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Key Questions on Advocacy in your Community
YOUTH VIOLENCE AND DELINQUENCY
KEY QUESTIONS

- What comes to mind when you think about “youth violence”?

- How does youth violence take shape in your community?

- Who are the major stakeholders?

- What are your communities strengths? What are your communities challenges?
YOUTH VIOLENCE

- Hyperactivity
- Tantrums
- Aggression
- Oppositional Disruptive Disorder
- Conduct Disorder
- Delinquency

- Physical Violence
- Teen Dating Violence
- Assault
- Aggravated Assault

Shaw et al. 1996
Mental Health Burden
- 2 out of 3 juvenile justice involved youth
- *Compared with 10% of youth in general population*

- Substance Use Disorders - 50%
- Anxiety Disorders - 25%
- Mood Disorders - 25%
- Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorders – 15%

Teplin et al. (2002)
Economic and Social Burden

National cost per year ~ $88,000 per year
- 12 times more than community based alternatives

In New York City, ~$70 per day per youth
GIRLS’ VIOLENCE
RISE IN GIRLS’ ARRESTS

Office of Juvenile justice and Delinquency Prevention, Juvenile Court Statistics
RISE IN GIRLS’ ARRESTS

Simple Assaults: 24% increase

Office of Juvenile justice and Delinquency Prevention, Juvenile Court Statistics
Distinct pathways to juvenile justice involvement
- Different needs
- Different outcomes

Need for Gender-responsive programming
- Girls comprise 1/3 of system-involved youth
- Girls programming comprises 1/20 of current models*

*OJJDP, 2010; Cauffman, 2008; Pajer, 1998
NEED FOR INTERVENTION

- Growing Interest

  - Sherman & Balck

- Girls Study Group (2010)
  - 26 total Interventions for Girls
  - None of them qualified as “effective”
NEED FOR INTERVENTION

- Youth who commit violent offenses are more than 3x more likely to end up in the criminal justice system as adults.

- Girls who commit acts of violence are even more likely to enter the criminal justice system as adults.
What does the response to youth violence typically look like in your community?

What have you noticed about girls’ violence?

What is missing in your communities response to violence? To girls’ violence?
WHAT IS ADVOCACY?
DEVELOPMENT OF ADVOCACY

- History in the field of Community Psychology
- Youth Diversion (Davidson & Rapp, 1976)
- Survivors of Domestic Violence (Sullivan & Bybee, 1999)
Change the *context* not the individual

- What does this mean...
- Increasing access to resources
- Educating about RIGHTS to community resources
changing person’s environment

connecting to resources.

focus on helping youth succeed at the goals they create.

finding the strengths and positive qualities of youth.
WHAT ADVOCACY IS NOT

- Changing the person
- Therapy or Counseling
- Making goals *for* youth that they might not agree with
- Focusing on weaknesses or what youth do wrong
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GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF ADVOCACY

- Strengths Based
- Youth Driven
- Community Centered
STRENGTHS-BASED

- Focus on seeing, pointing out, and building strengths
- Create opportunities to BUILD on these strengths
- Create opportunities to CREATE new strengths.
The goals are made by youth.
The timing is based on youth.
The whole process is shaped by youth.
All of advocacy takes place in youth’s natural communities

**Community**: Natural environment, including the people and places around you.

**Resources**: something in your community that may help you, offer you something you need.
ADVOCACY: STRUCTURE

- 10 – 15 week intervention
- Individualized
  - Paraprofessional, one-on-one model
- Fully community-based
- Focuses on access to resources
- Comprehensive
  - 6-8 hours per week on each client
- Free
Importance of partnerships

Example: University community partnerships: leveraging strengths of educational institutions
KEY QUESTIONS

- Where would paraprofessionals in your community come from?

- What institutions would make for good partners to implement advocacy?

- What are your hesitations?
FOUR PHASE MODEL OF ADVOCACY
FOUR PHASES OF ADVOCACY

- Strengths Based
- Youth Driven
- Community Centered

Assessment of needs and rights
Mobilization of resources
Monitoring
Self Advocacy
# Advocacy Materials

- Weekly progress report
- Weekly detailed log book
- Weekly in person supervision
- Weekly written supervision feedback
WHAT DO ADVOCATES DO?
Informal
- Getting to know your client

Formal
- Identify areas of unmet need
- Collectively, decide what resources are needed
- Generate as many alternatives as possible
  - Your client is in charge
MOBILIZING COMMUNITY RESOURCES

- Identify area of unmet need
- Brainstorm all possible alternatives
- Prioritize alternatives and choose one
- Identify critical individual in control of resource
- Prepare client for advocacy process
- Implement one of nine advocacy approaches
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Advocacy</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MONITORING

- Takes place throughout whole intervention
- Ask specific, educated questions of all involved
- Directly assess clients satisfaction with efforts
- Employ skeptical patience
- Decide with client and supervisory group
TERMINATION

- Make intervention period clear from beginning
- During last 2-3 weeks of intervention, intensify methods to transfer advocacy skills
  - Modeling
  - Example and observation
  - Instruction
  - Emphasis on rights
Advocates Need
- In person training
- In person supervision
- Community resources “binder”
- Access to the community

Advocacy Requires
- Institutional partnerships
- Effective and persistent advocate-youth relationship
- Effective and persistent advocate-supervisor relationship
- Referrals from institutions that respond to youth violence
LESSONS LEARNED

- Advocates presence in court
- Advocates to meet youth in their communities
- Persistence of advocates
- Sustainability
- Intensive programming
- Crisis response
What would you need to engage in advocacy in your community?
- People?
- Places?
- Resources?
YOUTH ADVOCACY – THE CASE OF NYC ROSES
A NEW ADAPTATION: NYC ROSES

- Resilience
- Opportunity
- Safety
- Education
- Strength

Poem by Tupac
Design by Shokur Christie Kim
RISC Team
New York University
NYC ROSES
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- Based on empirically-supported models in the field of community psychology
  - Youth Advocacy (Davidson & Rapp; 1976)
  - Community advocacy with survivors of intimate partner violence (Sullivan & Bybee, 1999)

- Critical stage of girls’ development

  1) Gender\(^1\)
  2) Context\(^2\)

\(^1\)Zahn et al (2008); Girls Study Group, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
\(^2\)Miller (2008); Zahn et al (2010).
**GENDER AND CONTEXT**

- **Relationship-based**
  - Trained advocates
  - Warmth, empathy, unconditional positive regard
- **Targets context**
- **Individualized**
- **Comprehensive**
- **Female-specific needs and risk**
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GENDER AND CONTEXT

- Relationship-based
- Targets context
- Individualized
- Comprehensive

- Female-specific needs and risk
  - Crucial Contexts
    - Victimization
    - Violent relationships
    - Girls’ Motivations (e.g., status offenses)

Javdani & Allen (2014)
IS ADVOCACY EFFECTIVE?
THE PUNCH LINE: ADVOCACY IS EFFECTIVE

- Adolescent diversion
- States of IL and MI
- Youth-centered
- Strengths-based
- 20+ Years of evidence
  - Interview
  - Adopted by local systems
- Advocacy for survivors of intimate partner violence
- Central goal: increasing safety
- Randomized control trial design, 278 women
  - Were safer
  - Reported higher quality of life and social support
- 2 years later!

(Davidson & Rapp, 1976) (Sullivan & Bybee, 1999)
ADVOCACY IS A MODEL PROGRAM


- For adult women who have survived domestic violence
PARTICIPANTS
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PARTICIPANTS

- 52 adolescent girls from 3 cohorts
- Referred by
  - Juvenile Court (53%)
  - Mental Health/Child Welfare (25%)
  - Schools (22%)
- Mean age = 15 years (SD = 1.5, Range = 12-18)
- Race/Ethnicity
  - 73% African American
  - 21% White/Caucasian
  - 6% Multi-racial
PARTICIPANTS

- Legal and Risk Profile
  - 98% Had at least 1 police contact
  - Mean Arrests = 2.7 (SD = 2.0, Range 1-9)
  - 48% on Probation
  - 85% Incarcerated at least 1 time
  - Girls represented highest levels of risk (YRBS, 2010)
    - Health and mental health risk
    - Victimization experiences

Javdani & Allen (2015)
Design

- Prospective: 3 time points (pre, mid, post intervention)
- 97% retention rate
- 90% of youth completed evaluation

Javdani & Allen (2014)
RESEARCH DESIGN

- **Design**
  - Prospective: 3 time points (pre, mid, post intervention)
  - 97% retention rate
  - 90% of youth completed evaluation

- **High Fidelity Implementation**
  - Youth-driven
  - Strengths-based
  - Community-based
  - Average of 8 hours of intervention per week
  - Average of 1.5 meetings per week

Javdani & Allen (2014)
## Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Violence</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Risk Taking</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Efficacy</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing symptoms</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Trait Anger &amp; subscales</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interviews with youth after intervention**
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<table>
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<tr>
<th></th>
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<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Internalizing symptoms</td>
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<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
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<td>✓</td>
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<td>✓</td>
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<td>✓</td>
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OUTCOMES

Repeated Measures Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVAS)
OUTCOMES

Repeated Measures Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVAS)

- 2 Time Points
- 3 Time Points
OUTCOMES

Repeated Measures Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVAs)

- 2 Time Points
  \[ F(4, 48) = 16.01, \ p = .00 \]

- 3 Time Points
  \[ F(7, 45) = 6.31, \ p = .00 \]
Repeated Measures Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVAS)

- **2 Time Points**
  - $F(4, 48) = 16.01, \ p = .00$
  - Power = .7 to .9; $\eta^2_p = .3$

- **3 Time Points**
  - $F(7, 45) = 6.31, \ p = .00$
  - Power = .5 to .9; $\eta^2_p = .8$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>$t (1, 42) = -2.05, p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>$t (1, 45) = 2.07, p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Violence</td>
<td>$t (1, 45) = 6.42, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Risk Taking</td>
<td>$t (1, 27) = .85, p = .40$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Efficacy</td>
<td>$F (2, 36) = 4.40, p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalizing symptoms</td>
<td>$F (2, 34) = 7.45, p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Trait Anger</td>
<td>$Fs (2, 38) = 5$ to 7, p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use</td>
<td>$F (2, 39) = 3.64, p &lt; .01$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach’s alphas > .70
RESILIENCE

Error bars represent 95% Confidence Intervals
“Before...I really didn’t care about nothing, but now I care. I see I could do a lot more...[and] that I’m smart enough to reach my goals...[I] don’t pay attention to the...past, ...I just look forward to the future.”
DELINQUENCY

Error bars represent 95% Confidence Intervals
I ran away....I got caught stealing ....[M]y mom would always call the cops on me....I just wanted to be out of that situation. I guess and I am now, that’s why I think my life’s startin’ to come together... I do what I’m supposed to do and I have a job... And I come home at curfew
PHYSICAL VIOLENCE

Error bars represent 95% Confidence Intervals
"All I’ve been doin’ is try to stay out of trouble...It’s hard [because] wherever...I go thre’s ... a fight... so I’ve been walking away from it, cause I don’t want to go back [to the detention center]."
SELF EFFICACY

Error bars represent 95% Confidence Intervals.
“[In the past], if I had a problem at home, I ran away. [N]ow...I found out different ways to solve that problem, and figure out if the solution works or not, and if it doesn’t, cross it off and go to the next [solution].”
INTERNALIZING SYMPTOMS

Error bars represent 95% Confidence Intervals
“I use to [not be able] to even get dressed...., my hair was falling out, I was stressing out, I couldn’t eat, I couldn’t go to sleep...[but] the view I had of me then is totally different now...I’m feeling like I can do everything on my own”
Error bars represent 95% Confidence Intervals
“Now, every time I get upset, or [want to] do something negative or like put my hands on somebody...I always stop... and thought about, ‘if I hit [this girl], what is that going to solve?’ Nothing.”
SUBSTANCE USE

Error bars represent 95% Confidence Intervals
*Interviewer: “what’s different about your life now?”

“[In the past]...If I came home, I was normally ... high”
HOW MIGHT YOU IMPLEMENT ADVOCACY IN YOUR COMMUNITY?
What problems of youth violence/delinquency exist in your community?

For boys?

For girls?

What are the major settings that are affected by this?

What are the major settings that you would want to target?
What partners would need to be involved?
What contexts might you recruit from?
What materials might you need to develop?
Who might the advocates be?
What outcomes would you like to influence?
How would you evaluate the program?
THANK YOU!

Advocacy Resources

- **RISE Research Team**
  - [http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/faculty/Shabnam_Javdani](http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/faculty/Shabnam_Javdani)
  - [https://wp.nyu.edu/steinhardt-corelab/](https://wp.nyu.edu/steinhardt-corelab/)
  - @DrJavdani
  - Shabnam.javdani@nyu.edu

- **Community Advocacy**
  - [http://vaw.msu.edu/people/sullivan/](http://vaw.msu.edu/people/sullivan/)
  - [http://cap.vaw.msu.edu/](http://cap.vaw.msu.edu/)
  - [http://cap.vaw.msu.edu/author/sullcris/](http://cap.vaw.msu.edu/author/sullcris/)