OXFORD JOURNAL
OF STUDENT
SCHOLARSHIP

Beyond the Boston Miracle: Modernizing Youth Violence Prevention in Boston

Bea Samuels
beacsamuels@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Despite decades of innovative youth violence prevention policies such as Operation Ceasefire, Boston still struggles with youth violence. Contemporary public safety in the city remains unequal, where violent incidents primarily occur in historically marginalized areas such as Dorchester, Mattapan, and Roxbury. To explain this persistence, this research examines how post-pandemic structural shifts in the city affect youth violence and the efficacy of the city's response, or lack thereof, to these factors. This study employs a mixed-methods approach, using municipal safety reports, expert interviews, and youth perspectives from the 2025 Youth Speaks Boston qualitative data collection. After analysis, this data demonstrates that youth violence in Boston is no longer driven by the drug markets of the 1990s, but by insufficient nighttime infrastructure, social media hyper-vigilance, and an institutional legitimacy crisis. This paper aims to provide evidence-based policy recommendations for the city of Boston, arguing that effective youth violence prevention requires modernizing outreach frameworks and creating a codified interagency response framework.

INTRODUCTION

Although citywide crime metrics in Boston have celebrated historic lows in gun violence rates, beneath these statistics, public safety in the city remains unstable. According to data from the Boston Police Department (BPD) and Boston Public Health Commission (BPHC), between 2018 and 2024, approximately 80% of gun violence and severe youth incidents were concentrated in the historically marginalized communities of Roxbury, Mattapan, and Dorchester, while 4 out of 5 reported victims were Black youth (Boston Police Department; Boston Public Health Commission). This spatial and demographic inequality presents a core paradox for the treatment of youth safety in Boston: although Boston has low levels of youth violence and is a pioneer for youth safety policy across the nation, it continues to struggle with a severe degree of localized youth violence (Winship 11; Braga, Hureau, and Winship 348).

Scholarship on youth violence in Boston has shifted from an approach favoring policing and law enforcement-centric strategies to a multidisciplinary public health and community-focused approach that targets root causes for violence (Nation et al. 372) Historically, Boston played a fundamental role in shaping modern American youth violence prevention through the implementation of the Boston Gun Project, Operation Night Light, and Operation Ceasefire in the mid-1990s, which are collectively referred

to as part of the "Boston Miracle" initiative (Kennedy 29; Braga, Hureau, and Winship 341). Led by criminologists David M. Kennedy and Anthony A. Braga, this "focused deterrence" model aimed to target gang violence by coupling law enforcement and parole officers with social services and community faith-based organizations to help and monitor the minority of chronically gang-affiliated youth disproportionately responsible for a large percentage of city homicides (Kennedy 32-33). By coupling direct enforcement with social services and community partners, Boston youth homicides dropped by two-thirds across Boston in the late 1990s.

However, there has been a long-term failure of the focused deterrence framework. Critics of the framework argue that changes in leadership, funding, and organizational priorities may temporarily or permanently remove city-driven partnerships and interventions from the communities or individuals they aim to serve. In the early 2000s, key multi-agency communications ended, "working group" meetings between police officers, streetworkers, and probation officers were abandoned, and the key community group The TenPoint Coalition (a Black clergy) faced internal administrative issues. The "focused deterrence" strategy collapsed, and Boston experienced a resurgence of youth violence, including the highly publicized 2002 death of a three-year-old boy in Boston's Dorchester neighborhood due to a stray bullet during a shooting (Winship 399). Scholars highlight the importance of sustained partnerships and community support for long-term success.

In the decades following the original "Boston Miracle" Model, research has expanded beyond traditional deterrence mechanisms to examine the underlying socioeconomic and structural factors that lead to youth violence, including poverty, housing instability, racial inequality, immigration status, and mental health (Nation et al. S28-S29). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) currently recommends a comprehensive set of practices that identify community risks, modify physical or social environments, and provide early onset behavioral interventions for offending youth (David-Ferdon et al 11-33). Additionally, recent scholarship emphasizes the importance of trauma-informed care (Fehrenbach, T. et al. 1-3, 30-35). Recognizing exposure to violence at an early age as an Adverse Childhood Experience (ACE), current interventions include Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy or multi-systemic case planning to disrupt cycles of violence and recidivism.

Today, Boston's youth safety landscape operates under a fundamentally altered set of localized pressures. Under Mayor Michelle Wu, the city employs a broader youth violence intervention program that combines aspects of legacy-focused deterrence models with a public health and community outreach-based approach through the Boston Public Health Commission and other city agencies (Boston Police Department; Boston Public Health Commission). However, youth violence has simultaneously evolved with the introduction of new pressures, including social media, shifting neighborhood dynamics, and increased immigration enforcement that creates distrust among marginalized populations.

Despite the evolving dynamics, expert interviews in this study reveal that youth violence response strategies remain fragmented in the city (McLean-Nichols; Rivera). Although Boston maintains interagency initiatives, these efforts do not constitute the unified youth violence response framework

proposed in this study (Boston Public Health Commission). Additionally, youth voices remain unrepresented in both academia and policy creation for youth violence despite being the population most affected by safety interventions.

This study addresses this gap within public safety governance research by examining why Boston continues to face persistent high rates of localized youth violence by evaluating its current intervention approach with experts and youth insight. I argue that reducing localized youth violence in Boston requires moving past legacy frameworks to address post-pandemic structural realities through a formal integrated public health and community outreach approach that structurally embeds youth voices.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a mixed-methods research design, including interviews with experts, youth interview data, and published reports to evaluate why Boston continues to face localized sparks in youth violence despite top-tier interventions. The primary qualitative component included two semi-structured interviews with experts from the Boston area representing state-level and grassroots work against youth violence. To obtain these expert interviews, I targeted a variety of municipal and non-profit organizations (some of which I have already established relationships with through previous work) early in the research timeline and provided these experts with a plethora of interview times and options for meetings.

To contact professionals, I sent formal email requests (Appendix A). I first conducted an interview with Nathaniel McLean-Nichols of Teen Empowerment (TE), who represented neighborhood-level, peer-to-peer violence de-escalation tactics in the areas of Roxbury and Dorchester. This interview focused on the operational realities of violence prevention and de-escalation, including the role of social media in escalating conflict and physical barriers to safety, including gaps in public transportation and third spaces (Appendix B). I then conducted an interview with Alejandra Rivera of the Massachusetts Coalition to Prevent Gun Violence (MACOPGV), representing state-level advocacy and public health frameworks. This interview focused on recent state policy priorities and the impact of federal funding cuts on state-backed organizations (Appendix C). By interviewing these two professionals, I was able to gather expert perspectives from the dual policy and grassroots aspects of the Boston youth violence landscape, gaining holistic expert insight.

With consideration of the possible biases of individual perspectives, I corroborated insights from anonymous interviews with qualitative youth-safety data collected by the 2025 Mayor's Youth Council for the Youth Speaks city initiative. Specifically, I coded five focus group transcripts representing geographically diverse youth organizations across Boston (Appendix D). Using previously collected data rather than novel youth interviews adheres to the trauma-informed research standards, protecting youth from potential re-traumatization by discussing sensitive topics whilst still centering their lived experiences.

To obtain a holistic view of Boston's safety landscape, I systematically reviewed scholarship on violence prevention methods and institutional reports from the Boston Police Department (BPD), Boston Public Health Commission (BPHC), and the Massachusetts state government. This review included data from the "Boston Miracle" era and modern mechanisms such as the CDC's WISQARS and YRBSS systems. Analysis also incorporated 2026 GBH news reports on emerging city youth violence prevention policies.

I used thematic analysis to transform qualitative data into synthesized results. First, I conducted initial coding, a mechanism described by Johnny Saldaña in his book The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers (Saldaña 101), on the Dedoose platform to identify gaps in Boston's current youth violence intervention policies. I identified and labeled key concepts within interview transcripts such as [TRANS-ISO] for transportation isolation and [OP-GAP] for operational gaps in access to third spaces. To maintain consistency and organization in my codes, I made a table with definitions for each code and requirements for coded text (Appendix E). Then I conducted second-cycle and axial coding, a system popularized by researchers Braun & Clarke (Byrne 1391). During this process, I distinguished broader categories, including "digital determinants", which includes mentions of social media escalating violence and inciting recidivism. Then, using triangulation, I captured overarching themes by crossing all three areas of my data collection, including my review of reports published by the city and news, and synthesized my findings into a triangulated evidence matrix that included thematic categories defined by axial coding and the most relevant frequencies in youth transcripts, expert insight, and literature contextualization related to the category.

RESULTS

After coding youth and expert interview transcripts, I identified the four thematic categories of physical barriers, social media as a catalyst, institutional legitimacy, and exclusion of youth voices. I then triangulated my findings through cross-referencing with existing literature and city reports to come up with the triangulated evidence matrix below:

Table 1: Triangulated Evidence Matrix

Thematic Category	Frequency in Youth Transcripts	Expert Insight	Literature Contextualization
Physical and Temporal Barriers	24 mentions of significant delays in transit or isolation due to lack thereof Eight mentions of high risk after dark and unlit outside areas 11 mentions of lack of access to free third spaces Four mentions of gender-based unsafety Seven mentions of substance abuse as a tool for mental escape	McLean-Nichols (TE) identifies the Silver Line as an underutilized source of transit amongst youth McLean-Nichols (TE) identifies community center early closures as a barrier for third space access Rivera (MACOPGV) identifies federal funding cuts as detrimental to infrastructure/programming for youth (i.e., ROCA)	CDC Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) strategy to "modify the physical environment" of victims after a violent incident through environmental redesign Criminologist David M. Kennedy explains the concept of "Problem-Oriented Policing", which describes friction within specific geographical turf that sparks violence, requiring localized solutions

Thematic Category	Frequency in Youth Transcripts	Expert Insight	Literature Contextualization
Social Media as a catalyst	Nine mentions of social media rumors sparking physical fights	McLean-Nichols (TE) identifies social media as a privacy risk and source for misidentification with gang affiliation. Rivera (MACOPGV) identifies that social media can incite "hyper-vigilance" and create a "widened pool of trauma"	The National Child Traumatic Stress Network (Fehrenbach, T. et al.) describes an "Exposure/Reaction" framework, where witnessing violence via digital platforms creates "traumatic stress reactions" The AJPH calls for a shift toward "Structural Violence Prevention", which recognizes modern environmental factors (such as our digital landscape) within policy

Thematic Category	Frequency in Youth Transcripts	Expert Insight	Literature Contextualization
Institutional Legitimacy	15 mentions of police harassment, "shakedowns", and feeling targeted whilst wearing masks outside Six mentions of a gap in promotion for city events/opportunities for youth	McLean-Nichols (TE) notes "stigma" of law enforcement vs. the "approachability" of community members/peers Rivera (MACOPGV) cites "uptick of federal agent shootings" as reason for institutional distrust, as well as prevalence of unsolved homicides Rivera (MACOPGV) notes prosecutors treat 18–20-year-olds as adults within the justice system despite developmental science, denying them rehabilitative resources and future employment opportunities	The NCTSN highlights that a lack of "Cultural Humility" amongst providers can create "structural trauma" where youth feel targeted by those meant to help them Kennedy's "focused deterrence" model argues that "moral engagement" and discourse are essential to establish state legitimacy

Thematic Category	Frequency in Youth Transcripts	Expert Insight	Literature Contextualization
Exclusion of Youth Voices	12 mentions of adults dismissing feelings and struggles with mental health or academic stress	McLean-Nichols (TE) argues for moving from "youth-informed" to "youth-led" models Rivera (MACOPGV) notes that youth feel distanced from state legislators	AJPH argues "Empowerment Processes" for youth are vital to challenge structural marginalization NCTSN has "Full Partner" protocol, which mandates incorporating youth priorities instead of adult-imposed ones Kennedy identifies youth as "Rational Actors", with valuable input on policy decisions

Physical and Temporal Barriers

Amongst the most prominent obstacles to effectively addressing patterns of localized youth violence are physical and temporal barriers to safe spaces in Boston. Although many youths stay outdoors until 9-10 pm, most neighborhood resources such as community centers in Boston close at 7 pm (McLean-Nichols). Teen Empowerment's McLean-Nichols defines this as a "vacuum of safety", where adult supervision and constructive spaces vanish as conflict risk escalates (McLean-Nichols). For example, interviewed youth in Dorchester note that Basketball courts in Dorchester and Mattapan (areas that experience high rates of youth violence) remain dark whilst courts in more affluent areas such as the South End remain lit until 10:00 pm (Mayor's Youth Council, 300).

Additionally, limited public transportation makes access to constructive spaces in the city more challenging. 24 interviewed youths reported delays in popular train lines, which not only makes access difficult, but can leave youth stranded in unfamiliar areas where they fear their origins may "set someone off" (Mayor's Youth Council, 126).

Social Media as an Aggravant

Another critical determinant that is often absent from legacy literature and city policies is the role of our digital landscape in accelerating physical violence amongst youths. As seen in the triangulated data, both experts and youth identify rumors and drama on social media apps as causes for in-person fights. Expert McLean-Nichols notes that not only do rumors on social media "spread faster than word-of-mouth", but social media connections can lead to false gang-affiliation accusations, which endanger youth. He states that even "simple" digital interactions such as "following an account", liking a "funny video", or reposting a friend's post can be misinterpreted as affiliation with a gang. Additionally, he acknowledges that some apps allow location-sharing, which can endanger targeted youths.

Another aspect of our digital landscape is the "widened pool of trauma", which expert Rivera explains as a phenomenon that occurs because of the widened availability of footage of incidents of youth violence, traumatizing more individuals.

Institutional Legitimacy

The data reveals a lack of institutional legitimacy amongst youths similar to that which unraveled the efficacy of the Boston Miracle project in the 2000s, where particular Boston Police Department initiatives were "perceived as indiscriminate and overly aggressive by many inner-city minority community" (Braga, Hureau, and Winship 141). As seen in the table, 15 youths mentioned feeling "picked on" by law enforcement or subjected to "shakedowns" (Mayor's Youth Council, 305). One participant detailed a particularly traumatizing and invasive encounter with a "gang unit" that "pulled apart the whole car" only to leave when they found no illicit materials, with no explanation.

Expert McLean-Nichols notes a personal experience where he witnessed youth about to fight and then running away together at the sight of law enforcement, escalating the risk of severe violence given forced proximity in a more isolated area. In his experience as a community teen leader, he notes that when youth see someone they respect, such as a teen leader or older community member, they are more likely to de-escalate or disengage in illicit behavior (McLean-Nichols). For this reason, he advocates for peer-to-peer models of youth violence intervention instead of top-down management strategies.

Lastly, the legitimacy gap persists in how prosecutors treat 18–20-year-olds. Rivera notes that these youths are in a "delicate state of development," yet they are treated as grown adults by the justice system (Rivera). Thus, the justice system not only denies youth rehabilitative resources, but bars them from avenues of future employment, which youth perceive as a "system designed for us to fail" (Rivera; Mayor's Youth Council 427).

Exclusion of Youth Voices

Teen Empowerment's McLean-Nichols identifies that violence prevention needs a "paradigm shift", arguing that whilst city efforts are often "youth-informed", they are not "youth-led". He instead advocates for giving teens "the keys to the community center" to design their own events and safety protocols (McLean-Nichols).

However, the exclusion of youth voices is not limited to policy. The Mayor's Youth Council interview transcripts show 12 mentions of adults dismissing feelings and struggles with mental health or academic stress. This leads youth participants within Roxbury and Dorchester, areas with high levels of youth violence, to view substance abuse as a "100% escape" for mental health problems, revealing gaps in how mental health is treated in Boston, especially in cases of youth violence (Mayor's Youth Council 518). Boston's "Escape Paradox," or turning to vices for escape that can exacerbate existing problems, persists because interviewed youth report that adults in mental health spaces within Boston "minimize" or "dismiss" their issues, stating that they "don't have real problems yet" (Mayor's Youth Council 401).

DISCUSSION

This systematic triangulation of data reveals that youth violence in Boston is no longer driven by the "disorderly drug markets" of the 1990s, but by structural gaps within modern infrastructure (Winship 11). While historical models such as Operation Ceasefire during the "Boston Miracle" era relied on a coordinated "network of capacity" between law enforcement, social workers, and communities, these findings reveal that the current fragmentation of programs and the city's "dual" deterrence and outreach approach fail to address physical, digital, and institutional determinants (Braga, Hureau, and Winship 147; Adame).

Environmental Inequality as a Barrier

The observed disparity in street lighting between more affluent areas such as the South End and poorer areas with higher rates of localized youth violence is not merely a utility issue, but a breakdown of the CPTED youth violence prevention strategy (Mayor's Youth Council 300, 363; McLean-Nichols). According to the CDC, modifications to a victim's physical environment after an incident of youth violence are imperative to reducing recidivism and maintaining physical and mental safety as part of the CPTED strategy (David-Ferdon et al. 33). Modifications include investment in the marginalized communities themselves through enhanced visibility and proper infrastructure maintenance, allowing for social interaction and "collective efficacy", or the shared trust among community residents to intervene in cases of crime. According to an LA CDC study, areas experiencing youth violence observed an 8% reduction in overall violent crime after receiving investment compared to marginalized neighborhoods without investment, in addition to significant economic benefits due to reduced crime rates and reduced arrests (David-Ferdon et al. 33).

Thus, by neglecting the physical environments of marginalized areas, the city maintains high-risk areas at high-risk times for youth violence (McLean-Nichols; Mayor's Youth Council 300). Additionally, the environmental inequality facilitates decreased institutional legitimacy as residents feel abandoned by the city, directly undermining the "moral engagement" strategies of legacy focused deterrence models (Braga, Hureau, and Winship 141; Kennedy 12). These models aim to empower offenders in caring for their communities, which is undermined when the state fails to demonstrate its own stewardship through basic infrastructure, leading youth to feel institutionally abandoned, validating distrust and reinforcing cycles of localized youth violence. Additionally, the observed lack of infrastructure in marginalized areas reinforces youth violence because it encourages youth to stay close to their immediate geographic turf at night, reinforcing potentially violent neighborhood parochialism (or the prioritization of one's neighborhood over the broader community), rather than passing into potentially dangerous unlit areas (Rivera; Mayor's Youth Council 126; McLean-Nichols).

The Digital Frontier as a Hotspot for Youth Violence

While legacy frameworks like Operation Ceasefire were historically successful at reducing physically bound drug markets and gang violence, legacy frameworks in Boston are unable to target digital determinants of violence. Social media has kickstarted a stage of digital "hyper-vigilance" amongst youth, which is defined as a state of 24/7 awareness of violence, violent actors, and community rumors on social media (McLean-Nichols; Mayor's Youth Council 185). As mentioned by McLean-Nichols, social media can incite rumors and even gang-miss-association which can lead youth to be physically targeted, an issue that is further exacerbated when youth's location can be identified through location-sharing and other identifying social media posts. This "digital miss-association" creates a heightened sense of alarm for youth, as they know that peers and family scrutinize online interaction and it may be used to spark physical altercations (McLean-Nichols; Mayor's Youth Council 192).

Rivera details another aspect of digital hypervigilance, is when people post violence online, creating a "widened pool of trauma" (Rivera; Mayor's Youth Council 185). According to the NCTSN's "Exposure/Reaction" framework, witnessing digital violence creates "traumatic stress reactions" like witnessing in-person violence. These reactions include a constant state of being "on edge" or in a stage of "fight or flight", as well as relationship issues, psychological problems such as hopelessness or depression, as well as reactive violence that continues cycles of youth violence recidivism (Fehrenbach, T. et al. 808, 812; Mayor's Youth Council 193).

As expert McLean-Nichols observed, current city frameworks are ill-equipped to monitor the digital landscape, which often operates outside of the 9-5 hours of formal city intervention or monitoring programs (McLean-Nichols). Also, outreach workers in the city often lack the appropriate resources to de-escalate digital rumors in the city before they escalate into street violence, exemplifying the importance of a codified interagency digital-response framework (McLean-Nichols; Mayor's Youth Council 186). This is recognized by the AJPH, which calls for a shift toward "Structural Violence Prevention", which recognizes modern environmental factors (such as our digital landscape) within

policy, indicating a nationwide blind spot on the role of youth violence in our digital landscape (Nation et al. S28).

Institutional Legitimacy and System-Induced Youth Violence

The crisis of localized youth violence in Boston is fueled by "system-induced trauma", where victims feel targeted by those meant to protect them due to frequent shakedowns, invasive searches, and stigmatization. According to the NCTSN, these experiences are examples of providers lacking "cultural humility" or understanding of the communities they serve and possible historical biases; those youths feel victimized by those intending to protect or help them (Fehrenbach, T. et al. 794). This structural gap exacerbates tendencies towards violence because when youth distrust the systems designed to protect them, practitioners find they are more likely to engage in adaptive survival behaviors, such as joining gangs or delinquent groups for protection in their areas (Fehrenbach, T. et al. 745, 750).

Boston's institutional legitimacy crisis is further exacerbated by the exclusion of 18–20-year-olds from the juvenile system, barring them from rehabilitative resources and future employment opportunities despite not being at a fully developed cognitive stage. The barriers in opportunities experienced by these youths may trap young individuals in a cycle of poverty or lack of opportunity, one of the main root causes of community-based gun violence according to the MACOPGV, due to previous offenders resorting to violence and gang affiliation for income (Rivera). Additionally, when young individuals feel as though they have no place in the larger society, they remain in their immediate geographical turfs, which not only reinforces potentially violent neighborhood parochialism, but traps offenders in the same environmental pressures that may have once caused them to offend, inciting recidivism in their areas. By forcing youth through an adult justice system that increases recidivism rather than rehabilitation, the state facilitates the very same cycle of localized violence it intends to deter (Braga, Hureau, and Winship 153).

Lack of Youth Agency and the "Escape Paradox"

The lack of youth inclusion in discussions on reducing youth violence goes against criminologist and sociologist David M. Kennedy's description of youth as "rational actors" who respond better to empowerment rather than "top-down management" (Kennedy 12-13). By moving from "management" to empowerment, the city can fulfill the NCTSN's "Full Partner" protocol, which mandates incorporating youth priorities instead of adult-imposed ones to ensure policies are relevant to the lived experiences of modern Boston Youth. Furthermore, as argued by AJPH, "Empowerment Processes", or the inclusion of youth in the creation of prevention mechanisms, are vital to challenge structural marginalization (Nation et al. S29; Mayor's Youth Council 188).

Youth reliance on substance abuse within Boston is linked to violence. Over 75% of homicide victims and offenders in Boston have previous drug-related charges (Kennedy 30). This suggests that the "Escape Paradox" is not just a personal mental health crisis, but a problematic reaction pattern that systemically

traps youth in the illegal drug market and "disorderly markets" that spark youth violence (Mayor's Youth Council 197).

There are several limitations of my research. First, my study was constrained by a limited timeframe, which prevented me from being able to gather more than two expert interviews. Thus, although the interviews were corroborated with a larger set of qualitative data and existing literature, there is inherent bias in relying on a small number of professional perspectives. Additionally, although I interviewed a wide set of geographically diverse youth participants, the perspectives of the interviewed youth do not represent the opinions of all Bostonian youths. Also, although students from the areas of Dorchester and Roxbury were interviewed, no organization from Mattapan was interviewed despite Mattapan experiencing high rates of localized youth violence, leaving out potential area-specific youth insight. Additionally, the majority of my research on public health outreach mechanisms for youth violence was informed by studies conducted on a national scale, which allows for the possibility of generalizations non-specific or not relevant to the Boston safety landscape.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study suggest that Boston's current youth-violence prevention plan needs improvement to reduce or eliminate cycles of localized violence. Based on the results, I suggest Boston move toward a formalized interagency structure that addresses the physical, digital, and structural determinants above.

Spatial and Temporal Redesign

First, Boston should fund community centers to remain open until 10 PM on weekends and implement lighting in youth spaces such as transit hubs and basketball courts in Dorchester and Roxbury (McLean-Nichols; Mayor's Youth Council 190). Additionally, Massachusetts should designate dedicated youth shuttles for inter-neighborhood travel in geographically isolated areas to bypass train delays and neighborhood exposure on days of city youth events (McLean-Nichols; Mayor's Youth Council 126).

Legislative Reform

Massachusetts should incorporate the proposed "Raise the Age" legislation into justice systems and prosecute 18–20-year-olds as juveniles to provide rehabilitative services and lower recidivism and localized violence (Rivera; Mayor's Youth Council 196). Also, Boston should mandate "Cultural Humility" training for law enforcement to address implicit bias and gain community trust (Fehrenbach, T. et al. 187, 857).

Digital Oversight

The city should codify “Digital Outreach Teams” composed of outreach workers with space for youth to submit online tips to track digital drama and threats of violence (McLean-Nichols; Mayor's Youth Council 192). This would be in conjunction with city-established interagency programming for youth with tools on how to navigate digital “hyper-vigilance” safely. This would include creating “youth-led digital space”, where youth could draft their own safety protocols for their communities regarding digital communication (McLean-Nichols).

Interagency Programming

Boston should codify a formalized interagency “youth violence response" framework. This framework would include the implementation of Trauma-Informed Case Plans (TICP) for youth after a violent incident through the codification of a model where child welfare, juvenile justice, and schools use a coordinated multidisciplinary approach to ensure a youth’s Trauma and Recovery Safety Plan (T-RASP) follows them across systems (Fehrenbach, T. et al. 833, 848). Additionally, this framework would establish official neighborhood response teams composed of restorative justice practitioners and CPR-certified youth for peer-to-peer de-escalation in lieu of top-down interventions (McLean-Nichols; Mayor's Youth Council 187). Finally, this framework would transition select community centers in areas with high rates of localized youth violence to include youth input, where they would have a tangible impact on budget advocacy and programming to move youth in Boston from being “recipients of management” to “rational actors” with third spaces they actually know and care about (Kennedy 13, 198; Nation et al. S28).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the persistent nature of localized youth violence in the city of Boston suggests that the youth safety landscape is not stagnant, but a developing dynamic ecosystem that requires continuous policy evaluation and adaptation to address modern determinants. The study’s core findings reveal misalignment between legacy policies and fragmented response-based initiatives and the lived experiences of youth. This is primarily characterized by a safety "vacuum" at nighttime, unaddressed digital dangers, institutional distrust, and exclusion of youth experiences in policy and youth spaces that can be mitigated through a formalized interagency structure that addresses the physical, digital, and structural determinants of modern localized youth violence (McLean-Nichols; Mayor's Youth Council 300).

This research builds upon existing youth violence scholarship by bridging the gap between legacy focused deterrence scholarship and modern public health research to identify the most effective path for Boston to reduce current localized youth violence. While building on David A. Kennedy’s pioneering theory of

youth as “rational actors” who respond best to “moral engagement strategies”, this research reshapes the field by putting focus on the digital landscape as a primary non-physical landscape that incites physical violence (Kennedy 12; McLean-Nichols). Whilst legacy frameworks such as “Operation Ceasefire” during the “Boston Miracle” era of policies focused on the drug market as a main determinant for gang violence and youth homicide, my research prioritizes social media rumors, digital "hypervigilance", and gang misidentification as powerful yet unchecked determinants for violence.

Additionally, my research offers concrete evidence for the “Social and Structural Determinants of Health” (the theory that youth violence is caused by social and structural issues) identified by the AJPH by identifying the relationship between environmental infrastructure gaps, early community center closures, and transportation isolation in the exacerbation of localized youth violence in the city; thus proving that youth violence is not only a behavioral issue but a structural one (Nation et al. S28; McLean-Nichols; Mayor's Youth Council 126).

While this study captures a contemporary picture of localized youth violence in Boston, critical gaps remain. Future scholarship could identify the impact of gender on perceived safety in third spaces or outreach programs within the city, as well as the distinct structural factors impacting Latinx youth in the city, to define localized and culturally sensitive interventions. Additionally, there is a need for research on the impact of seeing violence on social media, and the long-term implications of this for brain development in youths and on overall violence recidivism rates in the city. For Boston to maintain a sustainable safety ecosystem, the city must stop viewing youth as subjects for management but as the facilitators for their own collective peace.

REFERENCES

Adame, Diane. "Boston seeks to stem seasonal spike in violence with expanded teen programming." GBH News, 20 May 2026, https://www.wgbh.org/news/local/2026-05-20/boston-seeks-to-stem-seasonal-spike-in-violence-with-expanded-teen-programming.

"Boston Strategy to Prevent Youth Violence -- Boston, MA." Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh176/files/pubs/gun_violence/profile02.html. Accessed 10 Aug. 2026.

Boston Police Department. Crime Incident Reports (2018-2024). Analyze Boston, City of Boston, 2024, https://data.boston.gov/. Accessed 10 Aug 2026.

Boston Public Health Commission. Public Health Data and Youth Safety Reports. Analyze Boston, City of Boston, 2024, https://bphc.org/. Accessed 10 Aug 2026.

Braga, Anthony A., David Hureau, and Christopher Winship. "Losing Faith? Police, Black Churches, and the Resurgence of Youth Violence in Boston." Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law, vol. 6, 2008, pp. 141-165.

Byrne, David. “A Worked Example of Braun and Clarke’s Approach to Reflexive Thematic Analysis.” Quality & Quantity, vol. 56, no. 3, 2022, pp. 1391-1412.

David-Ferdon, Corinne, et al. Youth Violence Prevention Resource for Action: A Compilation of the Best Available Evidence. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2016.

Fehrenbach, T. et al. A Trauma-Informed Guide for Working with Youth Involved in Multiple Systems. National Center for Child Traumatic Stress, 2022.

Kennedy, David M. Deterrence and Crime Prevention: Reconsidering the Prospect of Sanction. Routledge, 2009.

McLean-Nichols, Nathaniel. Interview. Conducted by Bea Samuels, 14 July 2026.

Nation, Maury, et al. "Social and Structural Determinants of Health and Youth Violence: Shifting the Paradigm of Youth Violence Prevention." American Journal of Public Health, vol. 111, no. S1, 1 May 2021, pp. S28-S31.

Mayor's Youth Council, Office of Youth Engagement and Advancement. "Boston Chinatown Neighborhood Center Focus Group Transcript." Spring 2025.

---. "Cape Verdean Association Focus Group Transcript." Spring 2025.

---. "Franklin Fields Focus Group Transcript." Spring 2025.

---. "Sociedad Latina Focus Group Transcript." Spring 2025.

---. "Youth Build Boston Focus Group Transcript." Spring 2025.

Rivera, Alejandra. Interview. Conducted by Bea Samuels, 15 July 2026.

Saldaña, Johnny. The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers. 4th ed., SAGE Publishing, 2021.

Winship, Christopher. "End of a Miracle? Crime, Faith, and Partnership in Boston in the 1990's." Harvard University, Mar. 2002.

APPENDIX

A. Email Sent to Nathaniel McLean-Nichols

Dear Teen Empowerment Team,

My name is Bea Camilla Samuels, and I am a high school student at The Newman School conducting a research study on modern youth violence prevention models. Drawing from my background with the Boston Mayor's Youth Council, I have so much respect for your neighborhood-level work. I would be deeply grateful to interview a member of your team about how local interventions interact with modern challenges such as digital conflicts and how city policy can better elevate youth perspectives.

I would love to coordinate a 10-minute Zoom meeting, or I can send over a short list of questions via email for a written response at your convenience. I am also open to other ideas at your convenience.
Thank you for your time and for everything you do to empower Boston's youth.

Best regards,
Bea Camilla Samuels
The Newman School

B. Questions asked to Nathaniel McLean-Nichols

1. In your opinion, is peer-to-peer youth organizing more effective at de-escalating neighborhood conflicts than traditional, top-down city interventions? Why?
2. What are the most pressing safety concerns your youth organizers are voicing today, and how have they been shaped by modern factors like social media?
3. In what ways do Boston's current public safety policies underperform when it comes to Youth Violence?
4. What barriers most heavily impact a teen's sense of safety in Boston right now? How effective are the city's expanded teen summer jobs and extended evening community center hours in keeping youth safe, and what needs to be improved?

C. Questions asked to Alejandra Rivera

1. How does your office balance immediate intervention strategies with long-term initiatives aimed at modifying the social and structural determinants of health (e.g., housing instability, environmental changes)?
2. Boston has historically relied on a "focused deterrence" model for gun violence reduction. In your view, how has the paradigm shifted toward a comprehensive public health framework in recent years?
3. What specific data points or emerging trends (such as seasonal spikes or changing neighborhood demographics) are currently driving your coalition's legislative and municipal policy priorities?
4. How has the rising intersection of social media communication and youth conflict altered the timing and deployment of city-funded street outreach workers or peacemakers?
5. What mechanisms does your division use to ensure that the actual lived experiences and policy preferences of Boston teens are elevated to state and municipal lawmakers?

D. Safety Questions Asked to Youth by Mayor’s Youth Council

1. How safe do you feel in your community?
    a. What are some things that make you feel safe in your community?
    b. What are some things that make you feel unsafe?
        i. What changes would make these places feel safer?
    c. What are the biggest safety concerns for youth in your community?
        i. What role can adults play in addressing these concerns?

E. Transcript Codebook

Thematic Category	Code	Code Name	Operational Definition	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Physical and Temporal Barriers	**Trans-ISO**	Transportation Isolation	Inadequate, delayed, or unreliable transportation that limits mobility or access to safety	References to train delays, transport barriers, or traversing unsafe areas	General complaints about traffic or trains that do not limit youth mobility
Physical and Temporal Barriers	**OP-GAP**	Operational Gaps	Operating hours for youth services being misaligned with higher risk hours	References to "safety vacuums" at nighttime or third spaces closing early	General discussion of neighborhood infrastructure without mention of temporal danger due to limited operating hours
Physical and Temporal Barriers	**ENV-DISP**	Environ -mental Disparities	Differences in safety related infrastructure across areas with socioeconomic differences	References to disparities in lighting or safety infrastructure between areas	Discussion of neighborhood aesthetics or infrastructure unrelated to youth safety
Social Media as a Catalyst	**DIG-MIS**	Digital Miss-associati on	Online activity leading to false gang association	References to social media rumors or perceived affiliation affecting physical safety of youth	General social media use for communication and entertainment or rumors unrelated to physical violence risk
Social Media as a Catalyst	**VIR-TRAU**	Viral Trauma	Widespread videos or imagery of violence on social media causing stress reactions	References to witnessing violence digitally	Witnessing fictionalized violence online, or witnessing violence in-person

Thematic Category	**Code**	**Code Name**	**Operational Definition**	**Inclusion Criteria**	**Exclusion Criteria**
Institutional Legitimacy	**SYS-TRAU**	Systemic Trauma	Negative thoughts or emotions associated with law enforcement due to perceived mistreatment	References to shakedowns, feeling targeted, or other police interactions described as abusive or traumatic	Lawful arrests or routine interactions where abuse is not mentioned
Institutional Legitimacy	**LEG-Gap**	Legitimacy Gap	Distrust of organizations due to lack of cultural sensitivity	Insufficient "cultural humility" amongst service providers or raise the age legislation.	General disagreement with city policies or government decisions.
Minimization of Youth Agency	**ADUL-DIS**	Adult Dismissal	When adults minimize youth experiences or exclude them from decision making	Mentions of youth mental health being minimized by adults or exclusion of youth in discussions about youth prevention policies	Successful youth-led initiatives or access to quality mental health resources
Minimization of Youth Agency	**ESC-PARA**	Escape Paradox	Reliance on harmful coping mechanisms to escape stress	Reference to substance abuse because of negative emotions, stress, or trauma due to perceived unsafety	Mentions of recreational substance use not connected to stress or perceived unsafety.