



ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.



Public Safety
Canada

Sécurité publique
Canada



www.publicsafety.gc.ca/ncpc

www.securitepublique.gc.ca/cnpc

Funding priorities under the National Crime Prevention Strategy

Fall 2012

NATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION CENTRE / CENTRE NATIONAL DE PRÉVENTION DU CRIME

Canada

Published by:

National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC)
Public Safety Canada
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
K1A 0P8

Visit the Public Safety Website and add your name to the NCPC Mailing List:
www.publicsafety.gc.ca/NCPC

Catalogue number: PS114-7/2012E-PDF
ISBN: 978-1-100-21193-0

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2012

This material may be freely reproduced for non-commercial purposes provided that the source is acknowledged.

La présente publication est aussi disponible en français. Elle s'intitule : Priorités de financement dans le cadre de la Stratégie nationale pour la prévention du crime- 2012.

Table of Contents

NATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION STRATEGY'S MANDATE.....	2
1. PREVENTING VIOLENCE AMONG YOUTH AGED 12 TO 17 YEARS	3
1.1 Background	3
1.1.1 Definition.....	3
1.1.2 Context.....	3
1.1.3 Rationale	4
1.2 Risk factors for youth violence	5
2. PREVENTING ABORIGINAL YOUTH DELINQUENCY IN URBAN CENTRES	8
2.1 Background	8
2.1.1 Definition.....	8
2.1.2 Context.....	8
2.1.3 Rationale	9
2.2 Risk factors for Aboriginal youth delinquency	10
3. PREVENTING SCHOOL-BASED BULLYING	12
3.1 Background	12
3.1.1 Definition.....	12
3.1.2 Context.....	12
3.1.3 Rationale	13
3.2 Risk factors for school-based bullying.....	14
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	16

National Crime Prevention Strategy's Mandate

The National Crime Prevention Centre's mission is to:

provide national leadership on effective and cost-efficient ways to both prevent and reduce crime by addressing known risk factors in high-risk populations and places.

The National Crime Prevention Strategy (NCPS) provides leadership in developing the Canadian-made knowledge base of what is effective in reducing and preventing crime. In doing so, the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC) supports the implementation and evaluation of model and promising programs to determine their effectiveness in achieving positive outcomes, particularly with regards to the prevention of offending behaviour among the populations most at-risk of delinquency. This knowledge is made available to communities, other levels of government, and crime prevention stakeholders to inform decisions regarding how to invest limited crime prevention resources.

However, given finite resources and diverse priorities, there is a need to strategically allocate NCPS funds. To that end, the NCPC must strike a balance between (a) focusing efforts on areas/communities that have pressing, demonstrable crime prevention needs; (b) addressing knowledge gaps in the repertoire of effective, evidence-based prevention/intervention programs, (c) supporting the public safety initiatives of federal and provincial/territorial governments, and (d) considering issues of program sustainability and/or capacity of organizations to deliver and maintain programs for the target population.

With this in mind, the NCPC has identified key issues for the 2012 Crime Prevention Action Fund (CPAF) call for proposals:

- Preventing violence among youth aged 12 to 17 years;
- Preventing Aboriginal youth delinquency in urban centres; and
- Preventing school-based bullying.

The following sections provide an in-depth look at these thematic areas, and examine the context and rationale for why they have been identified as priorities for the National Crime Prevention Strategy.

1. Preventing violence among youth aged 12 to 17 years

1.1 Background

1.1.1 Definition

According to the World Health Organization (2002), youth violence is defined as,

*the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, exerted by or against children, adolescents or young adults, ages 10–29, which results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation.*¹

In Canada, the Public Health Agency of Canada (2005) defines youth violence as:

*any intentional physical, sexual or psychological assault on another person (or persons) by one or more young people aged 12 to 19 years of age.*²

For the purposes of the CPAF call for proposals, the NCPC will retain the following definition:

any intentional physical, sexual or psychological assault on another person (or persons) meant to cause injury, committed by, or against, young people aged 12 to 17 years of age.

1.1.2 Context

(a) Canadian statistics

Police-reported rates of offending tend to be higher among youth and young adults, typically peaking at the age of 18 years. There is a negative relationship between age and crime, such that as age increases, crime rates decrease.³

The volume and severity of youth violent crime has declined slightly over the past decade (from 2001 to 2011), despite increases in the rates of youth accused of homicide or hate crime. For example, from 2001-2011, there has been a decrease (12%) in the youth violent crime rate (from 1,984 to 1,756 per 100,000). Over the same period, there has been a small decrease (3%) in the severity of youth violent crime, from a Youth Violent Crime Severity Index (CSI) of 91.4 in 2001 to 88.6 in 2011.⁴ The greatest volume of, and the most severe, youth violent crimes tend to occur in the Northern territories, and the Prairie provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.⁵

In general, youth tend to commit non-violent crime. Of the 135,647 youth accused of a crime in 2011, 30% (42,799) were accused of a violent crime. This represents approximately 1.8% of the total youth population aged 12 to 17 years.^{6, 7} In 2010-11, only 27% (14,084) of all youth court cases (total: 52,904) were violent offences. Since 2000-01, the number of youth court cases

involving violent offences/crimes against the person has decreased by 19%.^{8, 9}

(b) Characteristics of youth violent crime

Police-reported violent crimes committed by youth is more likely to occur in or around private residences (34%), outdoor public spaces (25%), and schools (23%).¹⁰

Youth tend to commit violent offences (e.g., physical assault, sexual assault, and robbery) with slightly greater frequency on weekdays (15-17%) than on weekends (10-12%). On weekdays, the peak time for violent youth crime to occur was between the hours of 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. (24%), followed by noon and 3 p.m. (21%). On weekends, however, violent police-reported youth crime tended to transpire somewhat later in the day, typically in the evening from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m. (19%) and from 9 p.m. to midnight (19%).¹¹

Youths tend to victimize young people of about the same age who are known to them. In 2008, about 6 in 10 victims of a youth crime were children or youth under the age of 18.¹² Additionally, physical assaults of teens were most often perpetrated by their peers (44% for 12 to 14 year olds, 43% for 15 to 17 year olds).¹³

Assaults against children and youth under 18 typically do not involve the use of a weapon. When injuries were sustained, they were most often the result of physical force (47%) rather than a weapon (15%).¹⁴ In 2006, around 5% of all Criminal Code violations committed by youth involved a weapon, most commonly a knife.¹⁵

More recent statistics have found that youth accused of committing a violent offence are more likely than adults to use a firearm. In 2010, police reported 1,013 youth accused of a firearm-related violent offence, accounting for 2.4% of all youth accused of violence. This was higher than the proportion of adults who had committed a violent firearm offence (1.6%).¹⁶

The number of youth accused of a firearm-related violent crime has generally increased between 2001 and 2007, except for a decrease of 15% in 2004. Between 2007 and 2010, the number has decreased by 32%. The rates during this period have shown similar trends with a decrease of 29% between 2007 and 2010. The overall firearm-related violent crime rates for youth were driven primarily by robberies, which comprised just over half of all violent crimes committed with a firearm by youth.¹⁷

1.1.3 Rationale

Given that most of youth crime is non-violent, why should there be a focus on youth violence?

First, chronic violent offending, although relatively rare (approximately 14% of the population of male delinquents, and 2% of the population of female delinquents¹⁸), is associated with long-term offending trajectories.

Most chronic offenders do not commit violent acts, although a substantial proportion of violent delinquents are also chronic offenders. For example, samples of youth from United States (U.S.) have revealed that approximately 29-36% of chronic offenders are also violent offenders, but an estimated 45-53% of violent offenders are chronic offenders. Further, the majority of chronic and violent offenders are also involved in serious albeit nonviolent offending.^{19, 20}

Among youth classified as violent delinquents, 53% progress to adult offending. This proportion increases to 63% for violent and frequent youth offenders.²¹ Thus, a way to reduce future chronic violence and criminality is to invest in targeted programs designed to reduce and prevent violent offending behaviour in the first place.

Second, these violent, chronic offenders impose long term consequences to society in terms of future offending patterns, as well as short and long term financial and social costs related to victimization, health care costs, criminal justice expenditures, loss of earnings due to incarceration, fear of crime and so on.

According to the World Health Organization (2002), youth violence has serious negative impacts on individuals, families, communities and societies:

*Homicide and non-fatal assaults involving young people contribute greatly to the global burden of premature death, injury and disability. Youth violence deeply harms not only its victims, but also their families, friends and communities. Its effects are seen not only in death, illness and disability, but also in terms of the quality of life. Violence involving young people adds greatly to the costs of health and welfare services, reduces productivity, decreases the value of property, disrupts a range of essential services and generally undermines the fabric of society.*²²

These impacts, which may manifest in the form of physical, psychological, social or economic costs, have the potential to unfold throughout the lifetime. In the United States, for example, the Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (2008) estimates that the cost of youth violence exceeds \$158 billion each year.²³

1.2 Risk factors for youth violence

Researchers^{24, 25, 26} in the area of developmental criminology have identified a number of risk factors that predict future violent behaviour in youth. Typically, these factors²⁷ are organized into five categories - individual, family, school, peers, and community/neighbourhood, for example:

(a) Individual factors

An example of an individual risk factor for violence is early aggressive/violent behaviour. Boys between the ages of 6 and 13 years who engage in aggressive behaviour are more likely to commit violent acts as adolescents and adults. In fact, young male offenders whose first offence involves violence will participate in more violent offences throughout adolescence and adulthood than non-violent young offenders.²⁸ Other individual risk factors include: hyperactivity, difficulty concentrating, risk-taking behaviour and general antisocial behaviour (e.g, substance abuse). Antisocial attitudes (e.g., pro-violence, pro-aggression, hostility towards authority) also predict later violence in young males.

One of the major predictors of serious and violent offender careers in the adolescent and young adult years is the age of onset of delinquency. Offenders who begin their delinquency at a very early age (age 10 and under) have criminal careers of greater duration, that also extend further into their lifecourse. These individuals will commit more offences and have higher individual offending rates, and their offences will tend to be more serious and more violent than those of late onset offenders.²⁹

(b) Family factors

Children whose parents have been arrested are more likely to commit violent crimes. Additionally, parents who model physically aggressive, and generally antisocial, behaviour promote the use of violence as an appropriate problem solving strategy. Children who have been physically abused and/or neglected are more likely than others to commit violent crimes in adolescence and adulthood.

Similarly, children of parents who employ coercive or hostile parenting strategies are more likely to be physically aggressive in childhood and maintain this pattern of behaviour throughout their lives. Furthermore, lack of parental supervision, inconsistent discipline and extreme punitiveness all predict future convictions for violent crimes against others. Chronic exposure to family conflict and/or domestic violence increases the chance that children will be violent themselves later in life, with family dysfunction being one of the most significant predictors of future violence.³⁰

(c) School factors

In the school environment, low levels of achievement predict general delinquency in youth as well as later involvement in violence for boys. Moreover, children who exhibit early behavioural problems are disruptive in classroom settings and are typically rejected by their peers making it more likely they will associate with other antisocial children who have also been rejected. Low commitment to school and lack of educational goals also puts children at increased risk of violence. Youth with poor school attendance who eventually drop out of school are at increased risk of engaging in violent acts as adults.³¹

(d) Peer factors

Socializing with other youth who engage in delinquent behaviour increases one's risk of becoming involved in violent crime. Likewise, belonging to a gang contributes to violent crime even more than delinquent peers, because gang-related operations (i.e. initiation, robbery, territory enforcement) often involve the commission of violent crimes³².

(e) Community/neighbourhood factors

Children who are chronically exposed to community violence, particularly involving firearms, are at higher risk of engaging in violent acts themselves. Chronic exposure to violence is associated with symptoms of depression and anxiety as well as the perpetration of violence. The presence of crime, drugs, guns, and gangs in the community also predicts greater involvement in violent crime; as does other community members' involvement in violent crime.³³ Last, but not least, neighbourhood disadvantage (e.g., high rates of poverty, unemployment) is also associated with an increased likelihood of youth violence.³⁴

The risk factors associated with violence are similar to those factors related to general antisocial behaviour, and in fact, there is much overlap in risk factors between violent delinquency and general delinquency. This comes as no surprise, considering that violent behaviour is itself considered antisocial.

Once a young person is identified as presenting certain risk factors, it is important to intervene as early as possible in order to prevent the young person from embarking on a serious, long-term, criminal career. Given that the risk of committing a physically violent crime is highest from mid-adolescence to early adulthood, and that adult violent crimes are generally linked to a history of youth violence, reducing youth violence would also reduce the incidence of adult violence.³⁵

2. Preventing Aboriginal youth delinquency in urban centres

2.1 Background

2.1.1 Definition

The NCPC will define preventing Aboriginal youth delinquency in urban population centres as,

preventing children and youth, ages 6 to 17, who live in medium and large population centres³⁶ (with populations of over 30,000) from committing antisocial, deviant, and/or criminal acts.

2.1.2 Context

(a) The Aboriginal population in Canada

In Canada, the number of people who self-identify as Aboriginal is growing. Between 1996 and 2006, this population saw an overall increase of 45%, a rate almost six times faster than the 8% increase in the non-Aboriginal population.³⁷ This growth is especially apparent in urban areas where there is an increasing number of Aboriginal people migrating to cities.

According to Statistics Canada, almost 28% of Aboriginal people live in 10 of the nation's largest cities and the growth has more than doubled in most of these cities, and in some cases has tripled.³⁸

As of 2006, half of the Aboriginal population in Canada lived in urban centres³⁹ (including large cities or census metropolitan areas and smaller urban centres), up from 47% in 1996. In turn, the proportion of the Aboriginal population that lives on-reserve or in rural (off-reserve) locations has declined.⁴⁰

In some western cities, including Winnipeg, Regina, Saskatoon and Edmonton, Aboriginal people make up a substantial portion of the population (between 5% and 10%). And in cities where Aboriginal populations are smaller, such as in Toronto and Montreal, their numbers have increased by 30% and 60%, respectively, between 2001 and 2006.⁴¹

The Aboriginal population in Canada is younger than the non-Aboriginal population. Half (48%) of Aboriginal people in Canada are children and young people under 24 years of age, a much higher proportion than the 31% of the non-Aboriginal population. This proportion is particularly high in Regina and Saskatoon, which have more than half (56% and 55% respectively) of their Aboriginal populations aged 24 or younger.⁴²

Furthermore, urban Aboriginal youth are the fastest growing segment of the Aboriginal

population in Canada. By 2026, the number of 15–19 year old Aboriginal youth is projected to be 37% larger than in 2001, compared to 6% for the same age group in the general population.⁴³

(b) Characteristics of Aboriginal youth offending

Within the delinquent population, the proportion of chronic offenders is higher for Aboriginal (19%) offenders as compared to Non-Aboriginal offenders (12%). However, Aboriginal young offenders may embark on serious and persistent criminal careers slightly earlier than their non-Aboriginal counterparts.⁴⁴

Aboriginal youth continue to be highly overrepresented in youth corrections. Although representing only 6% of Canada's youth population, Aboriginal youth accounted for 25% of youth admitted to remand, 33% admitted to sentenced custody, and 21% admitted to probation in 2007-08. The increase in the overall rate of admission to remand in Canada between 2004-2005 and 2007-2008 from 23% to 25% is largely explained by increase in remand, among Aboriginals in Manitoba and. Among admissions to sentenced custody, the greatest increases in the representation of Aboriginal youth were in New Brunswick (from 6% to 11%), Ontario (from 10% to 14%) and Manitoba (from 80% to 84%).⁴⁵

Currently, there are no existing nation-wide studies in Canada that have explicitly explored the link between urban Aboriginal populations and crime. However, there is some expectation that increasing numbers of Aboriginal youth are moving to cities, which, when compounded with marginalization, may lead to disproportionately high rates of offending and victimization in those regions.

2.1.3 Rationale

Compared to their non-Aboriginal counterparts, Aboriginal youth are often faced with situations of extreme marginality and vulnerability due to poverty, homelessness and intergenerational impacts of residential schooling, effects of placement in foster care, and substance abuse.⁴⁶ These factors may increase the risk that those youth engage in deviant and antisocial acts.

The reality is that the pressing needs of Aboriginal people in urban areas are in part associated with the growing numbers and the make-up of the population (young population), which have led to urgent demands from Aboriginal people for new frameworks of governance and calls for negotiations about new structures, programs, projects and policies.⁴⁷

2.2 Risk factors for Aboriginal youth delinquency

Over the years, studies have indicated that Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal youth share many of the same risk factors for delinquency.⁴⁸ However, there is a subset of risk factors which may be more predictive of Aboriginal youth delinquency:

(a) Individual factors

Offending patterns in Aboriginal youth offenders may be particularly affected by substance abuse problems, with Aboriginal juvenile probationers who experience major problems in terms of their consumption of alcohol/drugs being more likely to be chronic offenders.⁴⁹ Furthermore, the presence of Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD) in the Aboriginal population appears to increase the likelihood of criminal involvement.⁵⁰

(b) Family factors

Among Aboriginal youth who were in custody in Canada, high incarceration rates appear to be related to a series of interrelated factors, such as high rates of poverty, substance abuse, and victimization, which in turn leads to family breakdowns.⁵¹

Furthermore, an examination of Native/Métis youth offenders in Calgary reveals that often, families are negative sources of socialization due to greater incidences of family breakdown, abuse, and familial criminality. Given this volatility, Native/Métis youth experience a breakdown in socialization in other areas of life (e.g., school) and are less likely to be susceptible to the external constraints of social rules and norms. With a lack of pro-social bonds and external constraints, Native/Métis youth may be more likely to be drawn to negative sources of socialization, such as gangs and negative peers, and more likely to be involved in criminal activity.⁵²

Moreover, research specific to urban Aboriginal populations demonstrates that exposure to family violence as a child can lead to increased associations with the criminal justice system in later juvenile or adult life⁵³. In general, this research has shown that individuals who experienced exposure to factors such as childhood disadvantage, child abuse, contact with parental drinking and/or violence, often lead adult lives disproportionately affected by many similar problems, including victimization and involvement in the criminal justice system.^{54, 55}

(c) School factors

Poor educational attainment may also be a possible risk factor for deviant and antisocial activity among Aboriginal youth offenders. A recent Calgary study found that Native/Métis youth had poor school attendance, struggled with behavioural issues, and were more likely to be

suspended and use a weapon at school. They also had the highest incidence of being bullied in school.⁵⁶

(d) Peer factors

Negative peer associations are more predictive of a chronic-high offending trajectory for Aboriginal juvenile probationers compared to their non-Aboriginal counterparts.⁵⁷ In addition, the peer support, interaction, status, and protection that gangs provide make gang involvement an attractive option for Aboriginal youth who are struggling with self-identity and are having difficulty connecting with their Aboriginal culture.⁵⁸

(e) Community/neighbourhood factors

The fact that Aboriginal people are more disadvantaged and disproportionately concentrated in high-crime areas (such as inner cores of central metropolitan areas) may mean that they are more likely to engage in deviant activities, for both demographic and socioeconomic reasons. Even Aboriginal communities close to, or on the border of, urban centres do not generate as much Aboriginal crime as these inner city areas.⁵⁹ In inner cities, Aboriginal people are generally not connected to their families, culture and communities, live in disadvantaged conditions, are poor, and have low skill and education levels.

3. Preventing school-based bullying

3.1 Background

3.1.1 Definition

Bullying is a form of school violence and is defined as,

*acts of intentional harm, repeated over-time, in a relationship where an imbalance of power exists.*⁶⁰

Bullying can include physical (e.g., punching, kicking), verbal/written (e.g., threats, name calling) and psychological/social (e.g., intimidation, exclusion) aggression, as well as sexual, racial and/or cultural harassment. It is also important to note that bullying behaviours may be expressed through different means (e.g., cyber-bullying), and can range from mild to severe.⁶¹

3.1.2 Context

Bullying in Canada has become a growing concern and an important issue for many jurisdictions. This, in part, is due to a number of high profile cases of teen suicides, where bullying was considered a contributing factor.

Estimates of the prevalence of bullying at Canadian schools vary anywhere from 6 to 30%, and the frequency of bullying incidents vary as well.^{62, 63, 64} Approximately one in seven boys between the ages of 4 and 11 (14%) bully others, whereas girl bullies in the same age group are about one in 11 (9%).⁶⁵ In comparison to boys, adolescent girls tend to engage in indirect, social or relational aggression⁶⁶ (e.g., gossiping, slandering name calling) rather than physical aggression.⁶⁷

In Canada, data from the 2010 Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children (HBSC) indicates that the proportion of students who report engaging in bullying behaviour has declined very slightly, from 15% in 2002 to 12% in 2010. However, over the same period, the number of bully-victims (youth who both bullied others and were victimized) remained relatively constant at approximately 40%.⁶⁸ In 2011, among a sample of 9,288 students in grades 7-12 in Ontario, 29% reported being bullied at school, while 21% admitted to bullying other students.⁶⁹

Recently, two provinces have implemented bullying strategies (British Columbia and Saskatchewan), while other jurisdictions have enacted anti-bullying legislation for schools (Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba and Nova Scotia) or are in the process of examining bullying-related bills (Alberta, Prince-Edward-Island and Northwest Territories). Although provinces and territories have a key role to play to implement measures that would address bullying, this issue has elicited discussions on the potential role of the federal government in this domain.

Although a number of bullying programs are being implemented in schools across Canada, very few have been rigorously evaluated. This speaks to the reality that there is currently a lack of knowledge of what works in reducing/preventing bullying in Canada. Schools, however, cannot be expected to address this social problem alone. In efforts to reduce bullying, schools need the supportive attitudes and responses of all systems in which children live: at home, in sports and extracurricular activities, in recreation centres, in the neighbourhood and in the larger society, including the media.

3.1.3 Rationale

Children and adolescents who bully are more likely to also be involved in delinquent behaviour. For example, self-report delinquency studies reveal that compared to boys who never or infrequently bully, boys who engage in frequent bullying are eight times more likely to report delinquent behaviour (5% vs. 40% respectively). A similar trend is evident for girls, with those who bully frequently being 10 times more likely to report being involved in delinquent acts.⁷⁰

Children who bully may also later engage in sexual harassment behaviours, become involved in gang-related behaviours, abuse substances, carry weapons, engage in date violence or family abuse (marital, child, elder).^{71, 72, 73, 74 75} Thus, bullying behaviour may be an indicator of a general violent and aggressive behaviour pattern, and so, efforts to prevent bullying have the potential to decrease violence among adolescents in the community as well.⁷⁶

Longitudinal research indicates that bullying behaviour during childhood is closely associated with antisocial behaviour in adolescence and adulthood, and predictive of criminal violence, and contact with police and courts at later ages.^{77, 78, 79, 80, 81} Bullies are 37% more likely to commit offences as adults,⁸² and even up to 11 years after being a bully, the probability of offending is much higher for school bullies than for non-involved students.⁸³

Other research has revealed that even after controlling for childhood risk factors, bullying at age 14 is a predictor of violent convictions between ages 15 and 20, self-reported violence at ages 15 to 18, low job status at age 18, drug use at ages 27 to 32, and an unsuccessful life at age 48.⁸⁴ In Canada, bullies are twice as likely to receive a criminal conviction than non-bullies, even when adjusted for age, gender and other risk factors.⁸⁵

Thus, the prevention of bullying behaviour in children and youth is an important factor for reducing the likelihood of future delinquent and criminal activity.

3.2 Risk factors for school-based bullying

The literature on risk factors for bullying is rather sparse, and there are few empirically determined risk factors for school bullying that have been demonstrated consistently.⁸⁶ However, the research thus far, in addition to the established relationship between bullying and later delinquency, suggest that many of the risk factors associated with antisocial and delinquent acts also apply to bullying behaviours. Some risk factors that have been investigated thus far include:

(a) Individual factors

Children who bully tend to have aggressive personalities and have developed antisocial attitudes that are tolerant of aggression.⁸⁷ They also tend to engage in proactive aggression from an early age.⁸⁸ Low self-control and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) are also associated with bullying behaviour, as are higher levels of callous-unemotional traits and conduct problems.^{89, 90} Among the range of individual risk factors, impulsivity and low (affective) empathy appear to be the most associated with bullying.⁹¹

(b) Family factors

Children whose parents provide little emotional support and supervision, and/or who have scarce involvement in their lives, are at greater risk for engaging in bullying behaviour. An extremely permissive or excessively harsh disciplinary approach can also increase the risk of bullying.⁹² In addition, low parental socio-economic status is linked with bullying.⁹³

Bullying is especially prevalent among children who have experienced maltreatment by caregivers, particularly physical or sexual abuse.⁹⁴ Witnessing domestic violence by the age of 5 year is also associated with bullying behaviour.⁹⁵ Lastly, a history of family involvement with Child Protective Services has been linked to bullying behaviour in girls, but not boys.⁹⁶

(c) School factors

Youth who feel disconnected from their academic institutions are more likely to engage in antisocial behaviour such as bullying and peer aggression. Research has also found that students who attend schools with high rates of conflict, and who perceive a lack of social support and nurturing from teachers, faculty, administration, and other students are more likely to be bullies.⁹⁷

(d) Peer factors

Negative peer-related variables, such as having peers who are delinquent or gang-involved, are risk factors for bullying behaviour. Children whose friends participated in aggressive behaviour were more likely to engage in bullying behaviour.⁹⁸ Bullies are also strongly disliked by their peers, although not marginalized.⁹⁹

(e) Community/neighbourhood factors

Children who report having access to guns and who have neighbourhood safety concerns are more likely to be bullies. This may be as a result to being exposed to criminal elements (e.g., gang shootings) or other acts of antisociality or aggression.¹⁰⁰

Bibliography

- Andershad, H., Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2001). Bullying in school and violence on the streets: Are the same people involved? *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology & Crime Prevention*, 2(1), 31-49.
- Artz, S., Nicholson, D., & Magnuson, D. (2008). Examining sex differences in the use of direct and indirect aggression. *Gender Issues*, 25, 267–288.
- Bender, D., & Lösel, F. (2011). Bullying at school as a predictor of delinquency, violence and other anti-social behaviour in adulthood. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 21(2), 99-106.
- Bowes, L., Arseneault, L., Maughan, B., Taylor, A., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T.E. (2009). School, neighborhood, and family factors are associated with children's bullying involvement: A nationally representative longitudinal study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 48(5), 545-553.
- Bracken, D.C., Deane, L., & Morrissette, L. (2009). Desistance and social marginalization: The case of Canadian Aboriginal offenders. *Theoretical criminology*, 13(61), 61-78.
- Brennan, S. (2012a). *Police reported crime statistics - 2011*. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Brennan, S. (2012b). *Youth court statistics in Canada 2010/11*. Juristat article. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Centre for Addiction and Mental Health. (2011). *Ontario Student Drug Use and Health Survey (OSDUHS)*. Available at: www.camh.net/research/osdus.html (as of August 8, 2012).
- Centre for Disease Control and Prevention. (2008). Understanding youth violence. Available from <http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/yvfactsheet.pdf> (as of July 23, 2012).
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (undated). Available from <http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/youthviolence/riskprotectivefactors.html> (as of May 10, 2012).
- Charach, A., Pepler, D.J., & Ziegler, S. (1995). Bullying at school: A Canadian perspective. *Education Canada*, 35, 12-18.
- Craig, W.M., Peters, R.D., & Konarski, R. (1998). *Bullying and victimization among Canadian school children*. Working Paper Series - Applied Research Branch. Hull, QC: Human Resources Development Canada.
- Christie, C.A., Nelson, C.M., & Jolivet, K. (2005). *Prevention of antisocial and violent behavior in youth: A review of the literature*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky.
- DeCoster, S., Heimer, K., & Wittrock, S. M. (2006). Neighborhood disadvantage, social capital, street context, and youth violence. *The Sociology Quarterly*, 47, 723-753.
- EnviroNics Institute (2010). *Urban Aboriginal peoples study: Main report*. Toronto, ON: EnviroNics Institute.
- Espelage, D.L., Bosworth, K., & Simon, T.R. (2000). Examining the social context of bullying behaviors in early adolescence. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 78(3), 326-333.
- Falb, K.L., McCauley, H.L., Decker, M.R., Gupta, J., Raj, A., & Silverman, J.G. (2011). School bullying perpetration and other childhood risk factors as predictors of adult intimate partner violence perpetration. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 165(10),

- 890-894.
- Farrington, D.P. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.) *Crime and Justice, Vol 17*, (pp. 381-458). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Farrington, D.P., & Baldry, A. (2010). Individual risk factors for school bullying. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 2*(1), 4-16.
- Farrington, D.P., & Ttofi, M.M. (2011). Bullying as a predictor of offending, violence and later life outcomes. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 21*(2), 90–98.
- Freeman, J.G., King, M., Pickett, W., Craig, W., Elgar, F., Janssen, I., & Klinger, D. (2011). *The health of Canada's young people: A mental health focus*. Ottawa, ON: Public Health Agency of Canada.
- Grekul, J., & Sanderson, K. (2011). "‘I thought people would be mean and shout.’ Introducing the Hobbema Community Cadet Corps: A response to youth gang involvement?" *Journal of Youth Studies, 14*(1), 41-57.
- Hawkins, J.D., Herrenkohl, T.I., Farrington, D.P., Brewer, D., Catalano, R.F., Harachi, T.W., & Cothorn, L. (2000, April). *Predictors of Youth Violence*. Juvenile Justice Bulletin, Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Harris, S., Petrie, G., & Willoughby, W. (2002). *Bullying among 9th graders: An exploratory study*. Youth and violence factsheet - NASSP Bulletin, 86, 1630. Ottawa, ON: Public Health Agency of Canada.
- Herrenkohl, T.I., Maguin, E., Hill, K.G., Hawkins, J.D., Abbott, R.D., & Catalano, R.F. (2000). Developmental risk factors for youth violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 26*, 176-186.
- Homel, J.B. (2009). *Pathways from school bullying to adult aggression: A longitudinal study*. PhD thesis. Australian National University.
- Holmes, S., & Brandenburg-Ayres, S. (1998). Bullying behavior in school: A predictor of later gang involvement. *Journal of Gang Research, 5*(2), 1-6.
- Hull, J. (2008). Hope or heartbreak: Aboriginal youth and Canada's future: Aboriginal youth in the Canadian labour market. *Horizons, 10*(1), 40-44.
- Jansen, D.E.M.C., Veenstra, R., Ormel, J., Verhulst, F.C., & Reijneveld, S.A. (2011). Early risk factors for being a bully, victim, or bully/victim in late elementary and early secondary education. The longitudinal TRAILS study. *BMC Public Health, 11*, 440-446.
- Jiang, D., Walsh, M., & Augimeri, L.K. (2011). The linkage between childhood bullying behaviour and future offending. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health, 21*(2), 128-135.
- La Prairie, C. (1992). *Dimensions of Aboriginal over-representation in correctional institutions and implications for crime prevention*. Aboriginal People Collection. Ottawa, ON: Solicitor General Canada.
- La Prairie, C. (1994). *Seen but not heard: Native people in the inner city*. Ottawa, ON: Department of Justice.
- La Prairie, C. (2002). Aboriginal over-representation in the criminal justice system: A tale of nine cities. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 44*(2), 181-208.
- La Prairie, C., & Stenning, P. (2003). Exile on Main Street: Some thoughts on Aboriginal over-representation in the criminal justice system. In D. Newhouse & E. Peters (Eds.), *Not*

- strangers in these parts: Urban Aboriginal people* (pp. 179-193). Ottawa, ON: Policy Research Initiative.
- Latimer, J., & Foss, L.C. (2004). *A one-day snapshot of Aboriginal youth in custody across Canada: Phase II*. Ottawa, ON: Research and Statistics Division, Department of Justice Canada. Available from <http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/rs/rep-rap/2004/yj2-ij2/yj2.pdf> (as of August 8, 2012).
- Leschied, A. W., Cummings, A. L., Van Brunschot, M., Cunningham, A., & Saunders, A. (2000). *Female adolescent aggression: A review of the literature and the correlates of aggression*. Ottawa, ON: Solicitor General of Canada.
- Loeber, R., Van Kammen, W.B., & Fletcher, M. (1996). *Serious, violent, and chronic offenders in the Pittsburgh Youth Study: Unpublished data*. Pittsburgh, PA: Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic.
- Ludwig, K.A., & Warren, J.S. (2009). Community violence, school-related protective factors, and psychosocial outcomes in urban youth. *Psychology in the Schools*, 36(10), 1061-1073.
- Kempf-Leonard, K., Tracy, P.E., & Howell, J.C. (2001). Serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders: The relationship of delinquency career types to adult criminality. *Justice Quarterly*, 18(3), 449-478.
- Krohn, M.D., Thornberry, T.P., Rivera, C., Le Blanc, M. (2001). Later delinquency careers. In R. Loeber and D.P. Farrington (Eds.), *Child Delinquents: Development, Intervention, and Service* (p. 67-94). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kong, R. (2009). Youth custody and community services in Canada, 2007/2008. *Juristat*, 29(2). Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. Available from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2009002/article/10846-eng.pdf>
- Krug, E.G., Dahlberg, L.L., Mercy, J.A., Zwi, A.B., & Lozano, R. (2002). *World report on violence and health: Youth violence (Chapter 2)*. Available from the World Health Organization at http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/world_report/e (as of July 23, 2012).
- MacRae-Krisa, L.D., Bertrand, L.D., & Costello, M. (2011). *Risk and protective factors among an ethnically diverse sample of youth offenders in Calgary*. Calgary, AB: Mount Royal University Centre for Criminology & Justice Research.
- Marini, Z., Dane, A.V., & Bosacki, S.L. (2006). Direct and indirect bully-victims: differential psychosocial risk factors associated with adolescents involved in bullying and victimization. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32(6), 551-569.
- Mazerolle, P., Piquero, A., & Brame, R. (2010). Violent onset offenders: Do initial experiences shape criminal career dimensions? *International Criminal Justice Review*, 20(2), 132-146.
- McMullen, K. (2005). Aboriginal peoples in Canada's urban area: Narrowing the education gap. *Education Matters: Insights on Education, Learning and Training in Canada*, 2(3). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Min, J.K., Catalano, R.F., Haggerty, K., & Abbott, R.D. (2011). Bullying at elementary school and problem behaviour in young adulthood: A study of bullying, violence and substance use from age 11 to age 21. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 21(2), 136-144.
- Mohapatra, S., Irving, H., Paglia-Boak, A., Wekerle, C., Adlaf, E., & Rehm, J. (2010). History of

- family involvement with Child Protective Services as a risk factor for bullying in Ontario schools. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 15(3), 157–163.
- Monchalin, L. (2012). *Reducing crime affecting urban Aboriginal people: The potential for effective solutions in Winnipeg*. PhD thesis. University of Ottawa.
- Montreal Urban Aboriginal Community Strategy Network (2012). *Report: The Aboriginal justice research project*. Montreal, QC: International Centre for the Prevention of Crime.
- Mouttapa, M., Valente, T., Gallaher, P., Rohrbach, L.A., & Unger, J.B. (2004). Social network predictors of bullying and victimization. *Adolescence*, 39(154), 315-335.
- Nansel, T.R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R.S., Ruan, W J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among U.S. youth. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 16, 2094–2100.
- O'Connell, P., Sedighdeilami, F., Pepler, D.J., Craig, W., Connolly, J., Atlas, R., Smith, C., and Charach, A. (1997). *Prevalence of bullying and victimization among Canadian elementary and middle school children*. Available from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED427834.pdf> (as of May 19, 2011).
- Ogrodnik, L. (2010). *Child and youth victims of police-reported violent crime - 2008* (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics Profile Series). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Olweus, D., Limber, S. P., & Mihalic, S. (1999). *The Bullying Prevention Program: Blueprints for Violence Prevention, Vol. 10*. Boulder, CO: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.
- Pepler, D.J., & Craig, W.M. (2000). *Making a difference in bullying*. LaMarsh Research Report #60. Toronto, ON: LaMarsh Centre for Research on Violence and Conflict Resolution.
- Public Health Agency of Canada. (2005). *Youth and violence factsheet*. Available at Archives Canada http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/webarchives/20061104211543/http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/ncfv-cnivf/familyviolence/html/nfntsyjviolence_e.html (as of July 23, 2012).
- Renda, J., Vassallo, S., & Edwards, B. (2011). Bullying in early adolescence and its association with anti-social behaviour, criminality and violence 6 and 10 years later. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 21(2), 117-127.
- Rojas, E.Y., & Gretton, H.M. (2007). Background, offence characteristics, and criminal outcomes of Aboriginal youth who sexually offend: A closer look at Aboriginal youth intervention needs. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 19(3), 257-283.
- Shields, A., & Cicchetti, D. (2001). Parental maltreatment and emotion dysregulation as risk factors for bullying and victimization in middle childhood. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 30(3), 349-363.
- Smith, P.K., & Thompson, D. (1991). *Practical approaches to bullying*. Great Britain: David Fulton Publishers.
- Sourander, A., Brunstein Klomek, A., Kumpulainen, K., Puustjärvi, A., Elonheimo, H., Ristkari, T., Tamminen, T., Moilanen, I., Piha, J., & Ronning, J.A. (2011). Bullying at age eight and criminality in adulthood: Findings from the Finnish Nationwide 1981 Birth Cohort Study.

- Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 46(12), 1211-1219.
- Statistics Canada. (2008). *Youth crime — 2006*. The Daily.
- Statistics Canada. (2011). Personal communication, data requested by the National Crime Prevention Centre, Public Safety Canada.
- Snyder, H.N. (1998). Serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders: An assessment of the extent of and trends in officially recognized serious criminal behavior in a delinquent population. In R. Loeber and D.P. Farrington (Eds.), *Serious and violent juvenile offenders* (p. 428-444). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Taylor-Butts, A. (2010). Where and when youth commit police-reported crimes – 2008. *Juristat* 30(2). Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada.
- Tremblay, R.E. (2007). The development of youth violence: An old story with new data. *European Journal of Criminal Policy Research*, 13, 161-170.
- Ttofi, M.M., Farrington, .P., Lösel, F., & Loeber, R. (2011). The predictive efficiency of school bullying versus later offending: A systematic/meta-analytic review of longitudinal studies. *Criminal Behaviour & Mental Health*, 21(2), 80-89.
- Unnever, J., & Cornell, D. G. (2003). Bullying, self control, and ADHD. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 129-147.
- Van der Wal, M. F., de Wit, C. A. M., & Hirasing, R.A. (2003). Psychosocial health among young victims and offenders of direct and indirect bullying. *Pediatrics*, 111, 1312-1317.
- Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehinkel, A.J., De Winter, A.F., Verhulst, F.C., & Ormel, J. (2005). Bullying and victimization in elementary schools: A comparison of bullies, victims, bully/victims, and uninvolved preadolescents. *Developmental psychology*, 41(4), 672-682.
- Viding, E., Simmonds, E., Petrides, K.V., & Frederickson, N. (2009). The contribution of callous-unemotional traits and conduct problems to bullying in early adolescence. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry*, 50(4), 471-481.
- Volk, A., Craig, W., Boyce, W., & King, M. (2003, May). "Adolescent risk correlates of bullying and different types of victimization". Poster presented at the World Congress on Child and Youth Health, Vancouver, May 2003.
- Williams, K., Rivera, L., Neighbours, R., & Reznik, V. (2007). Youth violence prevention comes of age: Research, training and future directions. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 28, 195-211.
- Yessine, A.K., & Bonta, J. (2009). The offending trajectories of youthful Aboriginal offenders. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 51(4), 435-472.

Endnotes

¹ Krug et al (2002).

² Public Health Agency of Canada (2005).

³ Brennan (2012a).

⁴ Ibid.

-
- ⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷ CANSIM table 051-0001
- ⁸ Brennan (2012b).
- ⁹ Data table: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2012001/article/11645/c-g/desc/desc01-eng.htm>
- ¹⁰ Taylor-Butts (2010).
- ¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹² Ibid.
- ¹³ Ogrodnik (2010).
- ¹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁵ Statistics Canada (2008).
- ¹⁶ Statistics Canada (2011).
- ¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸ Kempf-Leonard et al (2001).
- ¹⁹ Snyder (1998).
- ²⁰ Loeber et al (1996).
- ²¹ Kempf-Leonard et al (2001).
- ²² Krug et al (2002).
- ²³ Centre for Disease Control and Prevention. (2008).
- ²⁴ Hawkins et al (2000, April).
- ²⁵ Herrenkohl et al (2000).
- ²⁶ Williams et al (2007).
- ²⁷ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (undated).
- ²⁸ Mazerolle et al (2010).
- ²⁹ Krohn et al (2001).
- ³⁰ Tremblay (2007).
- ³¹ Ibid.
- ³² Grekul & Sanderson (2011).
- ³³ Ludwig & Warren (2009).
- ³⁴ DeCoster et al (2006).
- ³⁵ Tremblay (2007).
- ³⁶ This definition is from Statistic Canada. For more information, consult (<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/subjects-sujets/standard-norme/sgc-cgt/urban-urbain-eng.htm>)
- ³⁷ Environics Institute (2010).
- ³⁸ McMullen (2005).
- ³⁹ According to Statistics Canada, an urban area is defined as having a population of at least 1,000 and a density of 400 or more people per square kilometre.
- ⁴⁰ Environics Institute (2010).
- ⁴¹ Ibid.
- ⁴² Ibid.
- ⁴³ Hull (2008)
- ⁴⁴ Yessine & Bonta (2009).
- ⁴⁵ Kong (2009).
- ⁴⁶ La Prairie (1994).
- ⁴⁷ Montreal Urban Aboriginal Community Strategy Network (2012).
- ⁴⁸ Yessine & Bonta (2009).
- ⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰ Rojas & Gretton (2007).
- ⁵¹ Latimer & Foss (2004).
- ⁵² MacRae-Krisa et al (2011).
- ⁵³ La Prairie (1994).
-

-
- ⁵⁴ La Prairie (1992; 1994; 2002).
⁵⁵ Monchalín (2012).
⁵⁶ MacRae-Krisa et al (2011).
⁵⁷ Yessine & Bonta (2009).
⁵⁸ Bracken et al (2009).
⁵⁹ La Prairie & Stenning (2003).
⁶⁰ Pepler & Craig (2000).
⁶¹ Ibid.
⁶² Charach et al (1995).
⁶³ O'Connell et al (1997).
⁶⁴ Volk et al (2003, May).
⁶⁵ Craig et al (1998).
⁶⁶ For further definitions of indirect, social and relational aggression, see Artz et al (2008).
⁶⁷ Leschied et al (2000).
⁶⁸ Freeman et al (2011).
⁶⁹ Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (2011).
⁷⁰ Van der Wal et al (2003).
⁷¹ Pepler & Craig (2000)
⁷² Holmes & Brandenburg-Ayres (1998).
⁷³ Andershad et al (2001).
⁷⁴ Falb et al (2011).
⁷⁵ Min et al (2011).
⁷⁶ Falb et al (2011).
⁷⁷ Farrington (1993).
⁷⁸ Homel (2009).
⁷⁹ Sourander et al (2011).
⁸⁰ Renda et al (2011).
⁸¹ Bender & Lösel (2011).
⁸² Olweus et al (1999).
⁸³ Ttofi et al (2011).
⁸⁴ Farrington & Ttofi (2011).
⁸⁵ Jiang et al. (2011).
⁸⁶ Farrington & Baldry (2010).
⁸⁷ Marini et al (2006).
⁸⁸ Olweus (1993).
⁸⁹ Unnever & Cornell (2003)..
⁹⁰ Viding et al (2009).
⁹¹ Farrington & Baldry (2010).
⁹² Olweus (1993).
⁹³ Jansen et al (2011).
⁹⁴ Shields & Cicchetti (2001).
⁹⁵ Bowes et al (2009).
⁹⁶ Mohapatra et al (2010).
⁹⁷ Nansel et al (2001).
⁹⁸ Mouttapa et al (2004).
⁹⁹ Veenstra et al (2005).
¹⁰⁰ Espelage et al (2000).