Youth violence surged to unprecedented levels during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Since the mid-1990s, there have been promising signs that it is declining, with national arrest records, victimization data, and hospital emergency room records all showing downward trends (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2001). Despite this, youth violence remains a pressing issue in the United States. As of 2007, homicide was still the second-leading cause of death for young people between the ages of 10 and 24 and the leading cause of death among African American youths (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010). Youths ages 15–24 are still at the greatest risk of being both a victim and perpetrator of homicide. In addition, 19.9% of all high school students have reported being bullied on school property in the past 12 months (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010).

In this chapter, we argue that the policy and programmatic responses aimed at youth violence reduction should be broadened to include a focus on youth agency and transactional interventions. We begin by examining common misperceptions about youths and youth violence that often underlie inadequate responses. Next, we provide a conceptual rubric
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for thinking about youth violence reduction strategies. This rubric has
two primary dimensions: (a) orientations to youth violence prevention
and (b) ecological levels of intervention. Orientations to youth violence
prevention can be conceptualized as a spectrum from control to preven­
tion to agency approaches. The second dimension, ecological levels of
intervention, can be understood according to the following categories:
individual-level interventions, environment or setting-level interventions,
and transactional interventions. We conclude with examples of program
models that illustrate our central argument: Youth violence reduction
strategies need to be broadened to include more transactional and agency­
oriented approaches. The common factor between these approaches is
youth community engagement.

Misconceptions of Youth and Violence

There are several prevalent misconceptions about young people and
violence. These fallacious beliefs not only distance youths from opportu­
nities to engage meaningfully in their communities but also lead to mis­
guided policies and programs. Public misunderstandings of youths and
violence often fuel punitive responses to crime. An example of this is
the implementation of policies that permit young people to be tried and
prosecuted as adults, in spite of substantial evidence demonstrating that
youths prosecuted in adult courts have higher recidivism rates than those
prosecuted in juvenile courts (Bishop, 2006; Soler, 2001). Acknowledging
the discrepancies between public beliefs and the evidence on youths and
violence is key to creating appropriate interventions designed to reduce
youth violence.

The general public perceives adolescence as a tumultuous and dan­
gerous developmental stage. This notion originated in G. Stanley Hall's
seminal work, which characterized adolescence as a period of “storm and
stress” (Lerner, Dowling, & Anderson, 2003). Although this view is largely
unsupported by contemporary research, negative stereotypes about ado­
lescents continue to permeate American society. To illustrate, one recent
study found that only 16% of a nationwide sample of adults believed that
young people under the age of 30 share most of their moral or ethical
values (Bostrom, 2000).

There are also widespread beliefs that youths are uninterested in and inca­
cpable of contributing to their communities. Scales and colleagues (2001)
found that when adults assess the importance of 19 possible actions that can
be taken on behalf of youths, 2 of the least frequent responses were to “seek
young people's opinions when making decisions that affect them” and to
“give young people lots of opportunities to make their communities better places.” Even in youth-serving organizations, adults are ambivalent about young people’s abilities to participate in decision making and action (Costello, Toles, Spielberger, & Wynn, 2000).

These public assumptions are not supported by research. For example, almost two-thirds of a national sample of youths reported that it is very important to give back to their communities (Peter Hart Research Associates, 1998). Further, youths have the competency to contribute. Many young people have a high level of decision-making competence by the age of 15 and are capable of contributing (Zeldin, 2004). This growing body of research suggests that youths are meaningfully contributing to their communities (Christens & Zeldin, in press), from participating on boards with elected officials (Zeldin, Petrokubi, & MacNeil, 2007) to organizing efforts for community change (Christens & Dolan, in press; Kirshner, 2009).

In addition to the misconceptions about youths, research also suggests that adults tend to overestimate or exaggerate the rate of youth violence (Gilliam & Bales, 2001). For example, many parents view America’s schools as dangerous and unsafe, but these fears are inconsistent with the facts regarding school violence. Youths are actually safer in schools compared to most other settings where they spend time (Cornell, 2006; Goldstein & Conoley, 2004), and recent statistics demonstrate that school violence has actually been on the decline (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010).

Studies indicate that the public also often equates youth crime with race, perceiving young African American and Hispanic men as being less law abiding and more apt to commit violent crimes (Gilliam, 1998; Males, 1999). However, when considered in isolation from other demographics, racial and ethnic characteristics are not indicative of an adolescent’s propensity for engaging in violence (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2001). Another common misconception is that violence is a premeditated act directed toward innocent bystanders, when in fact research has long demonstrated the opposite is true; the majority of violent crimes occur between friends and acquaintances or within families (Basile, Chen, Black, & Saltzman, 2007; Hepburn, 1973; Prothrow-Stith, 1987).

**Orientations to Youth Violence Reduction**

Orientations that underlie public responses to youth violence reduction can be thought of as a spectrum from control to prevention to agency (Figure 12.1). The first orientation is control, the belief that the public should reduce youth violence through measures such as surveillance,
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Orientations to Youth Violence Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>• Youth Development Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>• Increasing Everyday Opportunities and Supports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>• Violence • Teen Courts • Prevention-Focused Youth Coalitions • Youth Organizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12.1 Broadening the frame: Moving from individual-level and controlling strategies to transactional and agency-oriented strategies for reducing youth violence.

detainment, and punishment. The underlying assumption is that by controlling young people, society can reduce their participation in undesirable activities. A second orientation to youth violence is prevention, which focuses on implementing interventions before significant problems occur. Prevention strategies range from public education campaigns to targeted, intensive therapy for youths who repeatedly engage in delinquent behavior. The third orientation, and we argue the most frequently overlooked, is that of youth agency. Youth agency recognizes that all youths are capable of contributing to their environments in positive ways and, therefore, emphasizes approaches that promote community engagement.

Control. The United States relies primarily on the juvenile justice system—including police and courts—to control young people through both the threat and enactment of punishment. This system attempts to deter youths from participating in illegal activities through the use of punitive measures, including surveillance and incarceration. Given the prevalent view of youth as a developmental period of storm and stress and youth violence as an inevitable societal problem, it is not surprising that the dominant policy response has been the adoption of such punitive measures.

It is significant to note that the juvenile justice system attempts to implement evidence-based initiatives, such as community-based alternatives to secure confinements. However, these practices are not consistently evident because the justice system is responsible for administering the
harsh crime policies adopted in legislatures (Zeldin, 2004). Indeed, in the past 30 years, state legislatures have instituted multiple reforms that seek to punish and control young offenders (Bishop, 2006). Examples of such reforms include: the expansion of courts’ sentencing authority in order to permit certain sentences to extend into the adult years, the amendment of juvenile codes to endorse the goals of punishment and protection of public safety, and the removal of confidential protections of juvenile court records (Bishop, 2006; Soler, 2001).

Equally concerning is the fact that the juvenile justice system seems to have adopted the public’s belief that the primary perpetrators of youth violence are African American and Hispanic men (Gilliam & Bales, 2001). Although there is no racial difference in young people’s self-reported rates of violent behavior, the arrest rates by race differ greatly (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2001). This lack of consistency and fairness toward youths of color is a contributing factor to repeated mistreatment in the system.

**Prevent.** Public health professionals, along with social workers and community development professionals, have long advocated for, and advanced, prevention strategies as a means to reduce youth violence. Prevention strategies are classified into three categories: primary, secondary, and tertiary (Turnock, 2001). Primary prevention seeks to identify the risk factors associated with violence and to educate the general population on practical solutions. An example of primary prevention to reduce youth violence is a public information campaign that raises awareness about the dangers associated with keeping firearms in the home. Secondary prevention focuses on individuals who are at risk or are beginning to engage in delinquent behavior. Programs for secondary prevention of delinquent behavior often seek to inoculate youths against social problems through training sessions in decision making, impulse control, and anger management (Botvin, Griffin, & Nichols, 2006). Finally, tertiary prevention targets individuals who are engaged in a cycle of violent or delinquent behavior. Strategies for the reduction of youth violence range from intensive individual and family counseling to enrollment in special schools.

While prevention orientations are commendable for being proactive rather than reactive, there are still limitations. Namely, this approach primarily focuses on deterring young people from risky and delinquent behavior rather than seeking to meet the fundamental developmental needs of all young people. By focusing solely on preventing problems, the prevention approach unintentionally reinforces inaccurate societal perceptions of adolescents. This conception of youths as potential victims and problems has been recently countered by accounts of youths as assets.
Agency. The agency orientation to violence reduction is based on the principles of positive youth development (PYD). PYD is both a theory and practice that emphasizes "the growing capacity of a young person to understand and act on the environment" (Hamilton & Hamilton, 2004, p. 3). A key tenet of PYD is that youths are resources to be nurtured, not problems to be solved (Damon, 2004). This more holistic approach focuses on not just preventing problems but also building on youth strengths.

A central component of PYD theory and practice is youth agency, the recognition that youths are actors in their own development and are significant resources for creating the contexts and communities that promote positive development (Benson, Scales, Hamilton, & Sesma, 2006). An agency orientation, as theorized in PYD, emphasizes the need to engage youths in their communities. There are a range of opportunities through which youths can participate in community decision making and action. Examples include engaging young people on the boards of youth-serving agencies, on youth councils that advise elected officials, on community coalitions, or in community-organizing efforts. Agency-oriented approaches integrate young people into the "adult world" and give them a voice in the matters and policies that impact their lives. In short, youth agency recognizes that young people can and should inform the settings that in turn impact their development.

Unfortunately, youth agency is not supported by dominant policies or institutional practices in the United States. This is especially true of initiatives aimed at reducing youth violence. As Peterson, Dolan, and Hanft (2010) note, the participation "of students in the identification and implementation of violence prevention programs is almost completely ignored in the literature of violence prevention" (p. 236). Although some public agencies are beginning to create incentives for youth engagement in community decision making, there still remains little institutionalized support at the national or state level (Forum for Youth Investment, 2002).

Ecology of Interventions for Reducing Youth Violence

As with the orientations presented in the previous section, the concept of ecology provides a conceptual framework for making distinctions between different approaches to youth violence reduction. For the purposes of this analysis, we draw on Bronfenbrenner's (1977) conception of the human ecological environment as "a nested arrangement of structures each contained within the next" (p. 514). In a human ecological perspective, individuals are viewed in the context of their environments, similar to biology's understanding of organisms as components of their
ecosystems. We conceptually identify three categories of intervention for youth violence reduction that are focused on different components of an ecological system: (a) interventions that emphasize the choices, propensities, responsibilities, and capabilities of individuals; (b) interventions that emphasize the role of settings and environmental factors in constraining or facilitating the occurrence of crime; and (c) interventions that emphasize activities or processes that simultaneously alter individuals and their ecological environments. Inherent in each type of intervention approach is an understanding of the etiology of youth violence. That is, by choosing an intervention approach, one makes a tacit statement about one's own attributions of responsibility for the occurrence of violence.

**Individual-level interventions.** Individual-level interventions emphasize the choices, propensities, responsibilities, and capabilities of individuals. Individual-level strategies are diverse. Some are control focused, others are focused on prevention, and still others focus on youth agency (see Figure 12.1). At the control end of the spectrum are policies and programs that seek to reduce violence by creating disincentives for individuals to engage in violent behaviors. Most of the functions of systems of juvenile justice can be characterized as individual-level, control-oriented interventions. In these interventions, individuals who commit violent acts are held responsible and punished according to the severity of the crime. The threat that this individual poses to society is temporarily removed while the individual is incarcerated. Alongside the punitive functions of this system, some attempts are made during and after incarceration to rehabilitate the individual and to create a system of stronger disincentives for relapses of violent behavior. Although this system represents the mainstream of intervention for reducing youth violence, there is little evidence to support its effectiveness (Pratt, 2008).

In the middle of the spectrum lie individual-level approaches to prevention that seek to reduce the susceptibility of individuals to engage in violence and other problem behaviors. This often takes the form of school-based programs that seek to inform young people of the risks and consequences of engaging in these behaviors, train young people in alternative strategies, or develop a set of competencies that are believed to make individuals less susceptible to engaging in drug abuse, gang membership, or violence. A fundamental premise of such programs is that individuals can be inoculated from such susceptibilities. For example, under Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, the Department of Justice began implementing a Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) program. GREAT's objective is “an immunization against delinquency, violence, and gang
membership” (Department of Justice, 2010). Claims are often made that these programmatic forms of intervention represent “evidence-based” effective practice. However, the evaluations that lead to these claims are frequently plagued by faulty evaluation practices (Gorman, Conde, & Huber, 2007) and conflicts of interest in which the creators of the program are also conducting the evaluation (Gorman & Conde, 2007).

At the agency end of the spectrum are youth development programs that seek to build developmental assets of young people (top right in Figure 12.1). These programs do not focus on deficits or risks of problem behaviors like violence. Instead, they focus on building what Lerner and colleagues (2005) call the five Cs of positive youth development: competence, confidence, connection, character, and caring. In a review of youth development programs, Roth and Brooks-Gunn (2003) identify the goals and practices of youth-serving organizations and development programs. These include preventing problem behaviors but also include providing a supportive and empowering environment, family and community connections, and expectations for positive behavior. Hence, the goals of youth development programs extend well beyond avoiding violence into concepts like “thriving” and—at an aggregate level—development of a civil society (Lerner, Dowling, & Anderson, 2003). The notion, substantiated by an emerging body of research, is that the promotion of positive youth development outcomes decreases the likelihood of problem behaviors (Benson, Scales, Hamilton, & Sesma, 2006).

Environment or setting-level interventions. Environment or setting-level interventions begin with the idea that while individuals may have propensities toward certain types of behaviors, some features of environments are conducive to these behaviors while other features of environments are inhibitive or preventive. This perspective draws on Lewin’s (1935) dynamic theory of personality, which posits that behavior can best be understood as a function of a person’s characteristics and their environment \( B = f (P, E) \). Yet the modern Western proclivity to attribute responsibility to individuals can stand in the way of implementing interventions that are focused on changing settings and environments rather than changing individuals. This individualist bias is evidenced in much social theory and practice. For example, consider the crime displacement perspective on violence, which argues that if opportunities to commit crime are reduced in one location, perpetrators will simply go elsewhere in search of opportunities to commit crime. The assumption inherent in this view is that criminality is a personal characteristic rather than an interactive function of persons and environments. In reality, there is very little evidence that crime displacement occurs (Weisburd et al., 2006), but the persistence of public belief
in crime displacement illustrates the difficulty in overcoming individualist bias and moving beyond individual-level interventions to those that focus on other ecological levels.

Like individual-level interventions, environmental and setting-level interventions are diverse. They range from interventions that are control oriented to those that are focused on prevention and agency. At the control end of the spectrum lie environmental interventions that block criminal opportunities or otherwise discourage or complicate the occurrence of crime. Examples include fences, gated communities, alarm systems, or surveillance. In the middle of the spectrum are interventions that seek to prevent violence through environmental interventions that are not punitive or threatening. Examples include prevention through urban designs that increase urban and suburban residential density (Christens & Speer, 2005), defensible space, or decrease environmental incivilities (Perkins, Wandersman, Rich, & Taylor, 1993). Other examples include efforts to reduce or mitigate the social conditions that give rise to violence, including policies that ensure human rights, environmental justice, and citizen security (Moser & McIlwaine, 2006) or address oppression with a focus on community well-being (Prilleltensky, 2008).

At the agency end of the spectrum are interventions that increase everyday opportunities and supports (middle right of Figure 12.1) to create the preconditions for peaceful settings and environments. This strategy is consistent with many of the goals of PYD. In particular, Benson, Scales, Hamilton, and Sesma (2006) highlight opportunities for skill building and belonging and supportive relationships that promote autonomy and positive social norms. In addition, increasing everyday opportunities and supports can include the creation of new recreational and extracurricular activities, new educational and employment opportunities, and new settings—such as new after-school programs or new community centers—which can function as venues for the facilitation of youth development.

Transactional interventions. We turn now to a third category of interventions, transactional interventions: those that emphasize activities or processes that simultaneously alter individuals and their ecological environments. The term “transaction” is drawn from Dewey and Bentley (1946), who distinguish transaction from self-action and interaction as ways of understanding the world. Transaction is distinguished from both self-action and interaction by a refusal to view individual entities or their interactions as detachable. A transactional view seeks to understand whole processes or actions with an understanding that there are no independent intrinsic qualities that these entities possess. Altman and Rogoff (1987) draw on Dewey and Bentley and others to set forth four worldviews in psychology:
trait, interactional, organismic, and transactional. For Altman and Rogoff, the transactional worldview involves “the study of the changing relations among psychological and environmental aspects of holistic unities” (p. 9). Hence, transactional strategies for youth violence reduction seek to alter the relations between youths and their settings and environments. In other words, unlike strategies that intervene only on individuals or their environments, transactional interventions focus on the relationships between youths and their environments.

In practice, transactional interventions are much less common than those focused on individuals or environments and settings. For example, writing about educational intervention, Dokecki, Scanlan, and Strain (1972) describe a pendulum effect, in which the dominance of individualistic interventions leads to calls for more social systemic interventions and vice versa. The authors suggest that “exclusive positions, either social system or individual oriented, may end up looking similar, structurally at least, and perhaps are similarly incomplete and unable to handle complex social problems” (p. 183). We assert that strategies for youth violence reduction that are focused on community engagement represent promising models of transactional interventions.

**Agency-Oriented and Transactional Interventions to Reduce Youth Violence**

Our central argument in this chapter is that the frame for interventions to reduce youth violence should be broadened to include more transactional approaches as well as more approaches that emphasize youth agency. Figure 12.1 depicts this argument. The majority of interventions are currently individual oriented and focused on control. While these approaches may be appropriate in some cases, they are not always optimal solutions. By combating public misconceptions on youth violence and understanding youth development in an ecological context, the frame can be broadened to include more interventions that focus on youth agency and ecological transactions. In order to make these approaches tangible, we put forward three specific models for reducing youth violence that employ a transactional and agency-oriented approach: teen courts, youth coalitions, and youth organizing. The common denominator of these models is youth community engagement.

**Teen courts.** Teen courts, also known as youth courts or peer juries, are an alternative for young people who have committed minor offenses, such as vandalism, stealing, or the possession of drugs. Rather than going to juvenile court and risking formal prosecution, young offenders can opt to attend teen court and avoid having a legal record (Butts, Buck, &
Coggeshall, 2002). The approach is based on the premise that a young person is less likely to reoffend if he or she is held accountable for the crime and also provided with an opportunity to positively reengage with the community (Forgays & DeMilio, 2005).

Teen courts function similarly to juvenile courts except the young offender is tried and sentenced by peers rather than adults. Youth volunteers—many of whom are former offenders returning to participate in other cases—serve as jurors, attorneys, judges, and court clerks. The youth volunteers are ultimately responsible for developing a sentence that reflects restorative justice principles, meaning the sentence must focus on building responsibility and reengagement in the young offender (Bazemore, 2001). Sentences often include serving on a teen court jury, engaging in community service, writing an apology letter to their parent(s) and the victim of their offense, or writing an essay about the effects of crime on the community (Butts et al., 2002). Sentencing allows youths to serve in a responsible role, empowering the young person to engage in prosocial behavior (Peterson-Badali, Ruck, & Koegl, 2001). In this model, youths become agents of restorative justice, not simply recipients.

Teen courts are rapidly expanding in the United States, growing from 78 programs in 1994 to 1,050 in 2005 (Pearson & Jurich, 2005). Given their prevalence, greater attention is now given to measuring and evaluating their effectiveness. The results are promising. For example, Harrison, Maupin, and Mays (2001) found that teen court first-time offenders had recidivism rates of 30% or less. Similarly, Butts and colleagues (2002) report that the youth court offenders had a lower recidivism rate than offenders processed through traditional juvenile courts in three surveyed states.

By altering the environments in which young offenders are prosecuted and tried, and by allowing youths to exercise some degree of agency in these settings, teen courts represent a transactional model that incorporates youth agency. Because teen courts operate within the juvenile justice system, however, the overarching orientation is still control.

Youth coalitions. Youth coalitions bring together diverse community stakeholders—including young people, parents, educators, nonprofit managers, business leaders, and public officials—to address a youth issue of mutual concern (Collura, Graff, & Zeldin, 2009). Youth coalitions may address a variety of youth-related concerns and serve as a valuable resource for the community. For example, the communitywide coalition in Oazakee County, Wisconsin, composed of youths and adults, works primarily on improving young people's relationships with local law enforcement. However, the coalition also provides input to the park and recreation board, business improvement district, and the chamber of commerce.
Engaging youths in coalitions is a promising approach for both community change and healthy youth development. Because coalitions engage a diversity of institutions and citizens and encourage cross-sector networking and resource sharing, they have the potential to make community change (Chavis, 2001). Youth coalitions, in particular, provide an effective forum for youth engagement and voice. When young people help define community problems and solutions and participate in settings where they wield influence, they develop a greater sense of community (Evans, 2007). Coalitions also have the potential to build strong relationships between youths and adults. Such relationships serve an important protective and developmental function: They can help prevent youths from engaging in problem behaviors while concurrently helping to promote knowledge, competency, and initiative among youths (Zeldin, Larson, Camino, & O'Connor, 2005). In addition, there is growing evidence that social connectedness is inversely associated with rates of crime at the community level (Kawachi, Kennedy, & Wilkinson, 1999). Youth coalitions engage young people and alter the environments in which policy decisions are made. Hence, this transactional model incorporates youth agency.

Youth organizing. Youth organizing "trains young people in community organizing and advocacy, and assists them in employing these skills to alter power relations and create meaningful institutional change in their communities" (Funders Collaborative of Youth Organizing, 2009). This practice is based on the belief that effective youth development and concrete social change occur in tandem. Youth organizing gained considerable momentum during the 1990s, with increasing evidence that it was an effective way for young people to develop leadership skills, effect concrete community change, and become politically engaged (Delgado & Staples, 2008). Perhaps because of its explicit emphasis on empowerment and social justice, youth organizing has been more effective than other youth development programs at engaging diverse youths, particularly youths of color (Yee, 2008).

Many youths engage in organizing because the issues have personal meaning to them. For example, young women who lived in poverty and had been involved with the juvenile justice system organized and established the Center for Young Women's Development in San Francisco. The center's programs are designed to help disenfranchised young women become employed citizens working to improve their communities. Toward that end, the organization is run completely by low-income women who have progressed through the center's programs (Camino & Zeldin, 2002).

There is a growing body of evidence for supporting youth organizing as an empowering approach to youth engagement and violence prevention (Christens & Dolan, in press; Peterson et al., 2010). Youth
organizing efforts have lobbied against punitive California legislation that would lead to increased youth incarceration (Gambone et al., 2006), led successful campaigns to increase affordable childcare access for high school-aged mothers (Ginwright, 2003), and expanded after-school programs with the aim of reducing youth violence (Peterson et al., 2010). Researchers are also documenting the positive impacts of youth organizing on both the young participants and their communities. Zeldin, Petrokubi, and Camino (2008) demonstrate that young people involved in organizing develop a sense of belonging and collective efficacy, an increase in sociopolitical awareness and civic competence, and an increase in community connections. Christens and Dolan (in press) describe a youth organizing effort in which young people work to reduce violence and crime through advocacy for policies that support youth development. In the process, they develop leadership skills, such as confidence in public speaking, research expertise, and a greater understanding of social and political issues. Hence, youth organizing is a particularly promising model, representing both a transactional and an agency-oriented approach to reducing youth violence.

Broadening the Frame

In this chapter, we provided a conceptual rubric for understanding approaches to youth violence reduction. The two dimensions of this rubric are orientations and ecological levels of intervention. Based on these two dimensions, we assert that policy and program responses aimed at youth violence reduction should be broadened to include more strategies that focus on youth agency and transactional interventions (see Figure 12.1). The commonality of these interventions is that they engage youths in their communities. Youth development programs and setting-level interventions focus on building youth agency through the development of supportive relationships with peers and adults. Youth coalitions and youth organizing engage youths in community-level decision making. Even teen courts, which employ a more traditional control orientation to juvenile justice, create a setting where youths can exercise agency.

To be clear, we are not arguing for an exclusive focus on these models of interventions. Indeed, control-oriented and individual-level approaches are necessary in some cases. We are, however, arguing that there is an imbalance in intervention approaches that favors individual-level interventions over environmental and transactional interventions and favors control-oriented approaches over preventive and agency-oriented approaches. This imbalance is reflective of prevalent misconceptions of youth violence. To broaden
the frame and rectify the imbalance, community engagement approaches to youth violence prevention must be rigorously evaluated, and findings must be translated into practice. Finally, the broader public and key decision makers (e.g., police, judges, prosecutors, legislators, etc.) must become more involved in combating misconceptions of youth violence and helping to broaden the frame.
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