



TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Barbara Jordan – Mickey Leland
School of Public Affairs
Center for Justice Research

Quarter 1 Report: National Coalition on Gun Violence Research Project – Phase 1

Juan Barthelemy, Ph.D. – Fellow
Denise Brown – Doctoral Fellow
Howard Henderson, Ph.D. – Director

Original Submission April 1, 2021

centerforjusticeresearch.org

Overview

With the financial support of the National Collaborative on Gun Violence Research, the **Center for Justice Research** (CJR) began the initial phase of *The Dangerous Recipe: Ingredients Contributing to African-American Gun Violence* project in January 2021. The goal of this phase of the project is to provide in-depth evidence upon which solutions can be based for the reduction of gun violence among African-American males between 15 and 24 years old. During this initial analysis of existing data, we will begin to identify the nature and extent of juvenile and young adult criminal activity. Based on these results, we will be able to determine trends focused on African-American males, who have the greatest likelihood of being negatively impacted.

The growing public security and legal concerns regarding youth gun possession levels inspired researchers to investigate crime patterns in different age groups. Scholars have focused on exploring not only risk factors associated with engagement of juvenile gun crime but also the personal characteristics of offenders, their motives, crime patterns, methods of crime prevention, and so on (Andersen et al., 2017; Beardslee et al., 2018; Deslauriers-Varin & Beauregard, 2014; Rowan et al., 2019; Wilson et al., 2016). In this first quarter report, we analyze the existing evidence regarding the difference between adolescent and adult crime patterns. Specifically, this quarterly report includes studies on unique adolescent crime patterns and the incidence of violent crime in different age groups. The paper ends with the identification of the gap in research that warrants further scholarly investigations

Adolescent Crime Patterns

More than two million young people under the age of 18 are arrested annually in the United States (Youth.gov, 2020). According to the data provided by Sickmund et al. (2011), young people are most commonly

referred to the juvenile justice system for property offenses. Other common types of offenses in this population include offense against persons, drug law violations, and public order offenses (Sickmund et al., 2011).

Researchers have reported high recidivism rates in adolescents, which stresses the need to prevent repeated involvement in criminal activities (Youth.gov, 2020).

Many studies have been explored the patterns of juvenile offending. The National Institute of Justice (2014) conducted a review of the existing research and pointed to the interesting time patterns. According to scholars, the prevalence of offending increases from late childhood, reaches its pinnacle in the teenage years, and declines in the early 20s. Notably, some crimes in which juveniles engage have greater persistence than others. For example, possession of weapons, drug dealing, and marijuana use are more likely to persist into adulthood compared to gang membership, the former serves as the basis of project.

According to MST Services (2018), adolescents usually engage in non-violent offenses, such as theft, larceny, assault, drug abuse, disorderly conduct, and alcohol offenses (including driving under the influence). They are more likely than adults to commit motor vehicle theft (Richards, 2011). Teens also commit acts of vandalism, either alone or in groups, by drawing graffiti and damaging property. Along similar lines, Miller (2014) maintained that for most young people, criminal activity is limited to mild, occasional, peer-driven events, the incidence of which decline as they become adults. Thus, most criminal activity among adolescents is limited to misdemeanor offenses that are relatively easy to address.

Unfortunately, while most young offenders (up to 60%) stop their criminal activity by adulthood, a small proportion of young offenders persist and increase the severity of offending. Many of these young people eventually demonstrate lethal violence (National Institute of Justice, 2014). Aggravation of crime patterns among the juvenile-onset offenders was also reported by Van Koppen (2018). In addition, research shows that chronic juvenile offenders make up less than ten percent of offenders in this age group, but they are responsible for most of violent offenses (The United States Department of Justice, 2020). Learning more about these individuals is crucial for reducing juvenile crime rates. Some researchers have tried to address this problem by searching for the individual and environmental factors that affect reoffending, but more research is still needed as the existing knowledge comes from low-quality student papers or outdated articles (Tremblay & Paré, 2003).

Crime patterns were also found to be connected with the environment. Andersen et al. (2017) pointed out that, according to the previous research conducted in Seattle, about 85% of street segments had very low crime rates, while most juvenile arrests occurred on fewer than one percent of street segments. Similarly, Breen et al. (2011) suggested that crime rates may be higher in areas with greater alcohol availability. However, more research is needed to understand the cause-effect relationships between juvenile crime and the environment in which adolescents live. Learning more about crime concentration would help develop strategies aimed at preventing juvenile crime and help young offenders to break the cycle of crime (Andersen et al., 2017).

There are some notable differences among adolescents and adults when it comes to non-violent crime patterns. Richards (2011) looked at how the nature of juvenile offending differs from adult offending. It has been found that juveniles are more likely than adults to attract the attention of police for many reasons. They are less experienced at committing crimes compared to adult offenders and tend to engage in criminal activity in groups (Richards, 2011). Adolescents also commit offenses in public places (e.g., public transport) and their neighborhoods, which makes it easy for people to identify them. Compared with adults, juveniles are more likely to commit crimes that are attention-seeking and poorly planned, which also help the police to arrest them. Finally, it is also important to mention that adolescents are more likely to be influenced by their peers and demonstrate risk-taking behaviors compared to adult offenders (Richards, 2011).

Violent Crime Rates and Patterns: Adolescents vs. Adults

Violent crime is an umbrella term that includes robbery, murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, and aggravated assault (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2019). The existing research on violent crime in the adolescent population is scattered, as researchers tend to focus on some violent crime types (e.g., gun violence in schools, sex offenses, etc.). As a result, it is difficult to understand the scope of the problem, especially given the fact that not all violent crimes are well-documented and researched.

As noted by Frederique (2020), homicides receive the greatest attention. According to the data provided by the OJJDP (2019), juvenile offenders committed 766 murders in the United States in 2019, which represents only seven percent of all known murder offenders. Adolescents ages 16-17 years constitute the majority of juvenile homicide offenders. These youth account for approximately 76% of the juvenile homicide offenders. The

general rate of homicides committed by adolescents has been decreasing since 1993. Interestingly, it has been found that most violent crimes committed by adolescents occur in the hours after the school. This pattern differs from that of adult offenders, whose criminal activity peaks in the evening (OJJDP, 2019). This finding is important because it highlights the need to engage adolescents in after-school activities to prevent offending.

Research also shows that the temporal patterns of violent crime, including sexual assault, aggravated assault, and robbery, differ for juvenile and adult offenders. The latter commit crimes in the evening and at night, while younger offenders are more likely to engage in criminal activity in the afternoon (OJJDP, 2019). For instance, juveniles tend to commit crimes that result in injury in the afternoon, while adults commit similar crimes around 9 p.m. At the same time, there are some similarities in violent crime patterns in adults and adolescents. For instance, it has been found that both juvenile and adult offenders tend to commit a violent crime with a firearm in the evening (8 p.m.-11 p.m.) (OJJDP, 2019). Adolescents and adults committing sex crimes are also similar in the way they avoid targeting strangers (Becker, 2007; Hunter et al., 2000). However, juveniles tend to have fewer victims and are less compulsive when it comes to sex offenses (Becker, 2007).

Violent crimes are often closely connected with non-violent offending such as substance abuse. A study by Lennings et al. (2003) used a sample of 300 incarcerated juveniles in New South Wales and found that in many cases, engagement in violent crime was preceded by consumption of alcohol and drugs. The same pattern is observed in the adult population of offenders (Webster et al., 2010). Substance abuse often leads to aggression that ultimately results in violent crime, so researchers pointed to the need to address the substance use problem to reduce violent crime rates among adolescents (Lennings et al., 2003). A more recent study by Stoddart et al. (2015) confirmed these findings and expanded the current understanding of the substance use effect on violent crime. The researchers found that the type of substance consumed may predict the type of violent behaviors among adolescents. For example, alcohol use was found to be associated with severe victimization (Stoddart et al., 2015).

Juvenile Gun Possession

Research on youth gun possession has shown that African-American youth are more likely to carry guns than youth of other races and ethnicities (Beardslee et al., 2018; Docherty et al., 2019; Reid et al., 2017). These

racial disparities may be a function of African-American youth being exposed to more risk factors than their White peers (Beardslee et al., 2018). Reid et al. (2017) also indicated that witnessing violence was a stronger predictor of gun possession than psychological distress. However, youth with psychological distress and exposure to violence had an increased likelihood of gun possession. Beardslee et al. (2018) found that while neighborhood crime is an important factor in youth gun possession, youth who demonstrated childhood behavioral problems that persisted over longer periods of times are more likely to carry guns. Furthermore, youth who associated with delinquent peers were also more likely to carry guns as well (Docherty et al., 2019).

Docherty et al. (2019) found that drug dealing was a significant factor in gun possession for both Black and White youth. Antisocial propensity has been posited as a predictor of gun possession, which is supported by this notion of drug dealing as a predictor. Loughran et al. (2016) stated that youths who carried guns in their study reported higher rewards associated with crime and lower perceived costs for getting caught. These youth also reported higher levels of exposure to violence.

Gap in Knowledge and Conclusion

Research expands the current understanding of the general crime patterns in the adolescent population, including the antecedent reality associated with gun possession. Nevertheless, it is clear that the root causes and motivations of juvenile crime have attracted limited attention from researchers. Most of the information on this issue comes from various governmental websites and NGOs, while the scholarly literature is embarrassingly scarce. Many studies on the topic were conducted more than ten years ago, raising questions about the current applicability of the findings.

Moreover, there is very limited research comparing gun possession and youth crime patterns between adolescents and adults. Arguably, the most valuable information has been provided by the OJJDP (2019), but scholarly research is limited, at best. Given this gap in knowledge, one may conclude that more large-scale studies are needed to better understand youth gun possession and violent crime patterns.

Methods

In order to better understand gun possession patterns among African American males between 15 to 24 years of age, four Historically Black Colleges and Universities have collaborated to gain more insight into this population. These HBCUs are situated in varying sized cities across the United States. This four-site study will be conducted in Baltimore, MD, Houston, TX, Jackson, MS, and Wilmington, DE. A comparative analysis of the four cities will be used to compare demographics, gun law strength, gun death rankings, gun deaths, health outcomes, and health risk factors.

Sample

The data used in this report was acquired from several different sources. The data from the Harris County District Attorney's Office was obtained after the approval of the Institutional Review Board at Texas Southern University. Other data used in this study included open source data from several sources, which included the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Firearm Mortality data, 2020 County Health Rankings and Roadmaps by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Program, Harris County Juvenile Probation Department data, Gun Violence Report Card and the Gun Violence Data Archive. In addition, the Wilmington Police Department annual report was also used in this study.

The Giffords Law Center publishes an Annual Gun Law Scorecard, which ranks states on their gun law strength and their gun death rank. Additionally, each state is given a composite score based on their combined ranking. According to their report, Delaware is the only state of the four states included in this study that has a gun death rate lower than the national average.

Table 1: Giffords Law Center Annual Gun Law Scorecard

State	Grade	Gun Law Strength Out of 50 States	Gun Death Rank Out of 50 States	Gun Death Rate per 100k people
Delaware	B	11 of 50	40 of 50	9.97
Maryland	A-	6 of 50	28 of 50	12.56
Mississippi	F	50 of 50	2 of 50	24.23
Texas	F	33 of 50	27 of 50	12.64

Source: <https://giffords.org/lawcenter/resources/scorecard/> National Average Gun Death Rate 11.9 per 100k

According to their report, Delaware is the only state of the four states included in this study that has a gun death rate lower than the national average yields them a grade of “B.” However, Maryland scored an A-, which is the highest grade of the states included in this study.

An exploration of deaths by states from 2014 to 2019, we see that for Maryland, Mississippi and Texas have all experienced a steady increase in homicides each year. Comparatively, Delaware deaths remained steady from 2015 to 2017 and have decreased from 2017 to 2019. Maryland has seen an increase in homicides since 2014. They remained consistent in 2015 and 2016 with a jump in homicides in 2017 followed by a return to 2016 numbers. Maryland then saw a jump in 2019, which was consistent with the increases observed in Mississippi and Texas. Mississippi also saw an increase in homicides with noticeable jumps from 2014 to 2015, 2016 to 2017, 2017 to 2018 and 2018 to 2019. Furthermore, Mississippi currently ranks second in the United States with regard to the number of homicides per 100,000 people. Texas saw a steady increase in homicides between 2014 to 2019. It should also be noted that while Texas has a lot more homicides than all of the other states combined, the population in the State of Texas is about 3 times the combined population of the other 3 states in the study.

Table 2. Deaths by States

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Delaware	102	112	111	111	107	93
Maryland	546	708	707	742	707	757
Mississippi	547	589	587	632	681	710
Texas	2848	3203	3353	3513	3522	3683

Source: www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/sosmap/firearm_mortality/firearm.htm

2020 County Outcomes and Factor Rankings

The research has remained consistent on the relationship between health-related factors and violent crime (Ruggles & Rajan, 2014). Table 3 provides a comparison of the four counties included in this study on Health Outcomes and Health Factors. Health Outcomes is a composite variable measured by Length of Life and Quality of Life. Health Factors is a composite variable comprised of Health Behaviors (Diet and exercise, alcohol and drug use, and other health behaviors), Clinical Care (Access to care), Social & Economic Factors (described

in the Table 5 summary), Physical Environment (described in the Table 5 summary), and Demographics. Each county is compared to the other counties in their respective state with lower scores representing more positive outcomes.

Table 3. Health Outcomes and Factors by County

	Health Outcomes	Health Factors
Baltimore (Baltimore County)	15 of 24	11 of 24
Houston (Harris County)	32 of 244	151 of 244
Jackson (Hinds County)	37 of 82	39 of 82
Wilmington (New Castle County)	1 of 3	1 of 3

Source: 2020 County Health Rankings Data

According to the county health rankings data, percentage of uninsured is the percentage of people under age 65 without insurance (Table 4). Unemployment is the percentage of population ages 16+ unemployed and looking for work. The income inequality income ratio is the ratio of household income at the 80th percentile to income at the 20th percentile. The violent crime rate is the number of violent crimes per 100,000 in the population. Severe housing problems is the percentage of households with at least 1 of 4 housing problems; overcrowding, high housing costs, or lack of kitchen or plumbing facilities.

Table 4. Health Outcomes by City

	% Uninsured	H.S. Grad Rate	Unemployment	Income Inequality Income Ratio	Violent Crime Rate (per 100,000)	Severe Housing Problems
Baltimore	6%	89%	4.0%	4.2	511	16%
Houston	22%	87%	4.4%	5.0	730	20%
Jackson	14%	74%	4.6%	5.0	755	21%
Wilmington	6%	88%	3.7%	4.6	551	14%

Source: 2020 County Health Rankings Data

Length of Life is a composite variable that consists of the following measures: life expectancy, premature

age-adjusted mortality (number of deaths among residents under age 75 per 100,000 population – age-adjusted), child mortality (number of deaths among children under age 18 per 100,000 population), and infant mortality (number of infant deaths, within 1 year, per 1,000 live births (Table 5). This composite variable is then used to rank each county to the other counties in the state, with lower numbers indicating more positive outcomes. For example, Baltimore is in Baltimore county and ranks 15th of the 24 counties.

Table 5. Health Outcomes by City (continued)

	Length of Life	Quality of Life	Social & Economic Factors	Physical Environment	Children in Poverty	Children in Single Parent Home
Baltimore	15 of 24	12 of 24	12 of 24	24 of 24	13%	34%
Houston	23 of 244	68 of 244	190 of 244	244 of 244	25%	36%
Jackson	41 of 82	44 of 82	45 of 82	82 of 82	30%	58%
Wilmington	1 of 3	2 of 3	1 of 3	1 of 3	16%	36%

Source: 2020 County Health Rankings Data

The *Quality of Life* composite score is the combination of the following measures: frequent physical distress (percentage of adults reporting 14 or more days of poor physical health per month), frequent mental distress (percentage of adults reporting 14 or more days of poor mental health per month), diabetes prevalence (percentage of adults aged 20 and above with diagnosed diabetes) and HIV prevalence (number of people aged 13 years and older living with a diagnosis of human immunodeficiency virus infection per 100,000 population).

Social & Economic Factors is comprised of the following measures: Education (disconnected youth, reading scores, and math scores), income (median household income and children eligible for free or reduced-price lunch), family and social support (residential segregation – Black/White) and residential segregation – non-White/White), and community safety (homicides, suicides, firearm fatalities, and juvenile arrests). Physical environment is measured by housing and transit (traffic volume, homeownership and severe housing cost burden). Percentage of children in poverty is the percentage of children (under age 18) living in poverty.

In Table 6, *Disconnected Youth* is the percentage of teens and young adults ages 16-19 who are neither working nor in school. Injury death rate, homicide rate and firearm fatality rate are computed by incidents per

100,000 in the population.

Table 6. Health Outcomes by City (continued)

	Injury Death Rate	Life Expectancy	Disconnected Youth	Median Income	Homicide Rate	Firearm Fatality Rate
Baltimore	95	78.1	5%	75,836	7	11
Houston	55	79.6	8%	60,241	9	13
Jackson	82	75.2	7%	44,776	26	31
Wilmington	75	78.5	5%	69,562	8	12

Source: 2020 County Health Rankings Data

Initial Findings

Research on youth gun possession suggests that African-American youth are more likely to carry guns than their peers of other races and ethnicities. Gun possession is highly correlated with associating with delinquent peers, as well as, early onset persistent behavioral problems. While neighborhood crime is often cited as a contributing factor, social norms and antisocial behaviors have been found to be stronger predictors of gun possession. In addition, youth who engage in violent criminal behaviors have been shown to view gun possession more favorably and the consequences of getting caught as less punitive. Some researchers have also posited that youth who carry guns are also more likely to have a history of trauma as a result of previous exposure to violence. Therefore, prevention and intervention efforts should include a screening component to assess trauma related psychological distress and access to guns.

The Wilmington Police Data reports revealed that while they have experienced an overall decrease in crime, they have experienced an increase in gun arrests. In 2020, Wilmington had 307 total gun arrests with 53 being juvenile gun arrests. Their juvenile profile data indicates that at least 20 of the defendants had prior gun arrests and at least one had prior gun arrests. They also indicated that at least 35 of the cases involved juvenile defendants who were on some type of probation or pretrial supervision at the time of the arrest. Collectively, juvenile defendants accounted for about 14.9% of their felony cases and about 10.6% of their misdemeanor charges in 2020.

Many of the police districts in Wilmington reported significant increases in juvenile shooting incidents and juvenile shooting victims in 2020, as compared to their 2019 year-end statistics. Between September 19, 2018 and January 5, 2021 there were 38 teens killed in Houston, 29 killed in Baltimore, 16 killed in Jackson, Mississippi and 10 killed in Wilmington, Delaware (gunviolencearchive.org).

Even though there has been a decrease in juvenile crimes over the last several years, it appears that felony crimes against persons and property have not decreased at the same rate. Violent felony crimes committed by youth have been much less predictable. It appears that every day when we turn on the news, there are reports of young people being shot and killed. It appears that these incidents continue to increase with each passing year. Culminating with the George Floyd killing on May 25, 2020, communities across the United States have called for decreased police funding and less police involvement in Black communities. However, less attention has been focused on addressing the violent crime in these communities if police intervention is reduced.

As a result of Covid-19 and juvenile justice reform efforts, many young people were released from secure care facilities and there has been a sharp reduction in the number of young people who are being arrested and detained. According to the Harris County Juvenile Probation Department's year to date statistics from 2019 to 2021, there has been a reduction in referrals and youth in the system. While there has been a decrease in youth referrals and adjudications, according the Harris County Juvenile Probation Department over the last three years, felony crimes against persons increased from 2019 to 2020, but are lower for 2021.

It is readily apparent when looking at crime statistics that violent crime appears to peak around 21 years of age. Comparatively, victim demographics of violent crime tend to mirror that of perpetrators, as there is often retaliation for violent crimes. Hence, today's perpetrators in many instances become tomorrow's victims. Therefore, it is imperative that we seek to provide pathways to more prosocial activities for young people in this age range especially in communities that have been identified as more prone to experiencing violence. This is done through one on one mentoring programs, which have been shown to be more effective than group based mentoring programs (Siegel & Welsch, 2015).

Research reveals that there are some neighborhoods that experience higher rates of violent crimes (Andersen, Curman, & Linning, 2017). Therefore, it is helpful to gain a better understanding of the drivers of

crimes in those neighborhoods, physical disorder, poor community relationships with law enforcement, limited employment opportunities, few activities for you and low collective efficacy in the neighborhood around feeling like they could fix the crime problem (Cantora, Seema & Restivo, 2016). Increased availability of alcohol may also contribute to higher rates of crime (Breen et al.) There is also evidence that indicates while young people may commit some of the same types of violent crimes as adults, there are also some distinctions and predictable patterns (Miller, 2014). Furthermore, Richards (2011) stated that young people are more likely to commit crimes after school hours near their own neighborhoods and communities (Richards, 2011). In addition, young people are more likely than adults to commit impulsive acts, which can sometime be the result of peer pressure. Thus, making their behaviors easier to recognize by people in the community and law enforcement (Richards, 2011). As a result of their propensity to draw attention to themselves, they are more likely to get caught and get in trouble for both major and minor infractions.

Earlier it was stated that there has been a concerted effort to reduce the number of arrests of young people for non-violent offenses and trying to find other ways to increase safety in these neighborhoods. For example, the Harris County Assistant District Attorney, who is the Chief of the Juvenile Division, while participating in a prosecutor led- juvenile justice reform forum conducted by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, discussed measures that his office has taken to change the criteria for accepting charges from law enforcement (aecf.org). In addition, ADA Jordan discussed how training school resource officers has led to a 38% decrease in the number of school referrals from 2018 to 2019. Furthermore, he stated that 48% of those cases were diverted from formal court proceedings (aecf.org). However, to do this effectively requires community members to work more closely with law enforcement to identify the crime drivers in those neighborhoods and cooperatively work to address those situations. For those communities, that choose not to establish stronger working relationships with law enforcement, it requires holding each other accountable for the improvement of the conditions in those neighborhoods. For example, maintaining safe and clean neighborhoods does not require outside entities to come in and pick up the trash in the common areas in those neighborhoods. In addition, taking the initiative to assist elderly neighbors who are unable to maintain their yards is another way that communities can help one another. With regard to crime reduction, when the community voices their displeasure with the violent crimes,

then they can work to reduce the number of violent incidents in their neighborhoods (Butts, Roman, Bostwick & Porter, 2015).

Reid et al. (2017) have suggested that programs addressing youth gun possession should assess for trauma associated with witnessing violence and the associated psychological distress. They further suggest that youth being treated in emergency rooms violence related injuries should be assessed for trauma-related psychological distress. Assessing for access to guns should also be included in these screenings and assessments.

Furthermore, policies have shown that restrictive gun laws and universal background checks are linked to decreasing youth gun carrying. Factors such as legislation and improving community and school environments can influence whether or not a youth engages in criminal activity such as gun violence (Gunn & Boxer, 2021). Although, the study of youth gun carrying behavior is complex, researchers have sought to answer why youth engage in gun-carrying behavior, by focusing on factors such as drug use and exposure to crime involvement. Youth that take risks, demonstrate signs of psychological disorders, and willing to carry other weapons such as a knife, are more likely to engage in gun carrying behavior (Gunn & Boxer, 2021). Research shows the primary reason for youth gun possession is for protection out of the fear of their lives. Researchers have been of the opinion that once youth are taught carrying a gun is not needed for protection, gun-related crime will start to decrease (Sheley & Wright, 1993).

Data Collection Challenges:

There have been a few challenges in obtaining youth gun possession data. The Houston Police Department has agreed to provide agency-level data and should be available in this next quarter. Furthermore, Baltimore, Maryland and Jackson, Mississippi police departments have been slow to respond to requests for data. Therefore, other data sources have been used to provide insight into youth gun possession in Baltimore, Houston and Jackson. The research team continues to follow up with requests for data from Baltimore and Jackson, as well as, exploring additional open data sources to better explain gun possession in the four cities in the study.

Methodological Next Steps:

In Quarter II we will examine multiple potential predictors of violent crime rates among youth. We will then take the mean value for ALL the counties and compare then using one-sample t-tests to a criterion set by the same value for each of the 4 cities (so each variable would get four t-tests, one for each city). From this we see patterns of similarity and differences across the 4 cities. Though very descriptive in the end, this analysis will give us a comprehensive picture of what stands out from those 4 cities that makes them different from the "average" US.

Below are the variables we will be considering, mainly from the county level datafile.

From “**Ranked Measure Data**” Potential Independent Variables:

Teen Birth Rate, % Uninsured, Primary Care Physicians Rate, Preventable Hospital Stays, Graduation Rate, Some College percent, Unemployment Rate, %Children In Poverty, Income Inequality, %Single Parent Households, Social Association Rate, %Severe Housing Problems, Housing Overcrowding, Inadequate facilities,

From “**Ranked Measure Data**” Potential Dependent Variables:

Violent Crime Rate, Injury Death Rate

From “**Additional Measure Data**” Potential Independent Variables:

Frequent Mental Distress, Food Insecurity, Limited Access to Healthy Foods, Drug Overdose Rate, Disconnected Youth, Reading Scores, Math Scores, Median household income, %kids in free lunch, Segregation black/white, Life Expectancy, Age Adjusted Death Rate, Infant Mortality Rate, Suicide Rate, Traffic volume, Sever Housing Cost Burden, Population, %Not proficient in English, %rural

From “**Additional Measure Data**” Dependent Variables:

Homicide Rate, Firearm Fatalities, Juvenile arrests,

References

- Andersen, M. A., Curman, A. S., & Linning, S. J. (2017). The trajectories of crime at places: Understanding the patterns of disaggregated crime types. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *33*, 427-449. doi:10.1007/s10940-016-9301-1
- Beardslee, J., Docherty, M., Mulvey, E., Schubert, C., & Pardini, D. (2018). Childhood risk factors associated with adolescent gun carrying among Black and White males: An examination of self-protection, social influence, and antisocial propensity explanations. *Law and Human Behavior*, *42*(2), 110–118. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/10.1037/lhb0000270.supp> (Supplemental)
- Becker, J. V. (2007). *A snapshot of sex offenders: Juveniles vs. adults*. <https://www.csg.org/knowledgecenter/docs/pubsafety/Becker.pdf>
- Breen, C., Shekeshaft, A., Slade, T., Love, S., D'Este, C., & Mattick, R. P. (2011). Do community characteristics predict alcohol-related crime? *Alcohol and Alcoholism*, *46*(4), 464-470.
- Colman, R. A., Kim, D. H., Mitchell-Herzfeld, S., & Shady, T. A. (2009). Delinquent girls grown up: young adult offending patterns and their relation to early legal, individual, and family risk. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *38*, 355-366.
- Deslauriers-Varin, N., & Beauregard, E. (2014). Unravelling crime series patterns among serial sex offenders: Duration, frequency, and environmental consistency. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, *11*, 253-275.
- Docherty, M., Beardslee, J., Grimm, K. J., & Pardini, D. (2019). Distinguishing between-individual from within-individual predictors of gun carrying among Black and White males across adolescence. *Law and Human Behavior*, *43*(2), 144–155. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/10.1037/lhb0000320.supp> (Supplemental)
- Gunn, J. F., & Boxer, P. (2021). Gun laws and youth gun carrying: Results from the youth risk behavior surveillance system, 2005–2017. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *50*(3), 446-458. doi:10.1007/s10964-020-01384-x
- Frederique, N. (2020). What do the data reveal about violence in schools? *National Institute of Justice*. <https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/what-do-data-reveal-about-violence-schools>
- Hunter, J. A., Hazelwood, R. R., & Slesinger, D. (2000). Juvenile-perpetrated sex crimes: Patterns of offending and predictors of violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, *15*(1), 81-93.
- Keil, S., Beardslee, J., Schubert, C., Mulvey, E., & Pardini, D. (2019). Perceived gun access and gun carrying among male adolescent offenders. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *18*(2), 179-195. doi:10.1177/1541204019865312
- Lennings, C. J., Copeland, J., & Howard, J. (2003). Substance use patterns of young offenders and violent crime. *Aggressive Behavior*, *29*, 414-422.

- Loughran, T. A., Reid, J. A., Collins, M. E., & Mulvey, E. P. (2016). Effect of gun carrying on perceptions of risk among adolescent offenders. *American Journal of Public Health, 106*(2), 350–352. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/10.2105/AJPH.2015.302971>
- Miller, L. (2014). Juvenile crime and juvenile justice: Patterns, models, and implications for clinical and legal practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*(2), 122-137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.01.005>
- MST Services (2018). *Trends in juvenile crime*. <https://info.mstservices.com/blog/trends-in-juvenile-crime#:~:text=The%20Most%20Commonly%20Committed%20Juvenile%20Crimes&text=The%20most%20common%20is%20theft,per%20100%2C000%20youths%20in%202016.&text=Third%20is%20drug%20abuse%20violations,of%20195.5%20per%20100%2C000%20youths.>
- National Institute of Justice (2014). *From juvenile delinquency to young adult offending*. <https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/juvenile-delinquency-young-adult-offending#note6>
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) (2019). *Juvenile arrests*. <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/crime/qa05101.asp>
- Reid, J. A., Richards, T. N., Loughran, T. A., & Mulvey, E. P. (2017). The relationships among exposure to violence, psychological distress, and gun carrying among male adolescents found guilty of serious legal offenses: A longitudinal cohort study. *Annals of Internal Medicine, 166*(6), 412–418. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.uh.edu/10.7326/M16-1648>
- Richards, K. (2011). What makes juvenile offenders different from adult offenders? *Australian Institute of Criminology*. <https://www.aic.gov.au/publications/tandi/tandi409>
- Rowan, Z. R., Schubert, C. A., Loughran, T. A., Mulvey, E. P., & Pardini, D. A. (2019). Proximal predictors of gun violence among adolescent males involved in crime. *American Psychological Association, 43*(3), 250-262.
- Ruggles, K. V., & Rajan, S. (2014). Gun possession among AMERICAN Youth: A Discovery-based approach to understand gun violence. *PLoS ONE, 9*(11). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0111893
- Sheley, J. F., & Wright, J. D. (1993). Motivations for gun possession and carrying among serious juvenile offenders. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 11*(4), 375-388. doi:10.1002/bsl.2370110405
- Sickmund, M., Sladky, A., and Kang, W. (2011). *Easy access to juvenile court statistics: 1985-2008*. <http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezajcs>
- Stoddard, S. A., Epstein-Ngo, Q., Walton, M. A., Zimmerman, M. A., Chermack, S. T., Blow, F. C., Booth, B. M., & Cunningham, R. M. (2015). Substance use and violence among youth: a daily calendar analysis. *Substance use & Misuse, 50*(3), 328–339. <https://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2014.980953>
- The United States Department of Justice Archives (2020). *Juvenile crime facts*. <https://www.justice.gov/archives/jm/criminal-resource-manual-102-juvenile-crime-facts>

- Tremblay, P., & Paré, Paul-Philippe. (2003). Crime and destiny: Patterns in serious offenders' mortality rates. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 45(3), 299-326. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cjccj.45.3.299>
- Van Coppen, M. V. (2018). Criminal career dimensions of juvenile- and adult-onset offenders. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology*, 4, 92–119.
- Webster, J. M., Dickson, M. F., Saman, D. M., Mateyoke-Scriver, A., Oser, C. B., & Leukefeld, C. (2010). Substance use, criminal activity, and mental health among violent and nonviolent rural probationers. *Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling*, 30(2), 99–111. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1874.2010.tb00060.x>
- Wilson, D. B., Olaghere, A., & Gill, C. (2016). Juvenile curfew effects on criminal behavior and victimization: A Campbell Collaboration systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 12, 167-186.
- Youth.gov. (2020). *Youth involved with the juvenile justice system*. <https://youth.gov/youth-topics/juvenile-justice/youth-involved-juvenile-justice-system>

About the Center for Justice Research

The Center for Justice Research is devoted to data-driven solutions for an equitable criminal justice system. Our primary focus is to produce innovative solutions to criminal justice reform efforts by utilizing an experienced group of researchers working to understand and address the current challenges of the criminal justice system.

The Center for Justice Research can be reached at 713-313-6843 or visit centerforjusticeresearch.org