members in adolescent homicides. The dynamics of gang homicides suggest that truce-making activities among rival gangs should be assessed (Maxson, 1998). Truce-making efforts have been initiated in the Los Angeles area and elsewhere but have never been adequately evaluated. Anecdotal evidence suggests that truces are difficult to maintain. Nevertheless, the sporadic nature of gang violence (Klein, 1995) and the contagious nature of the threat of rival gangs (Decker and Van Winkle, 1996) suggest that efforts to make peace and reduce the perception of threat by rival gangs should be considered. Truce-making might be one creative approach to reducing the lethality of gang membership.

The Los Angeles homicide study also found that firearms played a greater role in gang-related homicides than in nongang-related homicides involving juveniles. Thus, programs and policies attempting to reduce adolescent homicides in Los Angeles

clearly must target the accessibility and use of firearms by gang members. Firearms reduction strategies should take into account gang dynamics and the features of gang homicides. For example, particular attention should be accorded to the legal and extralegal suppliers of firearms to gang members. Attempts to control the availability of illegal firearms should be informed by the demand characteristics of gang consumers. Other studies have indicated that gang members most often purchase firearms for protection and "on the street" rather than from licensed firearms dealers (Lizotte et al., 1997; Decker and Van Winkle, 1996; Sheley and Wright, 1995). The Boston Gun Project, which will be discussed in the next section, is an example of a gun violence reduction program that focuses on gangs in its intervention activities.

Guns

Data from the violence studies indicate that guns play a major role in juvenile violence. The findings also show that adolescents own guns for a variety of reasons, including sport, protection, and intimidation of others. Although society should certainly be concerned about adolescents carrying firearms in certain circumstances (e.g., at school), findings from the SC homicide study and Lizotte and colleagues' (1994) Rochester analysis suggest that not all adolescent gun owners are equally dangerous. Thus, violence prevention, whether it be school based or community based, should focus on high-risk gun owners.

Maxson (1998) suggests that the Boston Gun Project (Kennedy et al., 1997) is a well-publicized illustration of an intervention that narrowly focuses on gang firearm possession and use. Operation Ceasefire is one of the interventions included in the Boston Gun Project. This program engages multiple law enforcement and criminal justice agencies in targeted deterrence activities. Gang members are notified that carrying firearms will precipitate a swift and severe response (e.g., Federal prosecution and disruption of drug activities). Homicides of young men age 24 and younger fell by two-thirds in Boston after the Ceasefire strategy was put in place in 1996 (Kennedy, 1998).

The LINC report points out that recent research shows two promising measures for reducing the number of adolescent males who carry guns and, therefore, reducing the number of fatalities that result from fights between youth with guns: (1) close down the main sources of guns reaching youth, and (2) give youth face-saving reasons not to carry guns. At this point in time, it is not known how best to accomplish those two objectives. Thus, there is a need for impact evaluations of promising programs for closing down sources supplying youth with guns and for further experiments on techniques for discouraging youth from carrying guns.

High-Risk Juveniles

The LINC report recommends identifying the 7% of neighborhood youth who are the most serious delinquents. Results from interviews of youth in three of the highest crime areas of the District show that about 7% are serious delinquents in need of immediate attention. These youth need to be told what forms of violent behavior (e.g., using a gun, aggravated assault, etc.) will result in massive crackdowns on them, their crews, and friends who are accessories. If they commit violent acts, they must be sanctioned immediately by those with authority to do so. If youth are to be deterred by such crackdowns and sanctions, they must be aware of the effort and believe that the consequences will actually take place. The process of handling juveniles in the courts and in corrections must be streamlined so youth realize that unlawful behavior results in rapid response. Teachers, police, and others who are mandated to control the youths' behavior may know who these youth are. A concerted justice system response working closely with the community can effectively control their worst behavior.

Locations and Times Associated With Highest Risk of Juvenile Violent Offending

As the results from the juvenile violence studies indicate, there are certain situational conditions that appear to be associated with an increase in juvenile violent offending. Thus, it is important for interven-

tions to target the locations and times associated with the highest risk of juvenile violent offending.

Where

Schools. The Washington, DC, studies suggest that since youth violence in the District tends to cluster near schools, especially high schools and middle schools, those areas may be promising targets for proactive police problem-solving, truancy prevention, and other activities to reduce youth violence.

One promising approach for reducing violence in the schools is bullying prevention. Bullying has been associated with a variety of adverse effects on adolescents, including antisocial behavior. The first intervention to reduce bullying among school children was developed by Olweus (1993) and launched in Norway in the early 1980's. This program involves interventions at multiple levels (e.g., schoolwide, classroom, and individual) designed to establish norms within the school environment that support prosocial and inclusive behavior among children and that discourage bullying and other antisocial behavior. Olweus (1993, 1991) observed a reduction in bullying, victimization, and antisocial behavior as a result of a bullying prevention program being implemented in Norwegian schools. Specifically, there were strong reductions in self-reports of vandalism, fighting, theft, alcohol use, and truancy.

Until recently, there have been few attempts to establish antibullying initiatives in U.S. schools. The SC Bullying Prevention study evaluated a bullying prevention program implemented in SC middle schools, a program based largely on the model developed by Olweus. Preliminary findings indicate that the program did reduce self-reported delinquency after 1 year. However, more research is needed on the long-term impact of this type of program.

Neighborhoods. The DC juvenile violence study found that certain neighborhoods are at greater risk for juvenile violence than surrounding areas and that the high-risk neighborhoods remained relatively stable over 2 consecutive years: 1993 and 1994. Current data should be analyzed to identify current "hot spots" for youth violence, existing programs in those

neighborhoods should be inventoried, and new programs should be strategically placed to fill the gaps.

The year-to-year stability in juvenile violence rates strongly suggests that the high-crime areas are geographically stable enough for new programs to become established and attract participants before youth violence would move elsewhere naturally—that new program locations will not be “obsolete on arrival.” Other findings of this study suggest that, at least in the most troubled District areas, programs should address the needs of entire neighborhoods, rather than specific conditions at pinpointed addresses or intersections.

The Milwaukee homicide study found that neighborhoods experiencing high homicide rates are among the most desolate in the city of Milwaukee. As in the DC juvenile violence study, the Milwaukee homicide study found that elevated risk at the neighborhood level exhibited a high degree of stability during the 1989–93 time period. Thus, the Milwaukee findings suggest that there is a need for neighborhood-level intervention and prevention strategies. However, very few neighborhood-level interventions have been implemented and even fewer have been evaluated. Therefore, there is a need for further development in this area.

When

The Washington, DC, studies recommend intervening with youth at times when youth violence most likely will occur. Interventions such as youth curfews and midnight basketball presuppose that youth violence occurs at generally the same times as adult violence: in the evenings, especially on weekends. Instead, prevention activities should be implemented at three generally overlooked times of day, when the risk of youth violence is elevated: after school, at school lunch periods, and in the morning before school.

Late summer evenings are also peak periods for youth violence. This pattern emerges from an analysis by The Urban Institute on youth violence in 1993 and 1994, especially when school months and summer months are considered separately. The hours between 3 p.m. and 5 p.m. are highest for

juvenile victimizations during the school months, but not during the summer months.

In summer 1995, the District passed a curfew law aimed at reducing juvenile offending and victimization between the hours of 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. By October 1996, a Federal judge overturned the law because the city council had not provided adequate data supporting the notion that a large number of crimes are committed during that period. In fact, during the hours associated with the curfew, youth are highly vulnerable in the summer, though less so during the school year. A recent LINC report, entitled *Kids, COPS, and Communities*, suggests that the best role police can play in the school and afterschool setting is to help contribute to the positive development of youth by participating in and supporting youth development programs run by professionals in the schools and youth organizations.

The Los Angeles homicide study notes that other incident characteristics provide some direction for program development. Programs should operate throughout the year with additional efforts expended in the high-volume months of May and July. The nighttime hours from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. are the most common period for adolescent homicide in Los Angeles, but elevated risk was detected earlier in the evening, beginning at 7 p.m. Although juvenile curfew laws may reduce some juvenile violence, the effects would be limited since so much violence occurs in the afternoon and early evenings, time periods that would not be covered in the curfew. One advisory board member for the Los Angeles homicide study suggested that probation conditions to stay at home after dark should be enforced, perhaps through the use of electronic monitoring techniques. Programs that productively occupy adolescents in the midevening hours might be more effective for homicide reduction than afterschool programs in Los Angeles. The high volume of street settings suggests that efforts to otherwise occupy youth might also be productive by keeping them off the streets. School and park facilities are convenient locations for adult-supervised activities.

Conclusion

The findings from these studies provide additional evidence that violence is taking an alarming toll on minority communities, particularly urban African-American and Hispanic communities. Recent research indicates that the disproportionate level of violence many urban areas are experiencing stems from a combination of macrolevel risk factors (such as poverty and joblessness) and individual-level risk factors, particularly family disruption (Hawkins et al., 1998). Consequently, there is a need for concentrated prevention efforts in those inner-city neighborhoods that experience the highest levels of juvenile violence. In addition to some of the programs and strategies suggested in this report, it is important to consider strategies that work with families and impact neighborhood disorder whenever possible.

A recent OJJDP Bulletin, *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders* (1998), identifies a number of early intervention programs that have been found to be effective in mediating risk factors associated with serious and violent juvenile offenders. These programs address risk factors in several domains—child, parent, school, and community. The following is a list of examples of effective interventions (for further details on effective programs, see *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions* (Loeber and Farrington, eds., 1998)):

- ◆ **Child**—Home visitation of pregnant teenagers, social competence training, peer mediation and conflict resolution, and medical treatment for neurological disorders and mental illness.
- ◆ **Parent**—Parent management training, functional family therapy, and family preservation.
- ◆ **School**—Early intellectual enrichment and school organization interventions.

- ◆ **Community**—Comprehensive community mobilization, situational crime prevention, intensive police patrolling, legal and policy changes restricting availability and use of guns, drugs, and alcohol and mandatory-sentencing laws for crimes involving firearms.

It is important to remember that it will take longer to see an impact from child, parent, and school interventions than from community interventions. The *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders* (1998) Bulletin suggests that the most successful early intervention programs involve simultaneous interventions in multiple domains—home, school, and community. However, there is a continuing need for further research to determine the effectiveness of these programs on a widespread basis and the combinations of programs that work best.

An additional finding worth noting is that much juvenile violence occurs when there is a group of unsupervised teenagers. Although adolescents cannot and should not be supervised at all times, it is possible to increase the level of supervision in some circumstances, particularly in and around schools. As the DC survey showed, a considerable amount of juvenile violence takes place in or near schools. Schools that experience high levels of violence should look into ways that they can increase the level of structure within the school and maintain a higher degree of adult supervision. The U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Justice recently released a joint report, entitled *Early Warning, Timely Response: A Guide to Safe Schools* (1998), which identifies a number of effective violence prevention and intervention activities that schools can implement to increase the level of safety on and around school premises. This guide is a good initial resource for schools looking for ways to reduce juvenile violence.

The overriding message from these studies is that there is a need for a balanced and comprehensive approach to address the problem of juvenile violence. Communities must work with the juvenile justice system to prevent the development of violent behavior and to intervene with violent youth in effective ways. Using precisely this concept, OJJDP's *Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders* (1995) provides a framework for strategic responses at the community, city, State, and national levels, designed to target the problem of juvenile violence. In 1996, the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and

Delinquency Prevention released *Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan (Action Plan)*, an eight-point statement of objectives and strategies designed to strengthen State and local initiatives to address and reduce the impact of juvenile violence and delinquency. The *Action Plan* provides model program examples that communities can draw from to address several of the problem areas identified by the Juvenile Violence Research Studies, including reducing youth involvement with guns and gangs and providing more neighborhood-based programs for children and youth.

References

- Bailey, S. 1996. Adolescents who murder. *Journal of Adolescence* 19:19–39.
- Capizzi, M., Cook, J.I., and Schumacher, M. 1995. The TARGET model: A new approach to the prosecution of gang cases. *The Prosecutor* (Fall):18–21.
- Chaiken, M.R. 1998a. *Kids, COPS, and Communities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, and Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Chaiken, M.R. 1998b. *Violent Neighborhoods—Violent Kids: What Could Be Done With Boys in D.C.* Alexandria, VA: LINC.
- Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 1996. *Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan (Action Plan)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Cornell, D.G. 1990. Prior adjustment of violent juvenile offenders. *Law and Human Behavior* 14:569–577.
- Cornell, D.G. 1993. Juvenile homicide: A growing national problem. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law* 11:389–396.
- Decker, S., and Van Winkle, B. 1996. *Life in the Gang: Family, Friends, and Violence*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Dwyer, K., Osher, D., Warger, C. 1998. *Early Warning, Timely Response: A Guide to Safe Schools*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Esbensen, F., and Osgood, D.W. 1997. *National Evaluation of G.R.E.A.T. Research in Brief*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Goetting, A. 1989. Patterns of homicide among children. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 16:63–80.
- Gouvis, C., Johnson, C.C., and Roth, J.A. 1997. *Patterns of Violent Crimes Committed Against Juveniles in the District of Columbia*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Hawkins, J.D., Herrenkohl, T., Farrington, D.P., Brewer, D., Catalano, R.F., and Harachi, T.W. 1998. A review of predictors of youth violence. In *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*, edited by R. Loeber and D.P. Farrington. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., pp. 106–146.
- Howell, J.C. 1995. *Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Howell, J.C. 1998. *Youth Gangs: An Overview*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Kennedy, D.M. 1998. Pulling levers: Getting deterrence right. *National Institute of Justice Journal* July:2–8.

- Kennedy, D.M., Braga, A.A., and Piehl, A.M. 1997. The (un)known universe: Mapping gangs and gang violence in Boston. *Crime Mapping and Crime Preventing*, edited by D. Weisburd and T. McEwen. New York, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Klein, M.W. 1995. Street gang cycles. In *Crime*, edited by J.Q. Wilson and J. Petersilia. San Francisco, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies.
- LaFree, G. 1995. Race and crime trends in the United States, 1946–1990. In *Ethnicity, Race, and Crime: Perspectives Across Time and Place*, edited by D.F. Hawkins. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lizotte, A.J. and Bordua, D. 1980. Firearms ownership for sport and protection: Two divergent models. *American Sociological Review* 45:229–244.
- Lizotte, A.J., Tesorio, J.M., Thornberry, T.P., and Krohn, M.D. 1994. Patterns of adolescent firearms ownership and use. *Justice Quarterly* 11:51–74.
- Lizotte, A.J., Tesorio, J.M., Thornberry, T.P., and Krohn, M.D. 1997. Patterns of illegal gun carrying among young urban youths. *Valparaiso University Law Review* 31(2):375–418.
- Loeber, R., and Farrington, D.P. (eds). 1998. *Never Too Early Never Too Late: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions for Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Loper, A.B., and Cornell, D.G. 1996. Homicide by juvenile girls. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 5:323–336.
- Maxson, C.L. 1998. Selected preliminary findings from interviews with Los Angeles adolescents. Unpublished report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Maxson, C.L., Sternheimer, K., and Klein, M.W. 1998. Characteristics of adolescent homicide. Unpublished report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- McEwen, T., Chaiken, M.R., and Roth, J.A. 1998a. *Juvenile Violence in the District of Columbia: Report Summary*. Alexandria, VA: Institute for Law and Justice.
- McEwen, T., Chaiken, M.R., and Roth, J.A. 1998b. *Juvenile Violence in the District of Columbia: Summary of Recommendations*. Alexandria, VA: Institute for Law and Justice.
- Melton, G.B., Limber, S.P., Cunningham, P., Osgood, W., Chambers, J., Flerx, V., Henggeler, S., and Nation, M. 1998. Violence among rural youth: Final report to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Unpublished report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 1998. *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Olweus, D. 1991. Bully/victim problems among school children: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. In *The Development and Treatment of Childhood Aggression*, edited by D.J. Pepler and K.H. Rubin. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Olweus, D. 1993. *Bullying at School: What We Know and What We Can Do*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Rose, H.M., Maggiore, A., and Schaefer, B. 1998. The Milwaukee homicide project: Final report. Unpublished report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Sheley, J.F., and Wright, J.D. 1995. *In the Line of Fire*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Sickmund, M., Snyder, H.N., and Poe-Yamagata, E. 1997. *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

-
- Snyder, H.N. 1998. *Juvenile Arrests 1997*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Snyder, H.N., and Sickmund, M. 1995. *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Loeber, R., Huizinga, D., and Porter, P. 1997. The early onset of persistent serious offending. Unpublished report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Tatem-Kelley, B., Huizinga, D., Thornberry, T.P., and Loeber, R. 1997. *Epidemiology of Serious Violence*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Thornberry, T.P. 1998. Membership in youth gangs and involvement in serious and violent offending. In *Never Too Early Never Too Late: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions for Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders*, edited by R. Loeber and D.P. Farrington. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Thornberry, T.P., and Burch, J.H. 1997. *Gang Members and Delinquent Behavior*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Thornberry, T.P., Huizinga, D., and Loeber, R. 1995. The prevention of serious delinquency and violence: Implications from the program of research on the causes and correlates of delinquency. In *Sourcebook on Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*, edited by J.C. Howell, B. Krisberg, J.D. Hawkins, and J.J. Wilson. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., pp. 213-237.
- Thornberry, T.P., Krohn, M.D., Lizotte, A.J., and Chard-Wierschem, D. 1993. The role of juvenile gangs in facilitating delinquent behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30:55-87.

Appendix

South Carolina Juvenile Violence Research Study

The rural violence research was conducted by the Institute for Families in Society at the University of South Carolina. The five components of this research include homicides committed by juveniles, patterns of gun ownership among nonmetropolitan middle school students, community factors affecting violence among rural youth, bullying and antisocial behavior among middle school students, and bullying prevention. The goal of this group of studies was to help fill a gap in the body of knowledge pertaining to the prevalence and nature of violence among youth in rural and nonmetropolitan communities and community-level predictors of youth violence.

The SC homicide study involved the examination of minors who committed homicides in a 3-year period in South Carolina. Computerized case record information was obtained from the State Department of Juvenile Justice for 98 youth referred to the State solicitor for homicide between 1992 and 1994. For the purposes of these analyses, only the data for the male youth ($n=86$, 88% of total sample) were reported. Case record information included limited demographic information about the youth and his family and a complete listing of referrals to the State solicitor (including dates for each offense, solicitor decisions, and dispositions). In order to obtain additional information pertaining to the circumstances surrounding the homicides, newspaper accounts were retrieved wherever possible ($n=34$).

For the purpose of comparison, computerized case record information was also obtained for two additional groups of youth who had been referred for serious and/or violent offenses: (1) 77 male youth who had been referred for assault and battery with

intent to kill (assault and battery group) and (2) 87 male youth who had committed other serious offenses (other serious offense group), exclusive of homicide or assault and battery with intent to kill. Case records for the assault and battery group and the other serious offense group were randomly selected from the total sample of youth referred for these offenses between 1992 and 1994.

The SC gun study examined gun ownership in rural communities. Studies of youth in urban settings indicate youth who own guns for recreational purposes are less likely to engage in criminal behavior and less likely to carry guns regularly than are youth who own guns for protection or for engaging in dangerous or illegal activities. South Carolina researchers surveyed 6,263 students in 36 middle schools in nonmetropolitan counties to obtain information on gun ownership, reasons for gun ownership, and the relationship between patterns of gun ownership, antisocial behavior, and bullying.

In an effort to extend the study of community social disorganization and crime beyond its exclusive focus on large urban centers, the SC community study involved an analysis of structural correlates of arrest rates for juvenile violence in 264 nonmetropolitan counties in 4 States (Florida, Georgia, Nebraska, and South Carolina), where total populations ranged from 560 to 98,000. Delinquency was measured using the number of arrests for juveniles (ages 11 through 17) in each county, pooled over a 5-year period from 1989 to 1993. The primary dependent variables were arrests for homicide, forcible rape, aggravated assault, robbery, weapons offenses, and simple assault; arrests for crimes compiled for the Uniform Crime Reports violence index; and arrests for burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft. Explanatory variables, which were based primarily on

1990 census data, included mobility, unemployment rates, family disruption, ethnic heterogeneity, poverty, proximity to metropolitan counties, and proximity to an interstate highway.

The SC bullying study examined bullying and anti-social behavior among middle school students. The South Carolina researchers surveyed all fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students from six nonmetropolitan school districts in South Carolina. The survey instrument was an English language version of the Olweus Questionnaire for Students, which was revised for use with middle school students. This questionnaire was designed to assess the nature and frequency of bullying and related antisocial behavior. Bullying is commonly understood as repeated negative acts committed by one or more individuals against another individual (Olweus, 1993). These negative acts can be physical or verbal in nature, or they may involve indirect aggression such as social exclusion. Implicit in this definition is an imbalance in real or perceived power between the bully and the victim. Thus, fighting among peers of equal power, generally, is not considered bullying.

The SC bullying prevention study examined the impact of a bullying prevention program on middle school students. Participants included fourth through eighth grade students in six nonmetropolitan school districts in the Southeast. The districts were organized into matched pairs based on geographic location and student demographics. In each pair, one district was selected to receive the intervention for both years of the project (Group A). The other district served as a comparison group for the first year of the project and received the intervention during the second year (Group B). There were 11 Group A schools and 7 Group B schools.

Within each school district, all fourth, fifth, and sixth graders were given a baseline assessment of bullying and antisocial behaviors during the first 2 weeks of March 1995. To assess the effects of the intervention, similar surveys were conducted with the same cohort of students during the first 2 weeks of March for the next 2 years. At baseline, 6,389 students completed the survey. One year later, 6,263 students completed the survey. For the final survey, 3 schools in Group B elected not to participate, resulting in a sample of 4,928 students for the third year.

Washington, DC, Juvenile Violence Research Study

The Institute for Law and Justice (ILJ), in partnership with LINC in Alexandria, VA, and The Urban Institute in Washington, DC, conducted a study of juvenile violence in the District of Columbia. There were several components of the ILJ study, each focusing on specific objectives laid out in the legislation.

ILJ directed the survey and analyzed the data from a survey of 213 African-American boys, ages 13 to 17, randomly selected from 3 of the highest crime areas in the District. These interviews, undertaken with the assistance of faculty and graduate students from Howard University, provide a wealth of information about the attitudes, victimization, and offending behavior of the boys. Findings from the interviews reflect many of the problems these youth encounter in the District.

The Urban Institute focused on identifying where and when violence involving children was taking place. They used court records of juvenile cases and juvenile victimization records from the Metropolitan Police Department to identify current trends in juvenile offending and victimization, with a particular focus on violent offenses committed by or against juveniles. Juvenile court cases for the 3-year period from 1993 to 1995 were reviewed. The sample of juvenile violent offenders in DC includes all 2,686 juveniles charged with violent crimes in the District between 1993 and 1995. These charges include homicide ($n=169$), rape ($n=66$), robbery ($n=801$), and aggravated assault ($n=1,650$).

Juvenile homicide victimizations in DC were examined for the 1993–95 time period. There were 51 juvenile homicide victims in 1993, 38 in 1994, and 39 in 1995, for a total of 128 during the time period examined. It is important to note that these numbers are different from those that may be officially reported by the police department. The reason for this is that the age of the victim is often missing in the police records. The Urban Institute research team worked with the police department to develop more accurate information on the ages of the victims.

Nonfatal juvenile violent victimizations in DC were examined for 1993 and 1994. Nonfatal violent acts

include rape, robbery, and assault. In 1993, there were 126 juvenile rape victims, 386 juvenile robbery victims, and 1,043 juvenile assault victims. In 1994, there were 140 juvenile rape victims, 374 juvenile robbery victims, and 902 juvenile assault victims.

Los Angeles Violence Study

Researchers at the Social Sciences Research Institute at the University of Southern California examined juvenile violence in the Los Angeles area, with special emphasis on gang violence. Two major components of this study are included in this report.

The first component looked at homicide incidents involving 12- to 17-year-old victims and/or offenders. A 50% sample of cases involving such incidents occurring in 1993–94 was selected from law enforcement agencies in each of three jurisdictions in Los Angeles County. The data were obtained from police department records.

The second component consisted of a household survey. Interviews with youth in neighborhoods with high rates of juvenile violence were undertaken to identify the characteristics and patterns of adolescent violence. Eight Los Angeles County neighborhoods (six in the City of Los Angeles) were included. Representative random samples of residential addresses yielded interviews with 349 boys ages 12 to 17. The age distribution of the sample is evenly distributed, with just 9 percentage points dividing the least frequent age category (17 years: 12% of the sample) to the most frequent (14 years: 21% of the sample). Consistent with the ethnic makeup of the selected neighborhoods, Hispanic (70%) and African-American (28%) youth comprise most of the interview sample.

Milwaukee Homicide Study

The Milwaukee Homicide Study examined homicides involving juveniles (ages 13 to 17) and young adults (ages 18 to 24) that occurred in Milwaukee in 1992–93, a period during which homicides were peaking in that city. The study uses life history information obtained from incarcerated offenders and next of kin of victims, along with official record data to analyze differences across types of homicides and

examine differences between victims and offenders. Official record data include court and police records, medical examiner records, social service records, and school records. The analysis is supplemented by an analysis of the spatial distribution of Milwaukee homicides over a longer period, from 1989 to 1993.

The sample was drawn from the total number of homicide incidents in Milwaukee in 1992 and 1993, which included a total of 417 offenders and 332 victims (next of kin). Eligible participants for the life history survey included a 40% sample of African-American male offenders and victims and the universe of victims and offenders in the other race/ethnic/gender groups. In order to increase the number of juveniles and young adults in the sample, the sample of eligible participants was weighted such that 50% of the pool of eligibles would represent 15- to 19-year-olds. The pool of eligible offenders was further restricted to include only incarcerated offenders. Of the 123 eligible incarcerated offenders, 86 agreed to be interviewed. Out of the 106 eligible victims, 57 next of kin agreed to be interviewed. The Milwaukee study report findings are based on a sample of juveniles and adults. The Milwaukee researchers provided OJJDP with followup results for some of the analyses, looking only at the juveniles in their sample. This sample comprised 30 juvenile offenders interviewed. Official record data were obtained for 48 juvenile homicide offenders. The findings used in this report to Congress are generally based on the followup analyses, thus limiting the Milwaukee findings in two ways: (1) the small sample size limits the generalizability of the findings, and (2) there are only a limited number of followup results to include in the report.

The Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency

The Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency, initiated in 1986, includes three coordinated longitudinal projects: the Denver Youth Survey, directed by Dr. David Huizinga at the University of Colorado; the Pittsburgh Youth Study, directed by Dr. Rolf Loeber at the University of Pittsburgh; and the Rochester Youth Development

Study, directed by Dr. Terence P. Thornberry at the University at Albany, State University of New York. The Causes and Correlates studies are designed to improve the understanding of serious delinquency, violence, and drug use through an examination of how individual youth develop within the context of family, school, peers, and community. While each of the three projects has unique features, they share several key elements. All of the projects are longitudinal investigations that involve repeated contacts with the same juveniles over a substantial portion of their developmental years.

In each project, researchers conducted face-to-face interviews with individual juveniles in a private setting to collect self-report information on the nature and frequency of serious violent behavior. The advantage of using self-report data, rather than juvenile justice records of arrests, is that researchers can more accurately measure actual violent behaviors and ascertain when a violent career began. Multiple perspectives on each child's development and behavior were obtained through interviews with the child's primary caretaker and, whenever possible, teachers. In addition to interview data, the studies have collected extensive data from official records, such as school, police, and juvenile court. This provides comparison data on the relationship between self-reported behavior and that which is officially detected and recorded.

The three longitudinal studies are prospective in nature. That is, subjects are repeatedly contacted to

report on their current and recent violent activities. Deterioration of recall is minimized by avoiding lengthy gaps between interviews. Reporting periods were either 6 or 12 months. Sample retention has been excellent; as of 1997, at least 84% of the subjects had been retained at each of the sites, and the average rate of retention across all waves was 90%.

Samples were carefully drawn to capture inner-city youth considered at high risk for involvement in delinquency and drug abuse. The samples can be described as probability samples, in which youth at greater risk are oversampled.

- ◆ Denver's sample includes 1,527 youth (806 males and 721 females) who were 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15 years old when data collection commenced in 1988. This sample represents the general population of youth residing in 20,000 households in high-risk neighborhoods in Denver.
- ◆ Pittsburgh's sample consists of 1,517 males who ranged in age from 7 to 13 and attended grades 1, 4, and 7 when data collection began in 1987. This sample represents the general population of males attending Pittsburgh's public schools.
- ◆ Rochester's sample of 1,000 youth (729 males and 271 females) was drawn from students attending grades 7 and 8. This sample represents the entire range of seventh and eighth grade students attending Rochester's public schools.

Publications From OJJDP

OJJDP produces a variety of publications—Fact Sheets, Bulletins, Summaries, Reports, and the *Juvenile Justice* journal—along with videotapes, including broadcasts from the juvenile justice telecommunications initiative. Through OJJDP's Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (JJC), these publications and other resources are as close as your phone, fax, computer, or mailbox.

Phone:

800-638-8736
(Monday–Friday, 8:30 a.m.–7:00 p.m. ET)

Fax:

301-519-5212

Online:

OJJDP Home Page:

www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org

E-Mail:

puborder@ncjrs.org (to order materials)

askncjrs@ncjrs.org (to ask questions about materials)

Mail:

Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse/NCJRS
P.O. Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20849-6000

Fact Sheets and Bulletins are also available through fax on demand.

Fax on Demand:

800-638-8736, select option 1, select option 2, and listen for instructions

To ensure timely notice of new publications, subscribe to JUVJUST, OJJDP's electronic mailing list.

JUVJUST Mailing List:

e-mail to listproc@ncjrs.org
leave the subject line blank
type *subscribe juvjust your name*

In addition, JJC, through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS), is the repository for tens of thousands of criminal and juvenile justice publications and resources from around the world. They are abstracted and made available through a database, which is searchable online (www.ncjrs.org/database.htm). You are also welcome to submit materials to JJC for inclusion in the database.

The following list highlights popular and recently published OJJDP documents and videotapes, grouped by topical areas.

The *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Brochure* (1996, NCJ 144527 (23 pp.)) offers more information about the agency.

The OJJDP Publications List (BC000115) offers a complete list of OJJDP publications and is also available online.

OJJDP sponsors a teleconference initiative, and a flyer (LT 116) offers a complete list of videos available from these broadcasts.

Corrections and Detention

Beyond the Walls: Improving Conditions of Confinement for Youth in Custody. 1998, NCJ 164727 (116 pp.).

Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders. 1997, NCJ 164258 (42 pp.).

Disproportionate Minority Confinement: 1997 Update. 1998, NCJ 170606 (12 pp.).

Juvenile Arrests 1996. 1997, NCJ 167578 (12 pp.).

Juvenile Court Statistics 1995. 1998, NCJ 170607 (112 pp.).

Courts

Offenders in Juvenile Court, 1995. 1997, NCJ 167885 (12 pp.).

RESTTA National Directory of Restitution and Community Service Programs. 1998, NCJ 166365 (500 pp.), \$33.50.

Youth Courts: A National Movement Teleconference (Video). 1998, NCJ 171149 (120 min.), \$17.00.

Delinquency Prevention

1997 Report to Congress: Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs. 1998, NCJ 170605 (71 pp.).

Allegheny County, PA: Mobilizing To Reduce Juvenile Crime. 1997, NCJ 165693 (12 pp.).

Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan (Report). 1996, NCJ 157106 (200 pp.).

Combating Violence and Delinquency: The National Juvenile Justice Action Plan (Summary). 1996, NCJ 157105 (36 pp.).

Mentoring—A Proven Delinquency Prevention Strategy. 1997, NCJ 164834 (8 pp.).

Mentoring for Youth in Schools and Communities Teleconference (Video). 1997, NCJ 166376 (120 min.), \$17.00.

Mobilizing Communities To Prevent Juvenile Crime. 1997, NCJ 165928 (8 pp.).

Reaching Out to Youth Out of the Education Mainstream. 1997, NCJ 163920 (12 pp.).

Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders. 1998, NCJ 170027 (8 pp.).

Treating Serious Anti-Social Behavior in Youth: The MST Approach. 1997, NCJ 165151 (8 pp.).

The Youngest Delinquents: Offenders Under Age 15. 1997, NCJ 165256 (12 pp.).

Gangs

Gang Members and Delinquent Behavior. 1997, NCJ 165154 (6 pp.).

Youth Gangs: An Overview. 1998, NCJ 167249 (20 pp.).

Youth Gangs in America Teleconference (Video). 1997, NCJ 164937 (120 min.), \$17.00.

General Juvenile Justice

Comprehensive Juvenile Justice in State Legislatures Teleconference (Video). 1998, NCJ 169593 (120 min.), \$17.00.

Developmental Pathways in Boys' Disruptive and Delinquent Behavior. 1997, NCJ 165692 (20 pp.).

Exciting Internships: Work Today for a Better Tomorrow. 1998, NCJ 171696 (6 pp.).

Guidelines for the Screening of Persons Working With Children, the Elderly, and Individuals With Disabilities in Need of Support. 1998, NCJ 167248 (52 pp.).

Juvenile Justice, Volume III, Number 2. 1997, NCJ 165925 (32 pp.).

Juvenile Justice, Volume IV, Number 2. 1997, NCJ 166823 (28 pp.).

Juvenile Justice, Volume V, Number 1. 1998, NCJ 170025 (32 pp.).

Juvenile Justice Reform Initiatives in the States 1994-1996. 1997, NCJ 165697 (81 pp.).

A Juvenile Justice System for the 21st Century. 1998, NCJ 169726 (8 pp.).

Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence. 1997, NCJ 165703 (32 pp.).

Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report. 1995, NCJ 153569 (188 pp.).

Keeping Young People in School: Community Programs That Work. 1997, NCJ 162783 (12 pp.).

Sharing Information: A Guide to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and Participation in Juvenile Justice Programs. 1997, NCJ 163705 (52 pp.).

Missing and Exploited Children

Court Appointed Special Advocates: A Voice for Abused and Neglected Children in Court. 1997, NCJ 164512 (4 pp.).

Federal Resources on Missing and Exploited Children: A Directory for Law Enforcement and Other Public and Private Agencies. 1997, NCJ 168962 (156 pp.).

In the Wake of Childhood Maltreatment. 1997, NCJ 165257 (16 pp.).

Portable Guides to Investigating Child Abuse: An Overview. 1997, NCJ 165153 (8 pp.).

Protecting Children Online Teleconference (Video). 1998, NCJ 170023 (120 min.), \$17.00.

When Your Child Is Missing: A Family Survival Guide. 1998, NCJ 170022 (96 pp.).

Substance Abuse

Beyond the Bench: How Judges Can Help Reduce Juvenile DUI and Alcohol and Other Drug Violations (Video and discussion guide). 1996, NCJ 162357 (16 min.), \$17.00.

Capacity Building for Juvenile Substance Abuse Treatment. 1997, NCJ 167251 (12 pp.).

The Coach's Playbook Against Drugs. 1998, NCJ 173393 (20 pp.).

Drug Identification and Testing in the Juvenile Justice System. 1998, NCJ 167889 (92 pp.).

Juvenile Offenders and Drug Treatment: Promising Approaches Teleconference (Video). 1997, NCJ 168617 (120 min.), \$17.00.

Preventing Drug Abuse Among Youth Teleconference (Video). 1997, NCJ 165583 (120 min.), \$17.00.

Violence and Victimization

Child Development—Community Policing: Partnership in a Climate of Violence. 1997, NCJ 164380 (8 pp.).

Combating Fear and Restoring Safety in Schools. 1998, NCJ 167888 (16 pp.).

Epidemiology of Serious Violence. 1997, NCJ 165152 (12 pp.).

Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders. 1995, NCJ 153681 (255 pp.).

Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions Teleconference (Video). 1998, NCJ 171286 (120 min.), \$17.00.

State Legislative Responses to Violent Juvenile Crime: 1996-97 Update. 1998, NCJ 172835 (16 pp.).

White House Conference on School Safety: Causes and Prevention of Youth Violence Teleconference (Video). 1998, NCJ 173399 (240 min.), \$17.00.

Youth in Action

Planning a Successful Crime Prevention Project. 1998, NCJ 170024 (28 pp.).

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Washington, DC 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

PRESORTED STANDARD
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/OJJDP
PERMIT NO. G-91



Report

NCJ 176976