

POSITION PAPER

RESPONSES TO YOUTH CRIME

Public opinion polls generally show that youth crime constitutes a major concern of Canadians. This is also an issue that is often the subject of political debate, with sometimes heated controversies over the extent and severity of youth crime and the best ways of dealing with the problem. It is common for members of the public and political leaders to take extreme positions on the issue. There are those who argue that juvenile crime constitutes a serious and growing problem within Canadian society and that punitive sanctions represent the most effective way of dealing with the crisis. On the other hand, there are those who take the position that serious criminal activity is confined to a relatively small number of youths, and who argue that prevention and rehabilitation approaches represent the most effective long term responses to the challenge of youth crime.

The purpose of this paper is to review findings from the current psychological literature that bear on these issues and to use those findings for deriving recommendations regarding the most effective means for addressing this serious social issue.

SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

Part of the debate on this issue concerns the actual extent of youth crime and whether or not this activity is increasing or decreasing. Data relating to the rates of youth crime are systematically collected and reported by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics branch of Statistics Canada. However, as Doob, Marinos, and Varma (1995) show, these data are not always easy to interpret. What is being measured are rates of arrests, charges, and criminal convictions, and these do not always provide an accurate picture of the actual rates of youth crime or of changes in those rates.

In spite of difficulties in interpreting these data, it is possible to state some broad conclusions about youthful criminal activity. First, while some adolescents engage in some forms of illegal activity (e.g., underage drinking, illegal drug use, traffic infractions), the majority of Canadian youth do not engage in criminal activity serious enough to warrant attention by the juvenile justice system. It is important to keep this in mind when evaluating some of the more drastic solutions proposed for dealing with the perceived problem of youth crime.

Second, a small number of youth do commit illegal acts serious enough to merit charges and to be processed by the judicial system. It must be recognized that most of these young people are not committing serious crimes and most do not continue a life of

criminal activity. There is, however, a subgroup that do merit attention; the reference is to those engaging in relatively minor antisocial activities but who may be at risk for more serious actions. We can include as well those too young to be charged with crimes but who are beginning to exhibit early warning signs of later criminal activity.

The third group includes the very small number of Canadian youth who engage in serious and persistent criminal activity. This is an important group in two senses. First, the crimes committed by these individuals are often very damaging to victims and to society. Second, a high percentage of this group are likely to continue their criminal activities into the adult years resulting in terrible costs to the individual and to society.

These conclusions should not be interpreted as de-emphasizing the importance of youth crime. There are significant social, economic and emotional costs associated with these activities for victims, the young people committing the crimes, the families of victims and offenders and society in general. The conclusions do, however, emphasize that we are dealing with a relatively small number of Canadian youth. They also help us to understand that the focus of our efforts should be on youths engaged in serious or persistent criminal activity and those at high risk for initiating those activities.

THE CORRELATES AND CAUSES OF YOUTH CRIME

Identifying the factors underlying engagement in criminal activity has preoccupied philosophers, psychologists and other groups of scholars for a very long time. The issues raised in that debate have by no means been completely resolved, but it is encouraging to note that significant theoretical and empirical advances in our understanding of youth crime have been made over the past 20 or so years by psychologists and criminologists.

Discussions of this theoretical and empirical work have been provided by Andrews and Bonta (1998), Hoge (2001a), Loeber and Farrington (1998), and Rutter, Giller, and Hagell (1998). The significant empirical work in this respect is based on sophisticated cross-sectional and longitudinal studies of the factors associated with youthful antisocial behaviour. The longitudinal studies are particularly important because of their potential for yielding information about the causes of this activity. The continuing longitudinal investigation of the precursors of youthful antisocial behaviour being conducted by Mark Le Blanc, Michel Tremblay and their associates at the University of Montreal and Concordia University is an excellent example of this type of study (Le Blanc, Ouimet, & Tremblay, 1988; Tremblay, Masse, Perron, Le Blanc, Schwartzman, & Ledingham, 1992). These researchers have shown that youths who associate with antisocial peers, demonstrate aggressive-egocentric personality traits, and fail to embrace positive social values are at highest risk for serious conduct disorders.

Lipsey and Derzon (1998) and Loeber and Dishion (1983) have provided meta-analyses of the data from these investigations that are useful in summarizing and integrating the results. Integrative theories based on this recent research have also been provided by Andrews and Bonta (1998), Catalano and Hawkins (1996), Elliott and Menard (1996), and Farrington (1996). Table 1 represents an effort to summarize the major factors identified in these theoretical and empirical efforts.

Table 1**Major Factors Associated With Youth Crime**

Individual Factors

History of Conduct Disorder
School/Employment Problems
Antisocial Peer Associations
Substance Abuse
Poor Use of Leisure Time
Dysfunctional Personality/Behaviour Traits
Antisocial Attitudes and Values

Situational Factors

Problematic Parenting
Problems in family of origin: conflict, financial, substance abuse, criminal activity
Community/neighbourhood problems: high crime, drug availability, antisocial values
Low availability of medical and mental health services
Inadequate educational services

It must be acknowledged that the literature on which Table 1 is based does not provide a complete explanation of the causes of youth crime. For example, we do not have full understanding of the way in which the variables interact with one another. As well, the dynamic processes underlying the variables remain unexplained in some cases. How, for example, do parenting practices impact on the development of conduct disorders? The role of genetic factors in affecting the development of personality and behavioural traits is also not fully understood. Nevertheless, the identification of variables linked with youthful criminal activity is important from the point of view of understanding the phenomenon, developing tools for assessing risk for criminal activity, and developing prevention and treatment programs.

Andrews, Bonta, and Hoge (1990) apply the term risk factor to describe the variables identified in Table 1. That is, these represent conditions that are associated with the probability of criminal activity. Some of those variables may also be treated as criminogenic need factors. That is, they represent conditions that can be changed, and, if changed, will reduce the likelihood of antisocial activities. Antisocial attitudes and negative peer group associations are two examples. Protective factors constitute another type of variable relevant to antisocial actions. These refer to conditions that can help to buffer or modify the risk factors. High levels of emotional maturity, good problem solving skills, and the availability of a supportive adult are examples. Protective factors have received less attention in the literature than risk or need factors, but it is clear that these too have an important bearing on youth crime. Theories based on this research have been provided by Catalano and Hawkins (1996), Farrington (1996), and Tremblay

(1992). All of these theories emphasize the importance of recognizing that youthful criminal activity is not affected by a single risk or protective factor but by complex interactions among multiple factors.

As indicated, the identification of risk, need, and protective factors associated with youth crime is important from the point of view of developing intervention strategies for dealing with this serious social problem. We turn now to an examination of that issue.

APPROACHES TO PREVENTION

It is widely assumed in medicine that the prevention of disease is preferable to the necessity for treating diseased conditions. Prevention is nearly always less disabling to the individual and less costly. A similar kind of assumption can be made in connection with criminal and other antisocial behaviours in young people (Coie, 1996; Farrington, 2000). The social and economic costs of the criminal activities of young people and adults are so high that any early efforts that successfully prevent these behaviours are likely to be cost effective.

It is customary to make a distinction between primary and secondary prevention efforts. The former represent programs directed toward the population at large while secondary interventions are directed toward those at risk for a particular negative outcome. It is encouraging that we now have growing support for the efficacy of programs within both of those groups.

Brewer, Hawkins, Catalano, and Neckerman (1995), Hoge (2001a), and Tremblay and Craig (1995) have provided reviews of numerous community and school-based primary prevention programs with proven effectiveness in reducing the incidence of violent and other antisocial behaviours in young people. The Primary Mental Health project (Cowen, 1994), the School Development Program (Comer, 1988), and the Toronto Anti-Bullying Intervention (Pepler, Craig, Ziegler, & Charach, 1994) are three examples of these programs.

There is also growing support from sound program evaluation studies for the efficacy of secondary interventions; that is, programming directed toward high risk young people and families (see Brewer et al., 1995; Hoge, 2001a; Wasserman & Miller, 1998). One example is represented in the early compensatory education programs directed toward children from high risk family environments. Experimental programs such as those initiated at the University of Western Ontario by Mary Wright (1983) and the Perry Preschool Program conducted at Michigan State University (Schweinhart, Barnes, & Weikart, 1993) represent good examples of this work. The latter is particularly important because evaluations have established that the program has a long term impact on maladaptive behaviours and that the monetary benefits of the program far outweigh its initial costs (e.g., Barnett, 1993; Weikart & Schweinhart, 1992). Yoshikawa's (1994, 1995) reviews of this body of data conclude that well designed and carefully delivered early compensatory programs can have positive long term effects on criminal and other antisocial behaviours.

Other prevention type programs for high risk youth have been developed for implementation in the school setting and many of these are proving to be effective in reducing the incidence of antisocial behaviours. The program developed for boys at risk

for antisocial behaviours within the Montreal Prevention Experiment (Tremblay, Pagani-Kurz, Masse, Vitaro, & Phil, 1995) is an example of a program yielding positive results within long term longitudinal evaluations.

We should also not neglect the importance of psychological and special education services in the schools. It is difficult to formally document the impact of these services, but it is clear that school psychologists, social workers, educational specialists and other professionals play a critical role in identifying children at risk for negative outcomes and in providing services to address those risk factors.

Psychological services provided through the mental health system are also critical in the early identification and treatment of young people exhibiting early signs of risk for later serious antisocial behaviours. Many of the young people who come into contact with the juvenile justice system have a history of behavioural and emotional disorder. Numerous surveys show, however, that, for a variety of reasons, adequate psychological and psychiatric services are not available for those in need. This was established by Offord et al. (1987) in the Ontario Health Study and has been documented by numerous surveys conducted in the United States (e.g., Burns et al., 1997; Knitzer, 1982, 1996).

Community-based services for families are also important, particularly for higher risk groups. Family and parent counselling programs offered by social service agencies and psychologists and other professionals in private practice provide critical supports that can aid in the development of healthy young people. Strayhorn and Weidman's (1991) Parent-Child Interaction Training Program and Patterson, Reid, and Dishion's (1992) Parent Management Training Program are two examples of effective programs.

The ultimate solution to the problem of youth crime depends, of course, on a broader approach to addressing fundamental systemic problems associated with damaged children, families, and communities. Communities and neighbourhoods characterized by high levels of unemployment, drug and alcohol abuse, pervasive antisocial attitudes, poor quality housing and other such factors do not represent optimal environments for raising healthy children. While these systemic problems are often beyond the control of mental health professionals, the broad-based approaches to community improvement represented in Ontario's Better Beginnings, Better Futures project (Peters, 1994) and the Communities That Care model of Hawkins and Catalano (1992) have provided us with important guidance in this respect. (see Nelson, Laurendeau, and Chamberland [2001] for a recent review).

TREATMENT OF THE JUVENILE OFFENDER

It seems unarguable that efforts to steer youth away from antisocial activities are preferable to the necessity for dealing with young people engaged in criminal activity. Nevertheless, we must face the reality that a small number of youth do engage in these activities and that some percentage of them are involved in serious or and persistent criminal actions. How should we deal with these youth?

The ultimate goal of all juvenile justice systems is to prevent criminal activity in the individual youth and in society generally. However, there are sharp differences in assumptions about the best means of achieving those goals. Hoge (2001a) and Winterdyk (1997) have provided general discussions of alternative models of juvenile justice, and

Corrado, Bala, Linden, and Le Blanc (1992) and Leschied, Jaffe, and Willis (1991) have presented discussions of the models with specific reference to the Canadian system.

While the treatment of juvenile offenders in Canada is governed by federal law (the Young Offenders Act and its successor the Youth Justice Act), the administration of the act is a provincial responsibility, and there is considerable variability across and within provinces with respect to administration of the act (see Bala, 1997; Corrado et al., 1992).

Although something of an oversimplification, models of juvenile justice can be characterized on a dimension ranging from an emphasis on rehabilitation and child welfare to an emphasis on the deterrence of criminal activity through the use of punitive sanctions. While no Canadian juvenile justice system represents either of these extremes, there is always some tension within the systems regarding a rehabilitative versus a crime focused punitive approach.

Debates about the efficacy of different approaches to the treatment of youthful offenders are based to some extent on philosophic, moral, and legal considerations. It is also important, though, to look to the empirical and theoretical literatures on youth crime for guidance on this issue. Fortunately, a growing body of increasingly sophisticated research on the relative value of different approaches to the treatment of juvenile offending is emerging from the psychological and criminological literatures. These program evaluation studies have generally involved contrasting different strategies (e.g., intensive supervised probation with custody; boot camps with standard forms of incarceration) in terms of their impact on offender recidivism.

Reviews and meta-analyses of this literature have been presented by Altschuler (1998), Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, and Cullen (1990), Dowden and Andrews (1999), Krisberg and Howell (1998), and Lipsey (1992, 1995; Lipsey & Wilson, 1998). These reviews have yielded some important conclusions. First, it is clear that providing treatment interventions of some type with the juvenile offender is more effective than providing no services. This responds to the once popular “nothing works” position that nothing really has an impact on criminal activity; either the individual ceases their activity or does not, and the only sensible response is to curtail the activity through incarceration or some other form of restraint on behaviour. This position is clearly not tenable.

The research also makes clear, though, that some forms of intervention are more effective than others. Punitive sanctions appear generally ineffective in their effects on reoffending rates; this includes sanctions such as incarceration, shock incarceration, and boot camps. The research indicates that, at best, these sanctions produce small decreases in reoffending rates and, at worst, actually produce increased rates of offending.

On the other hand, treatment efforts can be effective in reducing the probability of the youth reoffending. Included are various forms of individual and group counselling, educational and vocational interventions, and other types of treatment. The evidence indicates that these interventions are most effective where delivered in the youth’s community environment, but that they can also be effective in institutional settings. The latter finding is important because it supports the position that, if youths are to be incarcerated, the effects of the institutionalization will be more effective where treatment services are provided.

It is also clear from this research that treatment strategies are not equally effective. A major finding from the research is that behavioural and cognitive-behavioural

interventions directed toward specific and concrete behavioural change represent the most effective type of strategy. This is not to say that other forms of therapy or counselling are ineffective, but it does seem clear that many of the problems exhibited by antisocial and conduct disordered youth respond best to behaviourist strategies.

This conclusion is somewhat modified by the finding in a number of studies that multimodal strategies that allow for the simultaneous targeting of multiple need areas are more effective than those focusing narrowly on one area of need. This finding is consistent with the models of youth crime cited above emphasizing the importance of recognizing complex interactions among these factors. Preliminary results from an evaluation of a multisystemic therapy program recently introduced into the Ontario young offender system supports this conclusion (Leschied & Cunningham, 2000). This program provides for identifying and targeting the entire range of personal, social, family, and educational problems affecting the youth.

Some of the meta-analyses cited above also address issues relating to the delivery of services within the juvenile justice system. One conclusion relevant to this issue is that systems utilizing standardized assessment procedures are generally more effective than those that do not. The reference is to the assessment of risk and need factors. This is consistent with recent efforts to call attention to the importance of assessment activities and to the development of improved assessment procedures (Grisso, 1998; Hoge, 1999a, 1999b, 2001b; Hoge & Andrews, 1996; Le Blanc, 1998).

This program evaluation research has also yielded support for what are termed the risk and need principles of case classification (Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990). These principles state the level of service delivered should reflect the youth's level of risk and that interventions should target specific need factors. The research also supports the responsivity principle that states that the choice of interventions should take account of other characteristics and circumstances of the youth that might affect the impact of a particular intervention. Protective factors may be included in the latter set. These findings all support the importance of careful case planning.

A somewhat separate program evaluation literature has addressed the more general issue of program integrity (see Henggeler, Melton, Brondino, Scherer, & Hanley, 1997; Hollin, 1995). This research indicates that the success of interventions depends very directly on the care with which programs are planned, supported, and monitored. Many failures of treatment programs for youthful offenders likely fail not because the programming principles are unsound, but because of inadequacies in their delivery.

One other issue might be noted, although it has not been the subject of empirical research. A key problem in the delivery of services to youthful offenders relates to a lack of integration of services for children and families. These services are provided by agencies within the medical, mental health, educational, and child protection systems. Also included are voluntary and for-profit community-based organizations. The problem is that there is often a lack of coordination among these systems, and this frequently results in uneconomic and ineffective service delivery. Walsh, Brabeck, and Howard (1999) attribute much of this lack of coordination to political factors ("turf protection" on the part of different agencies) and the inability of different helping professions to communicate and cooperate with one another. This is unfortunate because it is the children and families who suffer from this failure.

POLICY GUIDELINES

Few social issues receive more attention than youth crime. The debates on this issue are never ending and there seem continual pressures to change the laws governing youthful offenders. The policy recommendations emerging from these debates usually reflect compromises among competing philosophic, moral, and legal positions. Appendix A contains a summary of two sets of policy directives that illustrate recent directions emerging from these debates. The first is based on a report of the Canadian Parliament's Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs (Government of Canada, 1998) prepared in connection with the debate over revisions to the Young Offenders and the second is based on the United States' Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders (Howell, 1995).

The purpose of this paper is to formulate a set of policy guidelines for the treatment of juvenile offenders that reflect the broad social values represented in those reports, but that are also based on the most recent criminological and psychological theory and research as outlined above. The following is a summary of these guidelines:

Policy Guideline 1: We recognize that prevention efforts directed toward the general population of young people and their families can serve an important function in reducing levels of antisocial activities generally and criminal activities more specifically. These may involve the use of the media to promote positive values and attitudes (or to reduce the portrayal of negative values and attitudes), the provision of educational and social programs to promote positive parenting and healthy families, insuring that recreational and sports activities are widely available in the community, and the provision of conflict resolution and other such programs in the school setting.

Policy Guideline 2: We recognize the importance of the early identification of high risk families and children and the provision of services to meet their needs. These services may involve early compensatory education programs for children and parents, therapeutic recreational and social programs in the neighbourhood, and specialized treatment programs in the school for youth with behavioural and academic problems. These efforts should also include insuring that medical, mental health, and child protection systems have available effective and coordinated services for young people at risk.

Policy Guideline 3: We recognize that the majority of Canadian youth do not engage in serious criminal or other antisocial behaviours - but that a small number of youth do engage in these actions or are at serious risk for doing so. This emphasizes the importance of focusing on the latter groups and of providing services to help them and their families to address the factors producing the antisocial actions.

Policy Guideline 4: We recognize that the causes of youth crime are complex, and that they reside in the youth, their family environment, their community and the larger society. Further, there are wide individual differences in the factors affecting the

antisocial behaviours, and, hence, no single approach to prevention or treatment will be appropriate for all young people. This highlights the importance of flexibility in our approach to these young people.

Policy Guideline 5: We recognize that the juvenile justice system must embrace a number of goals. These include helping to insure protection of the public and demonstrating to victims of crime that perpetrators are held accountable for their actions. We believe, though, that another important goal of the juvenile justice system should be to insure that the criminogenic needs of the youth are addressed; that is, that measures are taken to reduce or eliminate the conditions that are contributing to the young person's criminal activities. Research clearly shows that the provision of appropriate services to young people provides the most effective means for addressing the problem of youth crime.

Policy Guideline 6: We recognize the importance of insuring that services offered to young people in the juvenile justice system are consistent with certain principles of effective programming. These services should be based on careful assessments of the youth and should be delivered in accordance with the risk, need, and responsivity principles of case classification; that is, intensive services should be delivered to high risk clients, services should be targeted to the specific needs of the youth and services should take account of responsivity considerations. Ideally, these services will be delivered within the youth's home, school, and community setting. If institutionalization of the youth is required, efforts should be made to insure that the appropriate treatments are delivered in that setting and that adequate follow-up services are made available. Finally, the selection of treatments should be based on the best available research regarding the efficacy of alternative intervention strategies.

Policy Guideline 7: We recognize that the ultimate solution to the problem of youth crime rests with efforts to insure that children and adolescents are raised in healthy family and community environments. This emphasizes the importance of insuring that policies and services are available to assist families to function effectively and to support youth as they grow and develop in their community and school settings. It is important as well to recognize that these services for children and families represent investments in the future of our society.

Prepared by:

Robert D. Hoge, Ph.D., C.Psych.
Department of Psychology
Carleton University
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6
(robert_hoge@carleton.ca)

References

- Altschuler, D. M. (1998). Intermediate sanctions and community treatment for serious and violent offenders. In R. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions (pp. 367-385). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (1998). The Psychology of Criminal Conduct (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R. D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. Criminal Justice and Behavior, *17*, 19-52.
- Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A psychologically informed meta-analysis. Criminology, *28*, 369-404.
- Bala, N. (1997). Young offenders law. Concord, ON: Irwin Law.
- Barnett, W. S. (1993). Benefit-cost analysis of preschool education: Findings from a 25-year follow-up. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, *63*, 500-508.
- Brewer, D. D., Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., & Neckerman, H. J. (1995). Preventing serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offending: A review of evaluations of selected strategies in childhood, adolescence, and the community. In J. C. Howell, B. Krisberg, J. D. Hawkins, & J. J. Wilson (Eds.), Serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders (pp. 61-141). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Burns, B. J., Costello, E. J., Erkanli, A., Angold, A., Tweed, D. L., Farmer, E. M. Z., & Angold, A. (1997). Insurance coverage and mental health service use by adolescents with serious emotional disturbance. Journal of Child and Family Studies, *6*, 89-111.
- Catalano, R. F., & Hawkins, J. D. (1996). The social development model: A theory of antisocial behavior. In J. D. Hawkins (Ed.), Delinquency and crime: Current theories (pp. 149-197). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Coie, J. D. (1996). Prevention of violence and antisocial behavior. In R. D. Peters & R. J. McMahon (Eds.), Preventing childhood disorders, substance abuse, and delinquency (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Comer, J. P. (1988). Educating poor minority children. Scientific American, *259*, 42-48.
- Corrado, R. R., Bala, N., Linden, R., & Le Blanc, M. (Eds) (1992). Juvenile justice in Canada: A theoretical and analytical assessment. Toronto: Butterworth.
- Cowen, E. L. (1994). The enhancement of psychological wellness: Challenges and opportunities. American Journal of Community Psychology, *22*, 149-179.
- Doob, A. N., Marinos, V., & Varma, K. N. (1995). Youth crime and the youth justice system in Canada: A research perspective. Toronto, ON: Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto.
- Dowden, C., & Andrews, D. A. (1999). What works in young offender treatment: A meta-analysis. Forum on Corrections Research, *11*, 21-24.
- Elliott, D. S., & Menard, S. (1996). Delinquent friends and delinquent behavior: Temporal and developmental patterns. In J. D. Hawkins (Ed.), Delinquency and crime: Current theories (pp. 28 - 67). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Farrington, D. P. (1996). The explanation and prevention of youthful offending. In J. D. Hawkins (Ed.), Delinquency and crime: Current theories (pp. 68-148). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Farrington, D. P. (2000). Explaining and preventing crime: The globalization of knowledge – The American Society of Criminology 1999 Presidential Address. Criminology, *38*, 1-24.

Government of Canada (1998). A strategy for the renewal of youth justice. Ottawa: Department of Justice.

Grisso, T. (1998). Forensic evaluation of juveniles. Sarasota, FL: Personal Resource Press.

Hawkins, J. D., & Catalano, R. F. (1992). Communities That Care. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Henggeler, S. W., Melton, G. B., Brondino, M. J., Scherer, D. G., & Hanley, J. H. (1997). Multisystemic therapy with violent and chronic juvenile offenders and their families: The role of treatment fidelity in successful dissemination. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, *65*, 821-833.

Hoge, R. D. (1999a). Assessing adolescents in educational, counseling, and other settings. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hoge, R. D. (1999b). An expanded role for psychological assessments in juvenile justice systems. Criminal Justice and Behavior, *26*, 251-266.

Hoge, R. D. (2001a). The juvenile offender: Theory, research, and applications. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Press.

Hoge, R. D. (2001b). A case management instrument for use in juvenile justice systems. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, *52*, 25-31.

Hoge, R. D., & Andrews, D. A. (1996). Assessing the youthful offender: Issues and techniques. New York: Plenum.

Hollin, C. R. (1995). The meaning and implications of “programme integrity”. In J. McGuire (Ed.), What works: Effective methods to reduce reoffending (pp. 195-208). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Howell, J. C. (Ed.) (1995). Guide for implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Knitzer, J. (1982). Unclaimed children: The failure of public responsibility to children and adolescents in need of mental health services. Washington, DC: Children’s Defense Fund.

Knitzer, J. (1996). Children’s mental health: Changing paradigms and policies. In E. F. Zigler, S. L. Kagan, & N. W. Hall (Eds.), Children, families, and government: Preparing for the twenty-first century (pp. 207-232). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Krisberg, B., & Howell, J. C. (1998). The impact of the juvenile justice system and prospects for graduated sanctions in a comprehensive strategy. In R. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions (pp. 346-366). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Le Blanc, M. (1998). Screening of serious and violent juvenile offenders: Identification, classification, and prediction. In R. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.),

Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions (pp. 167 - 193). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Le Blanc, M., Ouimet, M., & Tremblay, R. E. (1988). An integrative control theory of delinquent behavior: A validation of 1976-1985. Psychiatry, 51, 164-176.

Leshied, A. W., & Cunningham, A. Intensive community-based services can influence re-offending rates of high risk youth. EACR Journal, 1, 1-30.

Leschied, A. W., Jaffe, P. G., & Willis, W. (1991). The Young Offenders Act: A revolution in Canadian juvenile justice. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lipsey, M. W. (1992). Juvenile delinquency treatment: A meta-analytic inquiry in the variability of effects. In T. D. Cook, H. Cooper, D. S. Cordray, H. Hartmann, L. V. Hedges, R. J. Light, T. A. Louis, & F. Mosteller (Eds.), Meta-analysis for explanation: A casebook (pp. 83-127).

Lipsey, M. W. (1995). What do we learn from 400 research studies on the effectiveness of treatment with juvenile delinquents? In J. McGuire (Ed.), What works: Reducing reoffending (pp. 63-78). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Lipsey, M. W., & Derzon, J. H. (1998). Predictors of violent or serious delinquency in adolescence and early adulthood: A synthesis of longitudinal research. In R. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), Serious and violent offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions (pp. 86-105). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lipsey, M. W., & Wilson, D. B. (1998). Effective intervention for serious juvenile offenders: A synthesis of research. In R. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), Serious and violent offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions (pp. 313-345). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Loeber, R., & Dishion, T. J. (1983). Early predictors of male delinquency: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 94, 68-99.

Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. P. (Eds.) (1998). Serious and violent offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nelson, G., Laurendeau, M-C., & Chamberland, C. (2001). A review of programs to promote family wellness and prevent the maltreatment of children. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 33, 1-13.

Offord, D. R., et al. (1987). Ontario Child Health Study: Six month prevalence of disorder and rates of service utilization. Archives of General Psychiatry, 44, 832-836.

Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). Antisocial boys. Eugene, OR: Castalia.

Pepler, D. J., Craig, W. M., Ziegler, S., & Charach, A. (1994). An evaluation of an anti-bullying intervention in Toronto schools. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 13, 95-110.

Peters, R. D. (1994). Better Beginnings, Better Futures: A community-based approach to primary prevention. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 13, 183-188.

Rutter, M., Giller, H., & Hagell, A. (1998). Antisocial behavior by young people. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schweinhart, L. J., Barnes, H. V., & Weikart, D. P. (1993). The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study through age 27. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Foundation.

Strayhorn, J. M., & Weidman, C. S. (1991). Follow-up one year after parent-child interaction training: Effects of behavior on preschool children. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 30, 138-143.

Tremblay, R. E. (1992). The prediction of delinquent behavior from childhood behavior: Personality theory revisited. In J. McCord (Ed.), Facts, frameworks, and forecasts: Advances in criminological theory (pp. 193-230). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Tremblay, R. E., & Craig, W. M. (1995). Developmental crime prevention. In M. Tonry & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), Crime and justice: An annual review: Vol. 19. Building a safer society (pp. 151-236). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Tremblay, R. E., Masse, B., Perron, D., Le Blanc, M., Schwartzman, A. E., & Ledingham, J. E. (1992). Early disruptive behavior, poor school achievement, delinquent behavior, and delinquent personality: Longitudinal analysis. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 60, 64-72.

Tremblay, R. E., Pagani-Kurtz, L., Masse, L. C., Vitaro, F., & Pihl, R. O. (1995). A bimodal preventive intervention for disruptive kindergarten boys: Its impact through mid-adolescence. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63, 560-568.

Walsh, M. E., Brabeck, M. M., & Howard, K. A. (1999). Interprofessional collaboration in children's services: Toward a theoretical framework. Children's Services: Social Policy, Research, and Practice, 2, 183-208.

Wasserman, G. A., & Miller, L. S. (1998). The prevention of serious and violent juvenile offending. In R. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), Serious and violent offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions (pp. 197-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weikart, D. P., & Schweinhart, L. J. (1992). High/Scope Preschool Program outcomes. In J. McCord & R. E. Tremblay (Eds.), Preventing antisocial behavior (pp. 67-86). New York: Guilford Press.

Winterdyk, J. (Ed.). (1997). Juvenile justice systems: International perspectives. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Wright, M. (1983). Compensatory education and the preschool: A Canadian approach. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Yoshikawa, H. (1994). Prevention as cumulative protection: Effects of early family support and education on chronic delinquency and its risks. Psychological Bulletin, 115, 28-54.

Yoshikawa, J. (1995). Long-term effects of early childhood programs on social outcomes and delinquency. Long-Term Outcomes of Early Childhood Programs, 5, 51-75.

APPENDIX A

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE
AND LEGAL AFFAIRS, GOVERNMENT OF CANADA**

**UNITED STATES OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE COMPREHENSIVE
STRATEGY FOR SERIOUS, VIOLENT, AND CHRONIC JUVENILE
OFFENDERS**

**RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE
AND LEGAL AFFAIRS, GOVERNMENT OF CANADA (1998)**

PREVENTION AND MEANINGFUL ALTERNATIVES

The best way to deal with youth crime is to prevent it – through community-based crime prevention and by addressing the social conditions associated with the root causes of delinquency.

A number of alternatives to the formal justice system can be employed effectively to deal with the majority of non-violent young offenders – such as family-group conferencing, diversion programs and police cautioning. These alternative approaches hold youth accountable for their behaviour, acknowledge and repair the harm caused to the victim and the community and help to instill or reinforce values such as responsibility and respect for others.

MEANINGFUL CONSEQUENCES FOR YOUTH CRIME

Young people who commit crimes will be held responsible and accountable for their actions. The consequences for the crimes will depend on the seriousness of the offence and on the particular circumstances of the offender. Firm measures will be taken to protect the public from violent and repeat young offenders. Community-based penalties are often more effective than custody and will be encouraged for lower-risk, non-violent offenders – particularly measures that make clear to the youth the damage caused by the crime and its impact on others and which require steps to undo the harm done. These measures foster respect both for the legal system and for underlying social values.

REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION

The youth justice system is partly premised on the belief that the vast majority of young offenders, with proper guidance and support, can overcome past criminal behaviour and develop into law-abiding citizens. Successful rehabilitation and reintegration are important because of the obvious fact that young people sentenced to custody return to their communities as some point. Rehabilitation is particularly important for serious, violent offenders, including those receiving adult sentences.

Effective programs that guide and assist a young person's return to the community protect society and support law-abiding conduct. Sentences should instill a sense of responsibility and encourage the participation of the youth in constructive measures that involve the victim, the family and the community.

**UNITED STATES OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE COMPREHENSIVE
STRATEGY FOR SERIOUS, VIOLENT, AND CHRONIC JUVENILE
OFFENDERS**

1. Strengthen the family in its primary responsibility to instill moral values and provide guidance and support to children.
2. Support core social institutions (schools, religious institutions, and community organizations) in their roles of developing capable, mature, and responsible youth.
3. Promote delinquency prevention as the most cost-effective approach to dealing with juvenile delinquency. When children engage in “acting out” behavior, such as status offences, the family and community, in concert with child welfare services, must take primary responsibility for responding with appropriate treatment and support services. Communities must take the lead in designing and building comprehensive prevention approaches that address known risk factors and target youth at risk of delinquency.
4. Intervene immediately and effectively when delinquent behavior occurs, to prevent delinquent offenders from becoming chronic offenders or progressively committing more serious and violent crimes. Initial intervention attempts should be centered on the family and other core social institutions.
5. Identify and control the small group of serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders who have failed to respond to intervention and nonsecure community-based treatment and rehabilitation services offered by the juvenile justice system.

(Reference: Howell, J. C. (Ed.) (1995). Guide for implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.)