

Preface

Teachers make a difference. As someone who grew up in one of the poorest and rural areas of a poor state and ended up attending elite graduate and professional schools, I have much to credit my public school teachers. My teachers sure struggled much to teach an amazingly wide variety of students from different backgrounds, abilities, and hopes. Given that reality, which undoubtedly repeats itself across the United States and globe, one would think that I should be quite hesitant to criticize a system that produces countless grateful students and productive citizens. I agree.

The pages that follow surely can be perceived as yet another attack on already much maligned schools that do produce impressive outcomes despite their limited resources, increased obligations, and the sustained barrage of attacks from competing interest groups. Some may even view the text as an affront to the inalienable rights of parents to raise their children as they see fit. Others surely could understand the analysis as another assault on our decentralized legal and school systems that should retain the right to balance the needs of communities, parents, schools, and students. I clearly did not intend, and do not see the ultimate result, as yet another diatribe on the manner teachers, parents and communities treat students.

I embarked on this project to understand what kind of environment today's adolescents need and what teachers, parents, and communities can do to address those needs. I also embarked on this project to determine how adolescents and their environments best can be supported to effect the outcomes and ideals our society formally promises but does not always deliver. As a result, I have been struck by the possible role law and basic social science can play in efforts to create responsive schools,

families, communities, and most often ignored, adolescents. I also have been intrigued by the tendency to polarize the rights and obligations of parents, schools, communities, and students. An honest look at the actual rights and obligations that serve as fodder for the polarization reveals much less support for absolutes than it does for shared interests, goals, expectations, and needs. Likewise, an honest look at social science evidence reveals that no single person nor single institution can be charged with the responsibility of promoting positive adolescent development. The analysis that follows simply offers what we know about schools' responses to adolescents' developmental needs and explores the contours of what laws can allow and, hopefully, can foster. In addressing those issues, the text certainly leaves room for further analyses, especially some that would envision concrete steps for reform and more concrete ways to address polarizing tendencies. This text has a more modest goal: to examine and envision what can be done to address adolescents' needs and propose that we actually can better address those needs while remaining faithful to the rights of others.

My hunch is that those who read the following most likely will feel the same way I do: grateful for the education that they have received and hopeful that others can dream and achieve their own goals. My hope is that we can take that gratitude and hope as the starting point to engage with the research, analyses and proposals offered here and try to imagine how schools can help deliver the promises that our liberal, democratic, civil society reminds us we must constantly evaluate, develop, and seek to achieve.

ROGER J. R. LEVESQUE

Education's Role in Fostering Adolescents

Society pays close attention to adolescents' actions. Much of the modern history of adolescence involves attempts to control and limit this age group's freedoms deemed potentially disruptive to society. So fervent is the scrutiny and concern for controlling adolescents that their actions frequently serve to index society's general health and civility. As a result, when both society and adolescents face challenges and encounter disruptions, the public responds with a sense of crisis. The crises are deemed particularly potent when the disruptions occur in public places, especially in schools that essentially exist to control and direct adolescents into responsible citizenship. In those instances, both adolescents and society are deemed at risk.

Recent murderous rampages by students, armed with guns and ammunitions more befitting soldiers on battlegrounds than students on playgrounds, illustrate how adolescents serve as barometers of societal health and civility. The events shocked and horrified a public that otherwise had become inured to reports of violent crime. Many sought answers as to why students would pose such a public threat. Speculations about the root causes offered a variety of sources: inadequate home life, overburdened teachers, inattentive school officials, corrupting media, easy access to weapons, declining moral standards, sex discrimination, victimization, racism, inadequate penal systems, etc. (e.g., Jenson & Howard, 1999; Sousa, 1999). All explanations linked to a perceived deterioration in the manner adolescents now treat one another in an increasingly troubled and challenging society.

Although the young killers exemplified a distressed society unable to foster adolescents, they also served to confirm the essence of a resistant, defiant, and precarious adolescent subculture. Evidence of adolescents' alleged resistance to authority takes many forms, so much so that even normal adolescents are perceived as defiant and hedonistic. Their speech is viewed as uncivil; and their modes of dress—such as boys' long hair, earrings, and baggy pants—often are seen as vulgar or at least as expressing too much autonomy and self-expression (Myhra, 1999). Their interests continue to be viewed as narcissistic and lacking in commitment to the welfare of others or society (Cohen & Cohen, 1996). Their interactions with others are perceived as harsh and marked by rampant bullying and harassing (Stein, 1999). Adolescents' romantic relationships are deemed inconsiderate, and actually violent at so many levels that they themselves do not even recognize the violence (Higginson, 1999). Their music is viewed as so coarse, insensitive and immoral that it incites them to violence (Strasburger, 1997). Even their aspirations are maligned as they allegedly make adolescents drifting dreamers with unrealistic goals (Schneider & Stevenson, 1999). Although available evidence does not seem to match popular perceptions that adolescents, as a group, are in crisis any more than other age groups, society continues to fear that adolescents are in a state of moral decline, and that the family, school, and church have lost their power to shape the coming generation responsibly.

SCHOOLING'S SPECIAL ROLES AND FAILURES IN FOSTERING ADOLESCENTS

Society had responded to the plight of adolescents. One of the most common features of the American political landscape includes charges levied to all major social institutions to take better care of adolescents. The family, child welfare systems, juvenile justice systems, schools, religious organizations, and even the media and other big businesses are exhorted to reconsider how they treat adolescents. All institutions are currently being challenged, revived, dismantled, or reformed to shore up adolescents' proper social development. For example, welfare reform increasingly aims to address adolescent pregnancy (Levesque, 2000a); and the reform's promise to increase the number of working parents creates important challenges to fill non-school hours for adolescents whose parents will work rather than directly care for them (Quinn, 1999). Health reform's emerging focus on managed care also impacts adolescents; the renewed focus on prevention and healthy development directly aims at service provision for adolescents (Santelli et al., 1998). Juvenile justice

reforms increasingly treat adolescents more like adults and seek to abolish the traditional rehabilitative features of the juvenile court, a dramatic move that responds to new perceptions of crime and criminal behavior as well as to changing views of adolescents' needs and capabilities (Feld, 1999). Even though the limited data we have seem to suggest that the intended effects of juvenile justice reforms are not being realized, the (mis)perceptions of adolescents transfer to other social institutions. The get tough approach for the sake of enhancing proper development even finds expression in educational mandates, as reflected in efforts to eliminate social promotion, introduce zero-tolerance policies, mainstream exceptional children and provide more power to parents to direct their children's education (Adelman & Taylor, 2000). Even religious institutions reconsider the place and needs of adolescents, a recognition that becomes increasingly obvious as religious organizations become central to efforts to provide services to adolescents in need (Cnaan, Wineburg, & Boddie, 1999) and religion becomes viewed as highly linked to adolescents' health (Wallace & Forman, 1998). No institution remains immune from efforts to respond differently to adolescents' needs and perceptions of what adolescents may need.

Although many institutions are being challenged to respond to the needs of adolescents and society, only public schools must accept and transform all adolescents so that they become productive citizens capable of contributing to a democratic, civil society. Although facing the difficult challenge no other institution bears, schools have not been the site of public support. Instead of support, sociopolitical responses to school failure repeatedly result in weak public confidence and constant attacks. Schools have been wracked by polarizing political conflict over their educational missions; undermined by taxpayer revolts; weakened by teacher-bashing and by massive resource and racial inequalities; and continuously subjected to rhetoric that places schools at the center of culture wars (Hunter, 1991). Students themselves do not like school much either (Steinberg, 1999); most students report being bored about one-third the time they are in school (Larson, 2000) and nearly half report being bored most of the time (Scales, 1999). Likewise, schools play an important (but not necessarily determinative) role in promoting adolescents' distress (Schulenberg, Maggs, & Hurrelmann, 1997; Elliott, Hamburg, & Williams, 1998). Given these failures, it is not surprising to find a sagging confidence in public schools and a profound sense of despair that characterizes popular discussions of adolescents and their education (Loveless, 1997).

Public schooling certainly has not been a stranger to conflict, but the impact of social conflict on schooling now appears unusually excessive. Since its beginning as an effort to inculcate a common (Protestant,

Anglo American) culture through compulsory, common schools, public education has been at the center of repeating cycles of struggles over cultural turf, community boundaries, and efforts to create cohesion and unity out of diversity and self-absorption (Levesque, 1998a). Yet, it is only within the last decade that the challenges have been so great to question seriously the very notion and existence of public schooling. Commentators now note that the compact between the public and public education is close to null and void, so much so that leading commentators consider public schools essentially dead (Lieberman, 1993) or, if not dead, at least irretrievably about to be transformed (Minow, 1999). The increasing abandonment is particularly momentous given that the commitment to public schools decreases as the civil rights movement aggressively expands to address new mandates regarding race, gender, disability, economics, sexuality, violence and multicultural issues. As society burdens public schools and recognizes their fundamental place in ensuring more people's rights, desertion increases and challenges the very nature of schools deemed the bedrock of democratic life. In fact, the increased regulation needed to foster democratic schooling urges commentators with a wide variety of expertise and from a broad spectrum of political ideologies to conclude that society must move beyond public schools as a means to educate adolescents (Perkinson, 1995). Even those committed to public schooling argue that it is necessary to save public education from public schools (Arons, 1997) and that a system of non-public schools best meets public school values (Sugarman, 1991). As a result, one of the most popular approaches to privatizing public education—providing parents with vouchers and control to enroll students in schools of their choice—permits the sole legal requirement for education provided by alternative schools to be the simple confirmation of students' attendance (Keller, 1998).

Although commentators offer different futures for schools, differing views frequently agree on fundamental points. Schools ostensibly have lost their ability to foster adolescents. While no single body of data can document the state of American education and it remains important to recognize many schools' successes, all major evaluations point to consistent failure. Most notably, the National Assessment of Education Progress, which provides the "nation's report card," reveals that even dramatic reform efforts have been far from successful. Nearly one-third of the nation's high school seniors fail basic geography questions, almost two-thirds fail basic history questions, and where there has been the most improvement, mathematics, only 16% of seniors meet the requirements set by the National Educational Goals Panel (Macchiarola, Lipsky, & Gartner, 1996). Further, commentators typically agree that adolescents

themselves are in need of reform so that they could be more caring and responsible adolescents. For example, numerous reports reveal the subtle and ignored forms of maltreatment adolescent victims suffer at the hands of peers and how even victims engage in high levels of offending, much of which occurs in schools (Levesque, 1998b). Both areas of agreement distill to the fundamental point that schools' alarming failure roots in their inability to inculcate values and provide the skills necessary for adolescents to be productive and responsible members of society.

Despite pervasive agreement among commentators that schools fail both adolescents and society, reform proposals paradoxically fail to focus on adolescents and their place in society. A close look at current discourse about educational policy making and educational reform reveals that it has virtually nothing to do with adolescents. Recent efforts to impose national educational standards are grounded on the need to address the nation's economic vulnerability, not adolescents' individual needs (cf., Heise, 1994). Likewise, arguments about school choice essentially involve issues of parental choice to determine their children's entry into and exit from particular schools, not children's own choices (Ravitch & Viteritti, 1996). Concerns about student expression and adolescents' need for information really deal with school official control of curriculum, not students' demands and legitimate needs (cf., Verchick, 1991). Reforms to address school violence deal with societal fears of guns, gangs and violent adolescents, not necessarily the everyday fears and needs of students (Hyman & Snook, 1999). Cutting-edge policy approaches that guide the development of further educational reform and seek to include all relevant stakeholders actually fail to include students and opt to include their representatives—parents (Evans, 1992; Parker, 1996). Even commentaries that urge a more aggressive turn to human rights law in order to recognize adolescents' fundamental right to education in hopes of enacting more effective reform essentially ignore the adolescents they ostensibly aim to assist (cf., Levesque, 1998c). Although these mandates also include important forces that temper reforms so that they actually do consider the needs of adolescents, the mandates do clearly point to concerns that frequently override adolescents' own needs and interests. The needs and rights of adolescents in school settings remain pervasively subordinate to other concerns. Current discourse about education does not offer much hope to those interested in adolescents' own educational rights and the development of policies that address adolescents' peculiar needs.

Despite persistent failures of school reform, few commentators on law and education have sought to offer a different paradigm that actually would include a concern for adolescents' own interests, needs, and rights. In fact, discussions lump adolescents with children and fail to consider

Law and the Development of Public Education

American history reveals the law's powerful role in directing adolescents' education. The law has long served to specify what could be taught, how it should be taught, and even ensure that adolescents are taught. Given the law's centralizing role, formative developments in law and social influences on those laws necessarily serve as initial discussion points for understanding current educational trends and for imagining future efforts. Although links between the law's historical role and future reforms remain uncharted, the discussion need not go unguided. As we will see, numerous commentaries already chronicle well key historical moments in the development of public schools. These discernable periods have left critical imprints on the nature of public schooling and the social forces that sustain it. The periods span from the 1600s to the 1980s—from colonial times, to the construction of the modern common school system, to the progressive era and up to the cosmopolitan period. Although historians understand well those periods, many of which have been the subject of important controversies and commentaries, the role of law in those periods remains less documented, with the notable exception that many commentators do mention that law played a necessary role in the establishment of public schools, both in its design and implementation.

The pervasive lack of detailed analysis coupling historical and legal developments provides the impetus for the analyses that follow. The law impacted public schooling much more than by the obvious manner it mandated school attendance and required the establishment of schools. Legal systems influenced schooling by exerting powerful leverage on

formal and informal institutions that would help shape images of adolescents and society that fostered school reform. This leverage means that we must examine when, why, how, and for whom society (and the many social institutions constituting it) constructed a system of formal education. A close examination of the dominant (and some diverging) currents in each historical era contributing to the construction of formal education necessarily reveals the manner society, through its public schools and the law, construes its collective obligations to adolescents and what it expects from adolescents themselves.

A central theme that emerges from the historical record reveals that society constantly seeks to preserve itself, and through that need, exhibits a desire to save and control adolescents so that they will ensure social stability. As we will see, that need would lead to the emergence of formal schooling and the founding of “common schools,” those aimed at inculcating common values and skills into the next generation. The same need now urges a recent move away from public, common schools and explains why common schools still retain their essential validity. Indeed, many of the historical and present challenges facing public schools stem from efforts to establish common schools for all and efforts to determine the place of adolescents in society. The law gains importance in those efforts to the extent it can encourage, reflect, and delimit the contours of those challenges and determinations.

The analysis that follows emphasizes the law’s role in schooling and institutions impacting schooling. In fact, the discussion of the law’s role in the prevailing rationale for schooling—the preservation and sometimes reconstruction of society—serves as a foundation for the remaining chapters. The analysis suggests that educational reform must move beyond focusing on academic skills alone and must respond to adolescents’ place in society. Educational reform must both reform the nature of schooling itself and embark on concomitant improvements in the legal system’s responses to adolescents’ familial and communal experiences. Although constituting an ambitious agenda, urging consideration of the law’s multiple forces and roles remains a far from radical approach to understanding and fostering educational reform. The historical record reveals well how the law’s already expansive reach continues to expand. As it has in precolonial times, the law influences education through pressure exerted on the control and development of adolescents by variously regulating the institutions—mainly family, work and church—that serve to enculturate adolescents. The law now also influences education through new socializing institutions—child welfare and juvenile justice systems—developed to “educate” adolescents, respond to new images of adolescent development, and forge a new place for adolescents in schools and

society. Despite the development and significance of non-school institutions in the education of adolescents (and the reshaping of those institutions and their relationships to schools), public schools have become the dominant center of response to modern society's demands. Schools have become the site of societal responses to social crises, most notably a rise in family breakdown, racial tensions, youth violence and victimization, religious dissension, economic deprivation, disease epidemics, and conflicting views of adolescents' place in society and the law. This chapter details how schools have assumed this powerful socializing role in adolescent development and the manner law and social forces shape that role.

THE COLONIAL PERIOD

Antecedents to today's educational system trace as far back as colonization. Colonization of the United States began with the 1630s' migration by those dissatisfied with conditions in Europe, those who sought various new opportunities, and those who had no choice but to migrate to the colonies. Many different motives underlaid the establishment of the colonies. Although the search for profit played a key role in urging exploration, historical records, though, reveal different motives for those who would actually settle. The Puritans of New England left the fullest record, and the reason they did so reveals their intentions. The Puritans documented their efforts because they hoped to set an example for the Old World by establishing a model Christian commonwealth (McClellan, 1999). To serve as an example, they migrated to establish religious utopias based on their interpretation of the Bible and sought refuge from persecution for their religious faith (Button & Provenzo, 1983). Concern that their children would drift away from faith and culture would lead colonists, including those who were not Puritans, to mold several basic institutions that would exert control over their children and, through that control, educate them into their proper place in society.

COLONIAL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Methods of obtaining educations essentially were the same methods used to socialize children into adulthood. Becoming an adult entailed an ongoing process rather than a discrete sequence of sharing common experiences of a distinctive legal status. No common age-graded experiences predetermined when a child would leave home, become apprenticed, obtain gainful employment, or get married (Bledstein, 1976). The heterogeneity was significant for at least three reasons. First, the diversity and

absence of age differentiation in social gatherings meant that this part of the life course was too undifferentiated to constitute a formal and sociologically recognized period of adolescence (Kett, 1977). As we will see, the "discovery" of the period of adolescence actually would come approximately 250 years later. Second, how the notion of adolescence essentially did not exist in colonial times reflects the absence of the need to formally educate adolescents. Colonists lacked formal, widely accepted institutions devoted solely to the education of children. Third, the available conceptual vocabulary to distinguish children from adults reflects colonial Americans' educational opportunities. Although the adolescent stage of life connoted neither a uniform set of experiences nor a fixed age span, colonists used the category of "youth" to describe individuals whose ages spanned from 10 up to 30, a time frame so large that colonists' term lumped together young children, apprentices, farmhands, servants, and slaves (Kett, 1977). This broad category of youth reveals that colonial efforts to educate adolescents needed to address immense diversity in individual development and place in society; these diverse experiences and needs fostered different educational "systems." The more educational systems needed to address common needs, the greater role law played to help address those needs and even foster more common experiences.

Although seemingly limited and informal, several institutions offered educational opportunities. Families served as the center of education, and education had a religious purpose. Thus, the most devout families used a range of occasions to instruct their children. So that children would be raised in faith and be credits to their families and communities, they were taught to read and sometimes to write so that they could be disciplined and drilled in the church catechism (McClellan, 1999). Despite variation in the extent to which families from different social and economic backgrounds and individuals within certain families benefitted from education, historians generally report that families responded to the educational inclinations of society and taught children basic educational skills, including reading levels necessary for religious activity (Cremin, 1970).

Families also educated other peoples' children. After families of origin had provided a grounding for education, it was not uncommon for these families to apprentice their children to other families. In addition to obtaining educational opportunities from families, youth gained educational experiences from apprenticeships. Although these family-type arrangements could be informal, they typically provided that masters go beyond the basic training of the child for a vocation and provide basic education in religion and civil law (Seybolt, 1969). Likewise, in some instances, the agreements called for masters to teach the skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Apprenticeships also served as the dominant

manner children without families received educations. Colonists placed out orphaned, wayward, destitute, or dependent children to work with other families' production of their needed goods; or integrated them into their own families; or involved them in the family economy of their masters (Hawes, 1991). In addition to apprenticeships, indentured servitude was an important means of educating youth, particularly those who migrated without families. This form of education was very prominent in the South, where the training mirrored the commanding socializing force of the patriarchal household in New England (Galenson, 1981). Importantly, education did not necessarily mean learning to write or read; education meant that adolescents would understand and behave in certain, approved ways. Ways of learning were educational in the broadest sense of the term.

Youth received educations not necessarily because of their own desires and aspirations. Colonists often used education in the form of work, particularly apprenticeships and servitude, as a form of punishment for youths' unruly and immoral behavior (Brenner, 1970). As noted earlier, children became adults by working with, acquiring the skills of, and by functioning as adults. The extensive focus on labor, however, reveals more than the primary manner individuals became adults. The use of labor to educate indicates well the communal, rather than the exclusively nuclear familial, character of child rearing in colonial times. Even when young people left their own parents' homes, they lived with their master's household or with other families. The focus on family-based labor and education also reveals attempts to exert control over youth. Colonists molded institutions to operate as families that provided stability, demanded accountability and sought to instill civility.

The above two educational institutions—work and family—played key roles in socializing and educating youth; but these institutions were complemented and reinforced by religious institutions. The colonial period reveals the church's tremendous impact on everyday life. The church played an overt, forceful, pervasive and significant role in efforts to control and educate youth in family and community life (Smith & Hindus, 1975). Church leaders and other community members actively oversaw child rearing, so much so that the colonists viewed child rearing as a communal endeavor in which religious, community, and private responsibilities overlapped (Sutton, 1988). As a result, families and masters were supervised both by caring and curious neighbors as well as civil and religious authorities. In addition to impacting families, churches played a key role in educational efforts. Education and religion were entwined, so much so that religion ultimately served to justify the founding of schools and public school systems.

Dangerous Adolescents

Extreme tragic events involving adolescents' brutal actions shatter our sense of basic civility and call for immediate responses. Such was the response to recent incidents involving the killing of several students by classmates in apparently safe schools and sheltered neighborhoods (Jenson & Howard, 1999). Although these extremes represent the popular types of interpersonal dangers that may lurk in or around schools, the violence actually reflects only a fraction of adolescent aggression and violence and the environments that sustain offending and victimization. In fact, only 1–3% of extreme forms of violence among school-aged adolescents actually occurs on school grounds or in related school-sponsored activities (Anderson, 1998). *Serious* violent events pervasively occur in adolescents' neighborhoods or in their homes—only about 7% of serious assaults take place at school (Snyder & Sickmund, 1995). Regardless of the actual reality of adolescents' offending, extreme violence grips and creates social consciousness regarding the realities of adolescents' offending against others and of disorder in schools. As a result, juvenile offenses in schools and the failure of schools to respond to offenses committed outside of schools rank among the most important social issues facing adolescents, schooling, and society.

Although the offenses receiving attention may be extreme, such episodes actually reveal much about school violence and environments in which adolescents find themselves. It is difficult to dispute the precariousness of adolescents' environments. Adolescents do live in and contribute to serious violence; e.g., within any given year, from 12–20% of males aged 13–16 report committing serious acts of violence (including aggravated assault, robbery, rape, or gang fights) (Kelley, Huizinga,

Thornberry, & Loeber, 1997). These serious offenses reveal only the tip of offenses and victimization. Environments conducive to serious violence strongly associate with risk for injury, exposure to intimidation and threats, and perceptions of fear and vulnerability (Brenner, Simon, Krug, & Lowry, 1999). These dangerous environments also breed school official reactions that themselves contribute to other forms of victimizations that induce severe physical, psychological, and sociological consequences (Hyman & Snook, 1999). Likewise, the extreme environments foster changes in adolescents' rights, as made most obvious in the dismantling of the juvenile court by transferring violent minors to adult court (Levesque, 1996a) and the removal of aggressive and violent adolescents from their community schools (Levesque, 1998c). Perhaps more importantly for policy reform, focus on extremely serious violence hampers the development of alternative approaches to other forms of problem behavior that may better alleviate adolescents' rates of more serious violence and that would otherwise reduce schools' iatrogenic effects on delinquency. Thus, even though adolescents' deadly violence and many less severe forms of violence now exhibit downward trends (Brenner, Simon, Krug, & Lowry, 1999), the dangers found in schools and communities remain significant social concerns and create potent images of the place of schools in adolescents' offenses.

The dangers (and perceptions of dangers) associated with adolescents and their schooling leave an important legacy for policies dealing with adolescents' rights and education. This chapter evaluates the legacy to lay a foundation for Chapter 6's delineation of reform alternatives consistent with the evolving understanding of adolescents, their offenses against others, and schooling's place in society. To do so, this chapter first details the nature of adolescents' offending, which for the purpose of this review ranges from severe violent criminal behavior, delinquency, to less recognized forms of abuse. The analysis then highlights the place of schooling in the creation and responses to adolescents' offenses. Having understood the important role schools play in addressing the needs of adolescent offenders and their victims, the discussion charts current legal responses to adolescents' offenses and delineates these responses' limitations.

ADOLESCENT OFFENDERS AND THEIR OFFENSES

A necessary starting point for discussion involves the manner researchers, policy makers, and society actually define certain offenses as problems and define schools' roles in addressing those problems.

Defining the contours of offenses worthy of intervention and the nature of schooling determines policies, the allocation of resources, and the extent to which schools may measure their success in responses to adolescents' offenses. As expected, delimiting the policy relevant contours of adolescents' offending and envisioning schools' roles remain contentious matters. Vastly different views of schools' roles in the reduction and production of problem behavior exist and complicate responses to the extent that each may marshal important empirical evidence to support their claims. Since none of the perspectives can negate fully the validity of others, attempts to establish policies that move toward any one perspective and approach to schools' roles in offenses necessarily must address issues raised by other views. That is a critical point. Although research supports many positions, some positions might gain more support and suggest the need to move toward certain poles of a polarizing continuum. Thus, delineating possible directions for addressing schools' failures in addressing adolescents' offending first requires a review of guiding themes emerging from empirical assessments of adolescents' offenses.

NATURE OF OFFENSES DEEMED WORTH ADDRESSING

Research that responds to adolescents' offending typically must begin by addressing two related issues. The first issue involves defining the problem. Research on adolescent offending usually focuses on some forms of violence but generally continues to have difficulty determining what precisely constitutes violence or even problem behavior. As a result, analyses often conflate aggressive behavior, violence against property or individuals, delinquency, crime, misconduct, and vague concepts such as disruptive behavior or school disorder (cf., Loeber & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1998; Welsh, Greene, & Jenkins, 1999). The second issue involves the need to address policy focal concerns. Thus, once problems have been defined more clearly, research must pinpoint the types of problem behavior deserving attention in light of competing resources, goals, and existing knowledge about what to do about the offenses. These directly intertwined issues affect both negative and positive outcomes. Lack of differentiation helps call attention to actions and allows for more inclusive research into the nature of adolescent offending. On the other hand, failure to distinguish between types of problem behavior leads to expected problems: it obscures the nature of violence, hampers comparisons between research findings, and potentially renders intervention ineffective when efforts are not tailored to specific problems. These issues generally continue to be addressed in a haphazard fashion; and no commentator has yet to propose a definitive resolution.

Despite continued failures to focus concerns, a close look at existing commentaries and research reveals two dominant positions regarding the types of offenses needing urgent attention and careful response. By far the most popular school responses to adolescents' offending involves the need to prohibit or suppress any form of overt, physical violence or actions indicative of possible violence. This approach is exemplified well by several "zero tolerance" policies that have emerged to deal with criminal activity in schools (Bogos, 1997) and the general community (Tonry, 1999). These efforts seek to remove offending adolescents from schools and tend to take a very narrow view of violence as constituting, for example, assault, intimidation, use of weaponry and conduct that seriously disrupts the education process (Johnston, 1999). Another group of commentators urges the need to address low-level aggression, such as cursing, disruptiveness, bullying, and horseplay (Goldstein, Palumbo, Striepling, & Voutsinas, 1995; Wilson & Petersilia, 1995). In addition to these two dominant positions, several now highlight the need to reconsider the nature of violence so as to include more covert violence, such as harassing behaviors that go ignored (Stein, 1999; Rigby, 2000) or the manner school staff, in the name of discipline, physically and psychologically assault students and impose violence (Hyman & Snook, 1999).

Notwithstanding controversies regarding the forms of violence that should receive priority, no one suggests that schools should ignore overt physical violence and that school environments should not be free of guns and weapons that place the school community at risk. Efforts to address school violence through suppressing gang activity reflect well the need for aggressive responses. For example, although several criticize policy makers' excessive focus on gangs, it is important to realize that some surveys reveal that up to 30% of urban inner-city adolescents join gangs at some point (Howell & Hawkins, 1998). Even if the percentage were smaller, the numbers gain significance by what we know about the extent to which gangs influence criminal activity. While in gangs, adolescents commit serious and violent offenses at rates several times higher than do non-gang members; and while in gangs, adolescents commit offenses at higher rates than before joining or after leaving (Thornberry, Krohn, Lizotte, & Chard-Wierschem, 1993). Their violence clearly impacts school life. A multi-state study of youth gangs reveals that 70% admit their gangs assault students and more than 80% bring weapons to school (Parks, 1995). Alleviating violence in several school districts, then, necessarily involves suppressing gang membership and the violence such membership produces.

Despite the significance of overt violence, research findings do support commentators' claims regarding the significance of addressing more

subtle forms of offending behavior. Commentators concerned with covert behavior receive support from three recent lines of research. First, episodes of subtle violence and the environments they create actually may be more harmful in terms of the number of students they impact, largely because less severe violence tends to be less addressed. For example, psychological maltreatment in the schools remains an area pervasively ignored by researchers and policy makers (cf., Hyman & Snook, 1999; Levesque, 1998b). Thus, addressing extreme forms of violence actually fails to respond to the major forms of aggression and violence adolescents receive and perpetrate in the form, for example, of bullying and harassment by peers (Pellegrini, Bartini, & Brooks, 1999). Second, addressing the more extreme forms of violence requires addressing the more subtle and ignored forms of violence (Goldstein & Conoley, 1997). Research convincingly reveals how subtle forms of violence contribute to adolescents' criminal activity. For example, low-level school disruption clearly increases the likelihood of serious school violence (Heaviside, Rowand, Williams, & Farris, 1998). Likewise, subtle violence relates to adolescents' needs to join gangs. Adolescents who are particularly drawn to gangs include those who are failing in school, not involved in school activities, have few perceived opportunities and come from socially depriving conditions (Spergel, 1995). Third, reductions in violent crime do not necessarily impact perceptions of the school's level of safety. For example, research clearly reveals decreases in adolescents' more violent crimes, especially fatal homicide and assaults at school (Brenner, Simon, Krug, & Lowry, 1999). However, research also fails to document parallel decreases in the percentage of students who feel too unsafe to go to school, being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property, or having property stolen or deliberately damaged at school (Brenner, Simon, Krug, & Lowry, 1999). One of every ten students fears being shot or hurt by other students; and more than 20% avoids going to unsupervised areas (such as restrooms) to dodge victimization (Elliott, Hamburg, & Williams, 1998). Although subject to different interpretations, the figures do highlight the extent to which fear does seem to infiltrate places which historically have been viewed as safe havens. Perceptions of school safety, the actual safety of adolescents in schools, and the contribution of low-level aggression to overt violent behavior suggest a need to respond to all forms of violence.

CHARACTERISTICS OF ADOLESCENT OFFENDERS

Perceptions of violence worth addressing color images of adolescent offenders. In general, those who take a narrow, more overt view of violence suggest that adolescent offending involves essential character flaws.

Model Adolescents

Society tends to view adolescents as amoral and as lacking in concern or respect for other people (Youniss & Yates, 1997). Although statistics offer a complicated picture of the reality of adolescent life, much research supports the negative view of adolescents' basic orientation to society. Compared to the several decades prior to the 1980s, for example, adolescents clearly have reneged on their role as political idealists who challenge tradition and seek a better society through political and social reform (Boyte, 1991; Flacks, 1988). Likewise, adolescents increasingly place themselves at risk for behaviors that contribute to their own and others' difficult circumstances. Many adolescents experiment with socially inappropriate behaviors—especially those related to alcohol and drug use, violence, and sexual activity—that they will not practice in adulthood but that nevertheless place them and society at risk for negative outcomes (Arnett, 1999). Even adolescents who do not engage in problem behaviors disapprove of them much less than other age groups do (Cohen & Cohen, 1996). These generally disturbing findings, though, frequently emerge with important contrary evidence suggesting that the vast majority of adolescents essentially do not manifest excessive self-interest and do not exhibit moral decline beyond that observed in previous generations or in adults (e.g., Youniss & Yates, 1997; Yates & Youniss, 1996; Arnett, 1999). In some domains, such as violent crimes and risky sexual activity, rates of adolescents' problem behaviors seemingly have peaked and exhibit downward trends (Jenson & Howard, 1999; Levesque, 2000a). Although adolescents may not disapprove as much of certain problem behaviors, they are indistinguishable from other age groups to the extent that they actually do place high priority on achieving very

positive goals (Cohen & Cohen, 1996). Despite more favorable evidence and persistent efforts to paint a more realistic picture of adolescents, society still seems unwilling to embrace a more favorable view of adolescents (e.g., Males, 1996).

Much debate surrounds explanations for emerging findings suggesting that society has countered some of the apparently negative shift in adolescents' morality and prosocial concerns (Jenson & Howard, 1999; Levesque, 2000a). Few, however, suggest that positive shifts result from systematic educational efforts to address them (Damon & Colby, 1996; Levesque, 2000a). Although some educational programs demonstrate promise and long-term benefits may accrue for some adolescents (e.g., Durlak, 1997), research pervasively documents the ineffectiveness rather than successes of currently implemented programs. Schools pervasively remain unable to respond to the adolescent period's apparent commitment to resistance, defiance, and lack of interest in prosocial activities; to adolescents' apparent amoral, anti-intellectual, and dangerous behaviors; and to perceptions that adolescents' apparent self-interest and hedonism renders them unable to adopt responsible adult social roles in an ever-changing society (Levesque, 1998c). To exacerbate matters, schools actually may be contributing to declines in adolescents' responsible behavior (Elliott, Hamburg, & Williams, 1998).

This chapter examines the pedagogical and legal tensions surrounding the extent to which schools must, can and should enhance the development of prosocial values and more exemplary orientations to society. To do so, the chapter presents the current social science understanding of adolescents' values and social development and schooling's place in fostering such development as a background to evaluate current legal mandates that both require yet limit schools' attempts to inculcate prosocial values in students. The analysis focuses on the manner adolescents reveal a commitment to others and contribute to community life. The review focuses on developmental topics such as identity, values, volunteerism, morality, and intergroup relations to frame them as issues of adolescents' positive social engagement. That analysis then serves, along with the previous chapter and the one that follows, as a springboard for Chapter 6's proposals for school law reforms to foster adolescents' healthy development and social responsibility.

MODEL ADOLESCENT SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Polls consistently reveal that the general public, educators, political and religious leaders, and students themselves support public schools'

efforts to instill proper social values (DeRoche & Williams, 1998). Although schools' roles in instilling values in students still may remain highly controversial, commentaries increasingly concur on the broad contours of values deemed worth fostering in adolescents. Examining the nature of values deemed worth inculcating, coupled by the current understanding of the nature of adolescent social and moral development, serves as a foundation for examining schools' efforts to provide opportunities and foster environments for students to express, experience, and internalize values critical to fostering and sustaining a civil society.

NATURE OF SOCIAL VALUES DEEMED WORTH DEVELOPING

Public schools necessarily confront a central paradox: They must ensure freedom while restraining it. Schools must both impose and oppose the inculcation of values. Although schools must deal with numerous and often conflicting values, their efforts fundamentally involve the need to promote the highly regarded value of individual students' self-determination (as well as that of their families and communities) while simultaneously denying that determination. Schools do so as they shape and constrain present and future choices to ensure a smooth functioning society in which adolescents (as well as their families and communities) take their social responsibilities seriously. Thus, adolescents must submit themselves to the yoke of educational demands in order to develop their own capacity for autonomous actions. The submission is not at all unusual, social institutions typically ask individual citizens to yield some degree of short-term personal freedom for the sake of long-term communitarian values. Although ubiquitous and necessary, the balancing undoubtedly poses many challenges as educational systems seek to support both individualistic and communal concerns and as they consciously indoctrinate and create values so that individuals, groups and communities will be capable of doing the opposite.

Existing efforts to understand moral development that is both healthy for individuals and for society constitutes an appropriate starting point to discuss the model social values deemed worth developing. Despite numerous potential controversies that can emerge (as we will see in the following section), scholars of morality and moral development increasingly concur on what constitutes model moral development and moral identity worth fostering. Researchers and commentators generally view effective moral identity as constituting a sense of self marked by empathy, altruism, and cooperation committed to promoting and respecting others' welfare (Hay, Castle, Stimson, & Davies, 1995; Berkowitz & Grych, 1998). This view implies a concern for society's well-being and a

sense that one can make a difference in society—moral maturity involves the willingness to grasp the moral aspect in everyday events and take action on its behalf. Thus, despite the tendency to distinguish socially focused morality and self-interest as separate and orthogonal orientations, individuals deemed moral exemplars and model citizens define others' welfare and their own self-interest as inseparable in that their socially-oriented moral goals constitute their very identities (Colby & Damon, 1995).

The values deemed worthy of developing generally involve those that allow individuals to develop and exhibit moral identities that fuse self- and socially-oriented interests (Hart, Atkins, & Ford, 1998). From this view, there actually may be numerous values worth fostering so long as individuals exhibit, and eventually end up exhibiting, concern for themselves and others. These values derive from different dimensions of personality, intellectual style, temperament, and other dimensions that influence individuals' general approach to their social world. These dimensions allow for the existence of many different types of individuals deemed "of good character." From this view, character involves ways by which individuals pursue a consistent yet flexible path around social and ethical dilemmas; character involves the manner individuals mesh their ability to make moral judgements and their tendency to engage in prosocial behavior.

The type of moral identity deemed mature and worth developing emerges during adolescence. The moral identity that unifies the self's basic orientation to society requires individuals to combine complex cognitive, emotional and behavioral elements. Given the need to combine these elements to achieve a coherent sense of one's social orientation, researchers aptly argue that developmental and social transformations that occur across the threshold into adolescence allow, for the first time, for the development of a moral identity integrated into adolescents' sense of self (Blasi, 1995; Davidson & Youniss, 1991). Moral judgments and behaviors are tied intimately with strong judgments of self-worth and values. A strongly articulated self-identity, concern for that concept and the individualism that gives rise to it, provides the basis for moral action (Hart, Yates, Fegley, & Wilson, 1995). Thus, although it is important to emphasize that even infants exhibit moral behavior (Trevarthen, 1993), researchers increasingly view the adolescent period as one of changes that lead to moral identity construction. Coupled together, research on adolescence and moral identity allows researchers to understand better the socialization that leads to the development of positive moral development and productive engagement with communities. The next section examines these changes and understandings.

CHARACTERISTICS OF ADOLESCENTS' SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT AND MODEL SOCIAL ORIENTATIONS

The adolescent period constitutes a time of remarkable changes in thinking, development and action. The transition fundamentally impacts both adolescents' current and future orientation to society. As with any other fundamental transition in human development, the changes in basic orientation to society emerge as part of other critical social, biological, and psychological developments. Although profoundly interrelated, five domains of development critically impact socio-moral development during adolescence.

The first critical transformation involves rapid and sweeping developments in adolescents' cognitive abilities that profoundly impact adolescents' orientations to their social environments. The cognitive transition allows adolescents to think conditionally (by using "if" and "it depends") and in terms of uncertainty. The transition also allows adolescents to be less egocentric and to engage in sociocentric functioning: unlike children, adolescents are better able to understand others. Thus, the period generally involves a move away from a focus on concrete information and personalized attributions of responsibility for certain actions and a move toward a focus on abstract conceptions of systems, ideologies, institutions and values. These critical changes allow adolescents to consider alternative possibilities, to engage in thinking about thinking, and to explore different value systems, political ideologies, personal ethics and religious beliefs. As a result of these changes, adolescents experience a heightened interest in ideological and philosophical matters, such as conceptions of individual freedom, civil liberty and social justice, and more sophisticated ways of looking at those matters.

The above cognitive developments are actually important to consider. They challenge negative views of adolescents' concerns for society and confirm adolescents' concern with social, political, and moral ideologies. Rather than selfish concern for themselves, adolescents exhibit a need to link themselves to communities and evaluate society's moral foundations. Adolescents' cognitive developments in perspective taking—the ability or tendency to understand internal and external states of others, including their social context—clearly benefits moral development and behavior. Overall, research suggests a positive relationship between the ability to engage in perspective taking and prosocial behaviors, all of which are associated with levels of moral reasoning. That is, higher levels and states of moral reasoning and other-oriented modes of moral reasoning relate positively to prosocial behaviors (Fabes, Carlo, Kupanoff, & Laible, 1999) and higher levels of moral reasoning relate negatively to

Thriving Adolescents

Efforts to alleviate rates of violence inflicted by adolescents and efforts to encourage model social development necessarily must include adolescents' emotional (mental health) development. Adolescents' risk-taking, aggressive, delinquent and violent behavior, for example, consistently link to adolescents' lack of emotional health, particularly the most prevalent psychological dysfunction reported during adolescence—depression (Kowaleski-Jones, 2000; Rutter, Giller, & Hagell, 1998). Adolescents' mental health also relates to the extent they will engage in risk behaviors, which in turn influences their responses to challenges placing them at risk for negative emotional health outcomes (Cocozza & Skowrya, 2000; Larson, 2000). Many of the adolescents affected by violence have, or are at risk of developing, a mental health disorder (Porter, Epp, & Bryan, 2000). Likewise, adolescents' positive psychological health, such as their level of happiness, directly links to numerous forms of prosocial behavior, such as community service, altruism, creativity and leadership (Colby & Damon, 1995). Adolescents' healthy emotional development—the extent to which adolescents thrive—simply cannot be extracted from their effective social development.

Given the important role schools can and do play in fostering social development, schools also necessarily play a critical role in students' emotional development. Educational experiences and outcomes reciprocally influence emotional health and thus determine the extent to which adolescents emotionally thrive. The most robust research supporting links actually focuses on adolescents' failure to thrive. School environments that undermine basic psychological needs generate negative emotional responses, negative motivational beliefs and negative behaviors

(Eccles & Midgley, 1989). Schools also can create emotional distress to the extent that schools socialize adolescents in particular ways of making sense of their worlds. Implicit and explicit ways schools emphasize different ways of appraising one's sense of self and signify the purpose of schooling also impact how adolescents view themselves, their abilities, and thus their emotional development. Likewise, early academic problems (such as grade retention, poor motivation, and declining academic performance) predict a wide variety of subsequent emotional or behavioral difficulties that emerge in later adolescence, including drug use and abuse, delinquency, teenage pregnancy, and the failure to complete high school (Eccles et al., 1997). Of course, adolescents also obviously bring emotional difficulties to schools, and that emotional development impacts both adolescents' abilities to learn effectively and to engage competently with their social environment.

Regardless of the initial cause of failing to thrive in and out of educational settings, it does seem that the reciprocal interactions between educational and educational problems eventuate in widespread comorbidity of academic and emotional difficulties as adolescents move through educational systems (Weist, 1997). Left ignored or addressed ineffectively, emotional difficulties compromise adolescents' ability to learn and become responsible and productive citizens. The effects on educational difficulties should not be underestimated. Approximately 25% of all 10- to 17-year-olds in the U.S. function behind their grade level in school (Roeser, Eccles, & Strobel, 1998) and up to 20% of students are retained at least once in their academic careers (Durlak, 1995). Emotional challenges also influence adolescents' decline in academic motivation and school engagement as they progress through school (Roeser et al., 1998). In addition to the broad impact of emotional development on motivation, adolescents also suffer debilitating emotional disorders that truncate their educational attainments, which affects about 7.2 million Americans (Kessler, Foster, Saunders, & Stang, 1995). Low academic motivation, and lack of support that fosters motivation, also accounts for the failure of students to even finish high school (Rosenthal, 1998).

Fostering adolescents' healthy emotional development undoubtedly constitutes a necessary, but frequently ill-addressed, component of effective socializing institutions. Current systems of care pervasively fail to serve adequately adolescents' mental health needs and do not even consider providing services that would allow adolescents to thrive. The ground-breaking Congressional Office of Technology Assessment's (1991) report on the state of adolescent health found that up to 20% of adolescents present emotional and behavioral disorders severe enough to warrant intervention, but less than one-third of that percentage actually

receive any form of mental health services. Other reports confirm that between 15 to 20% of adolescents are identified as needing, but not receiving, mental health services (Weist, 1997). Thus, despite high prevalence rates of mental health needs by public school students, society currently fails to respond. Reports examining adolescents' mental health do not even mention the nature of positive, thriving mental health, let alone try to index its existence.

The current failure to address adolescents' mental health needs and the necessity to address those needs in order to foster less violent and more model behavior leads to the need to link mental health concerns with broader school reforms aimed at educational outcomes. This chapter addresses the nature, extent, and opportunities to reform that link. The analysis first examines the nature of adolescents' mental health dysfunction and their positive mental health. The discussion then focuses on the peculiarities of adolescent development that challenge efforts to foster positive mental health, a discussion that serves as a springboard to discuss the role of schools in shaping mental health outcomes across adolescent development. As with previous chapters, the social science analyses provide the necessary background for a legal analysis of current and emerging efforts to address adolescents' mental health issues in school settings and the roles schools can play in fostering positive mental health.

ADOLESCENT MENTAL HEALTH: ITS DYSFUNCTIONS AND PROMOTION

Popular perceptions of and academic attention to adolescent development tend to focus on adolescents' negative responses to the significant changes and challenges associated with the adolescent period. The focus on disruptive transitions and negative outcomes, though, centers attention to only part of the adolescent experience. Transitions of this magnitude also bring the opportunity for positive growth. Commentators and researchers recently have begun to attach great significance to sites and opportunities that foster positive growth, a focus which promises to provide an understanding of mechanisms and processes by which adolescents reared in adverse and dysfunctional circumstances develop into competent and productive adults. Understanding adolescent mental health, then, requires an examination of both dysfunctional and optimal responses to developmental challenges. Much significance attaches to this examination. The analysis lays the groundwork to consider the extent to which and manner by which prevention programs and restructured

socializing institutions can provide opportunities to foster adolescents' resilience and optimal development.

MENTAL HEALTH DYSFUNCTIONS

The vast majority of adults view the adolescent period as more difficult in some ways than other periods of life and a period difficult for both adolescents and for the people around them (Arnett, 1999). Adolescents actually do exhibit conflicts, even to the point of serious dysfunctions, as they respond to normative challenges. Available evidence also indicates that conditions that led to the negative view of the adolescent experience actually increase as adolescents face new challenges and present a greater diversity of needs. This section examines trends in the nature of dysfunction adolescents experience and in our understanding of the roots of conditions leading to dysfunction.

Nature of Dysfunction

The most frequently reported symbol of adolescent development is their apparent experience of emotional turmoil. Research confirms the existence of emotional difficulty associated with the adolescent period. Adolescents report more extreme and negative moods than either preadolescents or adults (Larson & Richards, 1994). Adolescents also report higher rates of depressed mood than either children or adults, and their depressed mood peaks in midadolescence (Petersen et al., 1993). The extent of negative emotional experiences is highlighted by the persistent finding that depression constitutes adolescents' most common clinical diagnosis. Studies of prevalence rates of disorders that occur during the adolescent period reveal that the most common diagnosis is for unipolar depression, with a 20% prevalence rate over the adolescent period (Lewinsohn et al., 1993). Other studies reveal even higher rates; a highly cited evaluation of 24 studies of nonclinical samples of adolescents concluded that depressed mood above scores thought to be predictive of clinical depression apply to over one-third of adolescents at any given time (Petersen et al., 1993). Although adolescents may experience swings in moods, their experiences do tend to be marked by negative experiences that reach clinical levels.

Adolescents' familial relationships also provide a common domain of adolescent functioning often perceived as an area wrought with dysfunction. The popular image of adolescence suggests that adolescents' familial relationships are marked by excessive and continued conflict. Conflict with parents does seem to increase during early adolescence and typically

remains high until its decline during late adolescence (Laursen, Coy, & Collins, 1998). Although conflict may be more frequent in early adolescence, intensity peaks in midadolescence. Despite high rates of conflict, however, parents and adolescents do tend to report that their relationships are overall positive, that they share a wide range of core values, and that they retain mutual affection and attachment (Arnett, 1999). The majority of families do not report continued and excessive conflict. The adolescent period does not predict serious conflict with parents; however serious conflict with parents does predict an increase in adolescents' engagement in numerous risk activities that lead to physical and mental health hazards.

By far, the greatest hazards adolescents face emerge from the risks they take. Adolescents engage in risk behavior at greater rates than either children or adults. As a result, adolescents, especially those in their late adolescence, reveal the highest prevalence rates of a variety of behaviors that carries the potential for harm to themselves or others. Rates of crime, substance use, automobile accidents, sexually transmitted diseases all appear higher during adolescence (Moffitt, 1993; Arnett, 1992). These risks and associated hazards account for the primary causes of adolescents' ill health and early death. For example, according to the Centers for Disease Control, only five behavior-based causes account for over three-quarters of all mortality and a great deal of morbidity in American youth: motor vehicle crashes, homicide, suicide, preventable injuries, and sexual activity (Centers for Disease Control, 1998). Research consistently reveals that the main threats to adolescents' health are the risk behaviors they choose (Resnick et al., 1997).

Despite findings emphasizing that adolescents' unhealthy development emerges from the behaviors they engage in, it is important to recognize enormous individual differences and the relatively low percentages of disorders the behaviors actually indicate. For example, problems regularly attributed to adolescents typically include drug use, acting out, and eating disorders. Yet, prevalence rates for several diagnostic disorders among adolescents reveal that only 8% ever meet the criteria for any type of substance use disorder, 7% meet criteria for any form of disruptive behavior disorder, and less than 1% meet criteria for any type of eating disorder (Lewinsohn et al., 1993). Far from a period of excessive rates of chronic and serious dysfunction, the adolescent period does not appear more dysfunctional than other periods.

Although it is important not to diminish or trivialize problems regularly associated with adolescents, such as the seriousness of delinquency, eating disorders, and other problems, the current understanding of adolescent mental health and the image of adolescence suggest important