

Violence Prevention Focused on Children and Youth: Youth Transfer to Adult Criminal Courts

Summary Evidence Table

Studies measuring general deterrence effects of juvenile transfer policies

Author (year) Design suitability: design Limitations of execution (#) Specific limitations Analytic methods		Location Study period Unit of analysis Sample size (N) Sample demographics	Intervention group Comparison group	Reported effect measure Comparison period	Reported effect	Value used in review ^a
Barnoski (2003) Greatest: before-and-after population-based study Good (1) • No control for confounding Graphical comparison of Washington State and national violent crime arrest rate trends	Washington State expanded automatic transfer provisions in 1994 & 1997 16 and 17 yr olds with specified criminal offenses and histories were automatically transferred	Washington state Late 1980s to late 1990s Juveniles 10 – 17 yrs of age Population-based (not sampled) Demographics NA	Juveniles (10–17) in Washington state in yrs following law changes Graphically compared with: Juveniles (10–17) in Washington state in yrs preceding law changes. Juveniles (10–17) in U.S. in yrs preceding and following Washington law changes	Violent arrest rates among juveniles (10–17 yrs) per 1000 juveniles Comparison period: late 1980s–late 1990s	“Thus, we cannot attribute the decrease in juvenile arrests for violent crimes in the state solely to the change in WA’s jurisdiction statute.”	No effect Quantitative effect cannot be computed from the graphical analysis

Author (year) Design suitability: design Limitations of execution (#) Specific limitations Analytic methods		Location Study period Unit of analysis Sample size (N) Sample demographics	Intervention group Comparison group	Reported effect measure Comparison period	Results Reported effect	Value used in review ^a
<p>Jensen, Metsger (1994) Greatest: before-and-after intervention with concurrent comparison (Additional analysis—before-and-after design without concurrent comparison—not considered in this review.) Fair (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection of comparison populations not well justified • No control of confounding <p>Comparison of changes in rates of violent crime before and after law in intervention and comparison states</p>		<p>1981 Idaho law transferred more juveniles to adult court. There were no comparable changes in comparison states, Wyoming and Montana.</p>	<p>Idaho 1976 – 1986 States (Idaho, compared with Wyoming and Montana) Population-based (not sampled) Demographics NA</p>	<p>Juveniles <18 yrs of age in Idaho in yrs following law changes, 1982–86 Compared with: Juveniles <18 yrs of age in Idaho in yrs preceding law changes, 1976–80 Juveniles <18 yrs of age in Wyoming and Montana in yrs preceding and following law changes in Idaho</p>	<p>Changes in mean juvenile arrest rates, 1982–86 compared with 1976–80</p> <p>Before-and-after differences of means juvenile violent crime arrest rates</p> <p><u>ID</u> 12.8 p<0.005</p> <p><u>WY</u> -4.2 p<0.025</p> <p><u>MT</u> -14.1 p<0.005</p>	<p>Increase in violent crime arrest rates in state with strengthened transfer law, in comparison with neighboring states without this law Effect size not computed because population data not provided</p>

Author (year) Design suitability: design Limitations of execution (#) Specific limitations Analytic methods	Location Study period Unit of analysis Sample size (N) Sample demographics	Intervention group Comparison group	Results					
			Reported effect measure Comparison period	Reported effect		Value used in review ^a		
				Ω	t			
Singer & McDowell (1988) Singer (1996) Greatest: prospective cohort study Good (0) • No limitations Interrupted time series analysis and rate comparisons	New York Juvenile Offender Law of 1978 legislatively excludes from juvenile processing 14–15 yr olds on 15 charges, and 13 yr olds on non-capital murder	New York City and Upper New York State Jan. 1974 – Dec. 1984 Regions/cities NYC and NYS are compared. Philadelphia is used as an additional comparison for NYC Population-based (not sampled) Demographics NA	Two different sets of intervention and comparison groups: A. Juveniles in New York City ages 13–15 yrs Compared with: Juveniles in New York City ages 16–19 yrs Juveniles in Philadelphia, ages 13–15 yrs B. Juveniles in upper New York State, ages 13–15 yrs compared with: Juveniles in upper New York State, ages 16–19 yrs	Time series of monthly arrests for homicides, assaults, robberies, and rapes, with 1978 date of New York law as intervention point. Comparison period: January 1974 – December 1984	Shift in level of crime following introduction of law in 1978 <u>Homicides</u> NYC 13–15 NYC 16–19 Phil 13–15 <u>Assaults</u> NYC 13–15 NYC 16–19 Phil 13–15 <u>Robberies</u> NYC 13–15 NYC 16–19 Phil 13–15 <u>Rapes</u> NYC 13–15 NYC 16–19 Phil 13–15 <u>Homicides</u> NYS 13–15 NYS 16–19 <u>Assaults</u> NYS 13–15 NYS 16–19 <u>Robberies</u> NYS 13–15 NYS 16–19 <u>Rapes</u> NYS 13–15 NYS 16–19	–0.9633 2.0370 –0.6586 0.0230 –21.3500 –4.7540 16.0100 17.3400 7.4100 –4.1570 –6.4120 –.5748 –0.0104 0.0012 4.4320 2.2520 2.6180 9.9870 0.4211 0.8510	–1.62 1.55 –2.71 0.81 –1.49 –3.32 ^b 0.63 0.35 1.95 –3.12 ^b –3.14 ^b –0.92 –0.37 0.00 4.42 1.48 3.08 1.34 1.39	Effect size not computed because heterogeneous results within the study

Key: aggr aggravated; N sample size; NA not available; NS not significant; NYC New York City; NYS Upper New York State; Phil Philadelphia; t t-test; vs versus; yr year; Ω time series estimate of shift in the level of crime associated with introduction of the law

^a Because of heterogeneous methodologies and the absence of requisite and commensurate data among studies, we did not calculate an overall effect size for this body of evidence.

^b $p < 0.05$

References

- ¹ Barnoski R. Changes in Washington State's jurisdiction of juvenile offenders: examining the impact. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy, 2003, 03-01-1203.
- ² Jensen EL, Metsger LK. A test of the deterrent effect of legislative waiver on violent juvenile crime. *Crime Delinq* 1994;40:96-104
- ³ Singer SI, McDowall D. Criminalizing delinquency: the deterrent effects of the New York Juvenile Offender Law. *Law Soc Rev* 1988;22:521-35.
- ⁴ Singer SI. *Recriminalizing delinquency: violent juvenile crime and juvenile justice reform*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1996.