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## Add Health Violence Prevalence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use or threaten with a weapon</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull a knife or gun on someone</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoot/stab someone</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured in a fight</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured someone else in a fight</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Model for Understanding Juvenile Violence

(Reiss & Roth, 2001)
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Macro-level Environment
Gun control legislation
Media violence
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Macro-level Environment

Community

- poverty, unemployment, high crime rate
- no safe places for youth
- access to drugs, alcohol, weapons
- lack of adult role-models
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Macro-level Environment

Community Environment

Family
  - violence (witness or experience)
  - authoritarian parenting
  - severe physical punishment
  - poverty
  - access to weapons in the home
  - inability to discuss problems with parents
  - family suicide
  - parent expectations
  - parental presence
  - parenting skills
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- large/crowded schools
- school failure
- school disarray
- school expulsion, retention, suspension
- lack of connectedness
- perceived prejudice
- learning problems
- skipped school
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Macro-level Environment

Community

Family

School

Peers

- social isolation
- bullying
- anti-social peers
- unstructured free time
- gang membership
- friend suicide
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Macro-level Environment

Community

Family

School

Peers

Individual

- age: peak 18-25 yrs
- continuation of childhood aggression
- poverty
- male
- attention deficit, verbal processing deficits
- irritable, oppositional, temperament
- having experience racism
- low intelligence

- sexual abuse/physical abuse
- substance abuse
- religiosity
- suicialality
- emotional distress
- early onset vs. late onset offenders
- early puberty
Each risk factor, in itself, has very low predictive probability that an adolescent will be violent.
What is the predicted probability of violence perpetration given the presence of key risk and protective factors?
### Predicted Probabilities of Violence Perpetration Among Teens in Two Parent Families Not on Welfare

(contrlaling for age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Protective Factors</th>
<th>Family Connectedness</th>
<th>Connectedness to Other Adults/ Religiosity*</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Boys No Risk</th>
<th>Boys All Risks**</th>
<th>Girls No Risk</th>
<th>Girls All Risks**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Protective factor: Boys: Connectedness to other adults; Girls: Religiosity

** Risk factors: Friend/family suicide, substance use, easy access to firearm in home.
## Predicted Probabilities of Violence Perpetration Among Teens in Single Parent Families Receiving Welfare (controlling for age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Protective Factors</th>
<th>Family Connectedness</th>
<th>Connectedness to Other Adults/ Religiosity*</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Boys No Risk</th>
<th>All Risks**</th>
<th>Girls No Risk</th>
<th>All Risks**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Protective factor: Boys: Connectedness to other adults; Girls: Religiosity

** Risk factors: Friend/family suicide, substance use, easy access to firearm in home.
Interventions that Reduce Violence
Individual Level Interventions

- Psychotherapy (-)
- Behavior Modifications (±)
- Scare/Fear Based (-)
- Cognitive-Behavioral (+)
- Self-esteem Building (-,-)
- Anger Management (-)
- Drug Treatment (+)
Parent Level Interventions

• Positive Parenting (+)
• Home visitation programs (+)
• Multi-systemic Therapy (MST) (+)
School Level Interventions

• Bullying prevention (+)
• Classroom Management (+)
Community Level Interventions

- Community Rebuilding (+)
- Community Policing (+)
- Gang Reduction (-)
- Mentoring (+)
- School/Community/Parent Interventions (+)
Lessons Learned from Violence Prevention Programs

1. Family-based multilevel interventions appear to be most promising
2. Comprehensive and practical programs
3. Start prevention early
4. Effective programs understand the contexts in which violence occurs
5. Focus on high crime neighborhoods & schools
6. All stakeholders need to be committed
7. Careful replications and implementation of effective programs is critical
8. Popular programs ≠ successful programs