Development and Psychopathology, **12** (2000), 763–793
Copyright © 2000 Cambridge University Press
Printed in the United States of America

Problem behavior: The double symptom of adolescence

ALEXANDER W. SIEGEL AND LORI C. SCOVILL
University of Houston

Abstract
In this article we address several issues regarding problem or antisocial behavior in adolescents. First, we discuss conceptualizations of adolescent problem behavior to answer the question "What do we think we know so far?" Then, we briefly characterize current interventions designed to reduce these behaviors, and their relative success in doing so. Next, we examine earlier attempts to prevent and ameliorate problem behavior (including juvenile delinquency), situating them in the historical context of America from the turn of the century to World War II. Here, we attempt to answer the questions "How did we get to where we are?" and "How can we learn from the past?" Following this, we try to answer the question "Where do we go from here?" and articulate some research and policy implications relevant to developmental psychopathology that arise from these considerations. We argue that problem behavior is viewed most productively in its double aspect, which John Hughlings Jackson called a "double symptom," with the positive aspect of the symptom reflecting adolescents' attempts to satisfy their developmental needs.

> Youth loves intense states of mind and is passionately fond of excitement. . . . It is a natural impulse to experience hot and perfervid psychic states, and is characterized by emotionalism. This desire to feel and to be very much alive, and the horror of inertness and apathy, is . . . one of the chief features which incline youth to intoxicants. . . . Hence comes the proclivity to superlativeness, to high, lurid color and fast life, because youth must have excitement, and if this be not at hand in the form of moral and intellectual enthusiasms, it is more prone . . . to be sought for in sex or in drink. Athletic enthusiasm, the disposition of high school and college youth to yell and paint the town, to laugh, become boisterous and convivial, are better than sensuality and reduce temptation to it. (Hall, 1904, Vol. II, p. 77)

> The symptomatology of nervous diseases is a double condition; there is a negative and there is a positive element in every case. . . . The most absurd mentation, and most extravagant actions in insane people are the survivals of their fittest states. (Jackson, 1884, p. 46)

Problem behavior has been defined as "behavior that departs from familial or social standards, that poses some risk to the individual or to society" (Maggs & Galambos, 1993, p. 79). Similarly, Jessor (1992) defined "risk behavior" as "any behavior that can compromise healthy psychosocial aspects of successful adolescent development" (p. 375). Jessor (1992, 1993) included in his list of common risk behaviors smoking, drinking, illicit drug use, precocious sexual behavior, drunk driving, truancy, school and family problems, and delinquency.

Clinical psychologists and psychiatrists have, for the most part, considered problem behaviors as manifestations of underlying mental disorders. Specifically, such labels as "conduct disorder" and "oppositional–defiant

We would like to thank Dr. Sheldon H. White, Harvard University, for his insightful comments, constructive criticism, and editorial suggestions on an earlier version of this manuscript.

Address correspondence and reprint requests to: Alexander W. Siegel, Department of Psychology, University of Houston, Houston, TX 77204-5341.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

disorder" have been used as nosological categories into which are dumped a broad spectrum of adolescent behaviors. Several arguments have been put forth as to the inappropriateness of pathologizing what may be normative adolescent behavior (e.g., Cicchetti, 1993; Richters & Cicchetti, 1993). Wakefield (1992) has argued forcefully that behaviors should not be characterized as mental disorders unless they meet criteria for "harmful dysfunction." Males (1996), writing in a more popular vein, has noted that we have been rather cavalier in our application of the language of mental disorder to adolescent problem behavior.

While developmental psychologists commonly refer to troublesome teen behaviors as "problem behaviors," professionals within the legal community label similar antisocial behaviors as "delinquent." More precisely, "delinquent behavior" typically refers to behaviors that are (a) engaged in by adolescents and (b) labeled "criminal" by society. That is, delinquency is a socially and legally defined problem behavior (Reckless & Dinitz, 1972).

In this paper we address several issues regarding problem or antisocial behavior. First, we discuss conceptualizations of adolescent problem behavior to answer the question "What do we think we know so far?" Then we briefly characterize current interventions designed to reduce these behaviors, and their relative success in doing so. Next, we examine earlier attempts to prevent and ameliorate problem behavior (including juvenile delinquency), situating them in the historical context of America from the turn of the century to World War II. Here, we attempt to answer the questions "How did we get to where we are?" and "How can we learn from the past?" Following this, we try to answer the question "Where do we go from here?" and articulate some research and policy implications relevant to developmental psychopathology that arise from these considerations. We will limit our discussion by focusing on "externalizing" behaviors, and will not consider such adolescent difficulties as depression, suicidal ideation, or eating disorders. Nor will we consider severely compromised adolescents (i.e., those whose chronic antisocial behavior patterns seem to be the result of long-term cumulative effects; Yoshikawa, 1994).

What Do We Know?

What's the problem? What are problem behaviors? Who's engaging in them?

Antisocial behaviors committed by teens continue to be an anxiety-provoking issue for most adults. According to the Annie E. Casey Foundation (1993), in 1991 over 130,000 teenagers ages 10–17 years were arrested for violent crimes including rape, robbery, homicide, and aggravated assault—a 48% increase since 1986. According to the *Monitoring the Future Survey* (Johnston, 1995; Johnston, O'Malley, & Bachman, 1995), in 1992 the use of marijuana by high school seniors increased more than 50%; marijuana use nearly doubled among 10th graders. Further, estimates suggest that over 1 million unwed 15- to 19-year-old girls become pregnant each year (Alan Guttmacher Institute, 1994).

These troubling statistics, and the public perception that teens in America are on a crime rampage, may not reflect an accurate description of the prevalence, incidence, or social costs of antisocial behavior committed by young people. Nor do the statistics bear out the myth that antisocial behavior is solely, or even largely, a problem of adolescence. "Crime statistics" are open to different interpretations (Males, 1996). For instance, while violent crime arrests did rise sharply from 1975 to 1995 among adolescents, during that same period violent crime arrests rose even more sharply among adults (i.e., up 89%). While 33% of high school seniors reported using marijuana once or more during the past year, Johnston et al.'s (1995) survey results can also be read to indicate that 66% of high school seniors, 75% of sophomores, and 87% of 8th graders had not used marijuana even once in the previous year; 51% of high school seniors, 57% of 10th graders, and 65% of 8th graders had "*never* used an illegal drug *even once* in their lives" (p. 165). While teenage pregnancy is a growing concern, Males (1996) points out that the majority of teen pregnancies are fathered by *adult* males (i.e.,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

over two thirds in most states where records are kept); that is, it's not kids having sex with kids, it's adults having sex with kids. In short, while adults might prefer to believe that the problem of antisocial behavior rests squarely on the shoulders of America's teenagers, Males argues that the nature of the offense is what makes antisocial behavior problematic—not the offender's age.

In the same vein, Rutter, Giller, and Hagell (1998) have pointed that "Crime is a moving target. Establishing definitions, overall levels, and historical trends all involve estimates rather than facts. Each source of information is subject to different biases and distortions. The vast majority of antisocial behaviors do not become official statistics" (p. 62). The fact is that we simply don't have reliable and valid numerical indices of the magnitude of the problem.

Age, gender, and delinquency

Official crime statistics suggest that adolescents are involved disproportionately in antisocial behavior. According to the 1995 Uniform Crime Report (FBI, 1995), juveniles accounted for about 19% of all arrests and for 33% of all serious crime arrests, even though teens make up only one eighth of the total population. These national data have typically indicated that young women account for a far smaller proportion of recorded offenses than do young men (Rutter et al., 1998). Several researchers explain this difference as being due to differing sociocultural expectations for males and females in the expression of "acting out," and to a concomitant lack of appropriate diagnostic criteria for female antisocial behavior (Zahn–Waxler, 1993; Zoccolillo, 1993). Recent evidence suggests that this gender gap is being narrowed (Henggeler, Schoenwald, Bourduin, Rowland, & Cunningham, 1998).

Researchers generally agree that age is related inversely to criminality (Farrington, 1986; Henggeler, 1989). Specifically, rates of crime tend to "peak sharply at about age 17 and drop precipitously in young adulthood" (Moffitt, 1993). Hirschi and Gottfredson (1983) have argued that regardless of social variables, people commit fewer crimes as they get older. According to data collected by the Institute for Social Research, involvement in assault, gang fighting, robbery, stealing, and trespass declines substantially between ages 17 and 23 years (O'Malley, Bachman, & Johnston, 1989). According to self-reports, adolescents commit fewer crimes as they mature (Siegel & Senna, 1997). Collectively these data indicate that antisocial behavior is particularly problematic during adolescence.

Who commits the crimes? Distinguishing between life-course-persistent (LCP) and adolescence-limited (AL) offenders

How many teenagers in America are involved in delinquent behavior? Self-report surveys indicate that 60–80% (depending on the survey sample) of teens report having been involved in delinquent behavior at one time or another (Bachman, Johnston, & O'Malley, 1996; Elliott, Ageton, Huizinga, Knowles, & Canter, 1983). While estimates vary, the bulk of research suggests that (a) adolescents account for about 30% of all the crimes committed in the United States; (b) the rate of crime committed by teens has increased significantly over the last 50 years throughout the Western world; and (c) violent crimes have also increased, especially in the United States (Rutter et al., 1998). Still, we do not know with any certainty just how many teens are involved in delinquent behavior.

Overwhelmingly, research has shown that a relatively small number (percentage) of teenagers account for the majority of the crimes. Teenagers whom Moffitt (1993) has characterized as "life-course-persistent" (LCP) offenders account for the vast majority of the crimes committed. Teenagers who engage in LCP delinquent behavior can be distinguished from "adolescence-limited" (AL) teenagers by early onset, and by the association between their antisocial behavior and hyperactivity (or attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder [ADHD]), academic failure, and aggressiveness or violence. For these LCP adolescents (5–7% of the teens getting into trouble), very early intervention for both the child and the child's family appears to be the only effective

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

strategy (Bartusch et al., 1997; Rutter et al., 1998; Yoshikawa, 1994). In contrast, for teens whose participation in antisocial behavior seems to be adolescence limited, strategies for intervention are far less clear.

Still, if the data suggesting that up to 80% of teens in America engage in delinquent behavior at some time in their lives reflect fact, then we need to face the troubling argument that engaging in delinquent behavior is normative for American youth. For antisocial behavior to be considered by society both a significant problem and developmentally normative is truly enigmatic. How do we explain, much less resolve, this dilemma?

Present explanations for the relationship between age and delinquency?

The etiology of LCP and AL antisocial behavior may be different or may be developed through different pathways (Loeber, 1996). As opposed to teens whose antisocial behavior has early onset and is associated with ADHD, academic failure, and aggression, Moffitt (1993) proposes that youth who begin engaging in antisocial behavior during adolescence do so because of pressures associated with the gap between their biological and social age. As adolescents go through the individuation process, their need to feel important and that they have essential contributions to make to their family, school, and society strengthens markedly. Moffitt hypothesizes that because society is and has been ambivalent about when teens become adults (i.e., there are no official rites of passage into adulthood except for being allowed to engage in tobacco and alcohol consumption and have sex), teenagers participate in prohibited adult behaviors to give themselves the feeling of being adult. Because chronic delinquents have been engaging in antisocial behavior for a long time, "normal" teenagers simply mimic the "braver, more experienced" antisocial teens in their pseudoadult behavior (Moffitt, 1993). In effect, Moffitt hypothesizes that finding successful passage into adulthood should be associated with lower rates of delinquent involvement.

In support of this, Rand (1987) found that changing lifestyles also appear to influence offending patterns. For example, delinquent youths who got married early, earned a high school diploma, and received vocational training through the armed services were the most likely to give up their criminal behavior (Rand, 1987). Rutter and his colleagues (1998) have hypothesized that the peak age for offending may be associated with changes in opportunities for employment and education, since the peak age occurs progressively later in countries where education is prolonged and employment is less likely during adolescence. Likewise, both Arnett (1999) and Steinberg (1998) note that when adolescents take part daily in adult activities, or when they work to help support their families, they have fewer problems. Teenagers need legitimate ways to expend their energies and resources. From this perspective, antisocial behavior is normative only because our society fails to allow teens other means of adult expression.

Similarly, researchers have claimed that antisocial behavior is associated with other developmental tasks facing teens. Specifically, Arnett (1999) has argued that adolescence-limited behavior is caused by the biological disruptions inherent during puberty, the degree of independence allowed by adults and expected by adolescents and the focus on individualism in Western culture, and the difficulties that go along with facing inherently new challenges in their lives. Indeed, antisocial behavior seems to peak at precisely the ages that susceptibility to peer pressure peaks (Berndt, 1979). Further, as adolescents learn self-control, rates of delinquency decline (LeBlanc, 1993).

Shover and Thompson (1992) contend that most criminals desist with age because crime becomes too dangerous, too physically taxing, unrewarding, and punishments become too harsh and long lasting for crime to become a way of life for most people. Similarly, Glassner, Ksander, Berg, and Johnson (1983) found that teenagers feared punishment more as they got older. This fits with Canada's (1995) assessment that we actually "target" adolescents for use by drug and crime lords by making

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

them "immune" to adult punishment for crime.

Current Interventions for Antisocial Behavior: Prevention and Treatment

While the relationship between age and delinquency is well established, it is far less clear that teenagers deserve to be cast wholly in the role of "the bad guys." Where does our collective image of adolescents as the bad guys come from? By their nature, teenagers are an easy target—they're impulsive and engage in what adults view as poor decision making. Some teenagers, on occasion, do behave in a way that puts themselves and others at risk. But, given the numbers, they seem not to deserve the blanket, negative treatment they receive. As Ruby Takanishi (1996) aptly put it,

> The very word *adolescent* is almost always used in popular writing to characterize an immature, irresponsible, and undesirable individual or his or her behavior. In contrast to the overglorification of the early childhood years, we still have no adequate label with a positive connotation for the critical second decade of life. (p. 256)

Our demonization of our teenagers does not occur accidentally or incidentally. It's not just a product of contemporary society. Adolescents have been "demonized" since they were identified as being in a separate "stage" of life (Kett, 1977; Siegel, 1995).

We also have strong collective needs to do something *about* adolescents' antisocial or self-destructive behavior and much weaker needs to "do something for them." It is instructive to look at our current efforts on behalf of these teenagers. Here, we describe briefly contemporary procedures for the remediation and prevention of problematic behavior. Sadly, it appears that, to our legislators and policymakers, a pound of cure costs less than an ounce of prevention.

Intervening on "broken kids"

Programs designed to ameliorate deficits within individual troubled adolescents are, by far, the most common type of intervention for remediation and prevention of delinquent or problem behaviors. Services available for treating individual adolescents engaging in problem behaviors, from most to least restrictive care, include inpatient or institutional treatment and juvenile justice programs (i.e., incarceration, probation, and diversion projects), residential treatment, foster care, emergency shelter, day treatment programs, outpatient treatment or psychotherapy, and school-based interventions (Lyman & Campbell, 1996).

What all of these programs share in common is that the child is either removed from the home or "fixed" away from his family. The family and the home environment receive minimal or no intervention. For example, one outcome study indicated that while 56% of youth placed in foster care returned to live with their family of origin upon departure from the foster care system, no intervention had occurred with their families (Panel on High Risk Youth, 1993). These types of interventions are based on the assumption that the locus of the problem and its solution is *in* the affected child, and thus the goal of these interventions is to produce changes within the "identified patient." The vast majority of intervention strategies for adolescents seem to adopt this perspective. Some intervention strategies focus on "educating" teenagers to prevent antisocial behavior. But even these are based on "internalist" assumptions about why teenagers engage in problem behavior: (a) they simply don't know any better—if they truly understood the risks they would cease to engage in the problem behavior (Dryfoos, 1990); (b) they may have the knowledge but are poor decision makers (e.g., Furby & Beyth–Marom, 1992); or (c) they may really want to resist pressure to engage in destructive acts, but they just don't know how to go about doing it (i.e., they lack the skills necessary for them to successfully avoid antisocial behavior) (Dryfoos, 1990).

While programs like these have been the most heavily and frequently funded, for the most part their effectiveness has not been documented. Yet, "if adolescence is defined as a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

disease state, it must be cured" (Males, 1996, p. 219). Ironically, the effectiveness of "fix the kid" interventions may be hampered most by its characterization of the problem (Hill & Fortenberry, 1992):

> By creating adolescence as a developmental period defined by its problems "adolescent health" becomes an oxymoron. . . . Adolescence has been "medicalized" into a condition that is inherently pathological. . . . Adolescence per se is seen as the inevitable "risk factor" for these widespread problems as if the origin of these problems were innate to adolescents, rather than complex interactions of individual biology, personality, cultural preference, political expediency and social dysfunction. (p. 73)

Intervening on "broken environments"

In a second broad category of intervention strategies, the focus is on the social correlates of teen problem behavior (e.g., poverty, dangerous communities, underfunded schools, involvement with negative peers, lack of guidance or nurturing at home). Theorists who adopt this perspective focus on the "broken society" as most influential for delinquency and recommend "environmental" intervention strategies. In general, these strategies focus on unhealthy environments (e.g., slums, broken families, bad schools) as leading to the development of unhealthy habits and behaviors in children. Bronfenbrenner's (1986) ecological model represents perhaps the most sophisticated and complex contextual model currently in vogue (see also Lerner & Tubman, 1991). Indeed, considerable research (see Dryfoos, 1990; Zigler, Kagan, & Hall, 1996 for reviews) suggests that negative environmental influences associated with delinquency are found at all contextual levels, from the macro to the micro.

A number of contemporary developmental interventions can be categorized broadly as adopting this strategy (e.g., the Perry High Scope Project, Houston Parent–Child Development Centers, the Oregon Social Learning Center). These interventions are broadest in scope. Their proponents contend that broken environments set young children on a trajectory toward delinquent behavior, and suggest early childhood intervention to prevent adolescent delinquency. While these early childhood interventions are, arguably, the most effective in preventing delinquency and problem behavior, due to governmental funding policies they are becoming less and less available. Interventions designed to modify and improve adolescents' contexts are even fewer and farther between and are available to only a minority of teenagers with problems (U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, 1991).

While there is some promising evidence that these more contextual strategies are effective in reducing problem behavior (e.g., Johnson, 1988; Patterson, Reid, & Dishion, 1992; Zigler & Styfco, 1996), federal and state funding patterns preclude using them as a tool of first resort. Current funding for intervention services for troubled adolescents seems to have produced a horribly fractionated and compromised approach to intervention. Zigler et al. (1996) have coined the term "disorder du jour" to describe this funding pattern in which grants are offered to providers who serve children engaging in the specific problem behavior that has most recently captured public attention (Zigler et al., 1996; Dryfoos, 1990). These focused initiatives tend to treat "antisocial behaviors" as single behaviors rather than related phenomena. Further, while cost efficiency should be an essential aspect of any intervention strategy, concern with saving money has led to the development of programs where a "small 'dose' of treatment is expected to achieve long-term gains" (Kazdin, 1993, p. 137). Recent efforts to remediate or prevent delinquency can be described as the casting of wider and wider nets in an attempt to capture as many "at-risk" children as possible with the fewest resources. The bottom line is that children and adolescents continue to be underserved populations in terms of getting their mental and physical health needs met (Hechinger, 1992).

Currently, services for adolescents engaging in problem behaviors are made available to those teenagers whose parents (a) can afford to pay for services directly or with medical insurance (i.e., privately funded treatment) or (b) who seek and qualify for government funded services (i.e., publicly funded treat-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ment or welfare services). Those adolescents who fail to meet criteria for child welfare services and whose parents cannot afford to pay for treatment receive only those services available to all teenagers (e.g., public service announcements, school-based interventions such as "DARE," skill-based training), or no services at all. Chronically delinquent teenagers and delinquent teenagers whose parents lack financial resources typically end up in the care of the juvenile justice system.

To what extent are current interventions successful?

While some short-term improvements have resulted from interventions, long-term changes in behavior patterns are seldom realized (Dryfoos, 1990; Kazdin, 1993; Lyman & Campbell, 1996; Rutter et al., 1998). Of even greater concern is a growing awareness that many intervention strategies not only fail to correct problem behavior but may actually *increase* the likelihood of future delinquent involvement for participants (McCord, 1978, 1992). Correctional institutions have been characterized as little more than "finishing schools for criminal behavior" (Conger & Galambos, 1997, p. 347), as estimated reconviction rates among previously institutionalized youth run between 60 and 80% (Rutter & Giller, 1984). Additionally, research suggests that children placed outside of their homes are at *increased* risk of suffering from emotional disturbance (Institute of Medicine, 1989), are impacted negatively by multiple placements (Wolkind & Rutter, 1985), and may receive poor-quality care (Bowlby, 1973). Even well-known intervention strategies like the "Just Say No" prevention program have been linked to increased drug use among program participants (Donaldson, Graham, Piccinin, & Hansen, 1995). In their comprehensive literature review, Rutter and his colleagues (1998) concluded that delinquent behavior is difficult to modify and that, in fact, interventions typically produce less than a 12% reduction in future offending.

What we're doing isn't working very well. Yet Rutter et al. (1998) characterize recent reviews on the status of interventions as cautiously optimistic because researchers believe that as we come to understand the processes that underlie antisocial behavior, we will be better able to design successful strategies to prevent it. One way to get a better handle on the problem is to try to learn from past experience.

How Did We Get to Where We Are? An Argument for Rediscovering the Wheel

The strategy of fixing "broken environments" is not a creation of the 1990s. It has a long and honorable history (Siegel & White, 1982) and was much in vogue in this country at the turn of the century in one of the two forms of "degeneracy theory" (Gelb, 1990). In the more widely known form of degeneracy theory—that held by the eugenicists—criminal or antisocial behavior was characterological and innate, and the individual was genetically doomed. However, in its more liberal form, degeneracy theorists, in contrast to eugenicists, were most concerned with improving social conditions and training persons to live in healthier ways. They, along with other 19th-century commentators, blamed the characteristics of the urban poor on the slum conditions created by modern industrial capitalism rather than on the innate biological makeup of the poor. Simply put, eugenicists believed that people made slums, while degeneracy theorists believed that slums made people (Gelb, 1990, p. 243).

In *Helping Children: A Social History*, the Levines (1992) argue that there have been historically two fundamental methods for helping children. "Intrapsychic" interventions are based on the diagnosis that problem behaviors occur as the result of the child's personal weakness and failings. The goodness of the environment is assumed, the situation considered irrelevant. What must be changed is not the circumstance, but the person. In contrast, "situational" interventions are based on the assumption that children are basically "good," and that problem behavior patterns are evidence of children's exposure to poor conditions and lack of opportunities to reach anywhere near their full potential. Of course, both theories coexist, and have been defended by

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rivalrous camps, at every moment in political history. However, the Levines contend that intrapsychic solutions to mental health and other social problems become predominant in times of social conservatism, while situational solutions become more prominent during times of political reform.

Situational theory concerned with explaining juvenile delinquency and antisocial behavior comes in a variety of forms. Anomie and social-class theories put the onus on broad sociological factors (Agnew, 1985; Merton, 1957/1964). Labeling theories (Thrasher, 1927/1963) note the potential damaging effects of officially labeling children "delinquent." According to social disorganization theory (Shaw & McKay, 1942/1969), delinquency occurs primarily as the result of a breakdown in community-based, institutional controls. Other situational theories include peer-influence theories (Matza, 1964; Sutherland & Cressey, 1978), and control and containment theories that propose that delinquency results when an individual's bond to society is weak or broken (Durkheim, 1897/1951; Erickson, Sroufe, & Egeland, 1985; Reckless & Dinitz, 1972).

Our society has an extensive history of concern with the involvement of adolescents in problem behavior, and over the last century we have designed ways to keep them out of trouble. What did some of the earlier interventions look like? What were their goals? Who were they intended to serve? In what contexts were these mechanisms designed and implemented? How does this inform our current concerns, needs, and assumptions regarding adolescents?

G. Stanley Hall, adolescence, and the "gloss" of psychopathology

According to the "received" history of adolescence, as "given" in most texts, young people were around for thousands of years; Aristotle and Plato wrote about them. Nothing much happened for a long time. Then, in 1904, G. Stanley Hall came along and pronounced adolescence as a stage of life with special importance for the young person and society. Nothing much happened for a while. After World War II, juvenile delinquency became a real problem, and "serious" scientific work on adolescence began.

In actuality, of course, a psychology of adolescence did not spring full blown from the natural sciences or philosophy. Rather, out of a complex matrix of society's concerns, public and private activities on behalf of young people, and academics working in universities, it arose in a slow, trial-and-error process of communal knowledge building, much like Campbell has discussed in his evolutionary epistemology (1993). Like the child study movement at the turn of the century (Siegel & White, 1982), the psychology of adolescence has been, from its very inception, a curious mix of society's concerns and science, research, practice, and policy.

Curiously, developmental psychology may bear some responsibility for *creating* a distinctive stage or phase of human life. Among others (e.g., Kett, 1977), David Bakan (1972) has argued that " . . . the idea of adolescence as an intermediary period in life starting at puberty and extending to some period in the life cycle unmarked by any conspicuous physical change but socially defined as 'manhood' or 'womanhood' is the product of modern times" (p. 73).

G. Stanley Hall was in the right place at the right time. Institutional changes in America—child labor laws, compulsory school attendance laws, a differentiated system of juvenile justice—brought youth into the limelight (Bakan, 1972). Hall's *Adolescence: Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion, and Education*, published in 1904, seems to have done the most to raise public consciousness about adolescence. Alternating between description and prescription, in the two massive scholarly volumes Hall made a double-edged contribution to the lives of American adolescents. On the one hand, he brought their conditions and concerns toward the center of public awareness; on the other hand, he put what Bakan (1972, p. 83) calls the "gloss of psychopathology" on this age period (Hall, 1904, Vol. II).

> . . . Youth cannot be temperate, in the philosophical sense. . . . There is gaiety, irrepressible levity,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and euphoria that overflows in every absurd manifestation of excess of animal spirits, that cannot be repressed, that danger and affliction, appeals to responsibility and to the future, cannot daunt nor temper. To have a good time is felt to be an inalienable right. (p. 77)

The belief that "idle hands were the devil's tool" was in part a carryover from the Puritan age, but was also a function of the new revivified American work ethic and abhorrence of waste. Hall and those following his lead were much concerned to design, develop, and foster social institutions that could take advantage of (co-opt) the "gregarious" instinct of adolescents and at the same time keep them occupied, off the streets and out of trouble.

With this enhanced but slightly double-edged vision of adolescence as the conceptual platform, a great variety of colonies of adolescence sprang up—youth projects instigated by public concerns and fed by psychological theory and research. American psychologists after Hall participated in the design of new "behavior settings" for youth: enlargements of schooling, multiple organizations for groups of adolescence, and legal–clinical–research settings for understanding delinquency. The ideas of Freud, Watson, Thorndike, Dewey, and Mead loom large in the background. In what follows, we try to provide an overview of these institutional streams and settings. Developmental psychology has played a recognizable role in most of them—if not the prophetic and moralizing role favored by some turn-of-the-century psychologists, then at least an informing and advisory role.

Expansion and differentiation of the high school

The modern American comprehensive high school arose and expanded greatly from 1870 to 1910. It represented the compromise in the struggle of proponents of democratic common schooling with advocates of differentiated, vocationally relevant schooling. It was the "main track" for youth, but it was a controversial and not fully satisfactory solution for adolescents of different classes and cultures. Immigration, child labor laws, and compulsory school attendance laws brought kids into schools in droves. From 1910 to 1930 there was a further expansion, particularly among most of the groups that had previously been least exposed to schooling (Modell, 1989), and a functional differentiation into college preparatory and vocational tracks (Ueda, 1987).

The successful businessman was both an idol and an ideal. The business ideology was infused continuously into American life and strengthened by the muckrakers as they extolled "modern business methods" and "efficiency." The vigorous conservation movement was reinforced by a corollary drive to eliminate waste and inefficiency. Frederick Winslow Taylor had taken the country by storm, and his principles of scientific management (Taylor, 1911) were being applied and practiced in nearly every aspect of American life—Army, home, family, household. Between 1900 and 1925, magazines (e.g., *Atlantic Monthly, Harper's, Outlook, Nation, McClure's, Saturday Evening Post, Ladies' Home Journal)*, popular books (e.g., Ayres, 1909) and associations made unfavorable comparisons between the schools and business enterprise, urged the application of the criteria of "economy" and "efficiency" to education, and suggested that business and industrial practices be adopted by education (Callahan, 1962, p. 6).

The most insightful criticisms of scientific management and its efficiency devices came from William C. Bagley and John Dewey: both opposed the inappropriate application of business and industrial values and procedures to the schools and criticized the oversimplified and superficial activity undertaken in the name of science. But they were running against the tide. The 1920s were years of educational efficiency in American public schools, increased professionalization of school administration, and of numerical index making by which this efficiency could be measured (Callahan, 1962). The widespread acceptance of the ideas of the prophets of efficiency was understandable, given the staggering costs of the school expansions that went on at the turn of the century. In the development of schools, as in the development of all

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interventions, an essential tension existed between the needs of teenagers and the needs of adults.

Junior high schools developed to handle the realization that young adolescents were neither fish nor fowl, and that they needed their own niche in the expanding educational system. Numerous educators argued for the special status and needs of young adolescents (e.g., Judd, 1916). The junior high school "is an institution which is neither an elementary school nor a high school but a provision for the needs of those children for which neither of the older institutions made suitable provision" (Horn, 1916, p. 92). Professor Augustus Douglas of Clark University (Douglas, 1916) argued that

> The 7th, 8th, and 9th grades belong together for psychological reasons, for the average child enters the seventh grade at the beginning of the adolescent period and emerges from the ninth grade with the period of transition completed. Hence, such an arrangement permits the handling of a group of pupils psychologically similar, who form a homogeneous social group. . . . There is psychological justification for the claim that educational practice should differ both in content and method for the pupil of the adolescent stage as compared with the pupil of the preadolescent stage. (pp. 48, 89–90)

These needs and "psychological justifications" were dictated by the characterization of adolescents put forth by Hall: "Adolescence is a period of storm and stress, of changeableness, intense emotions, self-assertion, strong social attractions, and awakening to the significance of the industrial world and vocation" (Douglas, 1916, p. 18).

The serious players in education and psychologists agreed that the standard arrangement (8 years of elementary school and 4 years of high school) was "inefficient" (costly in terms of time, space, and facilities) and not suited to the needs of the pupils. Leaders including Nicholas Murray Butler (President of Columbia and editor of the *Educational Review*), William Rainey Harper (President of Chicago and chair of the 1905 "Committee of 21"), Paul Hanus of Harvard, Edward L. Thorndike at Columbia, and John Dewey (1903) agreed and persuaded other school administrators that (a) elementary school should be 6 years and should teach the rudiments, and (b) high school should be 6 years in a 3-and-3 arrangement beginning in seventh grade.

Social reformers got behind the junior high school because it promised a prolonged education, a better-informed citizenry, and improved vocational preparation—clearly articulated goals that would improve the lives of both young adolescents and society (Ueda, 1987).

> The JHS became the main safety valve for overcrowding . . . It was installed at the height of demographic pressure in the grammar classrooms. It became a high-volume pipeline conveying more students to secondary grade levels and made possible the development of mass high school attendance. . . . Proponents of the Junior High School argued in educational journals and scholarly monographs that this intermediate school would supply the special education needed by students making the difficult transition from childhood to adolescence . . . two features—a more mature school setting and technical courses—would make the junior high school an effective device for keeping students in school longer. (p. 199)

Pioneers of the junior high school were Columbus, Ohio (1909), Berkeley, California (1910), Concord, New Hampshire (1910), and Los Angeles (1911). Due in part to the arguments that it was good for kids and society, and with the backing of prominent citizens and educators, within the next 10 years the Junior High School movement exploded; nearly a thousand other cities across the nation introduced the junior high school into their public school systems.

Youth activities: Structuring leisure, co-opting the gregarious instinct

Young people spent only part of their time in school. Outside the walls of this differentiated set of educational arrangements, there arose a great variety of youth clubs, social service groups, competitive athletics, social service organizations, and religious groups. These youth activities were action-based, grassroots "colonies" largely devised to structure adoles-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cents' free time, to foster character education—and to keep kids out of trouble. As Tryon (1944), a prominent educator and sociologist, stated,

> During the last twenty or thirty years there has appeared a great variety of recreational agencies such as neighborhood clubs, playground associations, summer camps, Boy Scouts, which have sought to control the gregarious interests of boys and girls. These efforts to direct the activities of children and youth were not prompted primarily by a clear understanding of the needs of youth and the important developmental problems being attacked in the peer group, though they were concerned with providing "healthful" and "wholesome" conditions for growing up. The more imperative reason for promoting "youth-serving" agencies grew out of the antisocial products of increased leisure time—destructiveness, delinquency, and just plain mischief. (p. 235)

Various authors have characterized America in the 1920s (Fass, 1977; Levine & Levine, 1992; Lynd & Lynd, 1937; Modell, 1989) as a culture of abundance, a preoccupation with leisure and consumption, and as an exercise in individuality and expression of self. The individual hero captured the public's (and youth's) attention and admiration: Babe Ruth, Charles Lindbergh—even Al Capone. If you failed in this prosperous world, it was due to a lack of *character*, not circumstances. Wants became needs. Thrift and self-denial were out; buying on time was in. Now many older adolescents had access to a family car; dating became a new social form, and courtship moved from the front porch to the back seat (Bailey, 1988). The dance craze, forbidden alcohol, and movies gathered national attention. Sex and sexuality became a national fascination.

During the 1920s psychoanalysis took hold in this country, and psychoanalytic thinking provided an intellectual rationale for the social changes. Psychoanalysis, with its focus on the individual psyche, was consistent with the societal emphasis on the individual. Pop psychoanalysis—in magazines, books, and Sunday supplements—stressed the free expression of sexual impulses and the dangers of their frustration. It is not surprising that people working with youth—psychologists, social workers, Church people, and educators—were greatly concerned to create and provide "healthy" outlets for these urges.

In contrast to the 1920s, the 1930s—the Depression, FDR, and the New Deal—were characterized as a culture of scarcity, and an exercise in community and adaptation to the norm (Leuchtenberg, 1958). Millions were out of work through no fault of their own; the modal activity of youth over 18 years of age was idleness (Modell, 1989). As in the 1920s, youth had time on their hands. So the pressure for youth organizations continued. In the 1920s, delinquency was attributed, in part, to deficient or misguided character. In the 1930s, delinquency was seen as a result of deficient resources and environment—degeneracy, in the older sense of the word (Jordan, 1993).

Pendry and Hartshorne (1935) compiled and summarized a detailed listing of 40 organizations for youth extant in 1935. Most were founded in the teens and 1920s, or were founded earlier and experienced significant growth during the 1920s and 1930s. For each organization the authors were able to describe its mission and purpose, origins, clientele, procedures, activities, etc. A cursory analysis is instructive.

Eleven societies were listed, including the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, Woodcraft League of America, Boy Rangers, Highlander Organization, Pioneer Youth of America, Boys' Brotherhood Republic, 4-H, Junior Achievement, and Boys' Clubs of America. Collectively, these societies emphasized and tried to inculcate character growth—particularly self-reliance, self-discipline, and curbing the impulses of the self in service to the community—responsible citizenship and having fun.

Six junior programs of adult groups were noted, including Kiwanis, Order of the Builders, Order of the Rainbow for girls, Order De Molay, and the Optimist International Boys' Work Council. The motto of this latter group was "friend of the delinquent boy"; its slogan was "character is caught rather than taught." As with the societies, these junior programs appealed to what Hall called "the gregarious instinct," and youth's penchant for symbols,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ritual, and ceremony (Pendry & Hartshorne, 1935):

> The fraternity-joining tendencies of boys at this age are apparent. The constructive use of this gregarious instinct in its more refined sense, when guided by adult wisdom, may be a factor for good . . . Ritual and reverence is a natural part of youth's expression, as the common practice of fraternities attests. Forms, symbols, ceremonies, and the stately speech of Knights and Ladies are a part of the charm of the days of chivalry and its literature. Youth is held by symbols, by signs and passes, by ritual and ceremony as by a charm. (p. 141)

Nine plans for schools were all dedicated explicitly to character training and the development of citizenship skills. Under the Iowa Plan (directed by Edwin Starbuck, Professor at Iowa, and who received his Ph.D. with Hall at Clark), the focus was on the school as democratic community; the goal was to "recenter the unorganized self of childhood, with its instincts and desire, into a self of insight and refined tastes." Other plans included Collier's Code, The School Republic, National–Self Government Committee, Pathfinders of America, Knighthood of Youth, Junior Red Cross, American School Citizenship League, and the Young Citizens' League of South Dakota.

Seven special interest plans included the ASPCA, National Association of Audubon Societies, School Garden Association of America, National Recreation Association, and Girls' Service League of America. The code of the Sportsmanship Brotherhood was "Keep the rules. Keep faith with your comrades. Keep your temper. Keep yourself fit. Keep a stout heart in defeat. Keep your pride under in victory. Keep a sound soul, a clean mind, and a healthy body. Play the game" (p. 247). Friends of Boys was devoted to the interests of boys on the street, " . . . to enable them to solve for themselves their problems of adjustment to local conditions of work and play."

Finally, seven interreligious groups included Big Brother and Big Sister Federation, YMCA, YWCA, Toc H, Christian Quest Idea, and the Pi Christian Fraternal Orders. The Knights of King Arthur and Ladies of Avalon used the Sunday school to promote activities patterned according to the high aims of the days of King Arthur. The program was based specifically on Hall's psychology of adolescence as described in his 1904 work! Hall called this idealized court of King Arthur the best form of club for boys.

It is clear that the organizations showed great sensitivity to differences in the needs of younger and older children. The Cub Scouts, Indian Guides, and Brownies were aimed at 8- to 12-year-olds, and reflected the need for a reemphasis on home and neighborhood life. Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, Boys' Clubs, Junior Achievement, and 4-H were aimed at adolescents of junior high school age (12–15 years); these groups continued to sponsor home activities but also encouraged hobbies, athletic contests, vocational explorations, individual projects, and winning of honors for individual accomplishments.

Groups catering to adolescents of high school age (15–18 years) recognized their increasing consciousness and increased fraternizing spirit (Pendry & Hartshorne, 1935):

> High-school young people usually desire to be like their fellows, in dress, in speech, in expressions, in ideas. Individualism is submerged in group desires. At this age, boys and girls wish to belong to some group and to have a sense of security in that group. This makes the fraternity pledge and initiation not only attractive but definitely desired. Procedures for this age usually center around an adult club leader or camp counselor, and mother and dad from an appreciative, cooperative background, only appearing on state occasions. (pp. 2–3)

There were, unfortunately (as now), too few procedures for young people 18 years and older (Pendry & Harshorne):

> Crime statistics show that this is the most dangerous age. Yet the YMCA and YMHA, YWCA and YWHA, a few church organizations, Toc H, De Molay, and semifraternity groups are practically the only general organizations which aim to reach these boys and girls . . . Procedures for the younger groups present well-planned programs made almost wholly by adults. But now, more than ever, a youth desires to act according to his own ideas and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

plans. If such opportunities cannot be offered him by legitimate clubs, he joins secret clubs of his own making. (p. 4)

The final project for youth came at the beginning of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal: the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). "Desperate young men in desperate times were given the chance to be gainfully employed, learn occupations, receive education, send money home, and to earn self-respect and confidence in an era of social and economic chaos" (Hill, 1990, p. vii). The Great Depression brought unparalleled economic severity and hardship. The years from 1929 to 1932 were "Hoover days"; rabbits were "Hoover hogs", the jobless lived in shantytowns, and hobos rode the rails on "Hoover Pullmans" (freight cars). The First Baptist Church in El Paso, Texas, arranged to accept IOUs in the collection plate. States and towns were rapidly running out of funds.

By March 1933, some 13 million were unemployed. FDR's idea for the CCC was to provide employment for younger men, who would be required to send money home to their needy families. (The secondary purpose of the CCC was protection of natural resources.) Youth aged 18–25 years were to work and live under semimilitary control doing hard physical labor, often far from home and the hard times. The "we can take it boys and girls" were paid $30/month, of which $25 was sent home automatically. By April 5, 1933, the original quota of 25,000 was exceeded; by July, 1933, 1300 CCC camps had been constructed and filled with 275,000 enlistees. Before the program ended in 1941, 3 million had served.

The idea for organizing young men for constructive work was not new. William James (1912), in an essay entitled "The moral equivalent of war," wrote that "destructive tendencies in young men might be turned to good purposes with conscription of the whole youthful population for peaceful service." FDR claimed that he was unaware of James's work. While in New York, however, he was aware of other similar progressive views being articulated in other states.

To date, there has been only limited mapping of the swarming adult-initiated and peer-initiated organizations of "adolescent society." There is little doubt, however, that these social inventions played a significant role in structuring the lives of adolescents in the 20th century. Various social and institutional arrangements were put into place or expanded to deal with satisfying the gregarious instinct. With Hall as the conceptual platform, and with the blessings of Watson, Freud, and Dewey, it was believed that involvement in such prosocial groups would be a major deterrent to delinquency.

The motives and goals of this collection of youth programs and buildings—what White (1999) has referred to as "designed institutions"—can be summarized readily: (a) to build character, (b) to provide teenagers structured interactions with adults and mentors, and (c) to promote interactions with prosocial groups of peers. All this in the service of helping teenagers to focus their excess energies towards becoming successful and productive adults.

Juvenile delinquency

For young people who could not or would not follow the socially approved mainstream, a series of efforts were made to come to terms with delinquency. The gloss of psychopathology was on adolescents. Being adolescent was, in effect, a risk factor for (a) getting into trouble, (b) thinking about getting into trouble, (c) engaging in "naughty" or at least socially disapproved behaviors, and (d) precocious or premature engagement in adult activities (Healy & Bronner, 1926). These risk factors were believed to increase as the adolescent acted on his "gregarious" instinct and joined a small group of his close friends; the risk factors were believed to increase geometrically with larger collectives.

One of the two major tasks in dealing with juvenile delinquency is prevention, exemplified in the settlement houses and in child guidance clinics like those set up by the Commonwealth Fund's Program on the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (1921).

Most work on the prevention of delinquency focuses on the psychological and en-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

vironmental origins of delinquency and crime. Both Schlossman (1977) and Platt (1969) argued that in the teens and 1920s the older hereditarian model, a conservative social Darwinism, was supplanted in the reform era by a situational model. The social reformers (Platt's child savers), including Frederick Thrasher and Jane Addams, believed that "slums cause criminals" rather than the other way around. Stemming from a medical model, it was thought by many that early inoculation—prophylaxis—would prevent the boy from becoming delinquent and prevent the delinquent from becoming a hardened adult criminal. The new group of settlement houses were organized along the lines of Jane Addams's Hull House. They provided refuge and services to needy children and adolescents. Professionalism in social work—with graduate training in casework and group work grounded in psychoanalytic theory—influenced the later generation of settlement house leaders in the 1920s and 1930s.

The Commonwealth Program was a cooperative effort of the New York School of Social Work, the National Committee for Mental Hygiene's Division on the Prevention of Delinquency, and the National Committee of Visiting Teachers. In 1921, at a conference in Lakewood, New Jersey, the guidelines for the Commonwealth Fund's Program for the Prevention of Delinquency were hammered out by representatives of education, social work, psychology, and psychiatry. William Healy and Augusta Bronner attended. The report of the conference took a clearly situational stance: since the institution and social setting were largely responsible for problems, the institution and social setting needed to be modified for the individual to grow. The instruments of this prevention effort had already been forged: the program initiated by the Commonwealth Fund expanded rapidly in the 1920s (from 7 in 1921 to 102 in 1927), with the characteristic child guidance structure emerging (i.e., the psychiatrist–psychologist–social worker model). The number of state-supported clinics expanded similarly.

Due to the interest and influence of John Dewey, Chicago public schools had established a child study department to help with children's problems. With Dewey, James R. Angell and George Herbert Mead put the University of Chicago and the city in the forefront of the study of the real social problems. Several research projects focusing on youths in collectivities were conducted in the 1920s and 1930s. The observations and notes for William Foot Whyte's *Street Corner Society* were gathered during the 1930s. The Gluecks' (1950) studies on delinquency were also based here 2 decades earlier.

Perhaps the most ambitious study of adolescents in collectives—well known by sociologists but only recently becoming acknowledged by psychologists—was Frederick Thrasher's classic *The Gang: A Study of 1313 Gangs in Chicago* published in 1927. In this massive sociological monograph, Thrasher provides a rather full-blooded account of the gang—its origins, structures, functions, activities, and dynamics. The list of acknowledgments reads like a "Who's Who" of the juvenile court and its adjunct services, of city planning and social welfare, and of the "Chicago school." Data collection, with a variety of techniques including census and court records, personal observation, and personal documents, took 7 years, yet the details of how Thrasher collected his data remain unclear. By comparison with later work, Thrasher's material is unsystematic and incomplete. The study's greatest strength is its comprehensiveness, not its analytical sophistication.

For a book over 7 decades old, many of Thrasher's "findings" seem remarkably modern. In fact, as one reads modern material on "the gang," one gets the distinct impression that we are currently in the process of rediscovering the wheel.

- The origin of criminal careers is in childhood and adolescence.
- The slum provides the city gang its natural habitat.
- The gang is a social system that is alternative to and competitive with more conventional systems, rather than supplementary to them. "It is not meant to imply that the gang is in any sense inherently bad. It simply lacks wholesome direction. It is a spontane-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ous attempt on the part of boys to create a society for themselves where none adequate to their needs exists" (p. 268).

- The gang gives the boys status, loyalty, and respect they don't get in their homes.
- Gangs provide the social setting for much delinquency and crime. "Whether the schoolboy is a truant or not, the unsupervised gang is pretty likely to lead him in the direction of delinquency" (p. 260).
- "Criminals" develop. "Truancy (playing hooky) contains the germs of later delinquencies and is the first step in the formation of a gang and on the road to a life of crime" (p. 263).
- Gangs are very important to the control of delinquency and crime. You can't take the gang out of the boy and taking the boy out of the gang doesn't work. To prevent and control crime and delinquency you need to co-opt the gang and redirect the group's activities towards more positive ends.
- Boys' work agencies function to redirect the activities of existing gangs into "wholesome" changes by some sort of supervision. Many Chicago agencies took over the gang as a club, gave it a name, and affiliated it with the larger structure: YMCA, Boy Scouts, the Boys' Brotherhood Republics, the Chicago Boys' Clubs.
- Crime prevention is a community, not an agency, function.

In addition to prevention, the other major piece of juvenile delinquency is remediation. Under the doctrine of parens patriae, the two major components of today's modern juvenile justice system were essentially in place by World War I. Reformatories were created in the 1820s; the first juvenile court was instituted in 1900 in Chicago. By 1914 all states had adopted both institutional forms (Schlossman, 1977). The system supposedly rested on rehabilitation, and probation in the child's own home, if possible, in some form of reformatory (congregate or cottage) if not. As Schlossman (1977) and Platt (1969) have written, the end result was more dehumanizing and status quo ante than truly rehabilitative.

The Chicago juvenile court, 1899, was arguably the first. (Judge Ben Lindsey and the Denver Juvenile Court was also an early institution for juveniles in trouble.) At Hull House, a committee chaired by Julia Lathrop selected—on the recommendation of Angell, William James, and Adolph Meyer—William Healy as the first director of the new Juvenile Psychopathic Institute, which opened its doors in 1909. Healy had studied with James, got his M.D. at Rush Medical School in Chicago in 1900, and showed an early interest in psychoanalysis and its methods. The Juvenile Psychopathic Institute became a ready adjunct to the court. Healy was interested in studying delinquency (1915), and on a clinical level he also performed a service. His job was, after making a thorough study of the child, to make recommendations to the court and probation workers for treatment or disposition of cases: probation, foster home placement, or commitment to an institution for dependent children or to a correctional institution: "the greatest interest for all students of criminology centers about the fact that most frequently the career of the confirmed criminal begins during adolescence" (Healy, 1915, p. 713).

Healy's later reputation is based on the application of psychoanalytic concepts and psychotherapeutic methods to delinquency. He saw psychoanalysis as providing investigative tools (e.g., interviews, individual psychotherapeutics) and a way of doing good (Lazar, 1994). For Healy, the follow-up was the essence of treatment and of research. The follow-up reports of cases he later studied in Boston reflect the care and attention to detail that Healy displayed in his clinical and research work (Healy & Bronner, 1926).

Delinquents and Criminals is based on their case studies of thousands of juvenile repeat offenders (both male and female) in Chicago and Boston, on follow-up work, and a study of aftercareers (Healy & Bronner, 1926). Each case was categorized as a Success (" . . . when the individual was living in the community without known detriment to the community and had engaged in no criminality" [p. 17]) or Failure (denoting actual de-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

linquency, and " . . . a few were regarded as Failures who, though not known to have been arrested, were an actual drag on the community, vagrants, excessive drinkers, extreme loafers, those grossly immoral and thus indirectly costly to society" [p. 17]). Thirty-nine percent of the males were rated as successes, 54% of the females. Of the male failures the most common offense was professional criminalism; of the female failures the most common offense was sex delinquency.

In a careful and measured assessment, Healy and Bronner (1926) discuss background factors in their cases. Heredity was not a predictor: "Poor traits appearing in the family backgrounds of our cases do not correlate highly enough with outcome to afford a reliable criterion of potentialities inherent in the individual" (p. 205); neither was poverty. Parental lack of control was critical, as was excessive quarreling and alcoholism (i.e., family environment was important):

> For the treatment of delinquency the lesson to be learned from the above figures is very clear: the chances of good results through removal of a child for a long time from a bad home are very considerable, the expectancy of bad results if not so removed is even greater [Good homes were found by elimination: only 7.6% of the 2000 young repeat offenders were living in good homes] Where to place a large measure of responsibility, where to direct a strong attack in treatment and prevention of delinquency stands out with striking clearness. (pp. 128–129)

In a somewhat less balanced chapter, Healy and Bronner discuss "conditions directly causative of delinquency." They conclude that motion pictures are not causative, but "bad companions" were directly causative in 62% of their cases, early sex experiences (for girls) and school dissatisfaction were directly causative in some 13% of the cases. Most interestingly, *adolescence itself* was causative:

> Adolescent Instability and Impulses.—Nobody who studies juvenile delinquents with emphasis on the genesis of their misbehavior can doubt that adolescence frequently plays a very considerable part. Among 3000 cases we decided that the instabilities and impulses of adolescence were directly causative in 18%, being more active in the cases of girls, where this cause figured as 25%. (pp. 179–180)

Adolescents engage in delinquent behavior largely because they're adolescent! In effect, this argument was largely responsible for the development of a new legal category of criminal behavior that is known today as "status offenses."

Space does not permit a closer analysis of the activities and institutions involved in understanding the "growth industry" of juvenile delinquency. However, it impacted the lives of adolescents—both delinquent and nondelinquent—significantly in the 20th century. The fear of the "epidemic" of juvenile delinquency, and attempts to deal with it that seem to rise like Lazarus in every generation, surely have their roots in this early piece of the children's cause (Steiner, 1976).

Research in the universities

All of the youth projects were fundamentally action oriented, interventionist, and generated from public concerns about adolescence—colonies outside the university. While there were linkages between the academics and the practitioners, these linkages were largely conceptual, advisory, and intersupportive.

Academic interests in adolescence were embedded in the research activities of psychologists and sociologists. As in the early child study movement (Siegel & White, 1982) and the later child development movement (Sears, 1975), the major centers were to be found at Berkeley, Chicago, Yale, Harvard, and Columbia. What were the academics doing during all of this? Psychology—particularly child psychology—was still trying to establish itself as a legitimate (i.e., "hard") science. For the most part, academic psychologists were trying to engage in "normal science" and thus moved away from juvenile delinquency—and anything else viewed as "soft," "mushy," and "abnormal"—just about as fast as they could.

A sense of the "normal science" of the times can be gained by examining part I of the *Yearbook of the National Society for Education* for 1944, entitled Adolescence (Henry,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1944). The idea for the yearbook—"a critical summary of the results of the projects completed at places like Harvard, Yale, Chicago, the University of California, and agencies such as the American Youth Commission and the Progressive Education Association"—was proposed by Dr. Harold E. Jones, Director of the Institute for Child Welfare at Berkeley in 1939. The volume represented the state of the art. Edited by N. B. Henry of Chicago, the volume consisted of 18 chapters.

After an introductory chapter by Lawrence Frank (at the Institute on Personality Development, New York), there are four chapters on physical and physiological changes in adolescence and four chapters on physical, motor, and mental abilities. These first eight chapters are the longest, with the most references, and, in effect, devoted to the anthropometry of adolescence, a la Galton and Boas, and the psychometry of adolescence, ability testing. The chapters are largely empirical and atheoretical, relying heavily on Thorndike and measurement.

The next section—"The Adolescent and the Social Order"—contains five chapters, clearly different in tone and style. They are more essays in which the authors are trying to deal with "softer," social variables issues. The arguments are cogent but based on relatively little empirical research. The arguments rest mainly on Dewey, Mead, Horney, Freud, and . . . G. Stanley Hall. The final section on educational implications includes three chapters in which the authors attempt, vaguely and vainly, to link research with practice and policy.

The final chapter is an evaluation of the yearbook, written by George D. Stoddard (1944; Commissioner of Education, New York State). Basically, he argues that Hall did the best he could. But Hall's followers and the gloss of psychopathology come under fire:

> While the Yearbook committee would be the last group to maintain that new discoveries reside in this volume, its chairman deserves full praise for the balanced views presented in a field of study which has long been the happy hunting ground of sentimentalists and fanatics. G. Stanley Hall knew that adolescence was important, and he knew why, but most of his followers were tainted with a sense of vicarious sin. They wallowed in subscience and sermons; the adolescent veered from evil to saintliness, without enough good, rational, explorable territory in between. (p. 346)

Stoddard ends his chapter not with the conventional "more research is needed" but rather with the call for a new kind of research—more precise, experimental research:

> As scientists, the authors proceed cautiously—and with reasonable restraint, as social observers. The result is sometimes meager, but it is never preposterous. Their scientific method is the best available, but it is not as yet good enough. The next approach to adolescent development will be less statistical and comparative; it will become experimental. . . . [F]or a long time, we shall not need another yearbook based on the same type of material. It will be better to wait until new methods of analysis (physiological, mental, emotional and social) have been perfected. (p. 347)

Comparisons of Then and Now

All this happened a long time ago. It was a different time. Society was different. But we still have adolescents, parents, and a concerned society. What are some of the similarities and commonalities between "interventions" then and now? Just how, specifically, is the developmental context of adolescents in society different now than it was a half-century ago?

Interventions then and now are based on similar assumptions regarding adolescents

From Hall's time to the present, we have realized the gregarious and impulsive nature of adolescence. We know and accept that adolescents are neither children nor adults and that they have specific developmental needs. Since the time of the Puritans, as a society we have been worried that "idle hands are the devil's workshop" and have been concerned with the havoc that those idle hands might wreak (Hall, 1904; Muuss, 1995; Thomas, 1996). Generations of adults have voiced a collective need that adolescents control their "instincts and impulsive behaviors." We have designed

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

institutions (White, 1999) for their socialization and the internalization of our values. We have also tried, with varying degrees of awareness, effort, and success, to provide adolescents with constructive outlets to satisfy their developmental needs.

From flappers (1920s) to bobby-soxers (late 1930s to 1940s) to teenagers (1950s) to generation-Xers, certain adolescent developmental needs have remained constant (and are the stuff of textbooks): adolescents want instant gratification, need to test the limits of authority, need to engage in a modicum of outrageous behavior, etc. Adults, in turn, also have collective needs to put limits on them, to "control" their impulses, to socialize them. This much has been constant in every era (Davis, 1940).

What developmental needs were they and we trying to satisfy? These developmental needs and motives can be seen or inferred by looking at problem behavior as having a dual aspect. John Hughlings Jackson (1884), the father of modern neurology, first articulated this duality in the context of Herbert Spencer's evolutionary associationism as he applied it to his work with epilepsy; he labeled it the "double symptom":

> The symptomatology of nervous diseases is a double condition; there is a negative and there is a positive element in every case . . . Now, suppose that from disease the normal highest level of evolution (the topmost layer) is rendered functionless. This is the dissolution, to which answer the negative symptoms of the patient's insanity. I contend his positive mental symptoms are still the survivals of his fittest states, are survivals on the lower, but *then* highest level of evolution. The most absurd mentation, and most extravagant actions in insane people are the survivals of their fittest states. (pp. 46–47)

Our claim is not that all adolescents are insane. Our claim is merely that significant formal parallels (Siegel, Bisanz, & Bisanz, 1983) or analogies (Lorenz, 1976) exist among "symptomatic" behaviors in numerous human populations. There's the aspect of the behavior that bothers us—the negative symptom; the other aspect tells us of what the person is still capable.

Typically, "problem behavior" is viewed almost entirely in its negative aspect, as a symptom reflecting what's wrong; the craziness, the bad stuff. Rarely is problem behavior viewed in its positive aspect—the best of what's left—reflecting the function that the behavior serves or, alternatively, the developmental need that the adolescent is trying to satisfy. Over 60 years ago the neuropsychologist Kurt Goldstein (1942) articulated a doctrine—the definition of a symptom—that has become core to contemporary family systems theory:

> The attempt of the organism to find a new adjustment gives rise to two kinds of symptoms: the first kind reveals the struggle; the second reflects the tendency to build up substitute performances which allow it to escape this struggle and to come to terms with the demands of the outer world in the best possible way under the given conditions. (p. 69)

That is, any symptom must be looked at as an attempt on the part of the organism to maintain its integrity.

Interventions then and now are based on similar adult need structures

Just as adolescents' engagement in problem behaviors serves a function or need, our designed institutions serve or satisfy several deep-seated needs of adults. Maintaining control and preventing chaos satisfies our need for security. Maintaining the economic status quo or providing opportunity satisfies our (economic) need for prosperity. Maintaining a sense of personal efficacy (i.e., believing that what we do can make a difference) satisfies something like a need for mastery or competence. Providing for the continuity of society through our children likely satisfies some altruistic, "future-oriented" needs.

Why demonize or scapegoat adolescents? Characterizations of teenagers, as well as the interventions we devise for them, are designed to serve the needs of the adults as much as they are to serve adolescents. What "need" does it satisfy for adults? Males (1996) has argued and documented that we

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scapegoat teenagers, but doesn't really say why. Platt (1969) suggests that we keep poor teenagers down in order to maintain and perpetuate a working class.

The authors believe that adults really do want what's best for teenagers, at least their teenagers, but we may be a bit ambivalent about "other people's teenagers." We are very sensitive about any suggestion that as a society we are negligent in our treatment of children, although the evidence says that as a society we clearly are negligent. (Just how much of our social policy is shaped by efforts to get rid of the "burden of blame" is an open issue.)

While there are similarities, there are also notable differences between then and now

Adolescents are now a distinct and profitable economic "market." Palladino (1996) has argued that as "teenagers" became a consumer group targeted by marketing and advertising executives in the late 1940s, the official teenage rebel culture was birthed. There was money to be made by establishing teens as a separate culture with separate needs (i.e., a completely different line of products and styles to be sold in music, clothes, hair, cars, etc.). Just as "official teenage culture" was recognized by the economic marketplace, it was reified in research in universities.

For the most part, psychologists shied away from research on "applied issues." In contrast, sociologists embraced this new teenage culture and the applied research that such an acceptance implied. The 1950s and 1960s saw the groundbreaking research by the Gluecks (1950, 1970) and the McCords (1964) on juvenile delinquency, and James Coleman's *The Adolescent Society* (1961), in which he pointed to the existence and dangers of an entire "deviant youth culture." Developmental psychologists in the universities were latecomers in research on "applied" issues in adolescence. But in the 1980s, applied developmental research became the rage. Prior to the 1980s, empirical research on applied issues in adolescence was published largely in *Youth and Society* and *Journal of Youth and Adolescence,* and much of this was sociological rather than psychological in nature. In the 1980s, the Society for Research in Adolescence was founded (1986) and numerous new journals (e.g., *Journal of Research on Adolescence*) began publication. As Stoddard (1944) had hoped over 50 years ago, we have developed methods of analysis (e.g., structural-equation modeling, individual growth-curve analysis) that have permitted us not only to analyze data in a more sophisticated fashion but to ask more sophisticated questions.

Again, "teenager" is a concept that services adults primarily and teens secondarily. In a sense, World War I and World War II temporarily "solved" the problem of antisocial behavior—or at least seriously distracted the national attention away from it—because youth, as a group, could serve the larger society. Those conscripted fought; those remaining at home contributed to the "war effort." Antisocial behavior frequently decreases in the face of the need to unite and oppose a common enemy (James, 1912).

While problem behavior was largely "sociologized" through the 1960s, it has become "medicalized" in the 1990s. In an age in which we have been led to believe that there is a "magic scientific bullet" for nearly all physiological and social problems ("ailments"), we have "medicalized" problem behavior. An unspoken corollary of the "intrapsychic" view is that if the locus of the problem is in the adolescent, then parents and society are off the hook. The genetic or biological perspective provides that out: "There's nothing we could do; our child was born a delinquent." While this may sometimes be true, even the DSM-IV-R suggests that only a small percentage of people with mental illness have problems that are purely physiological in origin.

We contend that children's and adolescents' basic developmental needs are getting met less well now than before World War I and World War II. At a minimum, today's adolescents seem to be experiencing less connectedness with their families and the adult society. Historically, children were raised almost exclusively within a family or community context. Adolescents had adult mentors as they served in apprenticeships to learn their trade. Such an environment may have pro-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

moted closer, personal relationships between teenagers and adults and served to make adults the their official, socially sanctioned role models.

Now there is less adult–adolescent interaction. As a result of the colonization of teenagers that occurred earlier in the century, teenagers spend less time with adults than ever before. Mentoring and apprenticeships as formal institutions for introducing teenagers into the adult world are virtually absent. Further, we fail to (a) articulate clearly our goals for "success" and (b) establish clear trajectories for teenagers to negotiate successfully entry into the adult world. Currently, schools and other large institutions are expected to take the role once filled by parents, individual adults, and neighborhood clubs and facilities. The ready availability of firearms, the omnipresence of TV and its icons, instantaneous distal communication via chatrooms on the internet, huge shopping malls, enormous high schools with high teacher-to-student ratios in classrooms, and other changes in the last 50 years undoubtedly have contributed to a general sense of disconnectedness by teenagers.

The move away from adult-controlled and adult-monitored socialization has other negative consequences. We, as adults, feel less in control. This may help to explain what makes it possible for adult attacks on adolescent society to be as intense and vitriolic as they are. It's as if we think of adolescents as a different species, not just a younger age cadre. In his *Adolescence* (1904), Hall argued that adolescence was a stage in man's ontogenetic development that recapitulated earlier "savage"—primitive and tribal—stages in the evolution of culture. Konrad Lorenz has discussed scapegoating in terms of "pseudospeciation," a proposed psychobiological mechanism. In his classic work *On Aggression* (1963), Lorenz argued that throughout history the dominant society tends to characterize the underclass as not only a lower class but as a different species, in order to justify and rationalize their mistreatment.

Elkind (1987) provides a less mean-spirited argument. He pointed out that, historically, images of children are social constructions rather than reflections of any objective reality. Because modern-day false images of children are cloaked in the armor of "science," they are harder to combat. In Elkind's words, "the image of the child at any point in history always fills the predominant parent needs and defenses of that developmental epoch" (p. 9). He predicted that in the 1990s, because parents would be too busy to parent their children, society would focus on children's social sophistication and self-sufficiency, and the diminished influence of parenting. Harris (1998) reflects just this point of view: Since science has found that children are self- (and peer-) determinative, parents don't need to feel guilty because children have always raised themselves anyway, in spite of their parents' best efforts. Both of these views have in common an argument that places the full burden of responsibility on the child. By doing so, adults are excused from judgment, blame, and responsibility. By adopting these stances, adult behavior is automatically deemed "the best they can do given impossible circumstances."

Earlier and Recent Attempts to Understand Problem Behavior: What Are the Common Threads?

Problem behaviors still create significant social costs, and we have been largely unsuccessful in reducing their occurrence. In what follows, we describe briefly what we consider to be the reoccurring themes that offer reasonable probabilities of gains in that direction.

Risk and protective factors can be characterized as forces or vectors that move adolescents closer to or further away from successful completion of developmental tasks

A strong nurturing family is a potent protective factor; lack of it is a potent risk factor. At least since the time of Jane Addams and Hull House (Levine & Levine, 1992), we have known that family is an important factor in positive psychosocial development. Healy and Bronner's (1926) research nailed this down empirically. Recent evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (ADD Health) suggests that family

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

connectedness (i.e., the physical presence of parents in the home, nurturing family relationships, and instilling a sense of belonging) provides the single greatest protection against drug use, early sexual involvement, violence, and emotional problems for teens. Parents and home relationships may be primary predictors of antisocial behavior because it is in the home and within the family that so many fundamental needs must be met. In the words of the ADD Health team, "Feeling loved and cared for by parents matters in a big way" (Blum & Rinehart, 1997, p. 31).

Connectedness refers to more than just family. Being a member of a Girl Scout troop or the Knights of King Arthur and the Ladies of Avalon or the Civilian Conservation Corps provided a youngster with a sense of emotional connectedness and community. With a lack of as rich a set of potential "connecting places," schools today play an almost exclusive role of providing a place outside of the family for kids to connect. The ADD Health research team found that a feeling of connectedness to teachers and school (i.e., feeling fairly treated, close to others, and a part of the school) was the *only* aspect of the school environment associated consistently with healthier outcomes for students (Blum & Rinehart, 1997).

Interaction with a significant adult mentor provides the most powerful buffer against risk factors. Resiliency is best characterized as having enough of the right kind of a giant protective factor present in one's life at a critical time. Data from Emmy Werner's (1989) longitudinal study suggest that despite developmental difficulties (e.g., poverty, birth complications, discordant home lives, alcoholic parents), one third of the children in her study were resistant to risks and became healthy, productive adults. After examining a variety of protective factors (e.g., family stability, birth order, number of siblings), Werner concluded, "The resilient children in our study had at least one person in their lives who accepted them unconditionally, regardless of temperamental idiosyncrasies or physical or mental handicaps" (p. 109). Similarly, Bronfenbrenner (as cited in Schorr, 1997) has shared his belief that in order to "grow up whole, be able to learn, and develop a conscience, children need to experience the irrational love, attention and commitment of at least one adult. Someone needs to be crazy about the kid" (p. 225). Even John DiIulio (1994), who coined the term "super-predators" to describe his vision of the next generation of teens, admits that kids from the toughest circumstances can become successful if "they grow up believing that there are adults in their world who care desperately about their physical, emotional, and intellectual well-being, and who want nothing in return save love itself" (p. 23).

Given the present structure of adolescents' environments, prosocial peer groups are absolutely essential for the healthy transition between childhood and adulthood. A valid piece of Harris's (1998) otherwise controversial argument in *The Nurture Assumption* is that by isolating teenagers from the workplace and adult community we have established a culture in which teens are, in essence, raising each other. Teenagers spend far more time with other teenagers than they do with adults, creating an environment in which teenagers are each other's role models. In such an environment, Moffitt's argument that mimicry is a primary contributor to adolescence-limited antisocial behavior makes sense. Teenagers who are trying to find their way into competency and adulthood, and who fail to find productive means to do so, tend to engage in antisocial behavior with their antisocial peers. However, these same teenagers desist when they find a socially appropriate route into adulthood, e.g., marriage to a nondelinquent girlfriend, getting a job, military service (Nagin & Land, 1933; Pickles & Rutter, 1991; Sampson & Laub, 1996).

These findings can also be explained in terms of adolescents seeking an appropriate pathway to accomplish developmental tasks successfully. As a group, adolescents work very hard to discover their own personal identity. Research suggests that as they become increasingly self-aware, they are less likely to engage in antisocial behavior (LeBlanc, 1993). Adolescents work hard to individuate, to understand themselves separate from their family. Peer groups can be instrumental, for

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

good or ill, in this regard. Adolescents who belong to prosocial groups are less likely to engage in antisocial behavior. Further, adolescents are working hard to become competent, to make the transition from dependent child to productive adult. Teenagers who work to meet family needs (i.e., teens who serve an adultlike role within their family) are also less likely to engage in antisocial behavior (Elder, 1974/1999).

Not all problem behaviors are the same: Different behaviors have different meanings for different teenagers

Extensive research has now shown that problem behaviors are neither homogeneous nor alike. In a series of studies, Siegel and his colleagues (Lavery, Siegel, & Rubovits, 1993; Shapiro, Siegel & Scovill, 1998; Siegel, Cousins, Rubovits, Parsons, Lavery, & Crowley, 1994) asked adolescents to rate different "problem" behaviors in terms of (a) the frequency of their involvement and (b) how disadvantageous (i.e., "risky") and (c) how advantageous (i.e., "beneficial") the behavior was to them. In terms of rated involvement, the 20 problem behaviors "clustered" into 4–5 statistically distinct factors. Further, different behaviors have different meaning for different adolescents. As Judge Ben Lindsey observed over 70 years ago, the theft of a bar of candy "meant" something different for the son of a wealthy scion than it did for a poor street boy. Finally, while several of the behaviors may be "functionally equivalent" in their meaning to the teenager (e.g., smoking and truancy may both reflect a "middle-finger-up" response to authority), they are not topologically the same. These considerations make questionable the assumption "one size fits all" (i.e., that a single intervention is suitable for all problem behaviors or all adolescents) and imply the necessity to individualize interventions.

Alternative behaviors and activities are essential in reducing adolescent problem behavior

In the studies by Siegel et al. cited above, the best predictor of reported involvement was not how risky, but rather how beneficial, the behavior was perceived to be by the adolescent. Even though the rated risks of the behavior were usually significantly greater than the rated benefits, perceived benefits best predicted involvement. The literature is replete with theories stressing the importance of perceived risk to the decision whether or not to engage in problem behaviors (e.g., Furby & Beyth–Marom, 1992). Yet, at least for these adolescents, the "benefits"—although minimal—seemed to be more crucial. These results have an obvious interpretation: to reduce problem behavior, make available and reinforce alternative positive behaviors.

We need to prevent problem behaviors from reaching Wakefield's (1992) "harmful dysfunction" criterion. Early workers with youth realized this intuitively, if not explicitly. The Reverend Forbush (founder of the Knights of King Arthur and the Ladies of Avalon), Lord Baden–Powell (the Boy Scouts), and Frederick Thrasher realized early on the importance of asking "Why?" and, "What function does it serve?", and "What need does it satisfy?" about problem behaviors. They then went about devising ways to provide adolescents with alternative behaviors and activities with which these needs could be satisfied.

Implications for Social Policy and Research

What can be done to bridge the gap between theory and research and the development of successful intervention strategies?

Take developmental contexts seriously

One answer may be to take more seriously the suggestion to intervene both at the level of the child and at the multiple levels of the child's contexts. In order to do this, however, we must have a firmer grasp of what we mean when we use the term "context." As Siegel and Cohen (1991) have pointed out, in everyday usage the terms "context" and "environment" have been taken as equivalent expressions. But context implies much more than an environment or "behavior setting." Siegel and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cohen asserted that contexts are created by people and, so, are essentially social. Contexts do not exist independently of people, memories, motivation, and meaning. Thus, truly context-sensitive interventions will work, not only to strengthen hurting children but also to strengthen and support the important people who together make up the contexts within which children develop. Truly context-sensitive interventions will strive to understand what various contexts mean from the child's perspective, and will take seriously the challenge to create optimal environments for children replete with nurturing adults, growth-producing events, and the opportunity for successful tomorrows. That we are now beginning to take context seriously is evidenced in the recent Special Issue of this journal entirely devoted to contextualism and developmental psychopathology (Cicchetti & Aber, 1998).

View adolescent misbehavior as striving toward successful completion of developmental tasks

Problem behavior is viewed most productively in its double aspect, as a "double symptom." We need to educate policymakers in this regard. It's all too easy to focus on the negative behaviors that bother and irritate us. To understand the behaviors in any full-blooded sense, we need also to consider the positive aspect of the behavior—what function that behavior is serving or what need that behavior is satisfying. For example, consider teenage smoking in the school restroom, a common "problem behavior." The negative aspects of the "symptom" are obvious: irritating fumes to those around, violation of rules, and so forth. What is the positive aspect? Perhaps smoking in the restroom serves the function (need) of asserting one's independence.

Prior to designing a specific intervention, then, we need to do more than a behavior assessment. We also need to do a "needs" assessment. Risk taking may serve as a pathway to meeting needs that are otherwise blocked or unattainable. Fifteen years ago, Jessor (1984) argued that, when designing intervention programs, substitute behaviors had to be capable of fulfilling functions similar to those of the risk behaviors they were intended to replace (Jessor, 1984). Adolescents, like adults, do things for a reason. Behaviors that adults label "dysfunctional" or "inappropriate" may be the same behaviors that help the adolescent survive in his environment. The adolescent needs to learn more effective, appropriate, alternative methods of dealing with his environment so that he can get his needs met without getting into trouble (Scovill, Scovill, & Timbers, 1987; Takanishi, 1996). In Table 1, we try to articulate a potential set of relationships between functions of risk taking, examples of risk-taking behaviors, and alternative behaviors.

Design teenagers' environments to promote the successful completion of adolescents' developmental tasks and satisfaction of their developmental needs

We do not have currently the methodology to establish causal relationships between environmental factors and delinquency, or between genetic factors and delinquency. As Rutter et al. (1998) have argued:

> Genetic and physiological research has been clear cut in their findings that biological risk factors operate in a probabilistic, not deterministic fashion . . . One of the important (and valid) blocks to an acceptance of biological influences on crime was the implausibility of deterministic causation of a socially and legally defined behavior. . . . There is a small but growing body of evidence suggesting that—although there is a substantial genetic component in both aggressiveness and disruptive or anti-social behavior—in delinquency as such this component is much weaker. (pp. 128, 131)

We propose that, for purposes of social policy, it will be more productive to conceptualize environmental factors as being similarly probabilistic. From this view, then, the overarching goal of social policy is to increase the probability that teenagers will be able to negotiate successfully the tasks involved in becoming a healthy and productive adult (Takanishi, 1996).

We argue here for the promotion of developmental health and developmentally healthy environments. Increasing developmental suc-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. *A potential set of relationships among functions of risk taking, examples of risk taking behaviors, developmentally damaging practices, developmental goals, and alternative behaviors*

Examples of Antisocial or Problem Behaviors	Possible Functions of Behavior (i.e., Outcomes Teens May Be Seeking)	Developmental Task	Developmentally Damaging Practices	Developmentally Healthy Alternatives
Skipping school, disobeying teachers	Expression of frustration with inability to succeed in school setting	Competence	Large schools, high student to teacher ratios in classrooms, ability grouping	Provide individualized programs where youth with a wide range of skills can be successful
Engaging in pseudoadult behaviors such as drinking, drug use, and early sexual activity	Means of coping with anxiety, frustration, and fear of inadequacy—seeking to be recognized as competent, capable, respected through mimicry of pseudoadult peers	Transition to adulthood	Lack of connectedness with adults created by lack of parental presence at home, few opportunities to develop relationships with adults at school or in the community, little one-on-one time with adults	Teach alternative methods for coping with stress, presence of adult role models, opportunities to learn career skills, involvement in mentoring or apprenticeship programs
"Teenage behaviors" (e.g., outrageous clothing, music, use of profanity), violation of minor rules such as curfew, status offenses	Means of making a personal statement (how I'm different, important, angry, etc.) seeking to be recognized as an individual of worth, capable of making a unique contribution	Identity, autonomy, individuation	Targeting of teens as consumer group by media, lack of opportunities for teens to make a positive contribution to family and society	Allow teens to participate in rule making; allow teens to participate in decision making; increase the types of contributions teens can make to society; increase variety of socially sanctioned clubs at school
Joining a gang, involvement with delinquent peers	Means of meeting the need to belong (I want to be part of something)	Intimacy, relationship, building	Lack of opportunities to meet and interact with prosocial peers, coercive family interactions	Teach relationship enhancement skills, conversations skills, empathy skills; provide alternative niches or ecologies with prosocial peers and adults
"Acting out" (e.g., causing trouble at school, getting into fights, making threats, theft, running away)	To be heard or understood; to bring attention to perceived inequity of treatment	Identity, competence, industry	Failure to listen to teens, not allowing teens to participate in rule and decision making, doing things "to" teens rather than "with" them	Provide strong adult role models who listen to teens; teach youth to identify and express anger and other emotions (rational self-talk); teach negotiation skills; include teens in decision making

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Smoking, having sex, drinking, status offenses	Way of asserting/affirming the transition from childhood to adulthood—seeking to be recognized as a person with an opinion that counts; attempting to establish a role for oneself	Transition to adulthood	Double standard of behavior for adults and teens	Create more formalized markers to acknowledge transitions; recognize the cost to children/adolescents when adults fail to "walk the way they talk"
Speeding, riding on the hoods of cars, "sensation seeking" (Zuckerman, 1979)	Way to avoid boredom and seek excitement—seeking a way to not feel put down, ignored or unimportant	Competence	Few community centers, clubs, or other environments where adult monitored youth activities are provided	Develop exciting, adult-monitored activities for adolescents (e.g., midnight basketball)
Playing "chicken" with yourself and others, shoplifting, vandalism	Means of testing personal limits and status—seeking competence, finding something to be "in charge of"	Identity	Few opportunities for teens to succeed and to learn adult skills (e.g., career skills, communication skills) or to make a contribution to society	Create environments where adolescents can gain confidence and excel in something; broaden the scope of what defines success for adolescents beyond academics and sports
Violent behavior, law violations, conduct disorder	Expression of opposition to or outrage at adult authority—seeking control and power over disruptive/unsafe environments	Trust vs. mistrust, safety needs	Failure to protect children from poverty, child abuse, neglect, mistreatment, physiological disadvantages	(Early childhood intervention has been most successful here; prognosis in adolescence is poor)

cess will best reduce problem behavior and delinquency. Risk and protective factors might be best reconceptualized as those factors that deter or promote successful negotiation of developmental tasks. Teenagers' environments, in this scheme, need to be evaluated according to criteria centering on success in developmental tasks.

The environments to which we allocate today's teenagers are not, for the most part, designed to promote successful completion of their developmental tasks. Environments for today's teenagers are lean on the presence of protective factors (e.g., cohesive family relationships, school participation, interested adults, conventional role models, the presence of neighborhood resources, and involvement in school and community organizations) and rich in the presence of risk factors (e.g., poverty, low self-esteem, deviant role models, parent–child conflict, and poor school performance). Today's environments for teenagers meet the needs of adults quite adequately (e.g., maintain economic status quo, control to prevent chaos, structure for bureaucratic purposes, keeping kids off the street and busy). But, for the most part, they fail badly in meeting the needs of the teenagers (e.g., desire for autonomy, learning to deal with self-focus and self-consciousness, needing to know who they are and where they will fit as an adult, concern over developing healthy heterosexual relationships, desire to utilize their increased ability to use abstract reasoning).

For example, Eccles and Midgley (1990) have argued that junior high school environments not only fail to support teens in successful completion of developmental tasks, they work against teen success. Specifically, they argue that junior high schools

> . . . emphasize competition, social comparison, and ability self-assessment at a time of heightened self-focus; they decrease decision making and choice at a time when the desire for control is growing; they emphasize lower level cognitive strategies at a time when the ability to use higher level strategies is increasing; and they disrupt social networks at a time when adolescents are especially concerned with peer relationships and are in special need of close adults relationships outside of the home. (p. 143)

Eccles and Midgley (1990) have argued that junior high schools "ghettoize" early adolescents. They analyzed the changes that teenagers experience as they make the transition from elementary to junior high school—at the height of puberty. They found several patterns of negative environmental changes. As compared to elementary classrooms, junior high school classrooms were characterized by a greater emphasis on teacher control and discipline, a less personal and positive teacher–student relationship, and fewer opportunities for student decision making. According to Simmons and Blyth (1987), adolescents need a safe and intellectually challenging environment if they are to make the shift from adolescence to adulthood successfully. Specifically, teenagers need an environment that provides both a "zone of comfort" *and* challenging opportunities for growth. Research suggests that we are failing to provide such environments for our youth.

Provide alternatives for the positive expression of and satisfaction of developmental needs

We have articulated clearly what we want teenagers to *stop* doing. We have specified a wide range of behaviors in which we *don't* want them to be engaged. In contrast, we have failed to articulate an equally broad landscape of behaviors in which we *do* want them to be engaged. The message teenagers get is "go to school, succeed in school and school-based activities." If adolescents don't succeed in school or don't get involved in school activities, there are few, if any, alternative means to achieve success as a teenager. Note that most risk and protective factors have to do with family and school success. The kids we are losing are kids who have no family support and then fail to connect at school as well. We have few, if any, alternatives for these children. There are virtually no safety nets for children who don't fit into the school success mold. And with schools getting larger and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

larger, more and more children don't fit the mold. More kids are falling through the cracks. We have to do better at providing kids with alternatives. We need to go beyond telling kids what not to do and start telling them what we would like them to do *instead*. Interventions need to clearly articulate, teach, promote, and reinforce alternative behaviors for success. Historically, that was the goal of the clubs, programs, plans, and societies that arose earlier in this century. They provided youth with multiple environments to develop commitment to societal values, to learn long-term goal setting and planning, to develop empathy for others, and to learn effective social problem solving. In addition these clubs provided surveillance and monitoring of teens by caring and invested adults, provided prosocial peer groups, and made available social rewards for engaging in nondelinquent behavior. All of those things are listed by Rutter et al. (1998) as "features inhibiting antisocial behavior."

Think health promotion, not disease prevention

There appear to be different trajectories for entry into antisocial behavior patterns. Kids who get started early get more involved in more serious behavior. The pathway that leads to repeated and severe crimes almost always begins before age 12 years and starts with conflict with authority (Loeber, 1996; Loeber & Stouthamer–Loeber, 1998). Perhaps acting out can be interpreted as an expression of not having constructive ways to meet one's needs. However, these findings also suggest that the two "types" of delinquents might be expressing the same "needs" through different channels: teens who act out early and often engage in minor aggression first, then fighting, and then violent crime. In contrast, teens who prefer more covert ways of acting out lie, shoplift, vandalize, cut school, and progress to fraud, theft, burglary, and more serious crimes. The same small number of LCP delinquents seem not to be "specialists" (i.e., they seem to engage in a variety of antisocial behaviors). Loeber (1996) has argued that children who get involved in delinquency early tend to "stack" their behavior (i.e., add new behaviors to their repertoire of skills). Some of the behaviors develop to support other behaviors (e.g., lying may be a prerequisite to being a successful thief).

Albert Einstein is reputed to have once said, "The significant problems we face cannot be solved at the same level of thinking we were at when we created them." Adopting a new perspective—a positive and proactive one—may be required. Medicine has made substantial progress in reducing the occurrence of heart and lung disease, some types of cancer, and so forth by adopting a strategy of not only telling people what *not* to do (e.g., don't smoke, don't drink in excess, don't eat too much fat) but teaching people what *to* do to increase their health (e.g., eat fruits, vegetables and fiber, exercise, drinks lots of water). The emphasis in the new "health promotion" and "wellness" movements is not to instruct people to avoid disease but rather to encourage them to seek health.

History suggests that we might better accomplish the task of reducing problem behaviors by increasing the likelihood of adolescents' success. That's what Boys' Clubs and the Knights of King Arthur and Ladies of Avalon were all about nearly a century ago. We see several promising moves in this direction today: for example, Emory Cowen's work on resilience, prevention, and wellness promotion in the schools (Cowen, 1996, 1997); Scott Henggeler's multisystemic approach to violence prevention (Henggeler, 1991; Henggeler et al., 1998); and the Fast Track Project for prevention of antisocial behavior in high risk children (Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group, 1999a, 1999b). Recently, Martin Seligman (1998; Peterson, Seligman, Yurko, Martin, & Friedman, 1998) has called for the development of a "positive psychology" and believes that the development of human strengths such as courage, optimism, work ethic, responsibility, future-mindedness, and perseverance could arguably serve as buffers against mental illness. Perhaps the strategy would work when considering problem behavior, the double symptom of adolescence.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

References

Agnew, R. (1985). A revised strain theory of delinquency. *Social Forces, 64,* 151–167.

Alan Guttmacher Institute. (1994). *Sex and America's teenagers.* New York: Author.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (1993). *Kids count data book.* Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy.

Arnett, J. J. (1999). Adolescent storm and stress, reconsidered. *American Psychologist, 54,* 317–326.

Ayres, L. P. (1909). *Laggards in our schools*. New York: Charities Publications Committee.

Bachman, J. G., Johnston, L. D., & O'Malley, P. M. (1996). *Monitoring the future: Questionnaire responses of the nation's high school seniors, 1994.* Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Bailey, B. (1988). *From front porch to back seat*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.

Bakan, D. (1972). Adolescence in America: From idea to social fact. In J. Kagan & R. Coles (Eds.), *Twelve to sixteen: Early adolescence* (pp. 73–89). New York: Norton.

Bartusch, D. R. J., Lynam, D. R., Moffitt, T. E., & Silva, P. A. (1997). Is age important? Testing a general versus a developmental theory of antisocial behavior. *Criminology, 35,* 13–48.

Berndt, T. (1979). Developmental changes in conformity to peers and parents. *Developmental Psychology, 15,* 608–616.

Blum, R. W., & Rinehart, P. M. (1997). *Reducing the risk: Connections that make a difference in the lives of youth.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Printing Services.

Bowlby, J. (1973). *Separation: Anxiety and anger.* New York: Basic Books.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology, 22,* 723–742.

Callahan, R.E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, D.T. (1993). Evolutionary epistemology. In *Methodology and epistemology for social science: Selected papers* (pp. 393–434). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Canada, G. (1995). *Fist, stick, knife, gun: A personal history of violence in America.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Cicchetti, D. (1993). Developmental psychopathology: Reactions, reflections, projections. *Developmental Review, 13,* 471–502.

Cicchetti, D., & Aber, J. L. (1998). Contextualism and developmental psychopathology [Special issue]. *Development and Psychopathology, 10*, 137–141.

Coleman, J.S. (1961). *The adolescent society*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (1999a). Initial impact of the Fast Track prevention trial for conduct problems: I. The high-risk sample. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67,* 631–647.

Conduct Problems Prevention Research Group. (1999b). Initial impact of the Fast Track prevention trial for conduct problems: II. Classroom effects. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67,* 648–657.

Conger, J. J., & Galambos, N. L. (1997). *Adolescence and youth: Psychological development in a changing world* (5th ed.). New York: Longman.

Cowen, E. L. (1996). *School-based prevention for children at risk: The Primary Mental Health Project.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Cowen, E. L. (1997). Schools and the enhancement of children's wellness: Some opportunities and some limiting factors. In R. P. Weissberg & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Healthy children 2010: Establishing preventive services. Issues in children's and families' lives* (Vol. 9, pp. 97–123). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davis, K. (1940). The sociology of parent-youth conflict. *American Sociological Review, 5,* 523–535.

Dewey, J. (1903). Discussion: Shortening the years of elementary schooling. *School Review*, *11*, 17–20.

DiIulio, J. J., Jr. (1994). *Deregulating the public service: Can government be improved?* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Donaldson, S. I., Graham, J. W., Piccinin, A. M., & Hansen, W. B. (1995). Resistance-skills training and onset of alcohol use: Evidence for beneficial and harmful effects in public schools and in private Catholic schools. *Health Psychology, 14,* 291–300.

Douglas, A. A. (Ed.). (1916). *Fifteenth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part III: The Junior High School*. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

Dryfoos, J. G. (1990). *Adolescents at risk: Prevalence and prevention.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide* (J. A. Spalding & G. Simpson, Trans.). New York: Free Press. (Original work published in 1897)

Eccles, J. S., & Midgley, C. (1990). Changes in academic motivation and self-perception during early adolescence. In R. Montemayor, G. R. Adams, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *From childhood to adolescence: A transitional period?* (pp. 134–155). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Elder, G. H. (1974/1999). *Children of the great depression: Social change in life experience*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Elkind, D. (1987, May). The child yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Young Children,* 6–11.

Elliott, D. S., Ageton, S. S., Huizinga, D., Knowles, B. A., & Canter, R. J. (1983). *The prevalence and incidence of delinquent behavior: 1976–1980* (National Youth Survey Report No. 26). Boulder, CO: Behavioral Research Institute.

Erickson, M. F., Sroufe, L. A., & Egeland, B. (1985). The relationship between quality of attachment and behavior problems in preschool in a high-risk sample. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50*(1–2, Serial No. 209), 147–166.

Farrington, D. (1986). Age and crime. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and justice: An annual review* (Vol. 7, pp. 189–250). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fass, P. S. (1977). *The damned and the beautiful: American youth in the 1920s*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1995). *Uniform crime reports for the United States, 1993*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Furby, L., & Beyth–Marom, R. (1992). Risk-taking in adolescence: A decision-making perspective. *Developmental Review, 12,* 1–44.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gelb, S. A. (1990). Degeneracy theory, eugenics, and family studies. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 26,* 242–246.

Glassner, B., Ksander, M., Berg, B., & Johnson, B. (1983). A note on the deterrent effect of juvenile vs. adult jurisdiction. *Social Problems, 31,* 219–221.

Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1950). *Unraveling juvenile delinquency.* New York: Commonwealth Fund.

Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1970). *Toward a typology of juvenile offenders: Implications for therapy and prevention.* New York: Grune & Stratton.

Goldstein, K. (1939). *The organism: A holistic approach to biology derived from pathological data in man.* New York: American Book.

Goldstein, K. (1942). *Aftereffects of brain injuries in war.* New York: Grune & Stratton.

Hall, G. S. (1904). *Adolescence: Its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion, and education* (Vols. I–II). New York: Appleton.

Harris, J. (1998). *The nurture assumption: Why kids turn out the way they do.* New York: Free Press.

Healy, W. J. (1915). *The individual delinquent*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Healy, W. J., & Bronner, A. F. (1926). *Delinquents and criminals: Their making and unmaking*. New York: MacMillan.

Hechinger, F. (1992). *Fateful choices: Healthy youth for the 21st century.* New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Henggeler, S. W. (1989). *Delinquency in adolescence.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Henggeler, S. W. (1991). Multidimensional causal models of delinquent behavior and their implications for treatment. In R. Cohen, & A. W. Siegel, (Eds.), *Context and development* (pp. 211–231). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Henggeler, S. W., Schoenwald, S. K., Borduin, C. M., Rowland, M. D., & Cunningham, P. B. (1998). *Multisystemic treatment of antisocial behavior in children and adolescents.* New York: Guilford Press.

Henry, N. B. (Ed.). (1944). *Forty-third yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I: Adolescence*. Chicago: Department of Education, University of Chicago.

Hill, E. G. (1990). *In the shadow of the mountain: The spirit of the CCC*. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.

Hill, R. F., & Fortenberry, J. D. (1992). Adolescence as a culture-bound syndrome. *Social Science & Medicine, 35,* 72–79.

Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (1983). Age and the explanation of crime. *American Journal of Sociology, 89,* 552–584.

Horn, P. W. (1916). The junior high school in Houston, Texas. *Elementary School Journal*, *26*, 91–95.

Institute of Medicine. (1989). *Research on children and adolescents with mental, behavioral, and developmental disorders.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Jackson, J. H. (1958). Evolution and dissolution of the nervous system (Croonian Lectures). In J. Taylor (Ed.), *The selected writings of John Hughlings Jackson* (Vol. 2, pp. 45–75). New York: Basic Books. (Original work published in 1884)

James, W. (1912). *"The moral equivalent of war" and other essays*. New York: Longmans, Green.

Jessor, R. (1984). Adolescent development and behavioral health. In J. D. Matarazzo, J. A. Herd, N. E. Miller, & S. M. Weiss (Eds.), *Behavioral health.* New York: Wiley.

Jessor, R. (1992). Risk behavior in adolescence: A psychosocial framework for understanding and action. *Developmental Review*, *12*, 374–390.

Jessor, R. (1993). Successful adolescent development among youth in high-risk settings. *American Psychologist*, *48*, 117–126.

Johnson, D. L. (1988). Primary prevention of behavior problems in young children: The Houston Parent–Child Development Center. In E. L. Cowen, R. P. Lorion, & J. Ramos–McKay (Eds.), *Fourteen ounces of prevention: A handbook for practitioners* (pp. 44–52). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Johnston, L. D. (1995, December 15). Drug use rises again in 1995 among American teens [News release]. Ann Arbor: News and Information Services, University of Michigan.

Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., & Bachman, J. G. (1995). *National survey results on drug use from Monitoring the Future Study, 1975–1994: Vol. 1, Secondary school students.* Washington, DC: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Jordan, T. E. (1993). *The degeneracy crisis and Victorian youth*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Judd, C.H. (1916). The junior high school. *School Review*, *23*, 25–33.

Kazdin, A. E. (1993). Adolescent mental health: Prevention and treatment programs. *American Psychologist, 48,* 127–141.

Kett, J. (1977). *Rites of passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the present*. New York: Basic Books.

Lavery, B., Siegel, A. W., & Rubovits, D. S. (1993). Adolescent risk-taking: An analysis of problem behaviors in problem children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 55,* 277–294.

Lazar, F. E. (1994). *From social science to psychosomatic research: The failure of an alliance, 1908–1935*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.

LeBlanc, M. (1993). Late adolescence deceleration of criminal activity and development of self- and social-control. *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention, 2,* 51–68.

Lerner, R. M., &, Tubman, J. G. (1991). Developmental contextualism and the study of early adolescent development. In R. Cohen & A. W. Siegel (Eds.), *Context and development* (pp. 183–210). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Leuchtenburg, W. E. (1958). *The perils of prosperity, 1914–32*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Levine, M., & Levine, A. (1992). *Helping children: A social history* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Loeber, R. (1996). Developmental continuity, change, and pathways in male juvenile problem behaviors and delinquency. In J. D. Hawkins (Ed.), *Delinquency and crime: Current theories* (pp. 1–27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Loeber, R., & Stouthamer–Loeber, M. (1998). Development of juvenile aggression and violence: Some common misconceptions and controversies. *American Psychologist, 53,* 242–259.

Lorenz, K. Z. (1963). *On aggression.* New York: Harcourt Brace.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lorenz, K. Z. (1974). Analogy as a source of knowledge in science. *Science, 185,* 229–234.
Lyman, R. D., & Campbell, N. R. (1996). *Treating children and adolescents in residential and inpatient settings.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Lynd, R. S., & Lynd, H. M. (1937). *Middletown in transition*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
Maggs, J. L., & Galambos, N. L. (1993). Alternative structural models for understanding adolescent problem behavior in two-earner families. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *13*, 79–101.
Males, M. A. (1996). *The scapegoat generation: America's war on adolescents.* Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
Matza, D. (1964). *Delinquency and drift.* New York: Wiley.
McCord, J. (1978). A thirty-year follow-up of treatment effects. *American Psychologist, 33,* 284–289.
McCord, J. (1992). The Cambridge–Somerville study: A pioneering longitudinal–experimental study of delinquency prevention. In J. McCord & R. E. Tremblay (Eds.), *Preventing antisocial behavior: Interventions from birth through adolescence* (pp. 196–232). New York: Guilford Press.
McCord, W., & McCord, J. (1964). *The psychopath: An essay on the criminal mind.* Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.
Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure* (Rev. ed.). London: Free Press of Glencoe.
Merton, R. K. (1964). Anomie, anomia, and social interaction: Contexts of deviant behavior. In M. B. Clinard (Ed.), *Anomie and deviant behavior* (pp. 213–242). New York: Free Press.
Modell, J. (1989). *Into one's own: From youth to adulthood in the United States, 1920–1975*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review, 100,* 674–701.
Muuss, R. E. (1995). *Theories of adolescence* (6th ed.). New York: Random House.
Nagin, D. S., & Land, K. C. (1993). Age, criminal careers, and population heterogeneity: Specification and estimation of a nonparametric, mixed Poisson model. *Criminology, 31,* 327–362.
O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Johnston, L. D. (1989). Period, age, and cohort effects on substance abuse among young Americans: A decade of change, 1976–1986. *American Journal of Public Health, 78,* 1315–1321.
Palladino, G. (1996). *Teenagers: An American history.* New York: Basic Books.
Panel on High-Risk Youth, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council. (1993). *Losing generations: Adolescents in high-risk settings.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys: A social interactional approach.* Eugene, OR: Castalia.
Pendry, E. R., & Hartshorne, H. (1935). *Organizations for youth: Leisure time and character building procedures*. New York: McGraw–Hill.
Peterson, C., Seligman, M. E. P., Yurko, K. H., Martin, L. R., & Friedman, H. S. (1998). Catastrophizing and untimely death. *Psychological Science, 9,* 127–130.
Pickles, A., & Rutter, M. (1991). Statistical and conceptual models of "turning points" in developmental processes. In D. Magnusson, L. R. Bergman, G. Rudinger, & B. Torestad (Eds.), *Problems and methods npin longitudinal research: Stability and change,* (pp 133–165). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Platt, A. M. (1969). *The child savers: The invention of delinquency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Rand, A. (1987). Transitional life events and desistance from delinquency and crime. In M. Wolfgang, T. Thornberry, & R. Figlio (Eds.), *From boy to man, from delinquency to crime* (pp. 134–163). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Reckless, W. C., & Dinitz, S. (1972). *The prevention of juvenile delinquency: An experiment.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
Richters, J. E., & Cicchetti, D. (1993). Mark Twain meets DSM-III-R: Conduct disorder, development, and the concept of harmful dysfunction. *Development and Psychopathology, 5,* 5–29.
Rutter, M., & Giller, H. (1984). *Juvenile delinquency: Trends and perspectives.* New York: Guilford Press.
Rutter, M., Giller, H., & Hagell, A. (1998). *Antisocial behavior by young people.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sampson, R. J., & Laub, J. H. (1993). *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Schlossman, S. L. (1977). *Love and the American delinquent: The theory and practice of "progressive" juvenile justice, 1825–1920*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Schorr, L. B. (1997). *Common purpose: Strengthening families and neighborhoods to rebuild America.* New York: Doubleday.
Scovill, L. C., Scovill, T., & Timbers, B. J. (1987, October). *Child-centered teaching part II: Helping youth meet their needs.* Paper presented at the meetings of the National Teaching Family Association, Fort Worth, TX.
Sears, R. R. (1975). Your ancients revisited: A history of child development. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), *Review of child development research* (Vol. 5, pp. 1–73). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Seligman, M. E. P. (1998, April). Positive social science. *APA Monitor, 29*, 3–8.
Shapiro, R., Siegel, A. W., Scovill, L. C., & Hays, J. (1998). Risk-taking patterns of female adolescents: What they do and why. *Journal of Adolescence, 21,* 143–159.
Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942/1969). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas: A study of rates of delinquency in relation to differential characteristics of local communities in American cities* (Rev. ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Shover, N., & Thompson, C. (1992). Age, differential expectations, and crime desistence. *Criminology, 30,* 89–104.
Siegel, A. W. (1995, April). *Colonizing adolescence: Youth projects of the 1920s and 1930s.* Paper presented at the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.
Siegel, A. W., & Bisanz, J., & Bisanz, G. L. (1983). Developmental analysis: A strategy for the study of psychological change. *Contributions to Human Development, 8,* 53–80.
Siegel, A. W., & Cohen, R. (1991). Why a house is not a home: Constructing contexts for development. In R. Cohen, & A. W. Siegel, (Eds.), *Context and development* (pp. 305–316). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
Siegel, A. W., Cousins, J. H., Rubovits, D. S., Parsons, J. T., Lavery, B., & Crowley, C. L. (1994). Adoles-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cents' perceptions of the benefits and risks of their own risk taking. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 2,* 89–98.

Siegel, L., & Senna, J. (1997). *Juvenile delinquency* (6th ed.). New York: West.

Siegel, A. W., & White, S. H. (1982). The child study movement: Early growth and development of the symbolized child. *Advances in Child Behavior and Development*, *17*, 233–285.

Simmons, R. G., & Blyth, D. A. (1987). *Moving into adolescence: The impact of pubertal change and school context.* Hawthorn, NY: Aldine de Gruylter.

Steinberg, L. (1998). *Adolescence* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw–Hill.

Steiner, G. Y. (1976). *The children's cause*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Stoddard, G. D. (1944). An evaluation of the yearbook. In N. B. Henry, (Ed.), *Forty-third yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I: Adolescence* (pp. 341–349). Chicago: Department of Education, University of Chicago.

Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1978). *Criminology* (10th ed.). New York: Lippincott.

Takanishi, R. (1996). Changing images of adolescents: Rethinking our policies. In E. F. Zigler, S. L. Kagan, & N. W. Hall (Eds.), *Children, families and government* (pp. 256–267). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Thomas, R. M. (1996). *Comparing theories of child development* (4th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Thrasher, F. M. (1927/1963). *The gang*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tryon, C. E. (1944). The adolescent peer culture. In Henry, N. B. (Ed.), *Forty-third yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I: Adolescence* (pp. 217–254). Chicago: Department of Education, University of Chicago.

Ueda, R. (1987). *Avenues to adulthood: The origins of the high school and social mobility in an American suburb*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. (1991). *Adolescent health* (OTA-H-468). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Wakefield, J. C. (1997). When is development disordered? Developmental psychopathology and the harmful dysfunction analysis of mental disorder. *Development and Psychopathology, 9,* 269–290.

Werner, E. E. (1989, April). Children of the garden island. *Scientific American,* 106–111.

White, S. H. (1999). *Developmental psychology in a world of designed institutions*. Invited address, Biennial Meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, Albuquerque, NM.

Wolkind, S., & Rutter, M. (1985). Separation, loss and family relationships. In M. Rutter & L. Hersov (Eds.), *Child and adolescent psychiatry: Modern approaches* (pp. 34–57). Oxford: Blackwell Scientific.

Yoshikawa, H. (1994). Prevention as cumulative protection: Effects of early family support and education on chronic delinquency and its risks. *Psychological Bulletin, 115,* 28–54.

Zahn–Waxler, C. (1993). Warriors and worriers: Gender and psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology, 5,* 79–89.

Zigler, E. F., Kagan, S. L., & Hall, N. W. (Eds.). (1996). *Children, families, and government: Preparing for the twenty-first century*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zigler, E. F., & Styfco, S. (1996). Head Start and early childhood intervention: The changing course of social science and social policy. In E. F. Zigler, S. L. Kagan, & N. W. Hall (Eds.), *Children, families, and government: Preparing for twenty-first century* (pp. 132–155). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zoccolillo, M. (1993). Gender and the development of conduct disorder. *Development and Psychopathology, 5,* 65–78.

Zuckerman, M. (1979). *Sensation seeking: Beyond the optimal level of arousal.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004119 Published online by Cambridge University Press