Schools are safe and nurturing places where caring nonfamily adults protect students and guide their intellectual and social development. That is the ideal, anyway. In many cases, reality is close to the ideal, but not always or everywhere. Although schools are generally safe places, students’ school experiences differ, both in terms of exposure to crime and in the strategies implemented to prevent it. These differences occur between individuals located in the same schools and between students attending separate schools. Moreover, experiences vary widely for individuals who attend schools in different time periods.

Evidence of variation in school experiences across individuals, places, and time exists in many forms. Empirical evidence from social research is a primary form of evidence and is the focus of much of this book. However, the simplest form is anecdotal evidence derived from each of our own “lived experiences” or personal stories. Consider the experiences of the three authors of this book. In many ways, these experiences are homogeneous, reflecting positions of relative privilege within our society’s racial and social class stratification system. However, our lived experiences also illustrate personal, contextual, and temporal variations in school crime or safety concerns.

Pamela Wilcox’s story hints at the importance of place, highlighting vastly different experiences of students across school settings—even settings that are quite close geographically. At the same time, it highlights variation in experiences with school crime across students within the same setting, especially variation in offending behavior. The personal story of Graham
Ousey involves a contrast between his own school experiences and those of his children, providing anecdotal examples of how similar student behaviors are defined and reacted to differently over time. Moreover, it illustrates noted differences in experiences with school crime across individual students in any one place-time setting, especially differences in victimization experiences. Finally, Marie Skubak Tillyer’s story also contrasts her own experience and that of her children, highlighting how incidents of school shootings, while still rare, have altered school safety policies in a single generation.

School Crime and Spatial Divides

Pamela Wilcox attended public schools in a middle-class, inner-ring suburb of a midsize midwestern city. She graduated from high school in the mid-1980s. During the decade spanning 1980 to 1990, the population of her suburban community was approximately 60,000 and overwhelmingly racially and ethnically homogeneous—census data indicate that over 97% of community residents were White, with persons of Asian descent constituting the largest racial/ethnic minority group at just over 1% of the suburb’s population. Educational attainment was strongly encouraged in the community during this time, and over 90% of the adult population held a high-school degree (U.S. Census Bureau, 1992). Additionally, there was discernable community pride in the local schools, as residents consistently backed the schools through volunteerism and financial support in the form of tax levies (Gower et al., 2005). Such local support produced results: the school district was consistently considered high performing based on state standards and was even named a “Top 100” school district in 1995 by Money magazine. Commensurate with the community’s strong emphasis on education and local schools, fewer than 5% of households were impoverished during the 1980s (U.S. Census Bureau, 1992).

Over 2,000 students were enrolled in the community’s high school while Wilcox attended. There were no locked doors, buzzers for entry, or metal detectors to pass through. Police, school resource officers, private security, and drug-sniffing dogs were not present in the school. She recalls no security cameras. The truth is, nobody thought or talked much about strategies to ensure school safety because problematic incidents were uncommon and relatively minor. “Bad behavior” tended to consist of the sporadic fight breaking out in hallways during class changes or the occasional incident of someone getting “busted” for bringing alcohol to a football game. Perusal of archived clippings from the local newspapers revealed few headlines associated with crime at her school in the 1980s—an exception being a story written about
a burglary of the high school’s physical education building, during which time “at least eight bags of sports clothing and equipment [were] taken” (“Stolen Uniforms Sought,” 1984).

Just a few miles away, inner-city school students in that same midwestern metropolitan area experienced different, and more traumatic, events. Wilcox’s community was geographically contiguous to the central city, yet the two environments seemed worlds apart in terms of social structure. The central city, consisting of a total population of 182,000 in 1990, was in decline. Built on a manufacturing base, deindustrialization hit the city hard, leading to significant population loss throughout the 1980s.

In addition to its population instability, the city was much more racially and economically diverse than Wilcox’s suburban community during the 1980s (and still is today). Census data indicate that the population was 58% White and 40% African American around the time she was in high school, and the overall poverty rate in the central city was around 25% (over five times greater than in Wilcox’s residential suburb). Moreover, there were alarming pockets of concentrated disadvantage, with rates of poverty above 40% in 14 of its census tracts in 1990 (Gower et al., 2005). Indicative of segregation, there were obvious racial disparities in experiences with such disadvantage. Fully 54.3% of the African American children in the central city were living in poverty according to the 1990 census (Gower et al., 2005). Undoubtedly related to the city’s socioeconomic struggles, educational achievement and pride in local schools were lower in the central city than what Wilcox had experienced in her nearby suburb. Approximately a quarter of the adults were without high-school degrees. Additionally, there was consistent local media attention devoted to the struggling school district, and public opinion polls suggested that fewer than 25% of residents rated the local schools as either “good” or “excellent” (Gower et al., 2005).

Around the same time Wilcox attended her suburban school just a few miles away, students attending the schools within the central-city context faced classroom disturbances (e.g., pulled fire alarms, disrespect toward teachers), substance abuse, weapon-involved fights, gang violence, and suspensions numbering in the thousands (e.g., see Ancona, 1985; Madison, 1986). In one telling example occurring in the year prior to Wilcox’s high-school graduation, a 17-year-old male central-city student was assaulted at school by local gang members. Members of a rival gang, in turn, showed up on the school campus a few days later with a firearm, allegedly seeking retaliation (Sullivan, 1985). One year after Wilcox’s graduation, a 17-year-old central-city female student was stabbed in the chest by another female student during a scuffle on the school bus (“Stabbing occurs on school bus,” 1987). Violence continued, perhaps even escalated, in the early 1990s, as in-
ner-city-youth crime climbed nationally. In the course of mere weeks in 1992, a track star at one of the public city high schools was shot in the back by other teens who robbed him of his jacket and shoes, a female high-school student was “knocked cold” at a bus stop, and a nine-year-old boy was forced to have oral sex in an elementary school locker room (Lamb, 1992). Earlier that same year, the city’s superintendent ordered walk-through metal detectors for all middle- and high-school students after the stabbing of a middle-school student. At the time of the metal detector installation, the district indicated they had confiscated 59 weapons from students during the preceding six months of the school year (Scruggs, 1992). Along with metal detectors, the inner-city school district employed 18 unarmed security officers to patrol the grounds around the middle- and high-school campuses (Scruggs, 1992). City police also patrolled each weekday afternoon at the downtown spot where students switched buses after school—the spot of several large fights among teens that involved shootings (Bray, 1991).

School Crime and Historical Divides

Like Wilcox, Graham Ousey attended high school in the 1980s, graduating in 1986. His school was the only public high school in a small city (~20,000 population) located in central Virginia. It was, and is today, a blue-collar community with many adults working in manufacturing plants and others serving in the military or working as contractors for the Department of Defense. In the 1980s, the population was somewhat racially diverse but highly segregated. Whites made up roughly 72% of the population, and African Americans made up about 26% of the residents. About 14% of the population had income below the poverty line, placing it close to the national average at the time (Manson, Schroeder, Van Riper, and Ruggles, 2018).

Crime occurred in the city, but Ousey recalls moving freely throughout the city on foot, by bike, and, when older, by car. The general lack of concern about crime was evident in school as well. School doors were unlocked during the day; there were no buzzers required for entry; and security personnel, surveillance cameras, and metal detectors were nonexistent. While there were occasionally incidents that were classifiable as criminal—hallway fistfights, drug possession, drug use, thefts of money or clothing—they were generally handled “in-house” by school personnel handing out school-related discipline, usually in consultation with parents. Ousey recalls infrequent but routine instances (maybe one per year) when the police would visit the school with canine teams to search hall and gym lockers for illegal drugs. Mostly these events added a little excitement to the school day as students speculated whether anyone would be arrested. Contraband rarely turned up in these searches. On the other hand, bullying was a regular occurrence, and
Ousey recalls that an unlucky few bore the brunt of mistreatment. The behavior was not condoned, but neither was it highly condemned. It was perceived as an unfortunate, but mostly harmless, aspect of the transition through adolescent life.

“Shelter in place” or “active shooter” drills, or general concerns about armed intruders, were unheard of in the school experiences of Wilcox and Ousey. The idea of someone literally attacking the school was so far beyond the imagination, it was perceived comically by many students. Indeed, Ousey recalls that as his high-school graduation drew close, a rumor began circulating that one frequently bullied student had created a “hit list” containing all of those who had teased or mistreated him during school. These rumors seemed inspired by movies like the 1982 film *National Lampoon’s Class Reunion*, which depicted a former student returning to a 10-year class reunion to exact revenge for mistreatment that occurred during his senior year. Ousey recalls few students taking the rumors seriously, with many actively joking about the absurdity of such an attack during regular school-day banter.

Times have certainly changed. Although violent crime rates dropped substantially in the United States after the early 1990s, awareness and concern about violence has become a much more prominent part of the school experiences of students today. This is true not only in disadvantaged communities with higher levels of crime but also in higher-wealth, lower-crime communities. For example, Ousey’s children have grown up in a context of significantly greater privilege than he did. They are recent graduates of a public high school that *U.S. News & World Report* ranks among the top 20 schools in the state of Virginia. It is located in a well-educated and financially secure county where 95% of the population aged 25-plus has a high-school diploma, 50% have graduated from college, the median household income is $81,000, and the poverty rate is only 7% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018). It is also a safe place to live. Its 2019 violent crime rate was less than one-third of the U.S. violent crime rate, and gun violence and murder are rare (Virginia State Police, 2020; U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2020). Despite these facts, Ousey’s kids experienced at least one “lockdown/shooter” drill per year going back as far as middle school. Prior to these events, students were informed the drills were a precautionary preparation for an armed intruder attacking the school. Students learned they should close and lock classroom doors, turn off lights, hide behind desks, or otherwise locate themselves in areas not visible to someone peering through the small window embedded in the classroom door. In addition, bullying prevention programming was also a regular presence in the educational experience of Ousey’s kids. Antibullying educational programs were presented each year. Moreover, despite its location in a peaceful community, the school maintained an on-campus school safety officer, all entrances were monitored.
by surveillance cameras, visitors were required to enter through a single front
door location, and entry required communication with school staff prior to
being “buzzed” in to the vestibule by the main office.

Marie Skubak Tillyer is younger than Pamela Wilcox and Graham Ousey
and attended a Catholic high school in the Midwest in the late 1990s. The
school, which served approximately 1,000 students at the time, was located
in a middle-class residential neighborhood north of the central city with
98% White residents. Students, however, were drawn from a much larger
geographic area because of the school’s religious tradition. While many as-
pects of Tillyer’s experiences are similar to Wilcox’s and Ousey’s, one note-
worthy difference is that the shooting at Columbine High School occurred
just six weeks prior to Tillyer’s high-school graduation. On April 20, 1999,
two high-school seniors killed 12 fellow students and one teacher before
taking their own lives at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado.
Tillyer remembers the shock and sadness in the aftermath but notes that, at
the time, a mass shooting in school seemed like such a unique, once-in-a-
generation event. Unfortunately, we know now it was simply the first of sev-
eral horrifying events that shape how we view school safety today. Over a
decade later—on December 14, 2012—a 20-year-old man walked into Sandy
Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, and killed 22 children
and six adults. And on February 14, 2018, a 19-year-old former student at
Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida, returned to
the school grounds and killed 17 people (including students and teachers)
and wounded 17 others. Each of these events received national media atten-
tion for weeks and changed the discourse on school crime from a problem
of the inner city to a problem that could happen anywhere, with unfathom-
able consequences. Indeed, 20 years after Tillyer’s high-school graduation
in 1999, her young children practice active shooter drills in their suburban
Texas elementary school. Thus, crime awareness and preparation that was
far from the imagination of earlier generations of students has become cen-
tral to the experiences of present-day students in U.S. schools.

School Crime and Individual Differences

While school crime experiences—whether in the form of offending behav-
ior, victimization, or security efforts—vary among students in different
communities or across historical periods, there are also stark individual-level
differences in school crime experiences within any particular place-time
setting. The stories of Wilcox and Ousey, in particular, illustrate how the
risks of offending and victimization, respectively, vary greatly across indi-
vidual students. For example, the crimes described above that occurred
among students in the inner city adjacent to Wilcox’s suburban community
were relatively alarming, but only a small fraction of students was responsible for such acts. Archived news stories from the local community in the 1980s suggest that students, teachers, and administrators in the inner-city schools expressed frustration about how incidents involving a few students tended to harm the image of the entire school or school district, where the overwhelming majority of students were not involved in criminal misconduct. For example, while inner-city student violence tended to grab the headlines, officials at one school pointed out that “11 percent of students are involved in honors programs and 51 percent of students apply to 4-year colleges” (Madison, 1987). In fact, students in the same school blamed the media for exaggerating violent incidents involving a few individuals while largely overlooking the involvement of many more students in prosocial activities such as the annual blood drive or their vibrant performing arts program (Madison, 1987). Thus, even in a “high-crime” school district (relative to neighboring districts), offending behavior appeared concentrated among a small number of individual students. These patterns of concentration of offending behavior mirror those seen for decades in criminological research. Indeed, they reflect Marvin Wolfgang and colleagues’ famous study finding that a “chronic 6 percent” of boys from a Philadelphia birth cohort accounted for more than half of the crimes committed by the entire cohort through age 18 (Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin, 1972).

Similarly, Ousey’s recollection that relatively few unfortunate kids experienced the vast majority of mistreatment and harassment by fellow students is consistent with a pattern evinced over decades of large-scale research studies. For example, in one of the more famous studies of victimization concentration, Graham Farrell and Ken Pease’s analysis of data from the British Crime Survey found that just 4.3% of sampled respondents experienced 43.5% of the entire sample’s reported victimization incidents (Farrell and Pease, 1993). More recently, and more directly relevant to school-based crime incidents, Tillyer and colleagues reported that just 6.2% of a sample of middle- and high-school students across Kentucky experienced 40.6% of the total reported assaults (Tillyer, Wilcox, and Fissel, 2018).

Looking beyond variations in patterns of offending and victimization, there are also differences in how students experience “school safety” within a given place-time context. First, students have unique perceptions of their overall safety at school, and they express varying levels of fear of school crime (Wilcox, Campbell Augustine, Bryan, and Roberts, 2005). Second, while the use of measures aimed at making schools less vulnerable to attack (e.g., armed police, metal detectors, active-shooter preparedness training) is now widespread, students are often differentially exposed to particular types of discipline in response to offending. For some, the experience of harsh, exclusionary school discipline practices is more common, whereas for
others, therapeutic or restorative disciplinary practices predominate (Hirschfield, 2018; Hughes, Bailey, Warren, and Stewart, 2022; Jonson, 2017; Kupchik, 2010, 2016, 2020; Morris and Perry, 2017; Payne and Welch, 2010; Ramey, 2015; Rocque and Paternoster, 2011). Thus, while variations in school crime across unique places and times are important considerations, so, too, are cross-individual differences in school-based offending, victimization, fear, and punishment within any single place-time context.

Purpose of the Book: Understanding School Crime through Problem Analysis

Although limited, the preceding anecdotes help illustrate that experiences with school crime and safety vary across places, time, and individuals in the United States. Understanding and explaining those variations is a major focus of this book. For most students, schools are institutions that provide a caring, safe environment for learning and growth. Yet, they also are places where diverse individuals converge in settings with distinct social, cultural, and physical features (Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1985; Gottfredson, 2001). These convergences sometimes result in disapproved behaviors, including some that are violations of criminal codes or that threaten student well-being. Unfortunately, “school crime safety” is a term that has increasingly been intertwined with concerns about mass shootings in suburban schools since the late 1990s, such as those mentioned earlier (for reviews, see Butler, Kulig, Fisher, and Wilcox, 2019; Jonson, 2017). While these events are devastating and justify prevention efforts, they are as unusual as they are extreme (Addington, 2009; Chouhy, Madero-Hernandez, and Turanovic, 2017; Fox and Fridel, 2019; Musu-Gillette et al., 2018; Rocque, 2012). A negative consequence of the focus on school shootings is that it tends to obscure student-involved delinquency and victimization that is less extreme but more common: theft; weapon carrying; drug possession; and the verbal, physical, and sexual harassment of classmates. These phenomena also warrant focused attention on description, explanation, and prevention. This book is an effort in that direction.

The book is a culmination of our effort over the past 15 years to study crime among students located across diverse middle- and high-school settings. It seeks answers to several core questions: Why are some students more likely to engage in delinquency than others? Why are some students more prone to experience victimization? Why do some schools exhibit higher rates of crime than other schools? How do individual students and schools respond to crime or threats thereof? It integrates knowledge gained from our own research, as well as lessons learned from studies by other
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scholars, to provide deeper understanding of the patterns and causes of variation in individual-level and aggregate-level school-based offending and victimization experiences, while also addressing the adequacy of wide-ranging criminological explanations and crime prevention policies.

Our investigation of student offending and victimization—focused on adolescents in middle- and high-school settings in the United States—is anchored by the problem analysis framework. This framework emerged from scholars such as Ronald Clarke, John Eck, and Marcus Felson, and it is often portrayed by a simple triangle as shown in Figure 1.1. The “problem analysis triangle” views crime (or a crime-related problem) as an outcome emerging from the convergence between a motivated offender, a suitable target/victim, and a conducive environmental setting (e.g., Brantingham and Brantingham, 1981, 1993; Clarke 2010).

Problem analysis focuses on relatively small-scale settings or contexts in which motivated offenders access targets or victims, including street intersections, street segments, and street addresses. Indeed, several decades of research show that crime events cluster at such small-scale places, now commonly referred to as “hot spots” for crime (Sherman, Gartin, and Buerger, 1989; Weisburd, Groff, and Yang, 2012; Braga, Hureau, and Papachristos, 2011). However, the problem analysis perspective on crime also identifies both large- and small-scale public facilities as places where crime emerges. Marcus Felson (1987) first noted the important role of facilities as hosts of the convergence of motivated offenders and suitable targets in contemporary society. He claimed that many routine daily activities take place at facilities in modern-day life, thus making them susceptible to becoming hot
spots. Additionally, a focus on crime at facilities, as opposed to street segments, offers potential benefits for crime prevention: formal organizations can take responsibility for discouraging crime through facility design and management, rather than relying on public policing. A good deal of research over the past several decades has supported the idea that offender-target convergence is high in facilities—places such as parking lots, railway stations, shopping centers, taverns, convenience stores, and schools (Crowe, 1990; Eck, Clarke, and Guerette, 2007; Felson et al., 1996; Smith, 1996).

Schools are especially salient facilities for investigating crime among young people. As Garofalo, Siegel, and Laub (1987, p. 321) noted some three decades ago, students are pools of potential crime offenders and victims who are typically in contact for eight hours a day, five days a week. Often their convergence occurs in situations where capable guardians (e.g., responsible adults, security) are absent. This book endorses the idea that schools are important facilities hosting crime. It considers schools as key places where a better understanding of youth crime can develop through consideration of all sides of the problem analysis triangle.

Criminologists utilizing the problem analysis framework often treat offender motivation as an assumed “constant” and prioritize the analysis of variation in the other sides of the problem analysis triangle: targets/victims and places. They contend that focusing on the immediate situational circumstances associated with a crime event, not background factors that supply individual motivation, is the best means to understand and prevent crime. We depart somewhat from this approach, arguing that offender motivation is an important dimension of explanation that warrants examination, along with targets and places, within the problem analysis framework. Our position accords with eminent criminologist Francis Cullen. In his Sutherland Address to the American Society of Criminology, Cullen urged a more holistic approach: “The mistake . . . is to assume that ‘motivated offenders’ can be taken for granted and, in turn, to give only marginal attention to the way in which criminal decision making is bounded by factors that offenders import into the crime situation . . . the future of criminology will be advanced by exploring the nexus between propensity and opportunity—between offender and situation” (Cullen, 2011, p. 315; see also Cullen and Kulig, 2018; Wilcox, Gialopsos, and Land, 2013; Wilcox and Cullen, 2018). Hence, in School Zone, we consider all three sides of the crime problem analysis triangle: (1) factors that motivate some students to engage in delin-
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1. We thought it worth mentioning that the completion of this book occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic, which, at least temporarily, dramatically changed patterns of convergence of offenders and victims in facilities such as schools due to lockdowns forcing remote learning.
quency; (2) factors that make some students suitable targets, susceptible to victimization; and (3) characteristics of schools that facilitate or, conversely, constrain the convergence of the motivated offender and the suitable target.

A Look Ahead

We organize the remaining chapters according to the three sides of the problem analysis triangle sketched above. However, before diving headlong into research on offending, victimization, and criminogenic school settings, we provide in Chapter 2 a broad overview of key concepts that aid in understanding each of these dimensions of school crime. The concepts draw from a diverse array of criminological theories. Included are theories aimed at explaining why some students have a greater proclivity to engage in offending, theories building insights on why some students are more likely targets for victimization, and theories addressing factors that make certain school environments more likely to host crime incidents. Theories of offender motivation, theories of crime victims, and theories of crime places have traditionally been considered and examined somewhat separately, with the first thought to represent the domain of “traditional criminology,” while the latter two types of theory are often associated with what has been termed “environmental criminology.” As indicated above, most criminologists using a problem analysis approach to understanding crime do so with a heavy (if not exclusive) emphasis on environmental criminology, while setting aside the issue of offender motivation. In contrast, our problem analysis will blend both traditional criminology and environmental criminology, and, in the process, will address theoretical explanations for student offending, student victimization, and schools as crime places.

After providing an overview of theoretical concepts relevant to understanding school crime, Chapter 3 discusses data sources that are used to study school-based crime. The focus of that discussion is intentionally broad, covering an array of datasets. It also highlights the Rural Substance abuse and Violence Project (RSVP). RSVP was a multiyear data-collection effort conducted in the early 2000s, led by Richard Clayton and funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (R01 DA11317). Two authors of this book, Pamela Wilcox and Graham Ousey, served as coinvestigators on RSVP, which collected longitudinal data on students as well as contextual information about schools from teachers, administrators, and field observations made by the researchers. To date, nearly three dozen peer-reviewed journal articles using RSVP data have been published, many coauthored by the current authors: Wilcox, Ousey, or Tillyer. School Zone synthesizes many of the findings from the RSVP-based studies with research on other data sources.
to provide a cohesive, comprehensive volume on individual and contextual factors associated with school crime.

Chapters 4 through 7 represent the heart of the book, addressing what we know about school crime from empirical studies, with all sides of the problem analysis triangle (offender, victim, place) serving as our organizational guide. In Chapter 4, we review the empirical evidence regarding various types of delinquent offending occurring in schools, including violence, weapon carrying, property crime, and substance use. Discussion includes prevalence and patterns of behaviors as well as the key motivational factors observed in available research. In particular, the focus is on the offending motivation factors identified and discussed more generally in Chapter 2.

In Chapter 5, our attention turns to empirical studies addressing risk of victimization among students. This review takes stock of research on general victimization as well as categories or specific types of victimization—violent victimization, theft victimization, and sexual victimization as examples. It also considers research on short- and long-term repeat victimization among students. As with our review of research on offending, the research discussed in Chapter 5 provides information on prevalence and trends in victimization as well as key risk factors for experiencing victimization, with the latter discussion framed around the key theoretical concepts introduced in Chapter 2. Finally, Chapter 5 also considers research on students’ worries about crime at school, assessments of victimization risk at school, and behaviors employed to reduce victimization risk at school.

Chapter 6 addresses the potential comorbidity of student offending and victimization since a victim-offender overlap has been observed in general population samples. It reviews research examining the evidence of the victim-offender overlap among students. Drawing again from some theoretical perspectives outlined in Chapter 2, it considers whether overlap is due to similar underlying forces causing both offending and victimization (a population heterogeneity perspective), or, alternatively, whether there is a causal linkage between student offending and student victimization (i.e., offending causes subsequent victimization, or vice versa).

In Chapter 7, we consider empirical research addressing variations in rates of crime across school contexts, with special focus on characteristics of the school environment that make schools more or less susceptible to student offending and/or victimization. Here, we consider two major mechanisms: (1) whether characteristics of school environments are directly
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2. In Chapters 3 and 5, we report on trends in bullying victimization in addition to criminal victimization experienced by students at school. However, given our reliance on theories and perspectives developed to explain and understand crime, the focus of the book is on violent, property, sexual, and drug crimes, rather than on other forms of bullying.
related to offending and victimization, independent of student differences, and (2) whether school characteristics interact with student characteristics, potentially mitigating or enhancing the effects of individual-level correlates of student offending and/or victimization. The discussion centers on the key concepts from “crime and place” theories described in Chapter 2.

Finally, in Chapter 8, we discuss common school crime prevention efforts and their relationships to the theories and empirical research reviewed in the previous chapters. In doing so, we assess the extent to which currently popular strategies of school crime prevention align with the problem analysis framework and scientific understandings of student offending and victimization.