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1. Title of the review
Juvenile Curfew Policies’ Effect on Criminal Behavior, Public Safety, and Victimization

2. Background and objective of this review (briefly describe the problem and the intervention).

Curfew policies for juveniles restrict their presence to the home after prescribed hours in order to reduce juvenile offending and victimization. In the 100+ years since juvenile curfew policies began, they have become very popular with the public.¹ A “1994 survey of 300 adult citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, found that: 92 percent supported the continuation of the Cincinnati curfew; [and] 72 percent agreed that the curfew made them feel safer.”² In a “1995 survey of 411 adult citizens in Mobile, Alabama… [h]igh levels of support for the proposed [juvenile curfew] ordinance were found among both white (78%) and African-American (75%) respondents.”³

In addition to being popular, juvenile curfew policies have also been widely implemented. “[A]s of March 1995, 146 (73%) of the 200 largest American cities had curfews.”⁴ Similarly, “[a] 1995 survey by The U.S. Conference of Mayors found that [of] 272 cities, 70 percent of those surveyed[] had a nighttime curfew. Fifty-seven percent of these cities considered their curfew effective.”⁵

Despite the long history, popular support, widespread implementation, and the anecdotal belief in the effectiveness of juvenile curfews, there is some evidence that this confidence is unjustified. The author of a 2003 preliminary review of several studies concluded the research he reviewed “fails to support the argument that curfews can reduce crime and criminal victimization.”⁶

In the last 20 years, a significant body of literature on the effectiveness of juvenile curfew policies, larger than the few studies leading one author to conclude these policies are ineffective, has been published. This proposed Systematic Review intends to comprehensively collect and summarize all the research on juvenile curfews. This review should be able to provide the most complete assessment of the effectiveness of juvenile curfew policies, which will be a crucial empirical contribution to the debate over the use of juvenile curfew policies.

² Nelson, A. (1994), The Cincinnati Curfew Ordinance: A Preliminary Report, Cincinnati, OH: Cincinnati Human Relations Commission. – This reference could not be located, so the information described here is taken from the Ruefle and Reynolds, 1996 (p.68) description of that work.
³ Fisher, S. (1995), University of South Alabama Polling Group Report #95-17 (unpublished). – This reference could not be located, so the information described here is taken from the Ruefle and Reynolds, 1996 (p.69) description of that work.
⁴ Ruefle and Reynolds, 1996 (p.81)
3. Define the population

The particular population of interest is the jurisdiction or site implementing the juvenile curfew policy. It is expected that these studies will use mostly aggregate level data within each site. It is possible, but not anticipated, that we may find studies using individual level data to address the effects of juvenile curfew policies on the individual. These studies will also be included in the analysis, as appropriate.

4. Define the intervention

Generally, the term juvenile encompasses individuals up to and including those 18 years of age, but we will also include those individuals who are culturally accepted as juveniles by the country implementing the curfew policy.

We are operationalizing juvenile curfew policies as any policy that restricts, or otherwise imposes a penalty for, a juvenile’s presence outside of the home during predefined periods of time. The predefined time could be either night or day. Additionally, juveniles must have their presence restricted to a residence; we do not intend to address truancy policies, which would restrict access to schools rather than a residence.

5. Outcome(s) (what is aimed to accomplish – Primary and secondary outcomes should all be mentioned)

Outcomes of interest include any measures of criminal behavior, public safety, and/or victimization. Where available, we will also include traffic fatalities.

6. Methodology (What types of studies are to be included or excluded and what will be your method of synthesis? Will you use meta-analysis?)

We will include any experimental design, but it is anticipated that most studies will use a quasi-experimental design. More specifically, we will include studies that use a time-series design, and those that use various cross-sectional designs with comparison groups.

If the data allow, we will use meta-analysis.

7. Do you need support in any of these areas (methodology, statistics, systematic searches, field expertise, review manager etc?)

The review team has significant experience conducting Campbell Systematic Reviews and meta-analysis. The review team also has experience with research on juvenile crime policies.
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