

Child Access Prevention Laws, Youth Gun Carrying, and School Shootings

D. Mark Anderson
Montana State University & IZA
Department of Agricultural Economics and Economics
Email: dwright.anderson@montana.edu

Joseph J. Sabia*
Director of the Center for Health Economics & Policy Studies
San Diego State University, University of New Hampshire & IZA
Departments of Economics
Email: jsabia@mail.sdsu.edu

October 2017

* Corresponding author. Address: Department of Economics, Peter T. Paul College of Business & Economics, Durham, New Hampshire 03824. Phone: 603-862-3323. Email: jsabia@mail.sdsu.edu.

We thank Josh Latshaw, Taylor Mackay, Thanh Tam Nguyen, Kadeem Noray, Maggie O'Donnell, Usamah Wasif, and John Westall for excellent research assistance. We also thank David Simon, Ulf Zolitz, and participants at the 2015 Southern Economic Association Annual Meeting, the 2015 Western Economic Association Annual Meeting, the 2015 International Health Economics Association Annual Meeting, the 2017 Population Association of America Annual Meeting, the University of South Florida, the United States Military Academy, West Virginia University, and the University of New Hampshire for their comments and suggestions. Partial support for this research came from a *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development research infrastructure grant, R24 HD042828, to the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology at the University of Washington.

Child Access Prevention Laws, Youth Gun Carrying, and School Shootings

Abstract

Despite intense public interest in keeping guns out of schools, next to nothing is known about the effects of gun control policies on youth gun carrying or school violence. Using data from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveys (YRBS) for the period 1993-2013, this study is the first to examine the relationship between child access prevention (CAP) gun control laws and gun carrying among high school students in the United States. Our results suggest that CAP laws are associated with a nearly 17 percent decrease in the rate of past month gun carrying and a 19 percent decrease in the rate at which students reported being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property. In addition, we find that CAP laws are associated with a lagged decline in the probability that students miss school due to feeling unsafe. These results are concentrated among minors, for whom CAP laws are most likely to bind. To supplement our YRBS analysis, we assemble a novel dataset on school shooting deaths for the period 1991-2013. We find that while CAP laws promote a safer school environment, they have no observable impact on school-associated shooting deaths.

JEL Codes: K4, I2, H7

Key Words: Gun Control, Youth Risky Behavior, School Violence

1. INTRODUCTION

School shootings, such as the recent high-profile events in Chardon, Ohio; Sparks, Nevada; and Troutdale, Oregon, are usually committed by students under the age of 18.¹ In fact, between 2012 and 2015, approximately 70 percent of shootings at K-12 schools in the United States were committed by minors (Everytown.org 2015a). More often than not, the shooters obtained their guns from their own home or the home of a relative (Violence Policy Center 2001; Wood 2001; Copeland 2014). Based on survey data, roughly one-third of households with children reported that firearms were kept in or around their home (Okoro et al. 2005). Among homes with children and firearms, 43 percent reported having at least one gun in an unlocked place (Schuster et al. 2000). According to the Brady Center (2014), 1.7 million children in the United States live in a home with an unlocked and loaded gun.

Advocates for stricter gun control laws cite the wide availability of firearms to youths as an important risk factor for school violence (Wood 2001; Christakis and Christakis 2012; Vartabedian 2014). In an effort to restrict youth firearm access, a number of states have passed child access prevention (CAP) laws, which impose criminal liability on gun owners who allow children unsupervised access to firearms (Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence 2013). Proponents of CAP laws argue that they not only limit intentional shootings but also accidental ones (Shaffer 1999). On the other hand, opponents of gun control contend that CAP laws impede on a gun owner's constitutional right to bear arms. In emergency situations, they argue

¹ On February 27, 2012, Thomas Lane, a 17-year-old student, brought a .22 caliber handgun he had taken from his grandfather's barn to the Chardon High School cafeteria. He fired 10 rounds, killing three students and injuring two others (Crimesider staff 2012; Dolak et al. 2012). On October 21, 2013, 12-year-old seventh-grade student Jose Reyes brought a 9-mm semi-automatic handgun from home to the Sparks Middle School playground. He killed one teacher and injured two students before turning the gun on himself. He obtained the weapon from an unlocked case on a shelf above his kitchen refrigerator (Associated Press 2013). On June 10, 2014, 15-year-old freshman Jared Padgett carried an AR-15 assault rifle in a guitar case on the school bus to Reynolds High School. He used it to kill one student and wound a teacher in the boys' locker room before committing suicide (Bernstein 2014). He took the gun from his brother, a member of the U.S. Army Reserve program (Slauson 2014).

that safe storage requirements encumber a potential victim's ability to use a firearm for self-defense (Shaffer 1999; Lott and Whitley 2001).

While a small literature on CAP laws exists (Cummings et al. 1997; Webster and Starnes 2000; Lott and Whitley 2001; Webster et al. 2004; DeSimone et al. 2013), including recent evidence that CAP laws reduce the probability that minors reside in families with unsafely stored weapons (Prickett et al. 2014), no prior studies have estimated the effect of CAP laws on youth gun carrying or gun-related school violence. In fact, we know very little about the effects of gun control policies on these outcomes.² Studying the impact of CAP laws is appealing because (1) there is substantial state-level variation in the timing of policy adoption, (2) the laws create predictions as to which age groups should be most affected, and (3) heterogeneity in standards for criminal liability (negligent storage vs. reckless endangerment) generates predictions as to where effects should be most strongly felt.

This study begins by examining the relationship between CAP laws and gun carrying among U.S. high school students using data from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveys (YRBS) for the period 1993-2013 when 17 states and D.C. passed CAP laws.³ Our estimates show that CAP laws are associated with a nearly 17 percent decrease in the rate at which high school students under the age of 18 reported carrying a gun in the past month. A causal interpretation of this finding is supported by the fact that we find no evidence to suggest that CAP laws are associated with gun carrying among high school students 18 years of age and older, those students for whom the laws are less likely to bind.

² Economists have studied the crime effects of concealed-carry laws (Ludwig 1998), juvenile gun bans (Marvell 2001), right-to-carry laws (Mustard 2001; Aneja et al. 2012), and stand-your-ground laws (McClellan and Tekin 2016; Cheng and Hoekstra 2013), but none have examined the effects of gun control on school violence.

³ Data are available for before and after a CAP law went into effect for D.C. and 13 of these 17 states.

Turning to outcomes related to a student's own safety, we find that CAP laws are associated with a 19 percent decrease in the rate at which students reported being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property. We also find some evidence that CAP laws are associated with decreases in the rate at which students reported having missed school in the past month due to feeling unsafe.

Finally, we assemble the first comprehensive data set of school-associated shooting deaths in the United States and examine the relationship between CAP laws and these events.⁴ Our results provide little evidence that CAP laws are associated with school shooting deaths committed by minors. Although imprecise, estimated effects are small and statistically indistinguishable from zero at conventional levels. These results suggest that the benefits of CAP laws may not extend to deterring these rare, but tragic events.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Youth Gun Violence

Highly publicized school shootings have increased awareness about youth firearm access and use. A large literature exists on the individual-level correlates of youth gun carrying. Researchers have found that mental health (Saukkonen et al. 2016), victimization (Ruggles and Rajan 2014; Saukkonen et al. 2016), parental involvement (Vaughn et al. 2012), substance use (Hemenway 1996; Ruggles and Rajan 2014), academic performance (Hemenway et al. 1996), and drug dealing (Vaughn et al. 2012) are all strong predictors of youth gun carrying.⁵

⁴ Using data on Chicago high school students, Chandler et al. (2011) studied the determinants of getting shot.

⁵ See Emmert and Lizotte (2015) for a thorough discussion of the research on the demographics of youth weapon carriers and the risk factors for juvenile weapon carrying.

Teens who own guns for sport typically have parents who socialize them into gun use and are unlikely to be involved in criminal activity. On the other hand, teens who obtain guns illegally are often socialized into gun use by their peers, more likely to be criminally active, and more likely to bring guns to school (Lizotte et al. 1994; Lizotte et al. 1997). These teens may impose substantial costs on others. For example, beyond the direct costs incurred by victims and their families, gun-related school violence may have far-reaching consequences for educational attainment. Grogger (1997) found that increased levels of violence in and around schools led to lower graduation rates in the United States. Beland and Kim (2016) found that fatal shootings in U.S. high schools were associated with increased dropout rates and reduced test scores, while Abouk and Adams (2013) found evidence to suggest that school shootings induced private school enrollment. Poutvaara and Ropponen (2017) concluded that a highly publicized school shooting in Finland decreased the academic performance of students in other schools.⁶

Student gun carrying alone may create an environment that hinders academic performance. Researchers have established that school safety is correlated with test scores (Arum 2003; Lacoé 2013), classroom engagement (Ripski and Gregory 2009), absenteeism (Bryk and Thum 1989), and dropout rates (Rumberger 1995). Studies have also found that students who fear that their classmates may be carrying guns are more likely to carry themselves (Bergstein et al. 1996; Hemenway et al. 1996; Hemenway et al. 2011).

⁶ Relatedly, Gershenson and Tekin (2015) found that the 2002 “Beltway Sniper” attacks in Washington, D.C. reduced school-level proficiency rates in schools within five miles of an attack. They concluded that traumatic community events such as mass shootings have the potential to disrupt student learning.

2.2. CAP Laws

While there are no CAP laws at the federal level, state CAP laws have been around for over 30 years. In 1981, Missouri passed the first law aimed at punishing adults who give children unsupervised access to firearms. Since 1981, 26 states and D.C. have passed a CAP law. As of 2014, 13 states were considering some form of CAP legislation (Patel 2014).

The strongest CAP laws impose criminal liability when a minor gains access to a firearm that has been stored negligently. If a child uses a firearm that was not properly locked up or stored to injure or kill a person, CAP laws penalize the gun owner with fines, imprisonment, or a combination of both. For instance, based on California's recently signed Firearm Safe and Responsible Access Act, violators risk a potential \$1,000 fine and/or six months in jail (Peters 2013a). To take another example, Massachusetts imposes a minimum \$5,000 fine and/or 2.5 years in jail for those who allow children unsupervised access to handguns. Within the law, owners are not required to use specific locks or storage methods and may choose from a variety of options, so long as their guns are inaccessible to children (Shaffer 1999). On the other hand, some states impose a weaker standard for criminal liability and forbid persons from "intentionally, knowingly, and/or recklessly providing some or all firearms to children" (Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence 2013). CAP laws have also been used to penalize manufacturers and dealers who fail to include safety devices with the sale of their firearms (Shaffer 1999).⁷

⁷ It should also be noted that CAP laws vary along other margins. For instance, some states impose criminal liability only if a child uses or carries the firearm. CAP laws may apply to all firearms, loaded firearms, or handguns only. Some states require that firearms not only be stored, but must be done so with a locking device in place. The age at which a state defines a "minor" also varies. While most states define a minor as anyone under the age of 18, some states operate under a lower age threshold (Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence 2013). In our YRBS sample, three states that changed their CAP laws defined a "minor" more narrowly than individuals under the age of 18. Illinois, New Hampshire, and Texas classified minors at ages 13 and younger, 15 and younger, and 16 and younger, respectively. Given this information and the fact that our approach defines the treated group as students in CAP law states who are under the age of 18, we potentially capture a lower bound policy effect. However, (i) dropping these states from our estimation sample, or (ii) restricting each state's sample of students based on their own definition of a "minor", yielded a similar pattern of results.

CAP law prosecutions are most common when police are investigating other crimes, including gun violations (i.e., “stacking” of criminal charges), but also occur when police are given tips on unsafely stored firearms. For confirmed reports on individuals being charged with unsafe gun storage in a number of CAP law states, see Amaral (2014), Bell (2016), Boren (2017), Cutts and Majchrowicz (2016), “Father Charged” (2017), Harmacinski (2013), James (1996), Lopez and Goff (2014), Ly (2013), “Parents Charged” (2009, 2017), and Young (2012).⁸

The absence of state data on adult gun storage behavior over time has prevented researchers from studying the impact of gun control in general on the safe storage of weapons. However, recent evidence suggests that CAP laws are associated with a decrease in unsafe firearm storage behavior. Using data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study for the year 2005, Prickett et al. (2014) found that unsafe firearm storage was least likely to occur among families in states with both CAP laws and stronger firearm legislation.⁹ Yet, because this evidence is cross-sectional in nature, it should be viewed as largely descriptive.

While no previous studies have focused on school-related outcomes, several have used state-level data to examine the relationship between CAP laws and gun-related deaths. Using data for the period 1979-1994, Cummings et al. (1997) found that CAP laws were associated with a decrease in accidental shooting deaths by roughly 23 percent among children 14 years of age and younger. Using data for the period 1979-1997, Webster and Starnes (2000) also examined the relationship between CAP laws and accidental shooting deaths among children 14 years of age and younger. They found a negative association between CAP laws and accidental

⁸ Perhaps understandably, there is some reticence on the part of prosecutors to charge parents with violations of CAP laws if their child completed suicide or an accidental death occurred (Peters 2013b; Lithwick 2015).

⁹ Relatedly, Cook and Ludwig (2004) found that the prevalence of gun ownership in a community predicted gun carrying among adolescent males.

firearm deaths, but this association was entirely driven by one state (Florida). Webster et al. (2004) found that CAP laws were associated with an 11 percent decrease in the gun-related suicide rate among 14- to 17-year-olds for the period 1976-2001. These authors also found that CAP laws were associated with a similar decrease in the gun-related suicide rate among 18- to 20-year-olds, raising the possibility that their findings for the younger age group were spurious. Using data for the period 1979-1996, Lott and Whitley (2001) found little evidence to suggest that CAP laws were associated with accidental gun deaths or suicides among teens. On the other hand, they found that CAP laws were consistently associated with more rapes, robberies, and burglaries. Lott (2003) analyzed data for the period 1977-1998 and found results similar to those reported in Lott and Whitley (2001). However, Pepper (2005) showed that the estimates in Lott (2003) are clearly sensitive to model specification.

Most recently, DeSimone et al. (2013) used annual hospital discharge data for the period 1988-2003 to estimate the relationship between CAP laws and nonfatal gun injuries. They found that CAP laws were associated with 26 and 5 percent decreases in self-inflicted and non-self-inflicted gun injuries, respectively, among individuals under the age of 18. Supporting a causal interpretation, they found no effects on self-inflicted gun injuries among adults or on self-inflicted injuries without a gun.

Our study contributes to the above literature by being the first to examine the effect of CAP laws on youth gun carrying and school violence. We also compile the first census of school-associated shooting deaths in the United States over the last two decades and explore the relationship between CAP laws and these events.

3. YRBS ANALYSIS

3.1. YRBS Data

The data for our primary analysis come from the national and state YRBS and cover the period 1993-2013. Government agencies rely on these data to track trends in teen behaviors including physical activity, unhealthy eating, tobacco use, alcohol and other drug use, sexual activity, and violence. Previous studies such as Simon et al. (1999), Dinkes et al. (2009), and Sabia and Bass (2017) have used these data to examine determinants of weapon carrying and student victimization on school grounds.¹⁰

The national YRBS is carried out biennially by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and is representative of high school students in the United States.¹¹ We obtained the restricted-use versions of the national YRBS so respondents could be linked to their state of residence. The state surveys, which are also biennial and school-based, are coordinated by the CDC, administered by state education and health agencies, and mirror the national surveys in terms of content.¹² Roughly half of the states have granted the CDC permission to release their data, while the remaining states require direct requests. For both the national and state YRBS, the final stage of sampling selects classes within schools, where all students in sampled classes are eligible to participate (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2013).

¹⁰ Researchers have used these data to study a wide of a range of state policies. For examples, see Cawley et al. (2007), Carpenter and Stehr (2008), Anderson (2010), Hansen et al. (2013), and Anderson et al. (2015).

¹¹ Although designed to be nationally representative, not all 50 states contributed data to the national YRBS in any given survey wave.

¹² With a few exceptions, most states conducted their own YRBS at some point between 1993 and 2013.

For the national and majority of state surveys, trained data collectors travel to each participating school to administer the questionnaires.¹³ The data-collection procedures are designed to protect respondent privacy by preserving anonymity and allowing voluntary participation. Students complete the self-administered questionnaire during one class period and record their answers in a computer-scannable booklet. When possible, students' desks are spread throughout the classroom to decrease the likelihood they can see each other's responses. Students are also encouraged to cover their answers with an extra sheet of paper provided by the survey administrator as they complete the questionnaire. When finished with the survey, students seal their answer sheet in an envelope and place it in a box. For further details on the YRBS data-collection protocols, see Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2013).¹⁴

Following previous studies, we combine the national and state YRBS data so that identification comes from as many law changes as possible (Sabia et al. 2014; Hansen et al. 2015; Anderson and Elsea 2015, Anderson et al. 2015). Between 1993 and 2013, 13 states and D.C. contributed data to the YRBS before and after the adoption of a CAP law (see Table 1).¹⁵ Six of these states and D.C. impose criminal liability for negligent storage, while seven states impose criminal liability for reckless endangerment. The YRBS sample contains over one million observations and includes individuals from all 50 states and D.C.

We measure youth gun carrying using responses to the following questionnaire item:

¹³ In some states, the questionnaires are sent directly to schools and teachers administer the survey by following a standardized script (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2013).

¹⁴ Research on survey setting conducted by the CDC found that students are more likely to report health-risk behaviors when answering questions at school rather than at home (Brener et al. 2006).

¹⁵ Between 1993 and 2013, 12 states (CO, DE, GA, IL, MA, MN, MS, NC, NV, TN, TX, and UT) and D.C. contributed data to the national YRBS before and after the adoption of a CAP law and 12 states (CO, DE, GA, IL, MA, MS, NC, NH, NV, TN, TX, and UT) contributed data to the state YRBS before and after the adoption of a CAP law.

“During the past 30 days, on how many days did you carry a gun?”

The variable *Carry Gun* is set equal to 1 if the respondent reported carrying a gun at least once in the past 30 days, and equal to 0 otherwise.¹⁶

Respondents are then asked about weapons carrying, both overall and on school property, which we use to generate two separate indicators:

“During the past 30 days, on how many days did you carry a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club?”

“During the past 30 days, on how many days did you carry a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property?”

Carry Any Weapon (at School) is equal to 1 if the respondent reported carrying a weapon (on school property) at least once in the past 30 days, and equal to 0 otherwise. The obvious disadvantage of these two measures is that we cannot separate out gun carrying effects of CAP laws from knife or club carrying effects. Thus, we can only observe the *total* effect of CAP laws on weapon carrying and are unable to examine whether knives or other weapons are complements to or substitutes for guns. However, a comparison of the estimated effect of CAP laws on *Carry Gun* and *Carry Any Weapon* will provide at least some evidence as to whether substitution across weapons exists.

Respondents are also asked whether they faced a weapons-related threat or injury on school property:

“During the past 12 months, how many times has someone threatened or injured you with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property?”

¹⁶ We also examined the intensive margin of gun carrying, as well as the intensive margin for outcomes for which we have measures of frequency. These results, which are available upon request, suggest that CAP law effects tend to be largest on the extensive margin.

Weapon Threat at School is equal to 1 if the respondent reported being threatened or injured at least once in the past 12 months, and equal to 0 otherwise. Finally, respondents are asked:

“During the past 30 days, on how many days did you not go to school because you felt you would be unsafe at school or on your way to or from school?”

Missed School Due to Safety is equal to 1 if respondents reported missing school at least once in the last 30 days, and equal to 0 otherwise.¹⁷

Table 2 provides descriptive statistics and definitions for the YRBS data. Means are reported by whether a CAP law was in place during the year of the survey. According to the YRBS data, 5.5 percent of high school students carried a gun at least once in the past 30 days, 17.6 percent carried a weapon (i.e., a gun, knife, or club) in the past 30 days, 6.0 percent carried a weapon on school property in the past 30 days, 7.1 percent were threatened or injured with a weapon on school property at least once in the past year, and 5.3 percent missed school due to feeling unsafe in the past 30 days.¹⁸ An advantage of the first three outcomes (*Carry Gun*, *Carry Any Weapon*, and *Carry Any Weapon at School*) is that there are clear predictions as to which

¹⁷ It is worth noting that the wording of the questions for our outcomes of interest are identical across the national and state YRBS. The number of observations are smaller for some of the outcomes, including *Carry Gun* and *Carry Any Weapon*, because these items are not available in a number of state YRBS surveys. For example, the question for *Carry Gun* was not asked in CT (2007- 2011), ID (2001, 2003), ME (2009- 2013), NE (2013), NV (2003-2011), NH (2009-2013), NC (2003, 2009), ND (1999-2013), OH (2011), RI (2007-2011), SD (2005-2013), UT (2001, 2009, 2011), VT (1993-2001, 2005-2011), and WI (2013). The item for *Carry Any Weapon* was not available in CT (2011), ID (2003), ME (2009-2013), NE (2013), NH (2009, 2013), ND (1999-2013), RI (2013), SD (2001, 2005-2013), and VT (1997-2001, 2005-2011).

¹⁸ The non-response rate for the outcomes of interest are as follows: 1.5 percent for *Carry Gun*, 1.8 percent for *Carry Any Weapon*, 1.1 percent for *Carry Any Weapon at School*, 0.3 percent for *Weapon Threat at School*, and 0.4 percent for *Missed School Due to Safety*. In addition, the non-response rates are similar across the national and state YRBS. A concern is whether students underreport and, in particular, if this measurement error is correlated with CAP laws. While we cannot directly test underreporting, we can test whether non-response is correlated with CAP laws. In models where we regressed the probability of non-response for each of our outcomes of interest on a CAP law indicator, we found no evidence to suggest that these laws predict survey non-response. This, to an extent, quells concerns that students in CAP law states are more likely to lie when asked about gun carrying-related questions in the YRBS. These results are available from the authors upon request. For general information on data quality in the YRBS, see Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2013).

age groups should be most influenced by CAP laws. The laws are less binding for students 18 years of age and older than for students under the age of 18. However, because some of these older students live with younger individuals, there may be spillover effects. It is less clear that CAP laws should impact the latter two outcomes (*Weapon Threat at School* and *Missed School Due to Safety*) differently across the two age groups.

Figures 1 and 2 show trends in our dependent variables for the national and state YRBS, respectively. These figures illustrate that the national and state YRBS are each capturing the same broad changes in our outcomes over time. During the 1990s, rates of weapon carrying declined substantially; at the same time, safety-related absences and weapons-related threats at school rose. After 2001, the rates for all of our outcomes of interest remained steady.

3.2. YRBS Empirical Strategy

Our empirical analysis is based on the approach taken by previous researchers interested in the effects of gun laws.¹⁹ Specifically, to estimate the relationship between CAP laws and high school student outcomes, we exploit the spatial and temporal variation of these laws in a difference-in-difference framework. Our estimating equation is:

$$(1) \quad Y_{ist} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CAP\ Law_{st} + \mathbf{X1}'_{ist}\beta_2 + \mathbf{X2}'_{st}\beta_3 + v_s + w_t + v_s \cdot t + \varepsilon_{ist},$$

where i indexes individuals, s indexes states, and t indexes years. The dependent variable, Y_{ist} , represents one of the five possible outcomes listed in Table 2 (*Carry Gun*, *Carry Any Weapon*,

¹⁹ For examples, see Ludwig (1998), Marvell (2001), Mustard (2001), McClellan and Tekin (2016), Cheng and Hoekstra (2013), and DeSimone et al. (2013).

Carry Any Weapon at School, Weapon Threat at School, Missed School Due to Safety).²⁰

Because these outcomes are binary, we estimate equation (1) as a probit model where the errors are assumed to be distributed normally. The variable of interest, $CAP Law_{st}$, is an indicator for whether state s was enforcing a CAP law during year t .²¹ In alternate specifications, we allow the type of CAP law to vary by whether the state enforces a negligent storage or reckless endangerment criminal liability standard. The vectors v_s and w_t represent state fixed effects and year fixed effects, respectively, and state-specific linear time trends are denoted by $v_s \cdot t$. The state-specific linear time trends are included to control for state-level factors that evolve smoothly over time, such as sentiment towards gun control. An advantage of using the combined national and state YRBS data set is that it often contains thousands of individuals per state-year. If we observed smaller state-year cell sizes, a concern would be the ability to obtain consistent parameter estimates from a nonlinear model, such as the probit, with fixed effects. Neyman and Scott (1948) showed in their seminal work that estimation of nonlinear models with limited data can result in the well-known incidental parameters problem.

The vector XI_{ist} includes individual-level controls for race, age, grade, and gender, while $X2_{st}$ includes state-level controls for demographics (*% Nonwhite, Mean Age, % Male*), policing resources (*Police Expenditures, Police Employment*), the adult crime rate (*Property Crime, Violent Crime*), political preferences (*Democrat*), whether the state mandates insurance coverage to include mental health benefits at parity with physical health benefits (*Mental Health Parity*

²⁰ The YRBS defines a weapon as an object such as a "gun, knife, or club." Ideally, we would like to only observe gun carrying or gun threats on school property. However, if CAP laws restrict gun access among teens and other weapons such as knives or clubs serve as substitutes for firearms, then our estimates based on the outcomes *Carry Any Weapon, Carry Any Weapon at School, and Weapon Threat at School* will be conservative.

²¹ This variable takes on fractional values during the year in which a CAP law took effect.

Law), alcohol policies (*Beer Tax, ZT Drunk Driving Law*)²², economic conditions (*Unemployment, Per Capita Income*), education levels and school environment (*% Bachelor's Degree, Student-Teacher Ratio, Teacher Salary, School Lunch Program, ZT School Violence Law*²³, *Anti-Bullying Law*), and other gun laws (*Shall Issue Law, Stand Your Ground Law, Background Check Law*²⁴, *Minimum Possession Age Law, Trigger Lock Law, Gun Buyback Program*). Table 2 provides means and definitions for the variables included in $X1_{ist}$ and $X2_{st}$. Appendix Table 1 lists the data sources used to construct the independent variables measured at the state level.²⁵

All regressions are estimated such that the standard errors are corrected for clustering at the state level (Bertrand et al. 2004).²⁶ To ensure the combined YRBS data are nationally

²² Researchers have relied on beer taxes to proxy variations in the price of alcohol (Ruhm 1996; Markowitz et al. 2005). In addition, zero-tolerance drunk driving laws have been found to affect alcohol consumption of minor teens (Carpenter 2004)

²³ Zero-tolerance school violence laws severely punish offenses such as weapon carrying (e.g., one-year expulsions).

²⁴ Federal law requires federally licensed dealers to perform background checks on all firearm sales, but it does not apply to private sellers. Eighteen states and D.C. have extended the federal law to cover at least some private sales. Eight states (CA, CO, CT, DE, NY, OR, RI, and WA) and D.C. require universal background checks at the point of sale for all classes of firearms; two states (MD and PA) require universal background checks at the point of sale for handguns; four states (HI, IL, MA, and NJ) require a state license or permit to purchase any firearm; four states (IA, MI, NE, and NC) require a state license or permit to purchase a handgun (Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence 2016a).

²⁵ We also experimented with controlling for state-level measures of the stock of guns, the prevalence of metal detectors in schools, and anti-gun sentiment. The stock of guns in a state is proxied by the number of annual firearm background checks (Lang 2013a), while data on metal detector prevalence and anti-gun sentiment come from the National Center for Education Statistics' School Survey on Crime and Safety and the General Social Survey, respectively. In general, the results presented below were robust to controlling for these three variables and are available from the authors upon request. We opted to not include them in our preferred set of covariates due to missing data issues. For instance, because information on the number of firearm background checks is only available going back to 1999, we were forced to linearly impute the data for 1993, 1995, and 1997. Similar interpolation was used for the measure of school metal detector prevalence (available after 1999) and anti-gun sentiment (available in 1991, 1993, and every even year thereafter).

²⁶ We also estimated equation (1) as a linear probability model, as statistical inference with OLS is based on minimal assumptions regarding the error correlation process. These estimates were generally similar to, and often larger in magnitude than, the marginal effects produced by probits.

representative, we used population data from the National Cancer Institute’s Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results (SEER) Program (<http://seer.cancer.gov/popdata/>) and assigned population weights to each respondent based on state of residence, age, gender, and race (Hansen et al. 2015; Anderson and Elsea 2015, Anderson et al. 2015).

Beyond controlling for XI_{ist} and $X2_{st}$, in order for equation (1) to generate unbiased estimates of the effect of CAP laws on gun carrying and school violence, the parallel trends assumption must be satisfied. We take three approaches to test this assumption: (1) examine whether effects are stronger for students under the age of 18, for whom CAP laws are more likely to bind, as compared to students 18 years of age and older, as well as experiment with formal difference-in-difference-in-difference models; (2) conduct placebo tests on CAP law leads, including tests for whether salient violent events predict the adoption of CAP laws; (3) provide falsification tests on behaviors that should be unaffected by CAP laws.

3.3. YRBS Results

Table 3 presents the main results from the YRBS analysis. Because CAP laws specifically target households with children who are minors, we present results based on an age 18 cutoff. Panel I shows results for students under the age of 18, while panel II shows results for students 18 years of age and older. While the results in panel II do not represent a perfect falsification test (because high school students 18 years of age and older may live in households with younger siblings or parents’ gun storage behaviors may occur with a lag), we expect CAP laws to bind less for this age group.²⁷

²⁷ For example, according to wave 1 of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, 50.4 percent of 18-year-olds surveyed reported having a younger sibling.

For students under the age of 18 (panel I), CAP laws are associated with a .009 decrease in the probability a high school student reported carrying a gun within the past 30 days and a .018 decrease in the probability a high school student reported carrying any weapon (i.e., a gun, knife, or a club) within the past 30 days. Both of these estimates are statistically significant at the 10 percent level and reflect roughly 17 ($=.009/.054$) and 10 ($=.018/.175$) percent decreases relative to the mean rates of gun carrying and weapon carrying, respectively, among students under the age of 18.²⁸ While tests of differences in these coefficients cannot rule out substitution across types of weapons, the results suggest that CAP laws are effective at reducing net weapons carrying, at least across the range of weapons examined in the YRBS. CAP laws are also negatively associated with high school students having reported carrying a weapon specifically on school property, but this estimate is not statistically different from zero at conventional levels.

Regarding student safety, we find that CAP laws are associated with a .014 decrease in the probability a student reported being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property within the past year. This represents roughly a 19 percent decrease relative to the mean. We also find that CAP laws are associated with a (statistically insignificant) .007 decrease in the probability a student reported missing school within the past 30 days because he/she felt unsafe.

Panel II in Table 3 illustrates that CAP laws have no impact on the weapon carrying behavior or safety of students 18 years of age and older.²⁹ The across-the-board null findings provide confidence that our estimates in panel I are not spurious and potentially reflect a causal

²⁸ Appendix Table 2 presents means for the outcomes by age.

²⁹ Based on our own calculations using the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey, 41 and 7 percent of 18- and 19-year-olds, respectively, attended high school in the United States in 2013. If individuals 18 years of age or older in CAP law states have systematically different rates of school attendance and gun carrying than similarly aged individuals in non-CAP law states, then estimates for this age group could be biased. In 2013, 24.8 and 23.5 percent of 18- and 19-year-olds in CAP law and non-CAP law states, respectively, attended high school.

relationship between CAP laws and gun-related outcomes among high school students.³⁰ Formal difference-in-difference-in-difference (DDD) estimates, shown in panel I of Appendix Table 3, also suggest that our findings are not contaminated by unmeasured school- (e.g., presence of metal detectors or stiff punishments for weapons carrying) or state-level policies.³¹

In Table 4, we replace *CAP Law* with two mutually exclusive indicators, *Negligent Storage* and *Reckless Endangerment*, to examine whether heterogeneous effects by the type of CAP law in place exist. As discussed above, negligent storage laws are the strongest form of CAP legislation and impose criminal liability when a minor gains access to a negligently stored firearm. On the other hand, some states impose a weaker standard for criminal liability and prohibit persons from "intentionally, knowingly, and/or recklessly providing some or all firearms to children" (Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence 2013). The results in Table 4 are consistent with the notion that negligent storage laws are generally more effective than reckless

³⁰ We also explored whether the relationship between CAP laws and our outcomes of interest depends on gender or race. Across all outcomes, we failed to reject the hypothesis that CAP laws were more effective for male as compared to female students or white as compared to black students. In addition, we split the sample along several risky behaviors and tested the "selective recruitment" hypothesis; that is, that students who are most likely to carry guns are those least likely to be influenced by the law (for examples, see Dee (1998), Carpenter and Stehr (2008), and Anderson (2010)). We found that the CAP law effects for the weapon-carrying outcomes are isolated among students who reported past month substance use and drinking and driving. One possible explanation for these results is that CAP laws particularly influence the behavior of parents who believe their children have a propensity for seeking access to firearms. Lastly, given interest on the link between mental health and gun violence, we also split our sample based on recent suicide ideation (Konnikova 2014; Said 2015). For our three measures of weapon carrying, we failed to reject the hypothesis of equal CAP law effects across the two samples.

³¹ In panel I of Appendix Table 3, we present difference-in-difference-in-difference estimates based on a pooled sample, where the coefficient of interest represents the effect of CAP laws on students under the age of 18 relative to students 18 years of age and older (i.e., an interaction between the CAP law variable and an under-age-18 indicator). The advantage of this flexible specification is that it allows us to subtract out any confounding effect of unobserved state or school policies aimed at, for instance, decreasing gun carrying among teenagers and young adults in general, including the introduction of metal detectors in schools or non-minor targeted state gun laws. We note, however, that this empirical strategy is more appropriate for the outcomes related to gun and weapon carrying and less so for the outcomes related to a safe school environment. This is because students over the age cutoff may be as likely to be threatened with a weapon on school property or miss school for fear of their safety. Moreover, if there are spillover effects to 18-year-olds via younger siblings or lagged changes in parental behavior, we would expect the DDD estimates to be conservative. Estimates based on the DDD specification indicate that CAP laws are negatively associated with all of our outcomes of interest, and negatively and statistically significantly associated with the *Carry Gun*, *Weapon Threat at School*, and *Missed School Due to Safety* outcomes.

endangerment laws when it comes to reducing gun carrying among high school students and promoting a safer school environment. Again, we see that the effects are concentrated among students under the age of 18 (panel I).³²

3.4. Sensitivity Checks

In Tables 5 through 7, we perform a series of robustness checks, largely designed to explore whether our CAP law effects could be contaminated by school- or state-specific shocks that impact minor teens, but not individuals 18 years of age or older.

Table 5 presents results based on regressions where we replace *CAP Law* with an indicator *Year of Law Change*, 2 leads of this indicator, and 2 lags. *Year of Law Change* is equal to 1 the year in which a CAP law went into effect and is equal to 0 otherwise.³³ The primary purpose of this exercise is to test whether any of the outcomes were trending in the years prior to the law change. Consistent with the parallel trends assumption, there is little evidence to suggest that our outcomes of interest were trending in a systematic fashion leading up to the passage of CAP laws. We also see that there is a lagged policy effect, suggesting the impact is felt in the years after the law is implemented rather than immediately. This appears to especially be the case for outcomes related to a student's own safety. Our findings are consistent with evidence that policies often take time to change behavior due to, for example, information acquisition and

³² In panel II of Appendix Table 3, we report DDD estimates for the negligent storage form of CAP laws. In Appendix Tables 4 and 5, we assessed the sensitivity of our *CAP Law* and *Negligent Storage* estimates, respectively, to adding controls. We begin each table by showing estimates based on models without the state-level covariates listed in Table 2, and then sequentially add groupings of these time-varying controls. In general, our estimates remain robust across these various specifications.

³³ This variable takes on fractional values during the year in which a CAP law took effect.

adjustment costs (Kuo 2012; Taylor and Li 2015). Comparable leads and lags analyses using the *Negligent Storage* indicator, shown in Table 6, produce a similar pattern of results.

In Table 7, we conduct falsification tests on behaviors for which we would expect no causal effect of CAP laws. Specifically, we consider binary outcomes for the following risky behaviors: any cigarette use in the past month, any illicit drug use in the past month, any binge drinking (i.e., 5 or more drinks in one sitting) in the past month, any drunk driving in the past month, whether the respondent “never” or “rarely” wears a seat belt, and multiple sex partners in the past 3 months. If CAP laws were found to be negatively associated with these outcomes for students under the age of 18, it could suggest that estimates produced by equation (1) are spurious in nature. However, the findings in Table 7 suggest no evidence of a statistically significant association between any of these behaviors and CAP laws.³⁴ These results provide further support for the hypothesis that the parallel trends assumption is satisfied.

3.5. Do School Shootings or Violent Crime Rates Predict CAP Laws?

In Table 8, we explore whether salient events, such as school shooting fatalities or violent crime rates, predict the passage of CAP laws. If these laws are enacted in response to shocks that affect minor (but not non-minor) high school students, then the above estimates may be biased. The first column in panel I of Table 8 illustrates results where the enactment of a CAP law is regressed on whether a school-associated shooting death occurred in state s during year t (see Section 4 below for a detailed description of the school shooting data set). The second column in

³⁴ Appendix Table 6 shows results for this exercise based on the *Negligent Storage* indicator. We also found that CAP laws were not associated with measures of helmet use, exercise, or diet pill use/eating disorders.

panel I includes three lags of this school shooting indicator. In either set of results, there is little evidence to support the notion that school shooting deaths predict the passage of CAP laws.

In panels II and III of Table 8, we explore whether the count of school-associated shooting deaths and the violent crime arrest rate for minors, respectively, are associated with CAP laws.³⁵ The results suggest that these measures do not predict CAP laws going into effect.

4. SCHOOL SHOOTING ANALYSIS

The estimates above suggest that CAP laws play an important role in decreasing the likelihood that high school students report carrying a gun in the past month or a weapon on school property in the past month. Our results also suggest that students are less likely to be threatened or injured with a weapon on school property or miss school for fear of their safety in CAP law states. Here, we test whether the CAP law effect extends to school shootings.

4.1. School Shooting Data

To our knowledge, this study is the first to compile a comprehensive account of school-associated shooting deaths in the United States during the period of interest. Our primary data source is the National School Safety Center's (NSSC) report on School Associated Violent Deaths and covers the period 1992 through 2010.³⁶ To achieve as nearly complete coverage of

³⁵ The sample size for the violent crime regressions is smaller because not all states reported to the UCR each year during the period 1991-2013.

³⁶ The NSSC report, which is based on newspaper accounts, can be found at: <http://www.schoolsafety.us/media-resources/school-associated-violent-deaths>. The NSSC defines a school-associated violent death as

“...any homicide, suicide, or weapons-related violent death in the United States in which the fatal injury occurred: on the property of a functioning public, private or parochial elementary or secondary school, Kindergarten through grade 12 (including alternative schools); on the way to or from regular sessions at such a school; while person was attending or was on the way to or from

these events as possible, we called upon the following additional data sources to include events missing from the NSSC's (2010) report: Lieberman (2008), National School Safety and Security Services (2010), Van Fleet and Van Fleet (2010), Klein (2012), Stoptheshootings.org (2013), Stafford and Associates (2014), Columbine-angels.com (2015), Doll (2015), Everytown.org (2015b), and Laurine (2017). These sources, in addition to our own searches of newspaper archives, allowed us to extend our coverage from 1991 to 2013.³⁷

For the analysis below, we restrict our focus to school shootings where a death occurred (homicide, suicide, or accidental).³⁸ Our final data set includes information on when and where the shooting took place, the age of the shooter, and (when available) whether the shooting was reported as gang-related. We define a school shooting as an event that takes place on school property. This includes shootings on school buses and in areas outside of the main building, such as school parking lots and athletic fields. Appendix Table 7 presents descriptive statistics and definitions for our outcome measures. For our sample, we identify a total of 167 school-associated shooting deaths where the shooter was under the age of 18 and 187 deaths where the shooter was 18 years of age or older. We observe 76 school shootings involving more than one death and 12 involving four or more deaths.³⁹

an official school-sponsored event; as obvious direct result of school incidents, functions or activities, whether on or off school bus/vehicle or school property" (NSSC 2010).

³⁷ Because this data set covers a longer period than the YRBS data set, it captures additional policy variation.

³⁸ To ensure accuracy, we double-checked each observation with at least one other information source. For instance, if a shooting event was initially recorded from the NSSC's (2010) report, we checked it against at least one of the other sources listed above. If the event was not found in one of our other sources, we searched online newspaper archives for confirmation. Of the 354 school-associated shooting deaths used in our analysis, we found at least two sources for all but 3 observations. Our results were similar when dropping these 3 observations. While it is difficult to say with certainty that our data set captures every school-associated shooting death during the period under study, to our knowledge, it represents the most comprehensive list to date.

³⁹ A "mass" murder is generally defined as four or more murders occurring during the same incident, with no distinctive period between the murders. For research and press coverage on mass school shootings in the United States, see Lankford (2015), Los Angeles Times Staff (2016), and Willingham (2016). Other research has focused

4.2. School Shooting Empirical Strategy

To explore the relationship between CAP laws and school-associated shooting deaths, we generate a state-by-year panel from the data set described above and estimate the following difference-in-difference model:

$$(2) \quad Y_{st} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CAP\ Law_{st} + \mathbf{X}_{st}\beta_2 + \nu_s + w_t + \nu_s \cdot t + \varepsilon_{st},$$

where s indexes states and t indexes years. The binary dependent variable, Y_{st} , indicates whether there was a school shooting death in state s during year t , defined as one of the six possible school shooting outcomes listed in Appendix Table 7. The variable of interest, $CAP\ Law_{st}$, is defined as above and ν_s , w_t , and $\nu_s \cdot t$ represent state fixed, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends, respectively. The vector \mathbf{X}_{st} includes the same state-level controls used in equation (1). Similar to equation (1), the parallel trends assumption must be satisfied in order to generate unbiased estimates of β_1 in equation (2). All regressions are estimated as linear probability models and are weighted by the population of state s in year t .⁴⁰ Standard errors are corrected for clustering at the state level (Bertrand et al. 2004).

on “rampage” school shootings, defined as “expressive non-targeted attacks on a school institution” (Muschert 2007). For qualitative studies on rampage school shootings, see Larkin (2009) and Newman and Fox (2009).

⁴⁰ To retain sample size, we opted to use a linear probability model because the state fixed effects perfectly predicted the outcome for states with no school-associated shooting deaths. Probit models did, however, yield similar results. In addition, we explored Poisson and negative binomial models to take advantage of the full count of school shooting events involving a fatality. Approximately 21 and 23 percent of state-year observations included a fatal school shooting event committed by minors and non-minors, respectively. Results from these specifications were qualitatively similar to those presented in Table 9 and are available from the authors upon request.

4.3. School Shooting Results

Table 9 presents estimates of β_l from equation (2). Panel I shows results based on events where the shooter was under the age of 18 and panel II shows results based on events where the shooter was 18 years of age or older. We disaggregate all death-related school shooting events (first column) into those involving a suicide (second column) and a homicide (third column). In general, we find no statistically significant evidence to suggest that CAP laws are associated with fewer school-associated shooting deaths. However, we note that these estimates are sufficiently imprecise to conclusively rule out non-trivial effects of CAP laws. The 95 percent confidence interval associated with the relationship between CAP laws and homicides committed by shooters under the age of 18 is [-.193, .204]. With many explanatory variables and a relatively small number of events, the ability to detect an effect is difficult.

We next subjected the null findings to a number of sensitivity checks. First, because our school shooting data set includes some gang-related events, we focused on shootings where there was no mention of gang involvement.⁴¹ Non-gang-related shootings are more often considered “random acts of violence” and are less likely to be related to the community’s underlying trend of violent crime (Midlarsky and Klain 2005). We found no evidence to suggest that CAP laws are effective at reducing the likelihood of these events. Second, we replaced *CAP Law* with an indicator for the year of the law change and a series of leads and lags. Unlike the YBRS results in Tables 5 and 6, we found no evidence of a lagged CAP law effect.⁴² Third, we examined whether there were heterogeneous effects by the type of law in place. Our results suggested that

⁴¹ We were able to link 27 of the school-associated shooting deaths to gang involvement.

⁴² These results are reported in Appendix Table 8.

neither negligent storage nor reckless endangerment CAP laws are associated with fewer school shooting deaths.⁴³

In sum, while CAP laws appear to decrease gun carrying among high school students and generally promote a safer school environment, they do not have an observable impact on school-associated shooting deaths.

5. CONCLUSION

The National Poll on Children's Health recently indicated that adults ranked school violence and gun-related injuries as two of their top 10 child-health concerns in the United States.⁴⁴ These fears are perhaps driven by the fact that school shootings have been reported at nearly a weekly rate since 2012 (Everytown.org 2015b). While there is a wealth of research on the individual-level correlates of youth gun carrying (Emmert and Lizotte 2015), we know very little about whether specific policies may be leveraged to curb this behavior.

This paper draws on data from two sources to examine the effects of child access prevention laws. Using data from the Youth Risk Behavior Surveys for the period 1993-2013, we find that CAP laws are associated with substantial decreases in rates of gun carrying among high school students, and these results are primarily driven by states with stricter forms of enforcement. We also find that CAP laws are associated with fewer reports of being threatened or injured with a weapon on school property and school absences due to feeling unsafe. From an

⁴³ For the sake of brevity, we have omitted the results on non-gang related shootings and negligent storage versus reckless endangerment laws. Because some states define a minor based on an age threshold lower than 18, we also experimented with (i) dropping these states from our estimation sample, and (ii) restricting each state's sample of shootings based on their own definition of a "minor." Under both scenarios, we found no evidence that CAP laws are associated with fewer school-associated shooting deaths. All of these results are available upon request.

⁴⁴ School violence ranked 5th and gun-related injuries ranked 9th. Results from the poll are available at <http://mottnpch.org/blog/2014-08-29/top-10-us-childrens-health-concerns-2014>.

education perspective, these results are vital as school climate is a well-known predictor of academic success.

Finally, to supplement our YRBS analysis, we explore the relationship between CAP laws and school-associated shooting deaths. Using a novel data set that covers the period 1991-2013, we find no statistically significant evidence that CAP laws reduce school-associated shooting deaths. However, because these estimates are imprecise, we cannot rule out beneficial (or adverse) effects of CAP laws on school shooting deaths. Future research examining the effectiveness of other gun and anti-school violence policies will be critical to curbing these rare, but tragic and costly, events.

REFERENCES

- About, Rahi and Scott Adams. 2013. "School Shootings and Private School Enrollment." *Economics Letters*, Vol. 118, No. 2, pp. 297-299.
- Amaral, Brian. 2014. "N.J. Law Punishes Adults Whose Unsecured Guns Get Into the Hands of Children." *NJ.com*, November 16. Available at: http://www.nj.com/essex/index.ssf/2014/11/child_access_to_firearms_in_new_jersey.html.
- Anderson, D. Mark. 2010. "Does Information Matter? The Effect of the Meth Project on Meth Use among Youths." *Journal of Health Economics*, Vol. 29, No. 5, pp. 732-742.
- Anderson, D. Mark and David Elsea. 2015. "The Meth Project and Teen Meth Use: New Estimates from the National and State Youth Risk Behavior Surveys." *Health Economics*, Vol. 24, No. 12, pp. 1644-1650.
- Anderson, D. Mark, Benjamin Hansen, and Daniel I. Rees. 2013. "Medical marijuana laws, traffic fatalities, and alcohol consumption." *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 56, No. 2, pp. 333-369.
- Anderson, D. Mark, Benjamin Hansen, and Daniel I. Rees. 2015. "Medical Marijuana Laws and Teen Marijuana Use." *American Law and Economics Review*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 495-528.
- Aneja, Abhay, John Donohue, and Alexandria Zhang. 2012. "The Impact of Right to Carry Laws and the NRC Report: The Latest Lessons for the Empirical Evaluation of Law and Policy." NBER Working Paper 18294.
- Arnold, Larry. 2015. "The History of Concealed Carry, 1976-2011." Available at: <http://www.txchia.org/history.htm>.
- Arum, Richard. 2003. *Judging School Discipline: The Crises of Moral Authority*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Associated Press. 2013. "Gun Used in Nevada Teacher Killing Wasn't Locked Away: Shooter's Parents." *NY Daily News*, November 7. Available at: <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/gun-nevada-teacher-shooting-wasn-locked-article-1.1509274>.
- Beland, Louis-Philippe and Dongwoo Kim. 2016. "The Effect of High School Shootings on Schools and Student Performance." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 38, No. 1, pp. 113-126.
- Bell, Adam. 2016. "Toddler Shoots Himself. Now Dad Faces Felony Charges." *Charlotte Observer*, December 13. Available at:

<http://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/local/crime/article120565973.html>.

Bergstein, Jack, David Hemenway, Bruce Kennedy, Sher Quaday, and Roseanna Ander. 1996. "Guns in Young Hands: A Survey of Urban Teenagers' Attitudes and Behaviors Related to Handgun Violence." *Journal of Trauma*, Vol. 41, No. 5, pp. 794-798.

Bernstein, Maxine. 2014. "Jared Padgett Wrote About Killing Classmates in Journal." *The Oregonian*, June 13. Available at: http://www.oregonlive.com/gresham/index.ssf/2014/06/oregon_school_shooting_gunman_1.html.

Bertrand, Marianne, Esther Duflo, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "How Much Should We Trust Differences-in-Differences Estimates?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 119, No. 1, pp. 249-275.

Boren, Michael. "S. Jersey Officer Charged after Leaving Unsecured Gun that Killed Daughter, 8, on New Year's Eve." *Philadelphia Inquirer*, January 20. Available at: http://www.philly.com/philly/news/new_jersey/police-officer-sailor-lane-righter-kenneth-stratford-gun.html.

Brener, Nancy, Danice Eaton, Laura Kann, Jo Anne Grunbaum, Lori Gross, Tonja Kyle, and James Ross. 2006. "The Association of Survey Setting and Mode with Self-Reported Health Risk Behaviors among High School Students." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 70, No. 3, pp. 354-374.

Bryk, Anthony and Yeow Meng Thum. 1989. "The Effects of High School Organization on Dropping Out: An Exploratory Investigation." *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 353-383.

Cameron, A. Colin and Douglas Miller. 2011. "Robust Inference with Clustered Data." In *Handbook of Empirical Economics and Finance* (eds. Aman Ullah and David Giles). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Cameron, A. Colin and Douglas Miller. 2015. "A Practitioner's Guide to Cluster-Robust Inference." *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 50, No. 2, pp. 317-372.

Cameron, A. Colin and Pravin Trivedi. 2005. *Microeconometrics: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, A. Colin and Pravin Trivedi. 2009. *Microeconometrics Using STATA*. College Station, TX: STATA Press.

Carpenter, Christopher. 2004. "How Do Zero Tolerance Drunk Driving Laws Work?" *Journal of Health Economics*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 61-83.

Carpenter, Christopher and Mark Stehr. 2008. "The Effects of Mandatory Seatbelt Laws on

- Seatbelt Use, Motor Vehicle Fatalities, and Crash-Related Injuries among Youths." *Journal of Health Economics*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 642-662.
- Cawley, John, Chad Meyerhoefer, and David Newhouse. 2007. "The Impact of State Physical Education Requirements on Youth Physical Activity and Overweight." *Health Economics*, Vol. 16, No. 12, pp. 1287-1301.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2013. "Methodology of the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System – 2013." *MMWR*, Vol. 62, No. 1, pp. 1-20.
- Chandler, Dana, Steven Levitt, and John List. 2011. "Predicting and Preventing Shootings among At-Risk Youth." *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings*, Vol. 101, No. 3, pp. 288-292.
- Cheng, Cheng and Mark Hoekstra. 2013. "Does Strengthening Self-Defense Law Deter Crime or Escalate Violence? Evidence from Expansions to Castle Doctrine." *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 48, No. 3, pp. 821-854.
- Christakis, Erika and Nicholas Christakis. 2012. "Ohio School Shooting: Are Parents to Blame?" *TIME*, February 28. Available at: <http://ideas.time.com/2012/02/28/ohio-school-shooting-why-parents-are-to-blame/>.
- Columbine-angels.com. 2015. "School Violence Around the World." Available at: http://www.columbine-angels.com/School_Violence.htm.
- Cook, Philip and Jens Ludwig. 2004. "Does Gun Prevalence Affect Teen Gun Carrying After All?" *Criminology*, Vol. 42, No. 1.
- Copeland, Larry. 2014. "Report: School Shootings Often Involve Guns from Home." *USA Today*, December 10. Available at: <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/12/09/report-says-guns-in-school-shootings-often-come-from-home/20143495/>.
- Crimesider staff. 2012. "Report: Chardon High School Shooting Suspect TJ Lane May Have Used Grandfather's Gun in Attack." *CBS News*, February 29. Available at: <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/report-chardon-high-school-shooting-suspect-tj-lane-may-have-used-grandfathers-gun-in-attack/>.
- Cummings, Peter, David Grossman, Frederick Rivara, and Thomas Koepsell. 1997. "State Gun Safe Storage Laws and Child Mortality Due to Firearms." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 278, No. 13, pp. 1084-1086.
- Cutts, Emily and Michael Majchrowicz. 2016. "Ex-Pelham Police Chief Acquitted of Firearm Charges." *Daily Hampshire Gazette*, October 28. Available at: <http://www.gazettenet.com/Final-testimony-and-closing-statements-given-on-last-day-of-former-Pelham-Police-Chief-Edward-Fleury-s-trial-5680972>.

- Dee, Thomas. 1998. "Reconsidering the Effects of Seat Belt Laws and their Enforcement Status." *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 1-10.
- DeSimone, Jeffrey, Sara Markowitz, and Jing Xu. 2013. "Child Access Prevention Laws and Nonfatal Gun Injuries." *Southern Economic Journal*, Vol. 80, No. 1, pp. 5-25.
- Dinkes, Rachel, Jana Kemp, Katrina Baum, and Thomas Snyder. 2009. *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2008*. National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, D.C.
- Dolak, Kevin, Christina Ng, and Barbara Lowe. 2012. "Ohio High School Shooting: Student Suspect to Be Tried as Adult." *ABC News*, February 29. Available at: <http://abcnews.go.com/US/ohio-high-school-shooting-prosecutors-tj-lane-adult/story?id=15814303>.
- Doll, Jonathan. 2015. *Ending School Shootings: School and District Tools for Prevention and Action*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Donohue, John and Ian Ayres. 2009. "More Guns, Less Crime Fails Again: The Latest Evidence from 1977-2006." *Faculty Scholarship Series*. Paper 47. Available at: http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/fss_papers/47/?utm_source=digitalcommons.law.yale.edu%2Ffss_papers%2F47&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages.
- Emmert, Amanda and Alan Lizotte. 2015. "Weapon Carrying and Use Among Juveniles." In the *Handbook of Juvenile Delinquency and Juvenile Justice* (eds. Marvin Krohn and Jodi Lane). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Everytown.org. 2015a. "Analysis of School Shootings." Available at: <http://everytown.org/documents/2014/10/analysis-of-school-shootings.pdf>.
- Everytown.org. 2015b. "School Shootings in America since Sandy Hook." Available at: <http://everytown.org/article/schoolshootings/>.
- Father Charged with Improper Firearm Storage. 2017, March 17. *Wilkes Journal-Patriot*. Available at: http://www.journalpatriot.com/news/father-charged-with-improper-firearm-storage/article_e504f95e-0b10-11e7-abfb-97e62795e565.html.
- Gius, Mark. 2015. "The Impact of Minimum Age and Child Access Prevention Laws on Firearm-Related Youth Suicides and Unintentional Deaths." *Social Science Journal*, Vol. 52, No. 2, pp. 168-175.
- Grogger, Jeffrey. 1997. "Local Violence and Educational Attainment." *Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 659-682.

- Grossman, Richard and Stephen Lee. 2008. "May Issue Versus Shall Issue: Explaining the Pattern of Concealed-Carry Handgun Laws, 1960-2001." *Contemporary Economic Policy*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 198-206.
- Hansen, Benjamin, Daniel I. Rees, and Joseph J. Sabia. 2013. "Cigarette Taxes and How Youths Obtain Cigarettes." *National Tax Journal*, Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 371-394.
- Hansen, Benjamin, Joseph J. Sabia, and Daniel I. Rees. 2017. "Have Cigarette Taxes Lost Their Bite? New Estimates of the Relationship between Cigarette Taxes and Youth Smoking." *American Journal of Health Economics*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 60-75.
- Harmacinski, Jill. 2013. "Arrested on Gun Charges." *Eagle Tribune*, October 1. Available at: http://www.eagletribune.com/news/arrested-on-gun-charges/article_88ea251e-68c3-5c67-9793-22dda607c5fc.html.
- Hemenway, David, Deborah Prothrow-Stith, Jack Bergstein, Roseanna Ander, and Bruce Kennedy. 1996. "Gun Carrying among Adolescents." *Law and Contemporary Problems*, Vol. 59, No. 1, pp. 39-53.
- Hemenway, David, Mary Vrinotis, Rene Johnson, Matthew Miller, and Deborah Azrael. 2011. "Gun Carrying by High School Students in Boston, MA: Does Overestimation of Peer Gun Carrying Matter?" *Journal of Adolescence*, Vol. 34, No. 5, pp. 997-1003
- Hinkston, Mark. 2012. "Wisconsin's Concealed Carry Law: Protecting Persons and Property." *Wisconsin Lawyer*, Vol. 85, No. 7. Available at: <http://www.wisbar.org/newspublications/wisconsinlawyer/pages/article.aspx?Volume=85&Issue=7&ArticleID=8710>.
- James, Michael. 1996. "Uncle of Boy Who Shot Self Charged with Gun Violations." *Baltimore Sun*, April 25. Available at: http://articles.baltimoresun.com/1996-04-25/news/1996116108_1_felon-handgun-violations-charged-with-gun.
- Klein, Jessie. 2012. *The Bully Society: School Shootings and the Crisis of Bullying in America's Schools*. New York City, New York: New York University Press.
- Konnikova, Maria. 2014. "Is There a Link between Mental Health and Gun Violence?" *The New Yorker*, November 19. Available at: <http://www.newyorker.com/science/maria-konnikova/almost-link-mental-health-gun-violence>.
- Kuo, Tzu-Chun. 2012. "Evaluating Californian Under-Age Drunk Driving Laws: Endogenous Policy Lags." *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, Vol. 27, No. 7, pp. 1100-1115.
- Lacoe, Johanna. 2013. "Too Scared to Learn? The Academic Consequences of Feeling Unsafe at

- School.” Institute for Education and Social Policy Working Paper No. 02-13.
- Lang, Matthew. 2013a. “Firearm Background Checks and Suicide.” *Economic Journal*, Vol. 123, No. 573, pp. 1085-1099.
- Lang, Matthew. 2013b. “The Impact of Mental Health Insurance Laws on State Suicide Rates.” *Health Economics*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 73-88.
- Lankford, Adam. 2015. “Mass Shooters in the USA, 1966-2010: Differences Between Attackers Who Live and Die.” *Justice Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 360-379.
- Larkin, Ralph. 2009. “The Columbine Legacy: Rampage Shootings as Political Acts.” *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 52, No. 9, pp. 1309-1326.
- Laurine, Eric. 2017. “American School Shootings.” Available at: <http://www.schoolshootingdatabase.com/>.
- Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. 2013. “Child Access Prevention Policy Summary.” Available at: <http://smartgunlaws.org/child-access-prevention-policy-summary/>.
- Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. 2016a. “Universal Background Checks.” Available at: <http://smartgunlaws.org/gun-laws/policy-areas/background-checks/universal-background-checks/> .
- Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. 2016b. “Safe Storage and Gun Locks.” Available at: <http://smartgunlaws.org/gun-laws/policy-areas/consumer-child-safety/safe-storage-gun-locks/>.
- Lieberman, Joseph. 2008. *School Shootings: What Every Parent and Educator Needs to Know to Protect Our Children*. New York City, New York: Kensington Publishing Corp.
- Lithwick, Dahlia. 2015. “Leave Your Gun Out, Go to Jail.” *Slate*, October 12. Available at: http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/jurisprudence/2015/10/gun_accidents_why_are_parents_who_leave_loaded_weapons_lying_around_never.html.
- Lizotte, Alan, Gregory Howard, Marvin Krohn, and Terence Thornberry. 1997. “Patterns of Illegal Gun Carrying Among Urban Males.” *Valparaiso University Law Review*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 375-393.
- Lizotte, Alan, James Tesoriero, Terence Thornberry, and Marvin Krohn. 1994. “Patterns of Adolescent Firearms Ownership and Use.” *Justice Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 51-74.
- Lopez, Lolita and Kelly Goff. 2014. “Dad Charged After Son Takes Unsecured Gun.” *NBC Los Angeles*, December 5. Available at:

<http://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/Dad-Charged-After-Son-Takes-Unsecured-Gun-284922561.html>.

Los Angeles Times Staff. "Deadliest U.S. Mass Shootings, 1984-2016." *Los Angeles Times*, June 12. Available at:

<http://timelines.latimes.com/deadliest-shooting-rampages/>.

Lott, John, Jr. 2003. *The Bias Against Guns: Why Almost Everything You've Heard About Gun Control Is Wrong*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing.

Lott, John, Jr. and John Whitley. 2001. "Safe-Storage Gun Laws: Accidental Deaths, Suicides, and Crime." *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 44, No. S2, pp. 659-689.

Ludwig, Jens. 1998. "Concealed-Gun-Carrying Laws and Violent Crime: Evidence from State Panel Data." *International Review of Law and Economics*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 239-254.

Ly, Laura. 2013. "N. Hampshire Official: Police Chief Left Gun Unsecured, Teen Used it for Suicide." *CNN*, April 12. Available at:

<http://www.cnn.com/2013/04/12/us/new-hampshire-chief-gun/>.

Markowitz, Sara, Robert Kaestner, and Michael Grossman. 2005. "An Investigation of the Effects of Alcohol Consumption and Alcohol Prices on Youth Risky Sexual Behaviors." *American Economic Review*, Vol. 95, No. 2, pp. 263-266.

Marvell, Thomas. 2001. "The Impact of Banning Juvenile Gun Possession." *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 44, No. S2, pp. 691-713.

McClellan, Chandler and Erdal Tekin. 2016. "Stand Your Ground Laws, Homicides, and Injuries." Forthcoming at *Journal of Human Resources*.

Midlarsky, Elizabeth and Helen Marie Klain. 2005. "A History of Violence in Schools." In *Violence in Schools: Cross-National and Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (eds. Florence Denmark, Herbert Krass, Robert Wesner, Elizabeth Midlarsky, and Uwe Gielen). New York, New York: Springer Science+Business Media, Inc.

Muschert, Glenn. 2007. "Research in School Shootings." *Sociology Compass*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 60-80.

Mustard, David. 2001. "The Impact of Gun Laws on Police Deaths." *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 44, No. S2, pp. 635-657.

National School Safety Center. 2010. "School Associated Violent Deaths." Available at: <http://www.schoolsafety.us/media-resources/school-associated-violent-deaths>.

National School Safety and Security Services. 2010. "School Associated Violent Deaths and School Shootings." Available at:

<http://www.schoolsecurity.org/trends/violent-deaths-and-school-shootings/>.

- Newman, Katherine and Cybelle Fox. 2009. "Repeat Tragedy: Rampage Shootings in American High School and College Settings, 2002-2008." *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 52, No. 9, pp. 1286-1308.
- Okoro, Catherine, David Nelson, James Mercy, Lina Balluz, Ale Crosby, and Ali Mokdad. 2005. "Prevalence of Household Firearms and Firearm-Storage Practices in the 50 States and the District of Columbia: Findings from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2002." *Pediatrics*, Vol. 116, No. 3, pp. e370-e376.
- Parents Charged in Toddler's Accidental Shooting Death. 2009, October 2. *WRAL.com*. Available at: <http://www.wral.com/parents-charged-in-toddler-s-accidental-shooting-death/6126208/>.
- Parents Charged with Improper Gun Storage in Girl's Shooting. 2017, January 3. *Boston.com*. Available at: <https://www.boston.com/news/local-news/2017/01/03/parents-charged-with-improper-gun-storage-in-girls-shooting>.
- Patel, Sejal. 2014. "Kids and Gun Safety." Children's Rights Litigation, American Bar Association. Available at: <https://apps.americanbar.org/litigation/committees/childrights/content/articles/spring2014-0414-kids-gun-safety.html>.
- Pepper, John. 2005. "Review of, *The Bias Against Guns: Why Almost Everything You've Heard About Gun Control Is Wrong*, John Lott, Jr." *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, Vol. 20, No. 7, pp. 931-942.
- Peters, Justin. 2013a. "California's Strict New Access Prevention Law Won't Do Much to Stop Child Shooting Deaths." *Slate*, October 15. Available at: http://www.slate.com/blogs/crime/2013/10/15/firearm_safe_and_responsible_access_act_california_s_strict_new_access_prevention.html.
- Peters, Justin, 2013b. "194 Children Have Been Shot and Killed in America in 2013. This Has to Stop." *Slate*, December 10. Available at: http://www.slate.com/blogs/crime/2013/12/10/child_shootings_mother_jones_194_child_shooting_deaths_in_2013_show_that.html
- Poutvaara, Panu and Olli Ropponen. 2017. "Shocking News and Cognitive Performance." Forthcoming at *European Journal of Political Economy*. Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0176268016301768>.
- Prickett, Kate C., Alexa Martin-Storey, and Robert Crosnoe. 2014. "State Firearm Laws, Firearm Ownership, and Safety Practices Among Families of Preschool-Aged Children." *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 104, No. 6, pp. 1080-1086.

- Ripski, Michael and Anne Gregory. 2009. "Unfair, Unsafe, and Unwelcome: Do School Students' Perceptions of Unfairness, Hostility, and Victimization in School Predict Engagement and Achievement?" *Journal of School Violence*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 355-375.
- Rocque, Michael. 2012. "Exploring School Rampage Shootings: Research, Theory, and Policy." *Social Science Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 304-313.
- Ruggles, Kelly and Sonali Rajan. 2014. "Gun Possession among American Youth: A Discovery-Based Approach to Understand Gun Violence." *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 9, No. 11, e111893.
- Ruhm, Christopher. 1996. "Alcohol Policies and Highway Vehicle Fatalities." *Journal of Health Economics*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 435-465.
- Rumberger, Russell. 1995. "Dropping Out of Middle School: A Multilevel Analysis of Students and Schools." *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 583-625.
- Sabia, Joseph J. and Brittany Bass. 2017. "Do Anti-Bullying Laws Work? New Evidence on School Safety and Youth Violence." *Journal of Population Economics*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 473-502.
- Sabia, Joseph J., M. Melinda Pitts, and Laura Argys. 2014. "Do Minimum Wages Really Increase Youth Drinking and Drunk Driving?" Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta Working Paper No. 2014-20.
- Said, Stephan. 2015. "The Cause of School Shootings: We're Missing the Mark." *Huffington Post*, October 9. Available at: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/stephan-said/the-cause-of-school-shoot_b_8268078.html.
- Saukkonen, Suvi, Taina Laajasalo, Markus Jokela, Janne Kivivuori, Venla Salmi, and Eeva Aronen. 2016. "Weapon Carrying and Psychopathic-like Features in a Population-based Sample of Finnish Adolescents." *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 183-191.
- Schuster, Mark, Todd Franke, Amy Bastian, Sinaroth Sor, and Neal Halfon. 2000. "Firearm Storage Patterns in US Homes with Children." *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 90, No. 4, pp. 588-594.
- Shaffer, Rachel. 1999. "Child Access Prevention Laws: Keeping Guns Out of Our Children's Hands." *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, Vol. 27, No. 6, pp. 1985-2024.
- Simon, Thomas, Alex Crosby, and Linda Dahlberg. 1999. "Students Who Carry Weapons to High School." *Journal of Adolescent Health*, Vol. 24, No. 5, pp. 340-348.
- Slauson, Tyler. 2014. "Search Warrant: Oregon High School Shooter Took Gun from His Brother." *Q13 Fox*, June 19. Available at:

<http://q13fox.com/2014/06/19/search-warrant-oregon-high-school-shooter-took-gun-from-his-brother/>.

Stafford, D. and Associates. 2014. "Campus Shootings in the United States." Available at: <http://www.dstaffordandassociates.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Campus-Shootings-List-11-20-14.pdf>.

Stoller, Gary and Oren Dorell. 2012. "Classmate Says Adam Lanza Attended Sandy Hook School." *USA Today*, December 19. Available at: <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2012/12/18/adam-lanza-sandy-hook-student/1777525/>.

Stopheshootings.org. 2013. "List of School Shootings." Available at: <http://www.stopheshootings.org>.

Taylor, Benjamin and Jing Li. 2015. "Do Fewer Guns Lead to Less Crime? Evidence from Australia." *International Review of Law and Economics*, Vol. 42, pp. 72-78.

United States Government Accountability Office. 2012. "States' Laws and Requirements for Concealed Carry Permits Vary across the Nation." Report to Congressional Requesters GAO-12-717. Available at: <http://www.gao.gov/assets/600/592552.pdf>.

USA Carry. 2015. "Concealed Carry Permit Reciprocity Maps." Available at: http://www.usacarry.com/concealed_carry_permit_reciprocity_maps.html.

Van Fleet, David and Ella Van Fleet. 2010. *The Violence Volcano: Reducing the Threat of Workplace Violence*. Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.

Vartabedian, Ralph. 2014. "Related Story: Gun Violence at U.S. Schools Continues to Grow Sharply." *Los Angeles Times*, June 11. Available at: <http://www.latimes.com/nation/nationnow/la-na-nn-gun-violence-schools-20140610-story.html>.

Vaughn, Michael, Brian Perron, Arnelyn Abdon, Rene Olate, Ralph Groom, and Li-Tzy Wu. 2012. "Correlates of Handgun Carrying Among Adolescents in the United States." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 27, No. 10, pp. 2003-2021.


Vernick, Jon and Lisa Hepburn. 2003. "State and Federal Gun Laws: Trends for 1970-99." In *Evaluating Gun Policy: Effects on Crime and Violence* (eds. Jens Ludwig and Philip J. Cook). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Violence Policy Center. 2001. "Where'd They Get Their Guns?" Available at: <https://www.vpc.org/studies/wgunint.htm>.

Webster, Daniel, Cassandra Crifasi, and John Vernick. 2014. "Effects of the Repeal of


- Missouri's Handgun Purchaser Licensing Law on Homicides." *Journal of Urban Health*, Vol. 91, No. 2, pp. 293-302.
- Webster, Daniel and Marc Starnes. 2000. "Reexamining the Association Between Child Access Prevention Gun Laws and Unintentional Shooting Deaths of Children." *Pediatrics*, Vol. 106, No. 6, pp. 1466-1469.
- Webster, Daniel, Jon Vernick, April Zeoli, and Jennifer Manganello. 2004. "Association Between Youth-Focused Firearm Laws and Youth Suicides." *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 292, No. 5, pp. 594-601.
- Willingham, A.J. 2016. "A Visual Guide: Mass Shootings in America." *CNN*, June 21. Available at: <http://www.cnn.com/2016/06/13/health/mass-shootings-in-america-in-charts-and-graphs-trnd/>.
- Wood, Daniel. 2001. "Where School Shooters Get Their Guns." *The Christian Science Monitor*, March 12. Available at: <http://www.csmonitor.com/2001/0312/p1s3.html>.
- Yatchew, Adonis and Zvi Griliches. 1985. "Specification Error in Probit Models." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 67, No. 1, pp. 134-139.
- Young, Colin. 2012. "Dorchester Man Charged after Two Loaded Guns are found in his Apartment." *Boston.com*, November 8. Available at: <http://www.boston.com/2012/11/08/tom/Y1OqFJxuaVWh87w63OlrEM/story.html>.

Figure 1. Outcomes in the National YRBS



Notes: Weighted means based on national YRBS data for the period 1993-2013.

Figure 2. Outcomes in the State YRBS



Notes: Weighted means based on state YRBS data for the period 1993-2013.

Table 1. Child Access Prevention Laws

	Effective Date	Type of CAP Law
California	January 1, 1992	Negligent Storage
<i>Colorado</i>	October 13, 2000	Reckless Endangerment
Connecticut	October 1, 1990	Negligent Storage
<i>Delaware</i>	July 2, 1998	Reckless Endangerment
<i>D.C.</i>	January 28, 2009	Negligent Storage
Florida	October 1, 1989	Negligent Storage
<i>Georgia</i>	May 1, 1994	Reckless Endangerment
Hawaii	July 1, 1992	Negligent Storage
<i>Illinois</i>	January 1, 2000	Negligent Storage
Indiana	March 7, 1994	Reckless Endangerment
Iowa	April 5, 1990	Negligent Storage
Kentucky	July 15, 1994	Reckless Endangerment
Maryland	April 1, 1992	Negligent Storage
<i>Massachusetts</i>	October 21, 1998	Negligent Storage
<i>Minnesota</i>	May 20, 1993	Negligent Storage
<i>Mississippi</i>	July 2, 1994	Reckless Endangerment
Missouri	September 28, 1981	Reckless Endangerment
<i>Nevada</i>	July 1, 1995	Reckless Endangerment
<i>New Hampshire</i>	January 1, 2001	Negligent Storage
New Jersey	January 17, 1992	Negligent Storage
<i>North Carolina</i>	December 1, 1993	Negligent Storage
Oklahoma	July 7, 1993	Reckless Endangerment
Rhode Island	July 1, 1995	Negligent Storage
<i>Tennessee</i>	July 1, 1994	Reckless Endangerment
<i>Texas</i>	September 1, 1995	Negligent Storage
<i>Utah</i>	October 21, 1993	Reckless Endangerment
Virginia	July 1, 1992	Reckless Endangerment
Wisconsin	March 1, 1992	Reckless Endangerment

Notes: States for which YRBS data (1993-2013) are available before and after a CAP law went into effect are denoted in italicized font. Data on CAP laws were obtained from the Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence (2013).

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for YRBS Analysis, 1993-2013

	<i>CAP Law = 1^a</i>	<i>CAP Law = 0</i>	<i>Full Sample</i>	Description
Dependent variables				
<i>Carry Gun</i>	.056 (.230)	.053 (.225)	.055 (.228)	= 1 if respondent carried a gun in the past 30 days, = 0 otherwise
<i>Carry Any Weapon</i>	.181 (.385)	.169 (.375)	.176 (.381)	= 1 if respondent carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club in the past 30 days, = 0 otherwise
<i>Carry Any Weapon at School</i>	.059 (.236)	.062 (.241)	.060 (.238)	= 1 if respondent carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property in the past 30 days, = 0 otherwise
<i>Weapon Threat at School</i>	.071 (.257)	.072 (.258)	.071 (.257)	= 1 if respondent was threatened or injured with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property in the past 12 months, = 0 otherwise
<i>Missed School Due to Safety</i>	.054 (.226)	.051 (.219)	.053 (.224)	= 1 if respondent missed school in the past 30 days due to feeling unsafe at school or on the way to or from school, = 0 otherwise
Independent variables				
<i>White</i>	.829 (.377)	.830 (.376)	.829 (.376)	= 1 if respondent is white, = 0 otherwise
<i>Black</i>	.097 (.295)	.110 (.313)	.102 (.303)	= 1 if respondent is black, = 0 otherwise
<i>Other Race</i>	.038 (.190)	.034 (.180)	.036 (.186)	= 1 if respondent is an “other” race, = 0 otherwise
<i>Hispanic</i>	.037 (.189)	.026 (.160)	.033 (.177)	= 1 if respondent is Hispanic, = 0 otherwise
<i>Age 12</i>	.001 (.032)	.001 (.030)	.001 (.031)	= 1 if respondent is 12 years old, = 0 otherwise
<i>Age 13</i>	.002 (.039)	.006 (.076)	.003 (.057)	= 1 if respondent is 13 years old, = 0 otherwise
<i>Age 14</i>	.102 (.302)	.116 (.321)	.108 (.310)	= 1 if respondent is 14 years old, = 0 otherwise
<i>Age 15</i>	.250 (.433)	.254 (.435)	.251 (.434)	= 1 if respondent is 15 years old, = 0 otherwise
<i>Age 16</i>	.266 (.442)	.266 (.442)	.266 (.442)	= 1 if respondent is 16 years old, = 0 otherwise
<i>Age 17</i>	.244 (.429)	.235 (.424)	.240 (.427)	= 1 if respondent is 17 years old, = 0 otherwise

<i>Age 18+</i>	.137 (.343)	.122 (.327)	.130 (.337)	= 1 if respondent is 18+ years old, = 0 otherwise
<i>Grade 8</i>	.000 (.000)	.005 (.067)	.002 (.044)	= 1 if respondent is in grade 8, = 0 otherwise
<i>Grade 9</i>	.268 (.443)	.265 (.442)	.267 (.442)	= 1 if respondent is in grade 9, = 0 otherwise
<i>Grade 10</i>	.260 (.439)	.270 (.444)	.264 (.441)	= 1 if respondent is in grade 10, = 0 otherwise
<i>Grade 11</i>	.249 (.432)	.243 (.429)	.246 (.431)	= 1 if respondent is in grade 11, = 0 otherwise
<i>Grade 12</i>	.221 (.415)	.215 (.411)	.218 (.413)	= 1 if respondent is in grade 12, = 0 otherwise
<i>Male</i>	.504 (.500)	.506 (.500)	.505 (.500)	= 1 if respondent is male, = 0 otherwise
<i>% Nonwhite</i>	.203 (.082)	.191 (.084)	.198 (.083)	Percent of the state population that is nonwhite
<i>Mean Age</i>	36.51 (2.104)	37.07 (1.329)	36.74 (1.841)	State mean age
<i>% Male</i>	.492 (.212)	.487 (.006)	.490 (.006)	Percent of the state population that is male
<i>Unemployment Rate</i>	.065 (.022)	.063 (.020)	.064 (.021)	State unemployment rate
<i>Per Capita Income</i>	42,694 (6,302)	42,104 (7,549)	42,447 (6,857)	State real income per capita (2013 dollars)
<i>% Bachelor's Degree</i>	.290 (.056)	.271 (.053)	.282 (.055)	Percent of the state population with a bachelor's degree
<i>Student-Teacher Ratio</i>	16.0 (2.99)	14.7 (2.70)	15.4 (2.94)	Average Student to Teacher Ratio
<i>Teacher Salary</i>	57,623 (9,004)	62,532 (10,364)	59,673 (9,896)	Average Teacher Salary (2013 dollars)
<i>School Lunch Program</i>	.099 (.021)	.097 (.015)	.098 (.018)	National School Lunch Participation Rate
<i>ZT School Violence Law</i>	.961 (.182)	.921 (.261)	.944 (.219)	= 1 if state has a zero-tolerance school violence law, = 0 otherwise
<i>Anti-Bullying Law</i>	.397 (.479)	.194 (.381)	.312 (.452)	= 1 if state has an anti-bullying law, = 0 otherwise

<i>Police Expenditures</i>	306 (77.0)	313 (110)	309 (92.3)	State police expenditures per capita (2013 dollars)
<i>Police Employment</i>	2.20 (.314)	2.74 (.993)	2.43 (.733)	State police employees per 1,000 population
<i>Property Crime</i>	1,018 (339)	774 (320)	907 (352)	State adult property crime arrests per 100,000 population
<i>Violent Crime</i>	449 (226)	326 (167)	393 (210)	State adult violent crime arrests per 100,000 population
<i>Democrat</i>	.406 (.491)	.453 (.498)	.425 (.494)	= 1 if state has a democratic governor, = 0 otherwise
<i>Mental Health Parity Law</i>	.524 (.499)	.502 (.497)	.515 (.498)	= 1 if state has a mental health parity law, = 0 otherwise
<i>Beer Tax</i>	.292 (.195)	.271 (.221)	.283 (.207)	Beer taxes (2013 dollar)
<i>ZT Drunk Driving Law</i>	.951 (.212)	.917 (.266)	.937 (.237)	= 1 if state has a zero-tolerance drunk driving law, = 0 otherwise
<i>Shall Issue Law</i>	.600 (.490)	.435 (.496)	.531 (.499)	= 1 if state has a shall issue gun law, = 0 otherwise
<i>Stand Your Ground Law</i>	.304 (.449)	.186 (.388)	.255 (.429)	= 1 if state has a stand-your-ground gun law, = 0 otherwise
<i>Minimum Possession Age^b</i>	18.0 (.000)	18.13 (.679)	18.06 (.462)	State minimum age requirement to possess a handgun
<i>Background Check Law</i>	.426 (.494)	.581 (.493)	.491 (.500)	= 1 if state requires background checks for private sales on firearms, = 0 otherwise
<i>Trigger Lock Law</i>	.517 (.500)	.374 (.484)	.457 (.498)	= 1 if state requires trigger locks to accompany dealer and private firearm sales, = 0 otherwise
<i>Gun Buyback Program</i>	.176 (.381)	.000 (.000)	.103 (.304)	= 1 if a major city in the state held a gun buyback program, = 0 otherwise
N	508,614	541,900	1,050,514	

^a If a CAP law is in effect for any portion of the year, the observation is included in this column. ^b In our regression models, we control for a dummy variable that is equal to 1 if the state requires individuals to be at least 18 years of age to possess a handgun, and equal to 0 otherwise.

Notes: Weighted means presented along with standard deviations.

Table 3. CAP Laws, Gun Carrying, and School Safety

	<i>Carry Gun</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon at School</i>	<i>Weapon Threat at School</i>	<i>Missed School Due to Safety</i>
Panel I: Students under age 18					
<i>CAP Law</i>	-.009* (.005)	-.018* (.011)	-.003 (.004)	-.014*** (.005)	-.007 (.006)
N	672,373	799,904	889,523	892,550	916,544
Panel II: Students ages 18+					
<i>CAP Law</i>	.002 (.006)	.005 (.020)	-.003 (.013)	.008 (.011)	.019 (.012)
N	104,263	119,320	130,534	131,751	133,970

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: Each cell represents a marginal effect from a probit regression based on data from the YRBS for the period 1993-2013. All models control for the covariates listed in Table 2, state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends. Regressions are weighted using population estimates from the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.

Table 4. Examining Heterogeneous Effects by Type of CAP Law

	<i>Carry Gun</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon at School</i>	<i>Weapon Threat at School</i>	<i>Missed School Due to Safety</i>
Panel I: Students under age 18					
<i>Negligent Storage</i>	-.013** (.006)	-.026** (.012)	-.002 (.006)	-.009* (.005)	-.009 (.007)
<i>Reckless Endangerment</i>	-.005 (.007)	-.007 (.014)	-.005 (.007)	-.022** (.009)	-.003 (.009)
N	672,373	799,904	889,523	892,550	916,544
Panel II: Students ages 18+					
<i>Negligent Storage</i>	.002 (.009)	.005 (.027)	-.011 (.018)	.017 (.012)	.028** (.012)
<i>Reckless Endangerment</i>	.002 (.010)	.004 (.025)	.006 (.014)	-.004 (.012)	.005 (.012)
N	104,263	119,320	130,534	131,751	133,970

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: Each column within each panel represents marginal effects from a probit regression based on data from the YRBS for the period 1993-2013. All models control for the covariates listed in Table 2, state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends. Regressions are weighted using population estimates from the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.

Table 5. Leads and Lags of CAP Laws for Students Under Age 18

	<i>Carry Gun</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon at School</i>	<i>Weapon Threat at School</i>	<i>Missed School Due to Safety</i>
<i>2 Years before CAP Law</i>	.002 (.009)	.002 (.016)	.002 (.007)	-.007 (0.009)	-.007 (.011)
<i>1 Year before CAP Law</i>	-.004 (.010)	-.001 (.026)	.014 (.013)	-.004 (.010)	-.025*** (.010)
<i>Year of Law Change</i>	.008 (.010)	.017 (.017)	-.001 (.009)	-.003 (.011)	-.007 (.012)
<i>1 Year after CAP Law</i>	-.018** (.009)	-.031 (.021)	.005 (.009)	-.020** (.008)	-.025** (.010)
<i>2+ Years after CAP Law</i>	-.006 (.009)	-.017 (.023)	.005 (.010)	-.027*** (.008)	-.031*** (.010)
N	672,373	799,904	889,523	892,550	916,544

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: Each column represents marginal effects from a probit regression based on data from the YRBS for the period 1993-2013. All models control for the covariates listed in Table 2, state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends. Regressions are weighted using population estimates from the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.

Table 6. Leads and Lags of Negligent Storage CAP Laws for Students Under Age 18

	<i>Carry Gun</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon at School</i>	<i>Weapon Threat at School</i>	<i>Missed School Due to Safety</i>
<i>2 Years before Negligent Storage</i>	.004 (.008)	.002 (.014)	-.002 (.007)	-.008 (.009)	-.006 (.010)
<i>1 Year before Negligent Storage</i>	-.010 (.011)	-.015 (.030)	.022 (.018)	-.016 (.011)	-.038** (.012)
<i>Year of Law Change</i>	.014 (.008)	.017 (.017)	.003 (.009)	.002 (.011)	.003 (.012)
<i>1 Year after Negligent Storage</i>	-.026*** (.008)	-.049** (.022)	.006 (.011)	-.023*** (.009)	-.032** (.012)
<i>2+ Years after Negligent Storage</i>	-.017* (.009)	-.038 (.024)	.011 (.012)	-.030*** (.009)	-.038*** (.012)
N	672,373	799,904	889,523	892,550	916,544

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: Each column represents marginal effects from a probit regression based on data from the YRBS for the period 1993-2013. All models control for the covariates listed in Table 2, leads and lags of *Reckless Endangerment*, state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends. Regressions are weighted using population estimates from the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.

Table 7. Risky Behavior Falsification Tests for Students Under Age 18

	<i>Cigarette Use</i>	<i>Illicit Drug Use</i>	<i>Binge Drinking</i>	<i>Drunk Driving</i>	<i>Seat Belt Use</i>	<i>Sex Partners</i>
<i>CAP Law</i>	.006 (.012)	-.039 (.048)	-.001 (.011)	.002 (.007)	-.017 (.012)	.009 (.006)
Mean of dependent variable	.213	.258	.249	.091	.105	.075
N	886,205	711,238	904,960	883,577	892,147	773,650

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: Each cell represents a marginal effect from a probit regression based on data from the YRBS for the period 1993-2013. All models control for the covariates listed in Table 2, state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends. Regressions are weighted using population estimates from the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.

Table 8. Do School Shootings or Violent Crime Rates Predict CAP Laws?

Panel I	<i>CAP Law</i>	<i>CAP Law</i>
<i>Shooting Involving Any Death (Shooters Under Age 18)</i>	.007 (.021)	-.014 (.014)
<i>Shooting Involving Any Death (Shooters Under Age 18), 1 Year Lag</i>007 (.019)
<i>Shooting Involving Any Death (Shooters Under Age 18), 2 Year Lag</i>005 (.014)
<i>Shooting Involving Any Death (Shooters Under Age 18), 3 Year Lag</i>	...	-.002 (.013)
N	1,173	1,020
Panel II		
<i>Number of Shootings Involving Any Death (Shooters Under Age 18)</i>	.001 (.011)	-.002 (.006)
<i>Number of Shootings Involving Any Death (Shooters Under Age 18), 1 Year Lag</i>	...	-.006 (.013)
<i>Number of Shootings Involving Any Death (Shooters Under Age 18), 2 Year Lag</i>001 (.009)
<i>Number of Shootings Involving Any Death (Shooters Under Age 18), 3 Year Lag</i>001 (.006)
N	1,173	1,020
Panel III		
<i>Violent Crime Arrest Rate (Under Age 18)</i>	.001 (.001)	.0003 (.0003)
<i>Violent Crime Arrest Rate (Under Age 18), 1 Year Lag</i>0001 (.0003)
<i>Violent Crime Arrest Rate (Under Age 18), 2 Year Lag</i>0003 (.0003)
<i>Violent Crime Arrest Rate (Under Age 18), 3 Year Lag</i>0004 (.0003)
N	1,132	961

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: The first column within each panel represents an estimate from an OLS regression based on data for the period 1991-2013. The second column within each panel represents estimates from an OLS regression based on data for the period 1994-2013. All models control for the covariates listed in Appendix Table 7, state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends. Regressions are weighted using state populations. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.

Table 9. CAP Laws and the Probability of a School Shooting

	<i>Shooting Involving Any Death (Shooters Under Age 18)</i>	<i>Shooting Involving Suicide (Shooters Under Age 18)</i>	<i>Shooting Involving Homicide (Shooters Under Age 18)</i>
Panel I			
<i>CAP Law</i>	.049 (.138)	.053 (.078)	.005 (.099)
	<i>Shooting Involving Any Death (Shooters Ages 18+)</i>	<i>Shooting Involving Suicide (Shooters Ages 18+)</i>	<i>Shooting Involving Homicide (Shooters Ages 18+)</i>
Panel II			
<i>CAP Law</i>	.063 (.129)	.070 (.073)	-.021 (.084)
N	1,173	1,173	1,173

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: Each cell represents an estimate from an OLS regression based on data on school-associated shooting deaths for the period 1991-2013. All models control for the covariates listed in Appendix Table 7, state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends. Regressions are weighted using state populations. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.

Appendix Table 1. Data Sources for State-Level Covariates

	Data Source
<i>% Nonwhite</i>	National Cancer Institute's SEER population data
<i>Mean Age</i>	National Cancer Institute's SEER population data
<i>% Male</i>	National Cancer Institute's SEER population data
<i>Unemployment Rate</i>	Bureau of Labor Statistics
<i>Per Capita Income</i>	Bureau of Economic Analysis
<i>% Bachelor's Degree</i>	U.S. Department of Education
<i>Student-Teacher Ratio</i>	<i>Digest of Education Statistics</i> published by the National Center for Education Statistics
<i>Teacher Salary</i>	<i>Digest of Education Statistics</i> published by the National Center for Education Statistics
<i>School Lunch Program</i>	U.S. Department of Agriculture
<i>ZT School Violence Law</i>	Education Commission of the States
<i>Anti-Bullying Law</i>	Sabia and Bass (2017)
<i>Police Expenditures</i>	Bureau of Justice Statistics
<i>Police Employment</i>	Bureau of Justice Statistics
<i>Property Crime</i>	FBI's <i>Uniform Crime Reports</i>
<i>Violent Crime</i>	FBI's <i>Uniform Crime Reports</i>
<i>Democrat</i>	Authors' own internet searches
<i>Mental Health Parity Law</i>	Lang (2013b) and updates to Lang (2013b) were provided via personal correspondence with the author
<i>Beer Tax</i>	<i>Brewers' Almanac</i> published by the Beer Institute
<i>ZT Drunk Driving Law</i>	Updated from Anderson et al. (2013)
<i>Shall Issue Law</i>	Grossman and Lee (2008), Donohue and Ayers (2009), Aneja et al. (2012), Hinkston (2012), United States Government Accountability Office (2012), Arnold (2015), and USA Carry (2015)
<i>Stand Your Ground Law</i>	McClellan and Tekin (2016)
<i>Minimum Possession Age</i>	Marvell (2001) and Gius (2015)
<i>Background Check Law</i>	Vernick and Hepburn (2003), Webster et al. (2014), and Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence (2016a)
<i>Trigger Lock Law</i>	Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence (2016b) and authors' own searches of state legislative codes
<i>Gun Buyback Program</i>	Authors' own search of online newspaper archives. For each year in our panel, we systematically searched for gun buyback programs in the major cities in each state. Information on each buyback program and the accompanying sources are available from the authors upon request.

Appendix Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for YRBS Analysis by Age

	<i>CAP Law = 1</i>	<i>CAP Law = 0</i>	Full Sample
Students under age 18			
<i>Carry Gun</i>	.055 (.229)	.051 (.221)	.054 (.225)
<i>Carry Any Weapon</i>	.180 (.384)	.167 (.373)	.175 (.380)
<i>Carry Any Weapon at School</i>	.057 (.233)	.060 (.238)	.059 (.235)
<i>Weapon Threat at School</i>	.072 (.259)	.072 (.259)	.072 (.259)
<i>Missed School Due to Safety</i>	.054 (.226)	.050 (.219)	.053 (.223)
Students ages 18+			
<i>Carry Gun</i>	.061 (.240)	.068 (.252)	.064 (.245)
<i>Carry Any Weapon</i>	.188 (.391)	.185 (.389)	.187 (.390)
<i>Carry Any Weapon at School</i>	.069 (.253)	.076 (.265)	.072 (.258)
<i>Weapon Threat at School</i>	.064 (.245)	.066 (.248)	.065 (.246)
<i>Missed School Due to Safety</i>	.055 (.227)	.052 (.223)	.054 (.226)

Notes: Weighted means with standard deviations in parentheses.

Appendix Table 3. Difference-in-Difference-in-Difference Estimates of the Effects of CAP Laws on Gun Carrying and School Safety

	<i>Carry Gun</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon at School</i>	<i>Weapon Threat at School</i>	<i>Missed School Due to Safety</i>
Panel I: Students under age 18 vs. students ages 18+					
<i>CAP Law</i>	-.011* (.007)	-.023 (.016)	-.001 (.012)	-.023** (.010)	-.027** (.011)
N	776,636	919,228	1,020,057	1,024,301	1,050,514
Panel II: Students under age 18 vs. students ages 18+					
<i>Negligent Storage</i>	-.016** (.007)	.031 (.023)	.008 (.018)	-.028** (.012)	-.040*** (.011)
N	776,636	919,228	1,020,057	1,024,301	1,050,514

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: Each cell represents a marginal effect from a probit regression based on data from the YRBS for the period 1993-2013. All models control for the covariates listed in Table 2, state fixed effects, year fixed effects, state-specific linear time trends, and for interactions between an under-age-18 indicator and all right-hand-side variables. The models in panel II also control for *Reckless Endangerment*. Regressions are weighted using population estimates from the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.

Appendix Table 4. Sensitivity of CAP Law Effects to Sequentially Adding Controls

	<i>Carry Gun</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon at School</i>	<i>Weapon Threat at School</i>	<i>Missed School Due to Safety</i>
Panel I: Students under age 18					
Baseline model	-.010* (.005)	-.021*** (.007)	-.002 (.004)	-.009 (.006)	-.011** (.006)
+ Sociodemographic controls	-.010 (.006)	-.020*** (.007)	-.002 (.006)	-.010 (.007)	-.010* (.006)
+ School violence policies	-.009* (.005)	-.020*** (.008)	-.001 (.005)	-.009 (.006)	-.011** (.006)
+ Crime and political controls	-.010** (.005)	-.022** (.009)	-.005 (.005)	-.013** (.007)	-.013** (.006)
+ Economic controls	-.011** (.005)	-.021** (.009)	-.003 (.005)	-.013** (.006)	-.012* (.007)
+ Education controls	-.011** (.005)	-.021** (.010)	-.004 (.005)	-.014*** (.005)	-.013** (.007)
+ Mental health policy	-.011** (.005)	-.022** (.010)	-.005 (.005)	-.015*** (.005)	-.013** (.007)
+ Gun controls	-.009* (.005)	-.018* (.011)	-.003 (.004)	-.014*** (.005)	-.007 (.006)
N	672,373	799,904	889,523	892,550	916,544
Panel II: Students ages 18+					
Baseline model	-.000 (.009)	-.010 (.013)	-.000 (.013)	.006 (.014)	.011 (.011)
+ Sociodemographic controls	.004 (.007)	.000 (.014)	-.001 (.014)	.007 (.014)	.013 (.009)
+ School violence policies	.005 (.006)	-.000 (.014)	-.000 (.014)	.007 (.014)	.014 (.010)
+ Crime and political controls	.008 (.005)	-.007 (.017)	-.001 (.014)	.005 (.013)	.013 (.009)
+ Economic controls	.007 (.005)	-.004 (.017)	-.002 (.014)	.007 (.013)	.014 (.009)
+ Education controls	.006 (.005)	.001 (.019)	-.002 (.016)	.008 (.011)	.016 (.010)
+ Mental health policy	.006 (.005)	.000 (.019)	-.003 (.017)	.007 (.012)	.014 (.011)
+ Gun controls	.002 (.006)	.005 (.020)	-.003 (.013)	.008 (.011)	.019 (.012)
N	104,263	119,320	130,534	131,751	133,970

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: Each column within each panel represents marginal effects from a probit regression based on data from the YRBS for the period 1993-2013. Demographic controls: individual-level race, age, grade, and gender dummies, % *Nonwhite*, *Mean Age*, and % *Male*. School violence policies: *ZT School Violence Law* and *Anti-Bullying Law*. Crime controls: *Police Expenditures*, *Police Employment*, *Property Crime*, *Violent Crime*, and *ZT Drunk Driving Law*. Political control: *Democrat*. Economic controls: *Unemployment Rate*, *Per Capita Income*, and *Beer Tax*. Education controls: % *Bachelor's Degree*, *Student-Teacher Ratio*, *Teacher Salary*, and *School Lunch Program*. Mental health policy: *Mental Health Parity Law*. Gun-related policies: *Shall Issue Law*, *Minimum Possession Age*, *Background Check Law*, *Trigger Lock Law*, and *Gun Buyback Program*. All models control for state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends. Regressions are weighted using population estimates from the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.

Appendix Table 5. Sensitivity of Negligent Storage CAP Law Effects to Sequentially Adding Controls

	<i>Carry Gun</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon</i>	<i>Carry Any Weapon at School</i>	<i>Weapon Threat at School</i>	<i>Missed School Due to Safety</i>
Panel I: Students under age 18					
Baseline model	-.015* (.008)	-.026*** (.009)	-.002 (.010)	-.008 (.009)	-.010 (.008)
+ Sociodemographic controls	-.012* (.007)	-.027*** (.010)	-.003 (.008)	-.007 (.007)	-.012* (.007)
+ School violence policies	-.013* (.007)	-.028*** (.009)	-.003 (.008)	-.008 (.007)	-.012** (.006)
+ Crime and political controls	-.014** (.006)	-.029*** (.009)	-.006 (.007)	-.011 (.008)	-.015** (.006)
+ Economic controls	-.014** (.006)	-.029*** (.009)	-.004 (.008)	-.013 (.008)	-.015** (.007)
+ Education controls	-.015*** (.005)	-.030*** (.010)	-.005 (.008)	-.013** (.007)	-.019*** (.007)
+ Mental health policy	-.015*** (.005)	-.030*** (.010)	-.005 (.008)	-.014* (.007)	-.019*** (.007)
+ Gun controls	-.013** (.006)	-.026** (.012)	-.002 (.006)	-.009* (.005)	-.009 (.007)
N	672,373	799,904	889,523	892,550	916,544
Panel II: Students ages 18+					
Baseline model	.007 (.011)	-.018 (.015)	-.008 (.019)	.017 (.016)	.015 (.014)
+ Sociodemographic controls	.008 (.008)	-.008 (.018)	-.009 (.021)	.018 (.014)	.015 (.010)
+ School violence policies	.007 (.008)	-.012 (.017)	-.010 (.020)	.018 (.015)	.018 (.011)
+ Crime and political controls	.008 (.007)	-.016 (.016)	-.010 (.019)	.015 (.014)	.015 (.010)
+ Economic controls	.006 (.006)	-.014 (.017)	-.010 (.020)	.015 (.014)	.016 (.010)
+ Education controls	.007 (.006)	-.004 (.022)	-.009 (.022)	.016 (.013)	.018* (.011)
+ Mental health policy	.006 (.006)	-.005 (.022)	-.011 (.023)	.015 (.014)	.017 (.012)
+ Gun controls	.002 (.009)	.005 (.027)	-.011 (.018)	.017 (.012)	.028** (.012)
N	104,263	119,320	130,534	131,751	133,970

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: Each column within each panel represents marginal effects from a probit regression based on data from the YRBS for the period 1993-2013. Demographic controls: individual-level race, age, grade, and gender dummies, % *Nonwhite*, *Mean Age*, and % *Male*. School violence policies: *ZT School Violence Law* and *Anti-Bullying Law*. Crime controls: *Police Expenditures*, *Police Employment*, *Property Crime*, *Violent Crime*, and *ZT Drunk Driving Law*. Political control: *Democrat*. Economic controls: *Unemployment Rate*, *Per Capita Income*, and *Beer Tax*. Education controls: % *Bachelor's Degree*, *Student-Teacher Ratio*, *Teacher Salary*, and *School Lunch Program*. Mental health policy: *Mental Health Parity Law*. Gun-related policies: *Shall Issue Law*, *Minimum Possession Age*, *Background Check Law*, *Trigger Lock Law*, and *Gun Buyback Program*. All models control for state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends. Regressions are weighted using population estimates from the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.

Appendix Table 6. Risky Behavior Falsification Tests for Students Under Age 18

	<i>Cigarette Use</i>	<i>Illicit Drug Use</i>	<i>Binge Drinking</i>	<i>Drunk Driving</i>	<i>Seat Belt Use</i>	<i>Sex Partners</i>
<i>Negligent Storage</i>	.007 (.011)	-.036 (.057)	.002 (.014)	.0003 (.009)	-.007 (.017)	.003 (.007)
Mean of dependent variable	.213	.258	.249	.091	.105	.075
N	886,205	711,238	904,960	883,577	892,147	773,650

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: Each cell represents a marginal effect from a probit regression based on data from the YRBS for the period 1993-2013. All models control for the covariates listed in Table 2, *Reckless Endangerment*, state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends. Regressions are weighted using population estimates from the National Cancer Institute's Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.

Appendix Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for State-Level School Shooting Analysis, 1991-2013

	<i>CAP Law = 1</i>	<i>CAP Law = 0</i>	Full Sample	Description
Dependent Variables				
<i>Shooting Involving Any Death (Shooters under age 18)</i>	.230 (.421)	.185 (.388)	.211 (.408)	= 1 if there was a school shooting involving a death in state <i>s</i> during year <i>t</i> that was committed by someone under the age of 18, = 0 otherwise
<i>Shooting Involving Suicide (Shooters under age 18)</i>	.140 (.348)	.072 (.259)	.112 (.316)	= 1 if there was a school shooting involving a suicide in state <i>s</i> during year <i>t</i> that was committed by someone under the age of 18, = 0 otherwise
<i>Shooting Involving Homicide (Shooters under age 18)</i>	.141 (.348)	.128 (.334)	.136 (.342)	= 1 if there was a school shooting involving a homicide in state <i>s</i> during year <i>t</i> that was committed by someone under the age of 18, = 0 otherwise
<i>Shooting Involving Any Death (Shooters ages 18+)</i>	.326 (.469)	.191 (.393)	.271 (.444)	= 1 if there was a school shooting in state <i>s</i> during year <i>t</i> that was committed by someone 18+ years of age, = 0 otherwise
<i>Shooting Involving Suicide (Shooters ages 18+)</i>	.142 (.350)	.068 (.251)	.112 (.315)	= 1 if there was a school shooting involving a suicide in state <i>s</i> during year <i>t</i> that was committed by someone 18+ years of age, = 0 otherwise
<i>Shooting Involving Homicide (Shooters ages 18+)</i>	.278 (.448)	.168 (.374)	.233 (.423)	= 1 if there was a school shooting involving a homicide in state <i>s</i> during year <i>t</i> that was committed by someone 18+ years of age, = 0 otherwise
Independent Variables				
<i>% Nonwhite</i>	.198 (.087)	.175 (.086)	.189 (.087)	Percent of the state population that is nonwhite
<i>Mean Age</i>	36.1 (1.83)	36.4 (1.62)	36.2 (1.75)	State mean age
<i>% Male</i>	.492 (.006)	.489 (.007)	.491 (.006)	Percent of the state population this is male
<i>Unemployment Rate</i>	.062 (.022)	.062 (.017)	.062 (.020)	State unemployment rate
<i>Per Capita Income</i>	42,100 (6,170)	39,097 (6,349)	40,865 (6,414)	State income per capita (2013 dollars)
<i>% Bachelor's Degree</i>	.280 (.053)	.251 (.048)	.268 (.053)	Percent of the state population with a bachelor's degree
<i>Student-Teacher Ratio</i>	16.2 (3.50)	15.5 (3.14)	15.9 (3.37)	Average student to teacher ratio
<i>Teacher Salary</i>	58,893 (9,259)	59,857 (9,438)	59,290 (9,341)	Average teacher salary (2013 dollars)
<i>School Lunch Program</i>	.097 (.021)	.097 (.019)	.097 (.020)	State school lunch participation rate
<i>ZT School Violence Law</i>	.900 (.291)	.736 (.434)	.833 (.366)	= 1 if state has a zero-tolerance school violence law, = 0 otherwise

<i>Anti-Bullying Law</i>	.308 (.454)	.172 (.368)	.252 (.426)	= 1 if state has an anti-bullying law, = 0 otherwise
<i>Police Expenditures</i>	246 (86.6)	210 (92.2)	231 (90.6)	State police expenditures per capita (2013 dollars)
<i>Police Employment</i>	2.22 (.380)	2.44 (.800)	2.31 (.600)	State police employees per 1,000 population
<i>Property Crime</i>	888 (437)	917 (385)	900 (416)	State adult property crime arrests per 100,000 population
<i>Violent Crime</i>	439 (279)	384 (204)	416 (252)	State adult violent crime arrests per 100,000 population
<i>Democrat</i>	.414 (.493)	.451 (.498)	.429 (.495)	= 1 if state has a democratic governor, = 0 otherwise
<i>Mental Health Parity</i>	.505 (.497)	.291 (.453)	.417 (.490)	= 1 if state has a mental health parity law, = 0 otherwise
<i>Beer Tax</i>	.304 (.204)	.293 (.221)	.299 (.212)	State beer tax (2013 dollars)
<i>ZT Drunk Driving Law</i>	.892 (.304)	.731 (.435)	.826 (.372)	= 1 if state has a zero-tolerance drunk driving law, = 0 otherwise
<i>Shall Issue Law</i>	.545 (.498)	.506 (.500)	.529 (.499)	= 1 if state has a shall issue gun law, = 0 otherwise
<i>Stand Your Ground Law</i>	.199 (.393)	.145 (.345)	.177 (.375)	= 1 if state has a stand-your-ground gun law, = 0 otherwise
<i>Minimum Possession Age^b</i>	18.0 (.000)	18.22 (.960)	18.08 (.605)	State minimum age requirement to possess a handgun
<i>Background Check Law</i>	.469 (.500)	.433 (.496)	.455 (.498)	= 1 if state requires background checks for private sales on firearms, = 0 otherwise
<i>Trigger Lock Law</i>	.215 (.411)	.000 (.000)	.126 (.332)	= 1 if state requires trigger locks to accompany dealer and private firearm sales, = 0 otherwise
<i>Gun Buyback Program</i>	.381 (.486)	.367 (.482)	.375 (.484)	= 1 if a major city in the state held a gun buyback program, = 0 otherwise
N	543	630	1,173	

^a If a CAP law is in effect for any portion of the year, the observation is included in this column. ^b In our regression models, we control for a dummy variable that is equal to 1 if the state requires individuals to be at least 18 years of age to possess a handgun, and equal to 0 otherwise.

Notes: Weighted means with standard deviations in parentheses.

Appendix Table 8. Leads and Lags of CAP Laws and the Probability of a School Shooting

	<i>Shooting Involving Any Death (Shooters under age 18)</i>	<i>Shooting Involving Suicide (Shooters under age 18)</i>	<i>Shooting Involving Homicide (Shooters under age 18)</i>
<i>2 Years before CAP Law</i>	-.130 (.088)	-.140 (.111)	-.074 (.080)
<i>1 Year before CAP Law</i>	.089 (.140)	.015 (.064)	-.027 (.215)
<i>Year of Law Change</i>	.065 (.160)	-.016 (.103)	-.014 (.148)
<i>1 Year after CAP Law</i>	.027 (.217)	-.088 (.117)	-.001 (.197)
<i>2+ Years after CAP Law</i>	.206 (.194)	.106 (.120)	.093 (.214)
N	1,173	1,173	1,173

* Statistically significant at 10% level; ** at 5% level; *** at 1% level.

Notes: Each column represents estimates from an OLS regression based on data on school-associated shooting deaths for the period 1991-2013. All models control for the covariates listed in Appendix Table 7, state fixed effects, year fixed effects, and state-specific linear time trends. Regressions are weighted using state populations. Standard errors, corrected for clustering at the state level, are in parentheses.