

Comparisons Included in this Clinical Question

Group based cognitive and behavioural intervention versus control	Multi-component intervention versus control
GUERRA1990 LEEMAN1993 OSTROM1971 PULLEN1996 ROHDE2004 SCHLICHTER1981 SHIVRATTAN1988 SPENCE1981	DEMBO2000 ELROD1992 GREENWOOD1993

Characteristics of Included Studies

Methods	Participants	Outcomes	Interventions	Notes
<p>DEMBO2000</p> <p>Study Type: RCT</p> <p>Type of Analysis: Completers</p> <p>Blindness: Open</p> <p>Duration (days): Mean 70</p> <p>Followup: 12-month</p> <p>Setting: US, Florida Community</p>	<p>n= 303</p> <p>Age: Mean 15 Range 11-18</p> <p>Sex: 166 males 137 females</p> <p>Diagnosis: 100% Offending history by Court referred</p> <p>Exclusions: - youths not processed at the Hillsborough County Juvenile Assessment Center arrested on misdemeanor or felony charges</p>	<p>Data Used</p> <p>Arrest, any (12 months)</p>	<p>Group 1 N= 149</p> <p>Multidimensional intervention - Family empowerment intervention. 3 x 1 hour family meetings per week for 10 weeks. 24 hour/7 days a week access to youth support staff. Field consultants not trained therapists.</p> <p>Group 2 N= 154</p> <p>Control - Extended services. 24 hour/7 days a week access to youth support staff.</p>	
<p>Results from this paper:</p> <p>1.1 Adequately addressed</p> <p>1.2 Not reported</p> <p>1.3 Not addressed</p> <p>1.4 Not addressed</p> <p>1.5 Not reported</p> <p>1.6 Not addressed</p> <p>1.7 Adequately addressed</p> <p>1.8</p> <p>1.9 Not addressed</p> <p>1.10 Not addressed</p> <p>2.1 +</p>				
<p>ELROD1992</p> <p>Study Type: RCT</p> <p>Blindness:</p> <p>Duration (days): Mean 90</p> <p>Followup: 24-month</p> <p>Setting: Probation</p> <p>Notes: Details on randomisation not reported.</p> <p>Info on Screening Process: Subjects had been placed on probation for committing a variety of delinquent and/or status offences (i.e. running</p>	<p>n= 43</p> <p>Age: Mean 15 Range 12-17</p> <p>Sex: 33 males 10 females</p> <p>Diagnosis:</p> <p>Exclusions: - none reported</p> <p>Baseline: No statistical test performed however before intervention, treatment group committed 74 criminal offences and 88 status offences versus the control group who committed 98 criminal offenses and 56 status offenses.</p>	<p>Data Used</p> <p>Offences, status (up to 24 months)</p> <p>Offences, criminal (up to 24 months)</p> <p>Notes: TAKEN: during intervention (up to 3 months) and after intervention (up to 24 months).</p>	<p>Group 1 N= 22</p> <p>Multidimensional intervention - Components: wilderness, social skills training and parent skills training. Delivered by probation staff.</p> <p>Group 2 N= 21</p> <p>TAU - Standard probation.</p>	

away from home).				
<p>Results from this paper:</p> <p>1.1. Poorly addressed 1.2 Not reported 1.3 Not addressed 1.4 Not addressed 1.5 Not addressed 1.6 Not addressed 1.7 Well covered 1.8 None reported 1.9 Not addressed 1.10 Not applicable</p> <p>2.1 +</p>				
<p>GREENWOOD1993</p> <p>Study Type: RCT</p> <p>Type of Analysis: All with data; sub-analysis of completers</p> <p>Blindness: Open</p> <p>Duration (days): Mean 365</p> <p>Followup: 12-month</p> <p>Setting: US Residential</p> <p>Notes: Details on randomisation not reported.</p> <p>Info on Screening Process: Details not provided.</p>	<p>n= 150</p> <p>Age: Mean 17</p> <p>Sex: all males</p> <p>Diagnosis: 100% Juvenile offenders</p> <p>Exclusions: - female - < 15 years old - not committed to the Ohio Department of Youth Services (DYS) for a class 1 or 2 felony from 1 of 17 counties in the southwest part of the state - not certified as eligible for assignment to the Paint Creek Youth Center</p> <p>Notes: Youths in the study were about twice as likely to be convicted of a violent offence as a general DYS population i.e. more serious class of offender than general juvenile population.</p> <p>Baseline: Not statistically significant however a higher percentage of treatment youths were on probation at the time of their most recent arrests (42.7% vs. 31.3%) and averaged more prior convictions (3.1 vs 2.6) and placements (1.0 vs 0.6) than youths receiving TAU.</p>	<p>Data Used</p> <p>Incarceration, any (12 months)</p> <p>Arrest, any (12 months)</p> <p>Notes: TAKEN AT: pre-, post and 12-month post release. DROP OUTS: 2 (1 was still on placement and 1 absent without leave). 12-month official arrest records collected for 148/150 participants.</p>	<p>Group 1 N= 75</p> <p>Multi-modal residential intervention - 30-35 youths; close supervision; no locked facilities; clear incentives for positive behaviour - punishment of negative behaviour; CBT; daily group sessions; family group therapy (x2 monthly); intensive community reintegration + aftercare.</p> <p>Group 2 N= 74</p> <p>TAU - Two residential facilities in the same state; heavy emphasis on education + vocational training. Group and individual counselling provided at staff's discretion.</p>	
<p>Results from this paper:</p> <p>1.1 Well covered 1.2 Not reported 1.3 Not addressed 1.4 Not addressed 1.5 Well covered 1.6 Not reported 1.7 Well covered 1.8 1.3% in total 1.9 Not addressed 1.10 Not applicable</p> <p>2.1 +</p>				
<p>GUERRA1990</p> <p>Study Type: RCT</p> <p>Type of Analysis: Completers*</p> <p>Blindness: Open</p> <p>Duration (days): Mean 84</p>	<p>n= 120</p> <p>Age: Mean 17 Range 15-18</p> <p>Sex: 60 males 60 females</p>	<p>Data Used</p> <p>Parole violations (up to 24 months)</p>	<p>Group 1 N= 40</p> <p>Cognitive mediation training - 12 weekly 1 hour sessions. Group therapy (10-14 youths). Delivered by graduate students. Content: social solving problem skills, cognitive self-control and modification of</p>	

<p>Followup: 24-month</p> <p>Setting: US, Residential</p> <p>Notes: Details on randomisation not reported.</p> <p>Info on Screening Process: 196 juveniles met criteria; 171 willing to participate; 165 participated in pretest sessions = randomised; *126/165 completed both intervention + follow-up. 6/165 randomly deselected to avoid oversized groups.</p>	<p>Diagnosis: 100% Juvenile offenders</p> <p>Exclusions: - not between the ages of 15 - 18 - reading level of grade 6 or lower - learning disability - a parole date of less than 6 months - no previous offence for antisocial aggression</p>	<p>Notes: TAKEN AT: pre- and post-intervention and 24-month follow-up. DROP OUTS: recidivism data available for 81/120 as 39 still in institution or could not be located.RECIDIVISM: only reported parole violations.</p>	<p>beliefs that support aggression.</p> <p>Group 2 N= 40</p> <p>Control - Attention control. 12 weekly 1 hour sessions. Group therapy. Content: exercise of basic skills i.e. reading or maths and application of these skills to career preparation.</p> <p>Group 3 N= 40</p> <p>No treatment - Only participated in pre- and post-testing.</p>	
<p>Results from this paper:</p> <p>1.1 Well covered 1.2 Not reported 1.3 Not addressed 1.4 Not addressed 1.5 Well covered 1.6 Not addressed 1.7 Well covered 1.8 Not reported 1.9 Not addressed 1.10 Not applicable</p> <p>2.1 +</p>				
<p>LEEMAN1993</p> <p>Study Type: RCT</p> <p>Blindness:</p> <p>Duration (days): Mean 180</p> <p>Followup: 12-month</p> <p>Setting: US Institution (Prison)</p>	<p>n= 57</p> <p>Age: Mean 16 Range 15-18</p> <p>Sex: all males</p> <p>Diagnosis: 100% Juvenile offenders</p> <p>Exclusions: Newly admitted youths who were committed on a 90-day parole-revocation basis</p> <p>Baseline: No between group differences on behavioural-outcome variables</p>	<p>Data Used</p> <p>Institutional misconduct - self report Institutional misconduct - incident reports Recidivism</p> <p>Notes: TAKEN AT: pre- and post-assessment after completion of the programme and before release and recidivism taken at post-release, 12 months in the community.</p>	<p>Group 1 N= 18</p> <p>Multi-component - Youth-run small group treatment where individuals help others and themselves. Groups of 8-10 that meet for 1 - 1 1/2 hour, 5 days a week. Social skills training, anger management training and moral education.</p> <p>Group 2 N= 36</p> <p>Control - Received different instructions during or following pre-test. Simple controls were told that the tests were for the purpose of research on delinquency; motivational controls received a 5 min motivational induction before pre-test.</p>	
<p>Results from this paper:</p> <p>1.1 Well covered 1.2 Not reported 1.3 Not addressed 1.4 Not addressed 1.5 Well covered 1.6 Not addressed 1.7 Well covered 1.8 1.9 Not addressed 1.10 Not applicable</p> <p>2.1 +</p>				
<p>OSTROM1971</p> <p>Study Type: RCT</p> <p>Blindness:</p> <p>Duration (days): Mean 60</p>	<p>n= 38</p> <p>Age:</p> <p>Sex: all males</p>	<p>Data Used</p> <p>Arrests</p>	<p>Group 1 N= 19</p> <p>Behaviour Therapy - Monetary reinforcement for attendance and group participation. Role playing (RP) taking role of others i.e. parents/victims/police. Goal</p>	

<p>Setting: US Community (Probation)</p> <p>Notes: Matched (length probation, age, race, probation officer) 1:1& randomly assigned to treatment/control. No further details provided.</p>	<p>Diagnosis: 100% Juvenile offenders</p> <p>Exclusions: - not on probation within the previous 12 months - not having their probation scheduled to continue through the duration of the study - not arrested for felonious crimes other than sex, violent assault and drug offences - not between 15 and 16</p>	<p>Notes: TAKEN AT: 10-month period since trial inception. DROP OUTS: 1 died in treatment arm</p>	<p>of RP is to increase resistance to engage in delinquent behavior through moral dilemma. 7x2 hour sessions/2-months.</p> <p>Group 2 N= 19 TAU - Regular probations services.</p>	
---	--	---	---	--

Results from this paper:

1.1 Adequately addressed
1.2 Not reported
1.3 Not addressed
1.4 Not addressed
1.5 Adequately addressed [inclusion criteria & then matched but do not provide baseline data on characteristics]
1.6 Not addressed
1.7 Adequately addressed [query where also consider misbehaviour at school as bad outcome]
1.8 0%
1.9 Not applicable
1.10 Not applicable

2.1 +

<p>PULLEN1996</p> <p>Study Type: RCT</p> <p>Blindness: Open Duration (days):</p> <p>Setting: US, Colorado Probation (four sites)</p> <p>Notes: Every other juvenile sentenced to ISP was assigned to treatment. 3 cases bypassed randomisation because of their need for treatment.</p> <p>Info on Screening Process: Details not reported.</p>	<p>n= 40 Age: Mean 16 Sex: all males</p> <p>Diagnosis: 100% Juvenile offenders</p> <p>Exclusions: - if juveniles were not considered appropriate for placement in the programme as assessed when sentenced to the Colorado Intensive Supervision Program (ISP).</p> <p>Baseline: In the control group 40% vs 20% were more likely to be committed for a violent offence.</p>	<p>Data Used Recidivism (up to 10 months) Technical violation (up to 10 months) New crime (up to 10 months)</p> <p>Notes: TAKEN AT: recidivism measured before, during and 12 months after randomisation. DROP OUTS: 1 treatment group cancelled due to attrition (data not included). RECIDIVISM: new crime or technical violation.</p>	<p>Group 1 N= 20 Reasoning and Rehabilitation - Delivered by probation officers.35, 90-120 min session. Group therapy. Ideally a minimum of 2 sessions per week.</p> <p>Group 2 N= 20 TAU - Intensive Supervision Program but without the cognitive intervention.</p>	<p>Funded by the National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Results from this paper:

1.1 Well covered
1.2 Poorly addressed
1.3 Not addressed
1.4 Not addressed
1.5 Poorly addressed
1.6 Not addressed
1.7 Well covered
1.8 None reported
1.9 Not applicable
1.10 Not addressed

2.1 +

<p>ROHDE2004</p> <p>Study Type: RCT</p> <p>Type of Analysis: Completers</p> <p>Blindness: Open Duration (days): Mean 56</p>	<p>n= 76 Age: Mean 17 Range 12-22 Sex: all males</p> <p>Diagnosis:</p>	<p>Data Used Youth Self-report</p>	<p>Group 1 N= 46 Cognitive Problem Solving Skills Training - Coping Course for 8 weeks. Skills training in a number of areas: social skills, relaxation, cognitive restructuring, problem solving. In addition, incentives</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

Setting: US Juvenile Institution Notes: random number table used to assign participants to groups	100% Juvenile offenders Exclusions: - scheduled for release before end of programme - extreme concentration or behavioural problems	Notes: TAKEN AT: pre- and post-intervention	were provided for appropriate in-session behaviour and completion of homework. Group therapy. Group 2 N= 30 Control - Usual care treatment i.e. drug/alcohol, sex offender groups.
---	---	---	--

<p>Results from this paper:</p> <p>1.1 Adequately addressed 1.2 Adequately addressed 1.3 Not reported adequately 1.4 Not addressed 1.5 Not addressed 1.6 Adequately addressed 1.7 Adequately addressed 1.8 Not reported 1.9 Adequately addressed 1.10 Not applicable</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>SCHLICHTER1981</p> <p>Study Type: RCT</p> <p>Blindness:</p> <p>Duration (days): Mean 35</p> <p>Setting: 40 most difficult youth invited; 38 agreed; 11 dropouts (28.9%)</p>	<p>n= 27</p> <p>Age: Range 13-18</p> <p>Sex: all males</p> <p>Diagnosis: Juvenile offenders</p> <p>Exclusions: - not committed for an indefinite term to a correctional facility in the northeaster US - did not have preinstitutional histories of verbal and/or physical aggression - not nominated by 2 independent youth workers as exhibiting significant anger-control problems within the institution</p>	<p>Data Used</p> <p>Institutional misconduct - incident reports</p>	<p>Group 1 N= 10</p> <p>Anger management - Education, analyzing anger episodes, self-monitoring, coping skills, self-instructions, relaxation, assertive responding.</p> <p>Group 2 N= 8</p> <p>Control - Relaxation only; no modeling of coping skills or alternative responses took place.</p> <p>Group 3 N= 9</p> <p>No treatment</p>
---	--	--	---

<p>Results from this paper:</p> <p>1.1 Poorly addressed 1.2 Not reported 1.3 Not addressed 1.4 Poorly addressed 1.5 Adequately addressed 1.6 Not addressed 1.7 Well covered 1.8 Total: 28.9% 1.9 Not addressed 1.10 Not applicable</p> <p>2.1 +</p>			
---	--	--	--

<p>SHIVRATTAN1988</p> <p>Study Type: RCT</p> <p>Blindness: Open</p> <p>Duration (days):</p> <p>Followup: 12 -15 months</p> <p>Setting: CANADA, Ontario Juvenile residential facility for incarcerated youths</p> <p>Notes: Details on randomisation not reported.</p>	<p>n= 45</p> <p>Age: Range 15-17</p> <p>Sex: all males</p> <p>Diagnosis: 100% Juvenile offenders</p> <p>Exclusions: - if the youth was unable to remain in the facilities for the duration of the experiment.</p>	<p>Data Used</p> <p>Recidivism (12-15 months)</p>	<p>Group 1 N= 14</p> <p>Social Interaction Skills Program - 8 x 1 hour sessions. Individual therapy. Students asked to recall past experiences, identify the aversive social stimulus and follow systematic desensitisation using imagery techniques & cognitive reappraisal.</p>
--	---	--	--

Info on Screening Process: Details not reported.	Baseline: No significant test calculated.	Notes: TAKEN AT: recidivism investigated during 12-15 months post-release from institution DROPOUTS: 1/15 (social interaction skills programme); 1/15 (stress management); 0/15 (TAU). RECIDIVISM: sentenced + engaged in criminal activity+ waiting apprehension.	Group 2 N= 14 Stress Management - 8 x 1H sessions. Individual therapy. Teaches progressive relaxation as a means of reducing stress. Group 3 N= 15 No treatment - Did not receive either interventions.	
--	---	--	--	--

Results from this paper:

1.1 Well covered
 1.2 Not reported
 1.3 Not addressed
 1.4 Poorly addressed
 1.5 Poorly addressed
 1.6 Not addressed
 1.7 Well covered
 1.8 6.6% (social interaction skills program); 6.6% (stress management); 0% (TAU)
 1.9 Not addressed
 1.10 Not applicable

2.1 +

SPENCE1981 Study Type: RCT Blindness: Duration (days): Mean 42 Setting: UK Juvenile Institution	n= 76 Age: Range 10-16 Sex: all males Diagnosis: 100% Juvenile offenders Exclusions: - not offenders	Data Used Recidivism	Group 1 N= 32 Social skills training - Social skills training for 6 weeks. Use of instructions, modelling, discussion in order to teach various social skills e.g. eye contact, listening skills, accepting criticism, dealing with the police. Group 2 N= 20 Control - Attention control Group 3 N= 24 No treatment	
---	---	--------------------------------	--	--

Results from this paper:

1.1 Adequately addressed
 1.2 Adequately addressed
 1.3 Not adequately reported
 1.4 Not addressed
 1.5 Adequately addressed
 1.6 Adequately addressed
 1.7 Adequately addressed
 1.8 Not adequately reported
 1.9 Adequately addressed
 1.10 Not applicable

2.1+

Characteristics of Excluded Studies

Reference ID	Reason for Exclusion
BARTON1990	Intervention: not relevant [intensive supervision]
BERGER1978	Intervention: not relevant [volunteer programme]
BOTTCHER2005	Intervention: not relevant
BURNETTE1997	Paper is a highly abbreviated extract from a master's thesis

CALDWELL2005	Design: non-RCT
CHANDLER1973	Design: non-RCT
COOK1992	Design: non-RCT
DAVIDSON1987	Intervention: not relevant [court diversion]
FAGAN1990	Data
FOSTER2004	Design: non-RCT
FRIEDMAN2002	Method: does not report data for control group.
GARRIDO1991	Data: not extractable
GLICK1987	Data: not extractable
GOLDSTEIN1989	Method: does not report whether it is an RCT
GOLDSTEIN2007	Method: 5/12 participated in post-treatment assessment
HAWKINS1991	Outcome: not relevant
JOHNSON1983	Data: not extractable
LAWRENCE1999	Outcomes: not relevant
LEE1978	Quality: insufficient information to allow for an adequate quality assessment
LITTLE2004	Intervention: not relevant [intensive supervision + volunteer services]
NUGENT1997	Design: non-RCT
OLLENDICK1979	Quality: insufficient reporting of information; N is less than 10
PATRICK2004	Intervention: not relevant [court diversion]
PIERCY1976	Design: non-RCT
ROSENKOETTER1980	Design: non-RCT
ROSS1976	Method: not an intervention paper
SALAZAR2006	Outcome: not relevant
SCHNEIDER1986	Intervention: not relevant [restitution]
SPENCE1980	Outcomes: not relevant
STRONG1988	Outcomes: not relevant; intervention: not relevant

References of Included Studies

DEMBO2000 (Published Data Only)

Dembo, R., Ramirez-Garnica, G., Rollie, M.W., et al. (2000) Impact of a family empowerment intervention on youth recidivism. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 30, 59-98.

*Dembo, R., Ramirez-Garnica, G., Rollie, M., et al. (2000) Youth recidivism twelve months after a family empowerment intervention: final report. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 31, 29-65.

ELROD1992 (Published Data Only)

Elrod, H.P. & Minor, K.I. (1992) Second wave evaluation of a multi-faceted intervention for juvenile court probationers. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 36, 247-262.

GREENWOOD1993 (Published Data Only)

Greenwood, P.W. & Turner, S. (1993) Evaluation of the Paint Creek Youth Center: a residential program for serious delinquents. *Criminology*, 31, 263-279.

GUERRA1990 (Published Data Only)

Guerra, N.G. & Slaby, R.G. (1990) Cognitive mediators of aggression in adolescent offenders: 2. intervention. *Developmental Psychology*, 26, 269-277.

LEEMAN1993 (Published Data Only)

Leeman, L.W. (1993) Evaluation of a multi-component group treatment program for juvenile delinquents. *Aggressive Behavior*, 19, 281-292.

OSTROM1971 (Published Data Only)

Ostrom, T.M., Steele, C.M. Rosenblood, L.K., et al. (1971) Modification of delinquent behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1, 118-136.

PULLEN1996 (Published Data Only)

Pullen, S., English, K., Woodward, B., et al. (1996) Evaluation of the Reasoning and Rehabilitation Cognitive Skills Development Program as Implemented in Juvenile ISP in Colorado. Colorado: U.S. Department of Justice.

ROHDE2004 (Published Data Only)

Rohde, P., Jorgensen, J.S., Seeley, J.R., et al. (2004) Pilot evaluation of the coping course: a cognitive-behavioral intervention to enhance coping skills in incarcerated youth. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 43, 669-676.

SCHLICHTER1981

Schlichter, K.F. & Horan, J.J. (1981) Effects of stress inoculation on the anger and aggression management skills of institutionalized juvenile delinquents. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 5, 359-365.

SHIVRATTAN1988 (Published Data Only)

Shivrattan, J.L. (1988) Social interactional training and incarcerated juvenile delinquents. *Canadian Journal of Criminology/Revue Canadienne de Criminologie*, 30, 145-163.

SPENCE1981 (Published Data Only)

Spence, S.H. & Marziller, J.S. (1981) Social skills training with adolescent male offenders - II. Short term, long term and generalized effects. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 19, 349-368.

References of Excluded Studies

BARTON1990 (Published Data Only)

Barton, W.H. & Butts, J.A. (1990) Viable options: intensive supervision programs for juvenile delinquents. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 238-256.

BERGER1978 (Published Data Only)

Berger, R.J. (1978) An evaluation of a juvenile court volunteer program. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 6, 328-333.

BOTTCHER2005 (Published Data Only)

Bottcher, J. & Ezell, M.E. (2005) Examining the effectiveness of boot camps: a randomized experiment with a long-term follow-up. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42, 309-332.

BURNETTE1997

Burnett, W.L. (1997) Treating post-incarcerated offenders with moral reconnection therapy®: A one-year recidivism study. *Cognitive-Behavioral Treatment Review*, 6, 2.

CALDWELL2005 (Published Data Only)

Caldwell, M.F & Van Rybroek, G.J. (2005) Reducing violence in serious juvenile offenders using intensive treatment. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 28, 622-636.

CHANDLER1973

Chandler, M.J. (1973) Egocentrism and antisocial behavior: the assessment and training of social perspective-taking skills. *Developmental Psychology*, 3, 326-322.

COOK1992 (Published Data Only)

Cook, D.D. & Spurrison, C.L. (1992) Effects of a prisoner-operated delinquency deterrence program: Mississippi's project aware. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 17, 89-99.

DAVIDSON1987 (Published Data Only)

Davidson, W.S., Redner, R., Blakely, C.H. (1987) Diversion of juvenile offenders: an experimental comparison. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 68-75.

FAGAN1990 (Published Data Only)

Fagan, J.A (1990) Treatment and reintegration of violent juvenile offenders: experimental results. *Justice Quarterly*, 7, 233-263.

FOSTER2004 (Published Data Only)

Foster, M.E., Qaseem, A. & Connor, T. (2004) Can better mental health services reduce the risk of juvenile justice system involvement? *American Journal of Public Health*, 94, 859-865.

FRIEDMAN2002 (Published Data Only)

Friedman, A.S., Terras, A., Glassman, K. (2002) Multimodal substance use intervention program for male delinquents. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Substance Abuse*, 11, 43-66.

GARRIDO1991 (Published Data Only)

Garrido, V. & Sanchis, J.R. (1991) The cognitive model in the treatment of Spanish offenders: Theory and practice. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 42, 111-118.

GLICK1987 (Published Data Only)

Glick, B. & Goldstein, A.P. (1987) Aggression replacement training. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65, 356-362.

GOLDSTEIN1989 (Published Data Only)

Goldstein, A.P., Glick, B., Irwin, M.J., et al. (1989) *Reducing Delinquency: Intervention in the Community*. New York: Pergamon Press, Inc.

- GOLDSTEIN2007** (Published Data Only)
Goldstein, N.E.S., Dovidio, A., Kalbeitzler, R., et al. (2007) Anger management for female juvenile offenders: Results of a pilot study. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 7, 1-28.
- HAWKINS1991** (Published Data Only)
Hawkins, J.D., Jenson, J.M., Catalano, R.F., et al. (1991) Effects of a skills training intervention with juvenile delinquents. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 1, 107-121.
- JOHNSON1983** (Published Data Only)
Johnson, B.D. & Goldber R.T. (1983) Vocational and social rehabilitation of delinquents: a study of experimentals and controls. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation*, 6, 43-60.
- LAWRENCE1999** (Published Data Only)
Lawrence, J.S.St., Crosby, R.A., Belcher, L., et al. (1999) Sexual risk reduction and anger management interventions for incarcerated male adolescents: a randomized controlled trial of two interventions. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*, 24, 9-17.
- LEE1978** (Published Data Only)
Lee, R. & Haynes, N.M-G. (1978) Counseling juvenile offenders: an experimental evaluation of project crest. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 14, 267-271.
- LITTLE2004** (Published Data Only)
Little, M., Kogan, J., Bullock, R. (2004) An experiment in mulsti-systemic responses to persistent young offenders known to children's services. *Nritish Journal of Criminology*, 44, 225-240.
- NUGENT1997** (Published Data Only)
Nugent, W.R., Champlin, D. & Wiinimaki, L. (1997) The effects of anger control training on adolescent antisocial beahvior. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 6, 446-462.
- OLLENDICK1979** (Published Data Only)
Ollendick, T.H. & Hersesn, M. (1979) Social skills training for juvenile delinquents. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 17, 547-554.
- PATRICK2004** (Published Data Only)
Patrick, S. & Marsh, R. (2005) Juvenile diversion: results of a 3-year experimental study. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 16, 59-73.
*Patrick, S., Marsh, R., Bundy, W., et al. (2004) Control group study of juvenile diversion programs: an experiment in juvenile diversion - the comparison of three methods and a control group. *The Social Science Journal*, 41, 129-135.
- PIERCY1976**
Piercy, F& Lee, R. (1976) Effects of dual treatment approach on the rehabilitation of habitual juvenile delinquents. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 19, 482-490.
- ROSENKOETTER1980** (Published Data Only)
Rosenkoetter, L., Landman, S., Mazak, S.G. (1980) Use of moral discussion as an intervention with delinquents. *Psychological Reports*, 46, 91-94.
- ROSS1976** (Published Data Only)
Ross, R.R. & Palmer, W.R.T. (1976) Modification of emotional expressiveness in adolescent offenders. *Crime and/et Justice*, 1, 125-133.
- SALAZAR2006** (Published Data Only)
Salazar, L.F. & Cook, S.L. (2006) Preliminary findings from an outcome evaluation of an intimate partner violence prevention program for adjudicated, African American, adolecent males. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4, 368-385.
- SCHNEIDER1986** (Published Data Only)
Schneider, A.L. (1986) Restitution and recidivism rates of juvenile offenders: results from four expermental studies. *Criminology*, 24, 533-552.
- SPENCE1980** (Published Data Only)
Spence, A. J. & Spence, S.H. (1980) Cognitive changes associated with social skills training. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 18, 265-272.
- STRONG1988** (Published Data Only)
Strong, W.B., Stanitsky, C.L., Smith, R.E., et al. (1988) Physical and psychological effects of aerobic exercise in delinquent adolescent males. *Sports Medicine*, 142, 1361-1366.