Running Head: EXPOSURE TO COMMUNITY VIOLENCE

Exposure to Community Violence: What Factors Endanger and Protect Children and Adolescents?

A Review of the Literature

Exposure to Community Violence: What Factors Endanger and Protect Children and Adolescents? A Review of the Literature

> Our neighborhood is a fun neighborhood if you know what you're doing. If you act like a little kid in this neighborhood, you're not gonna last too long. 'Cause if you play childish games in the ghetto, you're gonna find a childish bullet in your childish brain. If you live in the ghetto, when you're ten you know everything you're not supposed to know. When I was ten I knew where drugs came from. I knew about every different kind of gun. I knew about sex. I was a kid in age but my mind had the reality of a grown-up, 'cause I seen these things every day!...When Baby Tony came out he was walking through the park when a boy lit him up and blew his face off. His face was *entirely* blown off. And then a couple of days later Little Cecil sold somebody a dummy bag of plaster form off the walls, so the man who was using it came back and asked him for his money back. Little Cecil took off running and the man shot him. And Cecil was dead. That was both of my cousin's friends that died in one week!..It's like Vietnam. I remember one time I was over at my auntie's house spending the night. We were playing Super Nintendo and I heard this lady say, "I heard you been looking for me…!" Then she just – BOOM! BOOM! BOOM! BOOM! She let off about eight shots. Then I heard the other gun fire off. And we were just still there playing like nothing happened. In Vietnam, them people came back crazy. I live in Vietnam, so what you think I'm gonna be like if I live in it and they just went and visited? Living around here is depressing! It's just depressing! (Jones, Newman, & Isay, 1997, pp. 33-36)

These alarming words were written by a teenaged boy living on the South Side of Chicago, reflecting on his childhood. Unfortunately, these descriptions also represent the experiences of a disturbingly large number of children and adolescents across the country who live in environments of violence and danger. Why must these relatively defenseless, innocent children endure such harrowing lives? Should not all children be afforded a safe environment in which to undergo a healthy, normal developmental process? As adults with the capability to protect our nation's children from the harmful effects of witnessing and experiencing community violence, researchers in psychology have an obligation to utilize the tools and resources available to them

to investigate ways to ameliorate children and adolescents from community violence and the negative outcomes that ensue from such exposure. With this notion as a guiding principle, the present literature review highlights the progress that has been made thus far toward understanding community violence in the lives of children and adolescents, and reveals areas in which research must be expanded and improved in order to protect more children from the devastating effects of community violence exposure.

First, a brief overview of recent prevalence rates of community violence exposure among children and adolescents is presented. Next, the general negative outcomes of community violence exposure are mentioned, including child and adolescent psychopathology and other sub-clinical symptoms of maladjustment. Subsequently, a review of the current literature regarding risk and protective factors for child and adolescent community violence exposure is provided, covering a range of variables in the following domains: community, sociodemographic, family, and individual cognitive, social, and behavioral factors. Finally, the gaps in the current community violence literature will be assessed, and suggestions for future research will be put forth.

The extremely high prevalence of child and adolescent exposure to violence in U.S. inner-cities is alarming (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Berman, Kurtines, Silverman, & Serafini, 1996; Buka, Stichick, Birdthistle, & Earls, 2001; Dempsey, 2002; Dempsey, Overstreet, & Moely, 2000; Farrell & Bruce, 1997; Gorman-Smith & Tolan, 1998; Hurt, Malmud, Brodsky, & Giannetta, 2001; Kupersmidt, Shahinfar, & Voegler-Lee, 2002; Lorion & Saltzman, 1993; Miller, Neugebauer, Gorman-Smith, & Kamboukos, 1999; Muller, Goebel-Fabbri, Diamond, & Dinklage, 2000; Osofsky, Wewers, Hann, & Fick, 1993; Richters & Martinez, 1993; Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001). Koop and Lundberg (1992) have declared the elevated rate of

violence in the United States a public health emergency. In fact, researchers have reported that 80-100% of inner-city adolescents have witnessed some form of violence in their communities (Berman et al., 1996; Campbell & Schwartz, 1996; Dempsey, Overstreet, & Moely, 2000; Farrell & Bruce, 1997; Fitzpatrick, 1997; Gorman-Smith, Henry, & Tolan, 1998; Gorman-Smith & Tolan, 1998; Horowitz, Weine, & Jekel, 1995; Osofsky et al., 1993; Overstreet, Dempsey, Graham, & Moely, 1999; Overstreet & Braun, 2000; Schubiner, Scott, & Tzelepis, 1993; Singer, Anglin, Song, & Lunghofer, 1995; Stein et al., 2001; Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom). Youth in impoverished neighborhoods not only witness a great number of violent events, but they also experience a wide range of types of violence (Gorman-Smith & Tolan, 1998). For example, 75% of young children (Hurt et al., 2001) and 84 - 92% of urban adolescents have heard gunshots in their neighborhoods (Miller et al., 1999; Overstreet & Braun, 2000), approximately 86.5% have witnessed the mugging of an individual (Berman et al., 1996), and up to 60% have seen a shooting or stabbing (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Dubrow & Garbarino, 1989; Gorman-Smith, Henry, & Tolan, 2004; Miller et al., 1999; Overstreet et al., 1999; Richters & Martinez, 1993; Schubiner, Scott, & Tzelepis, 1993; Schwab-Stone et al., 1995; Shakoor & Chalmers, 1991). Astonishingly, 42% of inner-city high school students reported witnessing a murder first-hand (Berman et al., 1996). Even preschoolers in crime-ridden neighborhoods are exposed to high levels of community violence on a daily basis (Dubrow & Garbarino, 1989; Shahinfar, Fox, & Leavitt, 2000; Taylor et al., 1994). Moreover, the violent events to which urban youth are exposed are not isolated experiences (Kupersmidt et al., 2002), but rather contribute to a chronic atmosphere of violence (Overstreet et al., 1999; Garbarino, 1999). Exposure to violence is also cumulative, in that witnesses of very threatening events have also been exposed to less traumatic incidents (Bell & Jenkins, 1993).

Even more disturbing are the high rates of youth victimization by community violence, aside from indirect exposure (Dempsey, Overstreet, & Moely, 2000; Finkelhor & Dziuba-Leatherman, 1994; Osofsky et al., 1993; Stein et al., 2001; Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001). Studies have found that more than 65% of urban children and adolescents and approximately 40% of suburban children and adolescents have been subjected to victimization by violent acts in their communities, including physical assaults, robberies, shootings, stabbings, and other horrendous traumas (Camptbell & Schwartz, 1996; Fitzpatrick, 1997; Fitzpatrick & Boldizar, 1993; Giaconia et al., 1995). Because community violence often occurs in the after-school hours when children and adolescents may be spending free time on their own (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999), and because they may be more vulnerable to their dangerous communities than more experienced and capable adults (Cauce et al., 2003), community violence exposure is a particularly strong threat to children's well-being and development. In the face of such devastating statistics, one must wonder who, if anyone at all, is looking out for these children who may be powerless to look out for themselves. Apart from the obvious and immediate danger that community violence poses for youth victims, it is also clear that both victims and witnesses undergo additional effects simply from being exposed.

Witnessing and being victimized by community violence has shown to have many deleterious effects on children's and adolescents' mental health and well-being (Buka et al., 2001). Perhaps the most readily apparent negative effects of community violence exposure are physical in nature, such as developing speech problems and regressing to early patterns of behavior (Garbarino, Dubrow, Kostelny, & Pardo, 1992). However, a wide range of emotional outcomes have been consistently observed as well, including fully-developed psychopathology. For example, children who witness violence in their neighborhoods or undergo direct

victimization are at elevated risk for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD; Dempsey, Overstreet, & Moely, 2000; Horowitz, Weine, & Jekel, 1995; Overstreet et al., 1999; Overstreet & Braun, 2000; Gorman-Smith & Tolan, 2003; Stein et al., 2003), sub-clinical distress symptoms (Hurt et al., 2001), anxiety disorders (Stein et al., 2003), depression (Martinez & Richters, 1993; Fitzpatrick, 1993; Farrell & Bruce, 1997; Stein et al., 2003), and low self-esteem (Hurt et al., 2001). Given that the chronic community violence to which many urban children and adolescence are exposed is more akin to a war zone than a residential neighborhood, it may be unsurprising that these emotional symptoms afflict these (Garbarino et al., 1992). Youth who are exposed to community violence tend to develop behavioral symptoms as well, such as aggression and delinquency (Linares et al., 2001; DuRant, Cadenhead, Pendergrast, Slavens, & Linder, 1994; Durant, Pendergrast, & Cadenhead, 1994; Farrell & Bruce, 1997; Nofziger & Kurtz, 2005; Gorman-Smith & Tolan, 2003; Miller et al., 1999; Schwab-Stone et al., 1999), even when controlling for previous behavioral problems (Gorman-Smith & Tolan, 1998). Furthermore, community violence exposure, and even subjective perceptions of neighborhood danger, also impacts children's cognitive and academic functioning, such as impairments in school (Garbarino et al., 1992; Hurt et al., 2001; Schwab-Stone et al., 1995; Stein et al., 2003), higher rates of dropping out of high school (Grogger, 1997), and decreased IQ (Delaney-Black et al., 2002; Ratner, 2006).

Some researchers have found that witnesses and victims of community violence may suffer from differential types of psychopathology. For example, in one study, witnesses were more likely than non-witnesses to develop internalizing problems, whereas victims were more likely than non-victims to develop externalizing problems (Shahinfar, Fox, & Leavitt, 2000). Furthermore, younger children who have been exposed to community violence may be more

likely to suffer from internalizing problems than older children (Schwab-Stone et al., 1999). Clearly, children who are victims of and witnesses to community violence are at enormous risk for the development of various types of psychopathology. The primary question on many psychologists' minds is, How can we reduce this risk?

Although research on the prevalence and impact of community violence exposure is undoubtedly important, the focus of this review is on examining risk and protective factors associated with witnessing and being victimized by community violence in the first place. Borrowing a term from research on cardiovascular disease, psychologists' foremost priority should be on the "primordial prevention" of community violence exposure in all of its forms – that is, turning efforts toward reducing the risk for initial violence exposure in order to protect youth from psychopathology that would subsequently develop, rather than focusing merely on reducing the effects of violence exposure that has already occurred (Farquhar, 1999). Fortunately, gains have been made in finding ways to protect youth from the negative effects of community violence by isolating mediating and moderating factors between exposure and outcomes (e.g., Berman et al., 1996; Ceballo, Ramirez, Hearn, & Maltese, 2003; Gorman-Smith & Tolan, 1998; Muller et al., 2000; Overstreet et al., 1999). However, much less work has investigated the factors that serve to increase or decrease youth's risk of being exposed to community violence (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001). The main purposes of this review are to examine progress that has been made in isolating these factors, highlight areas that will benefit from future work, and motivate researchers to turn more of their attention toward these initial predictors of child and adolescent community violence exposure in an attempt to attack this threat to children's well-being at the very root of the problem.

The risk factors that are perhaps most highly associated with increased likelihood and frequency of community violence exposure for children and adolescents are community variables, such as living in an urban neighborhood and in high-crime areas. It remains unquestioned in the field that inner-city children and adolescents experience much higher rates of community violence exposure than their suburban and rural peers (e.g., Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Campbell & Schwartz, 1996; Cauce et al., 2003; Gladstein, Rusonis, & Heald, 1992; Gorman-Smith and Tolan, 1998; Salzinger, Feldman, Stockhammer, & Hood, 2002; Schubiner, Scott, & Tzelepis, 1993; Stein et al., 2003). In fact, the threat of victimization and witnessing violence are among the greatest risks of living in an urban environment, as can be inferred from the unsettling anecdote with which this review began. The reality of the danger in low-income, urban neighborhoods has become so great that one researcher has labeled these areas "urban war zones," reflecting the chronic violence that these residents must face on a daily basis (Garbarino et al., 1992). Another community factor that appears to be associated with high levels of violence exposure is children's and adolescents' subjective perceptions of safety in their neighborhoods (Garbarino et al., 1992; Overstreet & Braun, 2000). Although this relation likely reflects the fact that children exposed to high levels of violence become frightened of their neighborhoods as a result and tend to perceive the community as a dangerous place, it is helpful for intervention researchers to be aware of this association so that when a child indicates abnormally high fears about her safety in her neighborhood, she can be identified as an individual at high risk for community violence exposure.

One community factor that has, perhaps surprisingly, shown to be protective against high rates of violence exposure among inner-city children is living arrangements: those whose families live in apartments rather that houses appear to be less likely to be exposed to community

violence (Richters & Martinez, 1993). Additionally, living in one place for a longer period of time may serve as a risk factor for higher levels of community violence, perhaps because with more stable living arrangements come more familiarity with one's community, and therefore more time spent out in the neighborhood with greater opportunity to witness violence in the community (Richters & Martinez, 1993). However, this finding describes children living in a low-income, high-crime neighborhood; therefore, this same house versus apartment dichotomy likely does not hold true among families in more middle- to upper-class neighborhoods. Similarly, the finding that inner-city adolescents tend to experience and witness more community violence when they uphold stronger feelings of neighborhood affiliation may not be generalizable to adolescents living in less dangerous neighborhoods (Perez-Smith, Albus, & Weist, 2001). Additional community factors, such as high levels of social disorder and low levels of social control among inhabitants, are related to high rates of community violence exposure among children and adolescents as well (Salzinger et al., 2002).

Researchers have discovered that the link between community variables and violence exposure may be more complex. For example, it appears that compared to youth living in inner-city neighborhoods without social processes and other urban neighborhoods, those living in inner-city neighborhoods *with* high levels of social processes experience higher rates of violence exposure, but only those from struggling, low-income families, as opposed to exceptional, task-oriented, and moderately functioning families (Sheidow, Gorman-Smith, Tolan, & Henry, 2001). The authors observe that perhaps "in inner-city communities without protective social processes, risk of exposure cannot be mitigated by family functioning. Risk is community-wide. Exposure for these youth does not depend on how their family is functioning" (Sheidow et al., 2001, p. 356). Conversely, other researchers have been unable to find evidence for interactive effects

between community and family functioning. In one study, no type of family functioning protected against community violence exposure for youth living in high-violence areas; stated differently, youth from struggling families with low discipline, structure, monitoring, and cohesion were more likely to be exposed to high levels of community violence regardless of overall community risk (Gorman-Smith, Henry, & Tolan, 2004). More interactive explanations for individual difference in levels of community violence exposure may prove more informative and accurate than direct associations between single factors and community violence exposure, but due to discrepancies in the current literature, further investigations of these interactive models are needed.

The after-school hours present the most dangerous time for children and adolescents in their communities, during which risk for witnessing of and victimization by community violence is highest. The rate of neighborhood crime, including serious violent crime and aggravated assault, peaks in the after-school hours between 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. – precisely when children and adolescents are most likely to be spending their leisure time in the community(Salzinger et al., 2002; Snyder & Sickmund, 1999); in fact, research has shown that although the most dangerous time for adults to be victimized is between 9:00 p.m. and midnight, the most dangerous times for adolescents and youth to be victimized is between the hours of 3:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). Research demonstrating the correlation between youth's idle after-school time and engagement in delinquency supplements these findings, since delinquent activity is also related to community violence exposure (Agnew & Peterson, 1989; Stiffman, Dore, & Cunningham, 1996). Thus, it appears that as children enter into adolescence, their freedom to spend their leisure time in the neighborhood may increase their opportunity to

be exposed to violence (Horn & Trickett, 1998; Stoolmiller, 1994), making the after-school hours a particularly dangerous time for adolescents.

Aside from these community factors, much research on predictors of community violence exposure has also focused on identifying individual demographic and sociodemographic variables that tend to be linked to living in dangerous neighborhoods and experiencing high levels of neighborhood traumas (Stein et al., 2003). Unfortunately, low socioeconomic status (SES) families are disproportionately represented in these dangerous, inner-city neighborhoods (Garbarino et al., 1992), making low SES a powerful risk factor for violence exposure as well (Crouch, Hanson, Saunders, Kilpatrick, & Resnick, 2000; Fitzpatrick, 1997; Fitzpatrick & Boldizar, 1993; Gladstein, Rusonis, & Heald, 1992; Salzinger et al., 2002; Schwab-Stone et al., 1995; Singer et al., 1995; Stine et al., 2003), particularly for direct victimization (Finkelhor & Dziuba-Leatherman, 1994) and especially for African American and Hispanic adolescents (Crouch, Hanson, Saunders, Kilpatrick, & Resnick, 2000). Additionally, other measures of a family's SES are highly predictive of children and adolescent levels of community violence exposure, such as family size (Overstreet, Dempsey, Graham, & Moely, 1999) and maternal education level, (Hill & Madhere, 1996; Kliewer, Lepore, Oskin, & Johnson, 1998; Kuo, Mohler, Raudenbush, & Earls, 2000), but perhaps not for younger children (Kliewer et al., 1998). Although low SES is a significant risk factor overall, among lower SES children and adolescents, specific levels of family income may be unrelated to community violence exposure (Giaconia et al., 1995). This may reflect the fact that lower income families who can only afford to reside in urban neighborhoods are automatically at increased risk for violence exposure. It also must be emphasized that along with being exposed to high levels of violence in their impoverished neighborhoods, low SES youth are more likely than higher SES youth to

experience a wide range of developmental risks associated with poverty, making their struggle against the burden of community violence an even greater one (Garbarino et al., 1992; Gorman-Smith & Tolan, 1998).

Gender has also been highly implicated as a predictor for violence exposure among inner-city children and adolescents who are already at risk. Boys are much more likely than girls to experience community violence exposure, and to experience it more often (Cooley-Quille, Boyd, Frantz, & Walsh, 2001; Fitzpatrick, 1997; Fitzpatrick & Boldizar, 1993; Flannery, Singer, & Wester, 2001; Gladstein, Rusonis, & Heald, 1992; Lynch & Cicchetti, 1998; Malik, Sorenson, & Aneshensel, 1997; Perez-Smith, Albus, & Weist, 2001; Richards et al., 2004; Salzinger et al., 2002; Schwab-Stone et al., 1995; Schwab-Stone et al., 1999; Selner-O'Hagan, Kindlon, Buka, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1998; Singer et al., 1995; Stein et al., 2003; Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001). In particular, many reports indicate that although boys are more likely to become victims of violence (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Esbensen, Huizinga, & Menard, 1999; Farrell & Bruce, 1997; Finkelhor & Dziuba-Leatherman, 1994; Richters & Martinez, 1993; Stein et al., 2003), girls are almost equally likely to witness violence in the community (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Berman et al., 1996; Stein et al., 2003). Jenkins & Bell (1994) found that boys are specifically more likely than girls to be robbed, shot, or beaten in their neighborhoods. It may be the case that boys are more likely than girls to spend their free time in dangerous sections of the neighborhood, whereas girls may spend their free time inside the relative safety of their homes or the homes of friends. Additionally, because males tend to display higher levels of aggressive behavior than females (Jenkins & Bell, 1994; Kazdin, 1995; Rutter et al., 1970) and higher levels of risk-taking behaviors (Schwab-Stone et al., 1995), perhaps boys are more likely than girls to

initiate aggressive violence against others, and therefore witness and become victims of more retaliatory violence.

On the other hand, one group of researchers found that gender was unrelated to community violence exposure of all types among a group of urban high school students (Berman et al., 1996). Others have found that gender was unrelated to levels of community violence exposure, and that girls may in fact witness more violence than boys when many different traumas were considered, including rape and attempted rape (Giaconia et al., 1995; Hurt et al., 2001; Kliewer et al., 1998). Although a wealth of research has identified more violence exposure, particularly victimization, among boys, perhaps this is a fallacious conclusion due to the existence of unmeasured community violence in these studies that girls are more likely to experience than males.

Youths' ethnicity is another oft-cited demographic variable that seems to be related to levels of community violence exposure. Many studies have found that ethnic minority youth are at increased risk to experience and witness community violence in their neighborhoods (Schwab-Stone et al., 1995; Schwab-Stone et al., 1999; see Stein et al., 2003, for review) and to live in neighborhoods with high levels of violent crime (Gorman-Smith, Henry, & Tolan, 2004). Specifically, African American youth are more likely than White (Kuo et al., 2000; Lynch & Cicchetti, 1998; Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001), Asian American, and Latino youth (Martin, Gordon, & Kupersmidt, 1995) to be exposed to violence in general, but White children and adolescents may be more likely to be victimized (Lynch & Cicchetti, 1998; Malik, Sorenson, & Aneshensel, 1997). African American adolescents may also know more victims of violent acts than their White counterparts (Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001). Additionally, some researchers have found that both African American and Latino adolescents undergo more

violence exposure than their White counterparts (Crouch et al., 2000; Finkelhor & Dziuba-Leatherman, 1994; Schwab-Stone et al., 1999).

Despite these findings, Stein et al. (2001) found that among a group of 6- to 12-year-olds in foster care in Los Angeles, ethnicity was not significantly related to children's levels of community violence exposure. One study reported that among preschoolers living in high-crime neighborhoods, African Americans were exposed to higher levels of community violence than Black Americans of other ancestry, such as Caribbean (Linares et al., 2001). In tandem with these findings, it is important to keep in mind that, unfortunately, ethnic minorities are disproportionately represented in poor, urban communities (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2007). Therefore, these associations may be at least partially spurious, and reflect one's ethnic minority status not necessarily as a true risk factor for violence exposure in and of itself, but rather as a correlate of some of the more accurate risk factors, such as SES and inner-city residency (Stein et al., 2003). Also, youths' minority status may actually be differentially related to different types of violence exposure. For example, Sheley, McGee, & Wright, (1992) found that ethnicity was unrelated specifically to gun-related victimization among inner-city high school students.

Many researchers have also investigated the association between age and community violence exposure. It seems likely that older children may be exposed to more violence than younger children, because older youth often enjoy more free time and greater independence to engage in activities alone or with friends in the neighborhood. Indeed, many reports indicate that there is a linear association between age and violence exposure, such that the older a youth becomes, the more community violence to which he is exposed (Horowitz, Weine, & Jekel, 1995; Kliewer et al., 1998; Kuo et al., 2000; Overstreet & Braun, 2000; Overstreet et al., 1999).

Even among adolescents, witnessing and victimization by community violence seems to increase with age. For example, researchers have found that 10th and 8th grade students experience more violence than 6th graders (Schwab-Stone et al., 1999), perhaps indicating that the transition to high school signals a peak developmental period for adolescent violence exposure. Alternatively, these same researchers found in an earlier study that 8th graders reported more community violence exposure than either 6th or 10th graders, possibly implicating the transition through middle school and adolescents' burgeoning independence from parents as another period of high exposure (Schwab-Stone et al., 1995). Among a group of inner-city high school students, age was actually found to be the strongest predictor of community violence exposure, with older adolescents experiencing more (Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001).

Other researches have found the completely opposite trend, that younger children are actually exposed to more community violence than older children (Selner-O'Hagan, 1998). On the other hand, the relation between age and exposure may be more nuanced. For example, it may be the case that older children are more likely to be victimized in the community, but not to witness community violence (Bell & Jenkins, 1993), or vice versa (Jaycox et al., 2002). Age effects may also vary depending on the specific type of community violence: no significant associations have been found between age and gun-related victimization (Sheley, McGee, & Write, 1992), but perhaps investigating the correlations between age and other subtypes of community violence would reveal more interactive associations. Alternatively, many researches have found age to be completely unrelated to all forms of community violence exposure, complicating the picture even further (Finkelhor, Dziuba-Leatherman, 1994; Fitzpatrick, 1997; Fizpatrick & Boldizar, 1993; Lynch & Cicchetti, 1998; Martin, Gordon, & Kupersmidt, 2005; Stein et al., 2001). One group of researchers found that age was not significantly associated with

community violence exposure, but in a sample of 3- and 4-year-olds (Shahinfar, Fox, & Leavitt, 2000). Because there is no theoretical reason why a 4-year-old would experience more community violence than a slightly younger 3-year-old in the same neighborhood, this particular finding is unsurprising.

Although these findings regarding the relation of community and demographic variables to violence exposure are informative, they do not have many practical implications for intervention, since many of them cannot be changed. For example, although knowing that boys are more likely to be exposed to community violence than girls allows prevention researchers to place more of their efforts on protecting boys, it is impossible to directly intervene on the risk factor itself: we cannot turn boys into girls in order to reduce their violence exposure. Admittedly, the literature is relatively sparse with information explaining why some children living in low-income, high-crime neighborhoods are exposed to higher levels of community violence than other youth in the same types of dangerous neighborhoods (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Gorman-Smith, Henry, & Tolan, 2004; Lorion & Saltzman, 1993; Osofsky, Wewers, Hann, & Fick, 1993; Richters & martinez, 1993). Therefore, some researchers have begun to examine other possible factors beyond mere demographics that may be associated with children's violence exposure, such as family variables (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Gorman-Smith, Henry, & Tolan, 2004; Gorman-Smith & Tolan, 1998).

One domain of alternative risk and protective factors is family variables and processes. For example, higher levels of family involvement, open communication among family members, and strong parental monitoring of adolescents' activities have been shown to protect inner-city children and adolescents from participating in gangs, which in turn reduces their community violence exposure (Li et al., 2002). Actual conflict in the home has also been shown to increase

risk for children's and adolescents' exposure to violence in the community, both domestic violence (Linares et al., 2001; Richters & Martinez, 1993) and general family conflict (Cooley, Turner, & Beidel, 1995; Farver, Xu, Eppe, Fernandez, & Schwartz, 2005; Osofsky et al., 1993; Overstreet & Braun, 2000; Overstreet et al., 1999; Salzinger et al., 2004). These results may be at least somewhat confounded, since children who provide self-reports of violence exposure may include witnessing domestic violence in their estimations of violence exposure, and confuse community violence with domestic violence as well. Measures that are designed to vigilantly separate these two constructs will be valuable in future research on predictors of community violence exposure. On the other hand, some researchers have found family conflict to be unrelated to victimization (Malik et al., 1997) and community violence exposure in general (Miller et al., 1999).

Witnessing and becoming a victim of community violence is also associated with a more specific form of interpersonal violence within the home: child abuse (Salzinger et al., 2002). Lynch & Cicchetti (1998) found that child maltreatment, particularly physical abuse and the most severe forms of neglect, were related to child-reported levels of community violence; whereas less than half of the children from a low-violent neighborhood experienced maltreatment, 65% of the children from a high-violent neighborhood experienced maltreatment. Child abuse may be a particularly strong risk factor for victimization versus witnessing (Malik, Sorenson, & Aneshensel, 1997). Several explanations may account for the association between maltreatment and community violence exposure. As noted previously, informants may confuse domestic abuse with violent abuse in the community, inflating the correlation between the two variables in reports of violence exposure. Alternatively, perhaps violence and abuse within the home reflects a lower standard of safety and care for children within the community at large.

Evidence for this hypothesis has emerged from one study that found that personal norms about violence mediated the relation between both family violence and violence perpetration among adolescents, as well as between family violence and victimization (Malik et al., 1997). Perhaps children and adolescents who experience violence at home learn to believe that violence is a viable method to solve problems, raising their frequency of violence perpetration in the community and therefore their likelihood of *experiencing* violence against and around them.

One family-related variable that may protect inner-city children and adolescents from violence exposure is parental and familial support. Children's perceptions of family social support have been found to be at least marginally significantly associated with community violence exposure (Kliewer, Lepore, Oskin, & Johnson, 1998; Hill & Madhere, 1996; Kuther & Fisher, 1998; Sullivan, Kung, & Farrell, 2004). Relatedly, lower perceptions of parental acceptance has been shown to be associated with more violence exposure among urban 9- to 13-year-olds (Kliewer et al., 2004). In a qualitative investigation of community violence exposure, inner-city African-American 6th graders carried a diary and noted receipt of familial support when signaled by researchers. Specifically for girls, witnessing and victimization was inversely related to daily family support, as well as time spent with the family, indicating that perhaps it is not only the quality of the family support received, but also the quantity of family support received each day that helps protect youth from violence exposure (Hammack, Richards, Luo, Edlynn, & Roy, 2004). Another study reported that as youth aged into adolescents, they spent significantly less time with their families, and this time was generally replaced by time spent alone for boys and engaging with peers for girls (Larson & Richards, 1991). This is a logical result, since when youth are spending time with their families, it likely means that they are *not* spending that time on the streets, exposing themselves to the violence going on in the

community. Furthermore, one study showed longitudinal relations between family support and later exposure to community violence, suggesting that perhaps living in a supportive family environment may protect youth from exposing themselves to community violence later in life (White, Bruce, Farrell, & Kliewer, 1998). Having a healthy, secure attachment style is another likely protective factor against community violence exposure. Among a sample of urban 7- to 13-year-olds, researchers found that highly victimized children or those who have witnessed a high level of community violence were more likely to have insecure attachment patterns with mothers and more separation anxiety than their less exposed peers, as well as perceptions of negative maternal behavior (Lynch & Cicchetti, 2002).

Parenting practices also have the potential to either increase or reduce for children's and adolescents' community violence exposure, depending on the quality. In poor, rural communities, low discipline, parental monitoring, and family involvement is associated with higher rates of violence exposure (Mazefsky & Farrell, 2005; Miller et al., 1999; Sullivan et al., 2004). Among young urban adolescents as well, parental supervision and communication were lower for victimized youth (O'Donnell, Schwab-Stone, & Muyeed, 2002). Additionally, inner-city male adolescents have been found to experience more community violence if they come from struggling families characterized by low parental discipline, monitoring, and cohesion, rather than moderately functioning families with adequate parenting practices. However, in another study of 11- to 15-year-old boys in a low-income urban area, exposure to violence was only slightly related to parental discipline, and surprisingly was not related to monitoring (Gorman-Smith & Tolan, 1998). This null finding for parental monitoring was replicated in other studies as well (Miller et al., 1999; Reese et al., 2001). Furthermore, another group of researchers found parental discipline and monitoring to be only marginally significantly associated with

violence exposure (Esbensen, Huizinga, & Menard, 1999). Interestingly, although struggling families placed youth at greater risk for violence exposure, exceptional families with very high levels of effective parental discipline and monitoring were not significantly protective against violence exposure compared to the moderately functioning families (Gorman-Smith, Henry, & Tolan, 2004). These results are surprising, assuming that controlling children's activities and behaviors would give parents greater ability to keep their children safe and away from dangerous areas of the community. Perhaps community violence exposure is more random and uncontrollable in these dangerous urban environments than parents and researchers would like to believe. The associations between parenting practices and exposure that have been documented may simply be artifacts of a high correlation between living in poverty and parental stress that tend to lower the quality of parenting strategies.

Individual characteristics of youth's family members may also put them at greater risk for community violence exposure. For example, general maternal distress is related to violence exposure in children and mother reports of perceived neighborhood safety (Aisenberg, 2001; Farver et al., 2005; Linares et al., 2001). More serious maternal PTSD symptoms are also positively related to exposure in children (Linares et al., 2001). In addition, more engagement in high-risk and other problem behaviors among family members seems to predict greater violence exposure among both children and adolescents (Esbensen, Huizinga, & Menard, 1999; see Salzinger et al., 2002 for review).

Even family structure – specifically, single parenthood – is related to high levels of violence exposure among children and adolescents according to some studies (Lynch & Cicchetti, 1998; see Salzinger et al., 2002 for review), but not others (e.g., Malik, Sorenson, & Aneshensel). Overall, the family seems to be a particularly important component in children's

and adolescents' exposure to community violence, with the potential to either protect from exposure to the violence occurring in one's neighborhood or place children at greater risk to become witnesses and victims. However, research on the risk and protective effect of various family factors on child and adolescent violence exposure is more divergent than other domains, highlighting the potential weakness of positive results and the need to replicate studies involving familial predictors.

Individual behavioral, psychological, and social variables may also partially account for individual differences in community violence exposure, and may hold even greater promise for intervention than the aforementioned family factors, which may be more entrenched and more difficult to change. Among children and adolescents living in poor, urban neighborhoods, some are exposed to more violence then others. If researchers can determine which factors protect some inner-city youth from violence exposure and which factors place them at greater risk, these factors can be specifically targeted for violence exposure intervention programs in communities. Not surprisingly, individuals who are members of a gang or who are perpetrators of community violence are much more likely to witness and be victimized by community violence (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Esbensen & Huizinga, 1991; Flannery, Singer, & Wester, 2001; Li et al., 2002; Malik, Sorenson, & Aneshensel, 1997), especially if they frequently carry a weapon (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Martin, Gordon, & Kupersmidt, 1995; Shahinfar, Fox, & Leavitt, 2000; Sheley, McGee, & Wright, 1992). Even associating with deviant peers increases youths' risk for victimization by and witnessing community violence (Richards et al., 2004; Whitbeck & Simons, 1990), likely because of the correlation between perpetrating and experiencing violent acts. Engaging in non-aggressive delinquent activities, such as substance use and other externalizing behaviors, is correlated with adolescent community violence exposure (Hurt et al., 2001; see

Salzinger et al., 2002, for review; Sheley, McGee, & Write, 1992; Stein et al., 2003; Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001). Externalizing behaviors have even been found to longitudinally predict both victimization and witnessing among children and young adolescents one year later (Lynch & Cicchetti, 1998). Researchers have found that some individual factors may protect adolescents from joining gangs and in turn reduce their risk of violence exposure, such as a strong commitment to positive peers, attitudes that are not accepting of delinquency and drug use, and adherence to strong social norms within one's family, peer group, and school (Esbensen, Huizinga, & Weiher, 1993). Higher self-esteem was not related to avoidance of gangs, perhaps because gang members enjoy an inflated sense of self-worth and powerfulness related to their criminal accomplishments within the gang.

Various other individual factors may be associated with children's and adolescent's levels of violence exposure. For example, school achievement and competency is inversely related to adolescent community violence exposure (Hurt et al., 2001), especially for girls (Reese et al., 2001). Similarly, repeating a grade in high school significantly predicted violence exposure among males, but not females (Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001). Other predictors are more psychological in nature. In Reese and colleague's qualitative study (2001), boys indicated that increased coping skills and more effective communication with peers and families may reduce their risk of community violence exposure in general. Additionally, greater life stress appears to be associated with higher levels of community violence exposure, (Overstreet & Braun, 2000; Overstreet et al., 1999; Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001), perhaps indicating an overall difficult life situation characterized by poverty, life stress, community violence, and other problems. Indeed, Gorman-Smith & Tolan (1998) observe that "one important question is whether violence is just one part of an additive model in which outcome is related to the

experience of multiple stressors, violence exposure being one, or if there is a distinct effect of exposure to community violence" (p. 103).

Other protective factors are social in nature, such as participation in structured extracurricular activities. Given the widely accepted finding that the after-school hours are the most dangerous for youth in terms of community violence exposure, it is likely that participation in structured and monitored after-school clubs, sports, and other activities may reduce students' time spent wandering in their neighborhoods and thus decrease the likelihood of witnessing or being victimized by community violence. Indeed, researchers who have begun to investigate extracurricular activities have found that they do protect adolescents from violence exposure in their communities (Larner, Zippiroli, & Behrman, 1999; Linville & Huebner, 2004; Reese et al., 2001; Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom). Further examination of how specific activities may protect children and adolescents more or less, and how they may differentially impact boys and girls.

In reviewing this body of research on risk and protective factors for child and adolescent exposure to community violence, several major themes emerge. For example, in American society, sociodemographic characteristics, such as ethnicity, SES, and gender, are often tied to living in high-crime, inner-city neighborhoods and being exposed to unacceptably high levels of community violence. Relations between other factors and violence exposure are somewhat weaker and more divergent, on the whole, but have nonetheless emerged as important predictors of community violence exposure, such as family characteristics, youth's externalizing behaviors, and involvement in extracurricular activities.

Despite the significant recent gains that have been made in identifying predictors of community violence exposure among youth, some important gaps still remain in the literature that must be addressed in future investigations. For example, many studies have focused

specifically on inner-city African American children and adolescents (e.g., Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Jenkins & Bell, 1994; Dempsey, Overstreet, & Moely, 2000; Farrell & Bruce, 1997; Fitzpatrick, 1993; Fitzpatrick & Boldizar, 1997; Overstreet & Braun, 2000; Overstreet et al., 1999; Reese et al., 2001; Richards et al., 2004; Schubiner, Scott, & Tzelepis, 1993; Shahinfar, Fox, & Leavitt, 2000; Shakoor & Chalmers, 2001), neglecting Latino adolescents who are also more likely than their Caucasian counterparts to live in conditions of poverty and therefore to suffer the damaging effects of community violence exposure (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2007). Additionally, some researchers investigate community violence exposure only among males (Gorman-Smith, Henry, & Tolan, 2004; Shahinfar, Kupersmidt, & Matza, 2001; Stoolmiller, 1994; however, the field will likely benefit from the inclusion of females, especially if types of violence exposure more often found among girls, such as rape and verbal aggression, are more often taken into account in measures of community violence exposure.

In designing future experiments investigating risk and protective factors for community violence exposure, researchers should make a more concerted effort to include very comprehensive measures of violence exposure, and to use consistent measures across experimenters and across researchers (Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom). For example, very few reported measures include sexual-related violence, which may at least partially explain the oft-cited finding that boys are more exposed to community violence than girls. Additionally, measures of verbal threats and aggression may need to be included if children and adolescents view them as violence to which they are exposed. Instruments also must clearly distinguish among domestic, media, and community violence in order for results to be as valid as possible, since these various events may be confused in the minds of respondents, especially young children. More importantly, perhaps, is the need to organize measures of community violence

exposure according to violence type and severity. Researchers have already begun to take into account the differential experiences of victims and witnesses in their measures, which has enabled them to factor the potential effect of proximity into their analyses (e.g., Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Finkelhor & Dziuba-Leatherman, 1994; O'Donnell et al., 2002). However, almost all measure of violence exposure that exist in the literature are simply checklists of the frequency or lifetime prevalence of various violent incidents, which yield an overall violence exposure score. This method may not accurately capture the full picture of child and adolescent community violence exposure, because some types of violence are more severe than others, and therefore are likely to have different (or at least differing degrees of) risk and protective factors. For example, should witnessing an individual being robbed without a weapon be counted the same as witnessing a massive gang shoot-out involving many brutal, bloody deaths toward one's total violence exposure score? By creating some sort of weighting scheme in which more severe violence increases one's quantitative violence exposure more than less severe forms, researchers may obtain more complete answers to their questions regarding community violence exposure.

Importantly, researchers should aim to include multi-informant reports of community violence exposure rather than only self-report or only parent-report. Several studies have shown that parents tend to underestimate the amount of violence to which their children have been exposed (Ceballo, Dahl, & Aretakis, 2001; Kuo, Mohler, Raudenbush, & Earls, 2000; Shahinfar, Fox, & Leavitt, 2000). Additionally, associations of age, gender, and parent education with community violence exposure are stronger in self-reports than in parent reports; therefore, a multi-informant approach is highly recommended over single-informant methods (Kuo et al., 2000).

Another step researchers should consider taking in order to progress the field further is to identify mediating variables that may explain *why* the identified factors reduce or increase risk for community violence exposure among children and adolescents. On the whole, researchers have refrained from delving into isolating these explanatory variables, which would provide further information for intervention researchers looking for specific mechanisms on which to operate to reduce risk for exposure (Salzinger et al., 2002). Longitudinal studies may help identify causal linking mechanisms between predictor variables and violence exposure; for example, the finding that maltreatment at one point in time is significantly related to community violence exposure one year later helps researchers understand the direction of causality and provides a richer conceptualization of risk for exposure (Lynch & Cicchetti, 1998). Additionally, intervention studies will add to our understanding of exactly which factors affect children's and adolescents' community violence exposure, and how those factors may differ for different groups. Since no intervention studies aiming to reduce risk for violence exposure and isolate risk and protective factors have been reported to date, this is an extremely important direction for future research (Weist, Acosta, & Youngstrom, 2001). Finally, employing more qualitative methods in tandem with quantitative ones may provide researchers with a deeper understanding of exactly what raises levels of community violence exposure for some children and adolescents but not others. The qualitative study conducted by Reese and colleagues (2001) is a prime example of how information generated by children and adolescents themselves may add to the research literature, and also instigate quantitative research on newly discovered predictor variables, such as extracurricular activities.

Finally, in addition to identifying mediating variables, researchers should begin to make more progress toward modeling more complex and inter-connected patterns of violence exposure

(e.g., Sheidow et al., 2001). Researchers have begun to find that risk and protective factors may be more intricately associated with community violence exposure than a simple cause-and-effect relation. Therefore, instead of merely isolating variables that are associated with violence exposure, it may be more helpful to researchers to identify more interactive effects. Specifically, researchers should be aware of potential differential predictors for boys and girls (e.g., Reese et al., 2001) by looking for gender interactions in all analyses. Youth of different ethnicities, genders, and ages may experience violence exposure differently and thus may need different protective factors to reduce community violence exposure (Schwab-Stone et al., 1999), so identifying these interaction effects are of utmost importance.

Despite a gloomy backdrop of high prevalence rates of child and adolescent exposure to community violence and devastating effects of these experiences, including serious psychopathology, research on factors that may reduce exposure, and thus these negative outcomes, is promising. Many predictor variables have been identified, and specific linking mechanisms and interactive processes have begun to emerge that have helped explain the various relations. With this relatively strong and increasing knowledge base, researchers must now delve into more practical applications of these findings, employing intervention and prevention studies to examine how these risk and protective factors actually operate in children's and adolescents' daily lives. The literature speaks for itself: our nation's children are in need of our immediate help. Now that researchers have an understanding of how to begin to reduce their risk of community violence exposure, it is time to get out into the field and *implement* these ideas. The safety of our children depends on our action.

References

Agnew, R., & Petersen, D. M. (1989). Leisure and delinquency. *Social Problems, 36*, 332-350.

Aisenberg, E. (2001). The effects of exposure to community violence upon Latina mothers and preschool children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 23*, 378-398.

Bell, C. C., & Jenkins, E. J. (1993). Community violence and children on Chicago's Southside. *Psychiatry, 56,* 46-54.

Berman, S. L., Kurtines, W. M., Silverman, W. K., & Serafini, L. T. (1996). The impact of exposure to crime and violence on urban youth. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 66,* 329-336.

Buka, S. L., Stichick, T. L., Birdthistle, I., & Earls, F. J. (2001). Youth exposure to violence: Prevalence, risk, and consequences. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 71*, 298-310.

Campbell, C., & Schwartz, D. F. (1996). Prevalence and impact of exposure to interpersonal violence among suburban and urban middle school students. *Pediatrics, 98*, 396-402.

Cauce, A. M., Stewart, A., Rodriguez, M. D., Cochran, B., & Ginzler, J. (2003). Overcoming the odds? Adolescent development in the context of urban poverty. In S. S. Luther (Ed.), *Resilience and vulnerability: Adaptation in the context of childhood adversities* (pp. 343-363). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ceballo, R., Dahl, T. A., & Aretakis, M. T. (2001). Inner-city children's exposure to community violence: How much do parents know? *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 63*, 927-940.

Ceballo, R., Ramirez, C., Hearn, K. D., & Maltese, K. L. (2003). Community violence and children's psychological well-being: Does parental monitoring matter? *Journal of* Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 32, 586-592.

Cooley, M. R., Turner, S. M., & Beidel, D. C. (1995). Assessing community violence: The

children's report of exposure to violence. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 34*, 201-208.

Cooley-Quille, M., Boyd, R. C., Frantz, E., & Walsh, J. (2001). Emotional and behavioral impact of exposure to community violence in inner-city adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 30*, 199-206.

Crouch, J. L., Hanson, R. F., Saunders, B. E., Kilpatrick, D. G., & Resnick, H. S. (2000). Income, race/ethnicity, and exposure to violence in youth: results from the National Survey of Adolescents. *Journal of Community Psychology, 28*, 625-641.

Delaney-Black, V., Covington, C., Ondersma, S. J., Nordstrom-Klee, B., Templin, T., Ager, J., et al. (2002). Violence exposure, trauma, and IQ and/or reading deficits among urban children. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 156*, 280-285.

Dempsey, M. (2002). Negative coping as mediator in the relation between violence and outcomes: Inner-city African American youth. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 72,* 102-109.

Dempsey, M., Overstreet, S., & Moely, B. (2000). "Approach" and "Avoidance" coping and PTSD symptoms in inner-city youth. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, Social, 19*, 28-45.

DeNavas-Walt, C., Proctor, B. D., & Smith, J. (2007). *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2006* (U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-233). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Dubrow, N. F., & Garbarino, J. (1989). Living in the war zone: Mothers and young children in a public housing development. *Child Welfare, 38*, 3-20.

DuRant, R. H., Cadenhead, C., Pendergrast, R. A., Slavens, G., & Linder, C. W. (1994). Factors

associated with the use of violence among urban Black adolescents. *American Journal of Public Health, 84,* 612-617.

DuRant, R. H., Pendergrast, R. A., & Cadenhead, C. (1994). Exposure to violence and victimization and fighting behavior by urban Black adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 15,* 311-318.

Esbensen, F., & Huizinga, D. (1991). Juvenile victimization and delinquency. *Youth & Society, 23*, 202-228.

Esbensen, F., Huizinga, D., & Menard, S. (1999). Family context and criminal victimization in adolescence. *Youth & Society, 31*, 168-198.

Esbensen, F., Huizinga, D., & Weiher, A. W. (1993). Gang and non-gang youth: Differences in explanatory factors. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justic, 9*, 94-116.

Farrell, A. D., & Bruce, S. E. (1997). Impact of exposure to community violence on violent behavior and emotional distress among urban adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 26,* 2-14.

Farquhar, J. W. (1999). Primordial prevention: The path from Victoria to Catalonia. *Preventive Medicine, 29*, S3-S8.

Farver, J. A. M., Xu, Y., Eppe, S., Fernandez, A., & Schwartz, D. (2005). Community violence, family conflict, and preschoolers' socioemotional functioning. *Developmental Psychology, 41*, 160-170.

Finkelhor, D., & Dziuba-Leatherman, J. (1994). Children as victims of violence: A national survey. *Pediatrics, 94*, 413-420.

Fitzpatrick, K. M. (1997). Aggression and environmental risk among low-income African-

American youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 21*, 172-178.

Fitzpatrick, K. M., & Boldizar, J. P. (1993). The prevalence and consequences of exposure to violence among African-American youth. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 21*, 424-430.

Garbarino, J., Dubrow, N., Kostelny, K., & Pardo, C. (1992). *Children in danger: Coping with the consequences of community violence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Giaconia, R. M., Reinherz, H. Z., Silverman, A. B., Pakiz, B., Frost, A. K., & Cohen, E. (1995). Traumas and posttraumatic stress disorder in a community population of older adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 34,* 1369-1380.

Gladstein, J., Rusonis, E. J. S., & Heald, F. P. (1992). A comparison of inner-city and upper-middle class youths' exposure to violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 13,* 275-280.

Gorman-Smith, D., Henry, D. B., & Tolan, P. H. (2004). Exposure to community violence and violence perpetration: The protective effects of family functioning. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 33*, 439-449.

Gorman-Smith, D., & Tolan, P. (1998). The role of exposure to community violence and developmental problems among inner-city youth. *Development and Psychopathology, 10*, 101-116.

Grogger, J. (1997). Local violence and educational attainment. *Journal of Human Resources, 32*, 659-682.

Hammack, P. L., Richards, M. H., Luo, Z., Edlynn, E. S., & Roy, K. (2004). Social support factors as moderators of community violence exposure among inner-city African American young adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 33*,

450-462.

Hill, H. M., & Madhere, S. (1996). Exposure to community violence and African American children: A multidimensional model of risks and resources. *Journal of Community Psychology, 24*, 26-43.

Horn, J. L., & Trickett, P. K. (1998). Community violence and child development: A review of research. In P. K. Trickett & C. J. Schellenbach (Eds.), *Violence against children in the family and the community* (pp. 103-138). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Horowitz, K., Weine, S., & Jekel, J. (1995). PTSD symptoms in urban adolescent girls: Compounded community trauma. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 34*, 1353-1361.

Hurt, H., Malmud, E., Brodsky, N. L., & Giannetta, J. (2001). Exposure to violence: Psychological and academic correlates in child witnesses. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 155*, 1351-1356.

Jaycox, L. H., Stein, B. D., Kataoka, S. H., Wong, M., Fink, A., Escudero, P., et al. (2002). Violence exposure, posttraumatic stress disorder, and depressive symptoms among recent immigrant schoolchildren. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 41*, 1104-1110.

Jenkins, E. J., & Bell, C. C. (1994). Violence exposure, psychological distress, and high risk behaviors among inner-city high school students. In S. Friedman (Ed.), *Anxiety disorders in African-Americans* (pp. 76-88). New York: Springer.

Jones, L., Newman, L., & Isay, D. (1997). *Our America: Life and Death on the South Side of Chicago.* New York: Pocket Books.

Kazdin, A. E. (1995). *Conduct disorders in childhood and adolescence* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kliewer, W., Cunningham, J. N., Diehl, R., Parrish, K. A., Walker, J. M., Atiyeh, C., et al. (2004). Violence exposure and adjustment in inner-city youth: Child and caregiver emotion regulation skill, caregiver-child relationship quality, and neighborhood cohesion as protective factors. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 33*, 477-487.

Kliewer, W., Lepore, S. J., Oskin, D., & Johnson, P. D. (1998). The role of social and cognitive processes in children's adjustment to community violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66*, 199-209.

Koop, C. E., & Lundberg, G. D. (1992). Violence in America: A public health emergency. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 267,* 3075-3076.

Kuo, M., Mohler, B., Raudenbush, S. S., & Earls, F. J. (2000). Assessing exposure to violence using multiple informants: Application of hierarchical linear model. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 41*, 1049-1056.

Kupersmidt, J. B., Shahinfar, A., & Voegler-Lee, M. (2002). Children's exposure to community violence. In A. M. LaGreca, W. K. Silverman, E. M. Vernberg, & M. C. Roberts (Eds.), *Helping children cope with disasters and terrorism (pp. 381-401).* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kuther, T. L., & Fisher, C. B. (1998). Victimization by community violence in young adolescents from a suburban city. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 18*, 53-76.

Larner, M. B., Zippiroli, L., & Behrman, R. E. (1999). When school is out: Analysis and recommendations. *The Future of Children, 9*, 4-20.

Larson, R., & Richards, M. H. (1991). Daily companionship in late childhood and early

adolescence: Changing developmental contexts. *Child Development, 62*, 284-300.

Li, X., Stanton, B., Pack, R., Harris, C., Cottrell, L., & Burns, J. (2002). Risk and protective factors associated with gang involvement among urban African American Adolescents. *Youth & Society, 34*, 172-194.

Linares, L. O., Heeren, T., Bronfman, E., Zuckerman, B., Augustyn, M., & Tronick, E. (2001). A mediational model for the impact of exposure to community violence on early child behavior problems. *Child Development, 72*, 639-652.

Linville, D. C., & Huebner, A. J. (2004). The analysis of extracurricular activities and their relationship to youth violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 34*, 483-492.

Lorion, R. P., & Saltzman, W. (1993). Children's exposure to community violence: Following a path from concern to research to action. *Psychiatry, 56*, 55-65.

Lynch, M., & Cicchetti, D. (1998). An ecological-transactional analysis of children and contexts: The longitudinal interplay among child maltreatment, community violence, and children's symptomatology. *Development and Psychopathology, 10*, 235-257.

Lynch, M., & Cicchetti, D. (1998). An ecological-transactional analysis of children and contexts: The longitudinal interplay among child maltreatment, community violence, and children's symptomatology. *Development and Psychopathology, 10*, 235-257.

Lynch, M., & Cicchetti, D. (2002). Links between community violence and the family system: Evidence from children's feelings of relatedness and perceptions of parent behavior. *Family Process, 41*, 519-532.

Mazefsky, C. A., & Farrell, A. D. (2005). The role of witnessing violence, peer provocation, family support, and parenting practices in the aggressive behavior of rural adolescents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 14*, 71-85.

Malik, S., Sorenson, S. B., & Aneshensel, C. S. (1997). Community and dating violence among adolescents: perpetration and victimization. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 21*, 291-302.

Martin, S. L., Gordon, T. E., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (1995). Survey of exposure to violence among the children of migrant and seasonal farm workers. *Public Health Reports, 110*, 268-276.

Miller, L. S., Wasserman, G. A., Neugebauer, R., Gorman-Smith, D., & Kamboukos, D. (1999). Witnessed community v iolence and antisocial behavior in high-risk, urban boys. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 27*, 203-213.

Muller, R. T., Goebel-Fabbri, A. E., Diamond, T., & Dinklage, D. (2000). Social support and the relationship between family and community violence exposure and psychopathology among high risk adolescents. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 24*, 449-464.

Nofziger, S., & Kurtz, D. (2005). Violent lives: A lifestyle model linking exposure to violence to juvenile violent offending. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 42,* 3-26.

O'Donnell, D. A., Schwab-Stone, M. E., & Muyeed, A. Z. (2002). Multidimensional resilience in urban children exposed to community violence. *Child Development, 73*, 1265-1282.

Osofsky, J. D., Wewers, S., Hann, D. M., & Fick, A. C. (1993). Chronic community violence: What is happening to our children? *Psychiatry, 56*, 36-45.

Overstreet, S., & Braun, S. (2000). Exposure to community violence and post-traumatic stress symptoms: Mediating factors. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 70*, 263-271.

Overstreet, S., & Braun, S. (1999). A preliminary examination of the relationship between exposure to community violence and academic functioning. *School Psychology Quarterly, 14*, 380-396.

Overstreet, S., Dempsey, M., Graham, D., & Moely, B. (1999). The impact of after-school peer contact on early adolescent externalizing problems is moderated by parental monitoring,

perceived neighborhood safety, and prior adjustment. *Child Development, 70*, 768-778.

Perez-Smith, A. M., Albus, K. E., & Weist, M. D. (2001). Exposure to violence and neighborhood affiliation among inner-city youth. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 30*, 464-472.

Ratner, H. H., Chiodo, L., Covington, C., Sokol, R. J., Ager, J., & Delaney-Black, V. (2006). Violence exposure, IQ, academic performance, and children's perception of safety: Evidence of protective effects. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 52*, 264-287.

Reese, L. E., Vera, E. M., Thompson, K., & Reyes, R. (2001). A qualitative investigation of perceptions of violence risk factors in low-income African American children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 30*, 161-171.

Richards, M. H., Crowe, P. A., Larson, R., & Swarr, A. (1998). Developmental patterns and gender differences in the experience of peer companionship during adolescence. *Child Development, 69*, 154-163.

Richards, M. H., Larson, R., Miller, B. V., Luo, Z., Sims, B., Parrella, D. P., & McCauley, C. (2004). Risky and protective contexts and exposure to violence in urban African American young adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 33*, 138-148.

Richters, J. E., & Martinez, P. (1993). The NIMH community violence project: I. Children as victims of and witnesses to violence. *Psychiatry, 56,* 7-21.

Rutter, M., Tizard, J., & Whitmore, K. (Eds.). (1970). *Education, health and behavior*. London: Longmans.

Salzinger, S., Feldman, R. S., Stockhammer, T., & Hood, J. (2002). An ecological framework for understanding risk for exposure to community violence and the effects of exposure on

children and adolescents. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 7*, 423-451.

Schubiner, H., Scott, R., & Tzelepis, A. (1993). Exposure to violence among inner-city youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 14*, 214-219.

Schwab-Stone, M. E., Ayers, T. S., Kasprow, W., Voyce, C., Barone, C., Shriver, T., et al. (1995). No Safe Haven: A study of violence exposure in an urban community. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 34*, 1343-1352.

Schwab-Stone, M., Chen, C., Greenberger, E., Silver, D., Lichtman, J., & Voyce, C. (1999). No safe haven II: The effects of violence exposure on urban youth. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 38*, 359-367.

Selner-O'Hagan, M. B., Kindlon, D. J., Buka, S. L., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. J. (1998). Assessing exposure to violence in urban youth. *Journal of child Psychology and Psychiatry, 39*, 215-224.

Shahinfar, A., Fox, N. A., & Leavitt, L. A. (2000). Preschool children's exposure to violence: Relation of behavior problems to parent and child reports. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 70*, 115-125.

Shahinfar, A., Kupersmidt, J. B., & Matza, L. S. (2001). The relation between exposure to violence and social information processing among incarcerated adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 110*, 136-141.

Shakoor, B. H., & Chalmers, D. (1991). Co-victimization of African-American children who witness violence: Effects on cognitive, emotional, and behavioral development. *Journal of the National Medical Association, 83*, 233-238.

Sheidow, A. J., Gorman-Smith, D., Tolan, P. H., & Henry, D. B. (2001). Family and community characteristics: risk factors for violence exposure in inner-city youth. *Journal of*

Community Psychology, 29, 345-360.

Sheley, J. F., McGee, Z. T., & Wright, J. D. (1992). Gun-related violence in and around inner-city schools. *American Journal of Diseases of Children, 146*, 677-682.

Singer, M. I., Anglin, T. M., Song, L., & Lunghofer, L. (1995). Adolescents' exposure to violence and associated symptoms of psychological trauma. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 273*, 477-482.

Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (1999). Violence after school. *Juvenile justice bulletin* (NCJ 178992). Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Stein, B. D., Jaycox, L. H., Kataoka, S., Rhodes, H. J., & Vestal, K. D. (2003). Prevalence of child and adolescent exposure to community violence. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 6*, 247-264.

Stein, B. D., Zima, B. T., Elliott, M. N., Burnam, M. A., Shahinfar, A., Fox, N. A., et al. (2001). Violence exposure among school-age children in foster care: Relationship to distress symptoms. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adoelscent Psychiatry, 40*, 588-594.

Stiffman, A. R., Dore, P., & Cunningham, R. M. (1996). Violent behavior in adolescents and young adults: A person and envrionment model. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 5*, 487-501.

Stoolmiller, M. (1994). Antisocial behavior, delinquent peer association, and unsupervised wandering for boys: Growth and change from childhood to early adolescence. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 29*, 263-288.

Sullivan, T. N., Kung, E. M., & Farrell, A. D. (2004). Relation between witnessing violence and

drug use initiation among rural adolescents: Parental monitoring and family support as protective factors. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 33*, 488-498.

Taylor, L., Zuckerman, B., Harik, V., & Groves, B. M. (1994). Witnessing violence by young children and their mothers. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 15*, 120-123.

Weist, M. D., Acosta, O. M., & Youngstrom, E. A. (2001). Predictors of violence exposure among inner-city youth. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 30*, 187-198.

Whitbeck, L. B., & Simons, R. L. (1990). Life on the streets: The victimization of runaway and homeless adolescents. *Youth & Society, 22*, 108-125.

White, K. S., Bruce, S. E., Farrell, A. D., & Kliewer, W. (1998). Impact of exposure to community violence on anxiety: A longitudinal study of family social support as a protective factor for urban children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 7,* 187-203.