



**Youth deviance and youth violence:  
A European multi-agency perspective on best practices in prevention and control  
(YouPrev)**

**Report on the German Nationwide Institutional and Expert Survey**

Anabel Taefi, Benjamin Kraus & Thomas Görgen

1	Survey process and composition of sample .....	2
1.1	Survey process.....	2
1.2	Response rate and sample composition .....	2
2	Experts' experiences with and views on youth crime prevention and control.....	3
2.1	Target groups of activities in the field of prevention and control of youth deviance, violence, and crime .....	3
2.2	Types of youth problem behaviour targeted by current activities .....	4
2.3	Approaches taken in prevention and control of youth deviance, violence and crime .....	6
2.4	Institutions and professions involved in prevention and control of youth deviance, violence and crime.....	7
2.5	Significance of interagency and multi-professional approaches.....	7
2.6	Situation of financing/funding.....	8
2.7	Political strategies with regard to youth problem behaviour .....	9
2.8	Evaluation of measures in the field of prevention and control of youth deviant behaviour	10
2.9	Sources of information on prevention of youth problem behaviour.....	10
3	Experts' views on effects and efficiency of measures in youth crime prevention and control	12
4	Summary/Conclusions.....	15

## **1 Survey process and composition of sample**

### **1.1 Survey process**

The German Nationwide Institutional and Expert Survey was – as in the other participating countries – mainly realized as a web-based (online) survey. It was set up in cooperation with German Police University's Quality Assurance Team. In addition to the web-based version, a paper-and-pencil questionnaire (along with an additional post-paid self-addressed envelope) was offered to the experts in case they preferred this version. The German survey was conducted between May 18<sup>th</sup> and October 9<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

### **1.2 Response rate and sample composition**

In total, 350 potential respondents were contacted and asked to participate in the survey. They were selected on the basis of a detailed search for experts and relevant institutions. Part of the potential sample had already participated as experts in previous expert surveys on youth crime which were conducted by the department of Criminology and interdisciplinary Crime Prevention at German Police University. Further experts, especially in the fields of social work and crime prevention, were added to the list after careful research.

At first, the potential experts received an e-mail that announced the survey was soon-to-begin. It also gave information on the subject of the study and the survey and kindly asked for their participation. After two months, a reminder was sent by email.

The overall response rate of the survey was rather low with 20.9 % (73 participants of 350 invitations sent). There were several unforeseen technical obstacles that occurred during the realization of the survey. Potential participants from various German institutions and organisations gave feedback that they couldn't access the online survey; later it was found out that this was occurring due to firewall restrictions. As a reaction, the survey was transferred to another server using another gate with a higher security standard; this helped in some of the cases. Further respondents complained that the login code they were provided with had already expired or that they were redirected to another website. It seems very likely that a considerable number of experts who were not able to enter the survey at their first attempt did not retry.

Of the 73 responses, 61 questionnaires were filled in online. 15 experts asked for a paper version. Eight of the 15 paper versions sent out were returned; additionally, as a response to the difficulties with logging on to the online survey, four respondents asked to receive the questionnaire emailed as a word document and returned it via post or fax. Twelve of the potential participants explicitly asked to be crossed off the contact list because they did not want to take part in this or further surveys.

The professional background of the experts can mainly be described as researchers and practitioners (cf. Table 1). Both groups stemmed from diverse fields, such as law, criminology, educational science, psychology, social sciences for the researchers and e.g. police, social work, crime prevention or judicial system for the practitioners.

Of 73 experts who took part in the German Nationwide Institutional and Expert Survey, 70.8 % were male and 29.2 % female. Average age was 50.42 years (SD = 10.227, Range 27–73). Only a minority of respondents were institutionally or organisationally affiliated to research institutions. The figures shown in Table 1 do not provide an exact picture of the relation of practitioners vs. researchers, since e.g. researchers can work for police or crime prevention organisations. 13 of the

experts did not provide the information on their institutional affiliation. Due to the anonymity of the survey, it could not be tracked exactly who of the potential 350 experts responded.

**Table 1: Professional Background of participating experts: “How would you describe your organisation/institution?”, N = 60**

Institutional Background	% (N)
Police	48.3 (29)
University	11.7 (7)
other research institution	10 (6)
crime prevention organisation	10 (6)
social service / welfare	8.3 (5)
School	5 (3)
Correctional facility	3.3 (2)
public prosecutor’s office	1.7 (1)
criminal court	1.7 (1)

## 2 Experts’ experiences with and views on youth crime prevention and control

In the second section of the questionnaire, experts were asked for their experiences with and assessment of measures of prevention and control regarding youth deviance and youth crime.

### 2.1 Target groups of activities in the field of prevention and control of youth deviance, violence, and crime

Section two begins with a question on the main target groups of preventive measures. The wording of the question was “Who are the main target groups of current activities in the field of prevention and control of youth deviance, violence and crime?”. Experts were asked to assess categories given and answer on a five-point scale from “1 = not at all” to “5 = very much”. Additionally, there was space for adding further categories. Table 2 gives an overview on the experts’ assessment of the main target groups of preventive activities in Germany.

**Table 2: Main target groups of preventive activities, 61 < N < 72, sorted by means**

Target Groups	M	SD
Male adolescents between age 14 and 17	4.32	.932
Repeat offenders	3.97	1.126

Young males (18-24 years)	3.75	1.155
Female adolescents between age 14 and 17	3.50	1.267
Semiformal/professional agents of social control (welfare offices, schools, health system etc.)	3.46	1.149
Ethnic minority youths	3.44	1.168
Formal agents of social control (police, criminal courts etc.)	3.26	1.212
Youths with substance abuse problems	3.24	1.088
Boys up to age 13	3.07	1.250
Victims	3.01	1.325
First time offenders	2.96	1.188
Informal agents of social control (family, neighbours, peers etc.)	2.94	1.221
Youths from disadvantaged families/neighbourhoods	2.93	1.234
Young females (18-24 years)	2.80	1.238
Youths with mental health problems	2.71	1.139
Girls up to age 13	2.60	1.236
People/groups at risk of becoming victims	2.57	1.218
Witnesses	2.34	1.202
Youths in care homes / in foster care	2.20	.926
Homeless youths	2.03	.874

From experts' experience, target groups of preventive activities are mainly young males (14–24 years old) and repeat offenders (cf. Table 2). Groups who are not in the spotlight of preventive approaches are – from the experts' point of view – children and juveniles from foster homes or in foster care as well as homeless youths. Unlike witnesses, who are a large group in society and who are also not focussed often, both are at least numerically smaller groups, but nonetheless are known to have special risks of deviance and victimisation.

## 2.2 Types of youth problem behaviour targeted by current activities

The second question in section two focusses on the main problem categories which are targeted by preventive activities. The question was “What are the main problem categories currently targeted by activities in the field of prevention and control?” Experts were asked to assess several given categories on a five-point scale from “1 = not at all” to “5 = very much”. Additionally, there was space

for the experts to add further categories. Table 3 gives an overview on experts' perceptions regarding youth problem behaviour targeted by preventive activities.

**Table 3: Youth problem behaviour targeted by preventive activities, 59 < N < 73, sorted by means**

<b>problem behaviour targeted</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
Youth violence	4.63	.613
School-related violence	4.03	1.074
Abuse of alcohol / legal substances	3.74	.993
Abuse of illegal substances	3.46	1.099
Bullying	3.42	1.143
Cyber crime	3.38	1.192
Use of violent media	3.17	1.242
Youth property offences	3.15	1.154
Hate crime / violence against minorities	3.11	1.029
Sexual offences	3.07	1.202
Political/religious extremism	3.05	1.041
School absenteeism	3.01	1.144
Adherence to violence-legitimizing norms	2.68	1.177
Gender-based violence	2.61	1.107
Knife crime	2.46	1.183
Dating violence	2.10	1.002

From experts' point of view, main categories (cf. Table 3) of youths' problem behaviour targeted by preventive approaches are general acts of violence committed by juveniles as well as school-related violence. The latter is focussed in many approaches since preventive measures are often carried out in a school context. Abuse of substances (legal or illegal) as deviant behaviour and as a mediator of delinquency is often targeted in preventive approaches as well. Problems rarely targeted are the very particular problems of gender-based and dating violence, knife-crime and adherence to violence-legitimizing norms. From the answers in this question it seems that most preventive approaches are targeted at widespread youth problem behaviours. Behaviours displayed only by smaller groups of the young population, like sexual offences, hate crimes or political extremism, do not seem to be targeted often.

Among additional categories named by experts were offences committed by girls, comorbidity of

alcohol and drug use, insecure legal status of residence of migrants, problems with inclusion in school system and labour market, vandalism through graffiti, hostility against Muslims, and violence occurring at sports events.

### 2.3 Approaches taken in prevention and control of youth deviance, violence and crime

“Main approaches taken in prevention and control of youth deviance, crime and violence” were the subject of the question following experts’ assessment of problem behaviour targeted by preventive activities. Again, experts were asked to assess several given categories on a five-point scale from “1 = not at all” to “5 = very much”. Additionally, there was space to add further categories. Table 4 gives an overview of experts’ views of approaches taken in prevention and control of youth deviance, violence and crime.

**Table 4: Approaches taken in prevention and control of youth deviance, violence and crime, 59 < N < 73, sorted by means**

Approaches taken	M	SD
Offender-focussed approaches	3.86	1.011
Secondary/targeted approaches (directed at at-risk populations)	3.83	1.183
Tertiary/indicated approaches (directed at persons who have already become offenders/victims)	3.52	1.217
Situational approaches (reducing crime opportunities and rewards; increasing offenders’ efforts and risks of detection and prosecution)	3.32	1.204
Measures targeted at reducing risk factors	3.32	1.058
Primary/universal approaches (directed at anybody)	3.29	1.238
Measures with a broader focus on individual development	3.22	1.109
Measures with a narrow focus on crime	3.21	1.115
Measures targeted at strengthening protective factors	3.12	1.125
Victim-focussed approaches	3.08	1.180
Measures with a focus on social integration	3.08	1.058
Measures based on punishment and deterrence	2.80	1.214

Although the question on problem behaviours targeted by preventive measures pointed at broad categories and widespread behaviours, experts did not consider primary and universal approaches or measures targeted at strengthening protective factors are the ones mostly taken (cf. Table 4). Approaches directed at certain groups who are already engaged in criminal behaviour are the ones taken the most in Germany.

Additional categories mentioned by experts were bystander intervention, empathy and social skills training, approaches reflecting gender-specific behaviour, diversion and programmes for chronic offenders.

## 2.4 Institutions and professions involved in prevention and control of youth deviance, violence and crime

Another question focused the institutions and professions involved in prevention and control of youth crime, deviance and violence. The wording of the question was “Which institutions and professions are involved in prevention and control of youth deviance, crime and violence?”, experts were – once more – asked to assess several given categories on a five-point scale from “1 = not at all” to “5 = very much”. Additionally, there was space to add further categories. Table 5 gives an overview on experts’ views.

**Table 5: Institutions and professions involved in prevention and control of youth deviance, violence and control, 61 < N < 73, sorted by means**

Institutions and professions involved	M	SD
Police	4.63	.675
Social workers	3.96	.885
Social services / welfare	3.69	1.030
Educational system / schools	3.59	1.103
Courts / Public prosecutors	3.49	1.192
Probationary service	3.35	1.160
Correctional facilities	2.91	1.189
Psychologists	2.80	.856
Health system / health professions	2.27	.894

From the experts’ experiences, the main institutions and professions involved are police, social work, social services / welfare and professionals from the educational and school system. Institutions and professions from the judicial system received only average ratings; most experts considered psychological and physical health professions to be not very much engaged in prevention and control of youth deviance, violence and crime (cf. Table 5). Additional categories mentioned by experts were public transport, churches and public administrations.

## 2.5 Significance of interagency and multi-professional approaches

Nowadays, multi-agency cooperation and multi-professional approaches that attempt to integrate several institutions are seen as key elements for successfully tackling juvenile deviant behaviour. Experts were asked about “the perceived importance and current status of interagency cooperation / multi-professional approaches in youth crime prevention and control in your country, region or

community". They were asked to assess several given categories on a five-point scale from "1 = not at all" to "5 = very much". Results are shown in Table 6.

**Table 6: Importance and status of interagency cooperation and multi-professional approaches, N = 70**

<b>interagency cooperation and multi-professional approaches</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
... are regarded as important in tackling youth crime / violence	4.44	.895
... are common practice in tackling youth crime / youth violence	3.56	1.072

Experts had a high level of agreement with regard to the ascribed status of interagency cooperation and multi-professional approaches (cf. Table 6). Most experts also have the impression that such cooperation is already common practice in tackling youth crime and violence.

## **2.6 Situation of financing/funding**

Question 13 in section 2 of the questionnaire highlights the state of financing and funding, The wording of the main question was: "How would you describe the situation of financing/funding in the field of youth crime prevention and control?" which was followed by two sub questions: "(a) Who provides financial resources for activities in the field of youth crime prevention and control?" and "(b) How do you judge the current status of funding in the field of youth crime prevention and control?". In question (a) experts were asked to answer on a 5-point scale from "1: not at all" to "5: very much" with additional space for further categories. The items in question (b) were to be answered on a five-point scale as well and consisted of three assessments, whether funding was "stable", "predictable" and "sufficient"<sup>1</sup> (cf. Table 7 and Table 8).

**Table 7: Experts' view on the situation of financing and funding in the field of prevention and control of youth crime, deviance and violence, 67 < N < 71**

<b>Who are the sources of funding and financing preventive measures</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>SD</b>
Municipality	3.41	1.042
(National) Government	3.24	1.140
Non-profit / voluntary organisations	2.93	.958
Charities	2.69	.874
Foundations	2.62	1.146
European Union	2.40	.986
Commercial enterprises / companies	2.09	.818

From the experts' experience, sources of financing and funding in the field of prevention and control of youth crime, deviance and violence are mostly municipalities and (national) governments,

<sup>1</sup> on scales from e.g. „1: very unstable“ to “5: very stable”



followed by non-profit organisations, charities, foundations, and the European Union. Private companies were regarded as least important. Additional categories mentioned by experts were crime prevention councils, private financiers and victim assistance associations.

**Table 8: Experts' views on the reliability of funding of preventive measures in the field of youth crime, deviance and violence, N = 70**

Funding is...	M	SD
sufficient	2.13	.962
predictable	2.66	1.034
stable	2.69	1.071

Mean values in Table 8 signify that from expert's view funding is neither sufficient, nor predictable or stable.

## 2.7 Political strategies with regard to youth problem behaviour

Following the question on the status of funding, the experts were asked "to what extent [they] would say there is a coherent political strategy of dealing with problems of youth deviance / youth crime / youth violence in [their] country, region or community".

Table 9 gives an overview of the experts' expertise on the existence of a coherent political strategy of dealing with youth problem behaviour.

**Table 9: Experts' views on the existence of a coherent political strategy on tackling youth deviance, crime and violence, N = 72**

Is there a coherent strategy?	N	%
no strategy at all	16	22,2
only partially	39	54,2
fully developed	17	23,6

The vast majority of experts think there only is a partially developed political strategy (cf. Table 9). 62.5 % of the experts stating there is a fully developed strategy stem from the institutional background of police. They know of strategies that are laid down in strategic concepts of governments, governmental institutions and public authorities, but also the federal state's crime prevention organisations have strategies. The content of concepts and strategies mainly refers to the outlines of interdisciplinary, multi-agency and multi-institutional approaches and co-operation in tackling youth crime and violence, or they describe concepts of early intervention. Due to the relevant actors implied as agents in the concepts, from the experts' point of view the ones who are in charge of setting the strategies into action are mainly public administrations and institutions of the state or the German federal states.

## 2.8 Evaluation of measures in the field of prevention and control of youth deviant behaviour

The status of evaluation was the subject of question 15 in section two of the questionnaire. The wording of the question was “How would you characterize the overall status of evaluation in the field of prevention and control of youth deviant behaviour / youth crime / youth violence in your country (in your region/community)?”. Experts were asked to answer on a five-point scale (cf. Table 10).

**Table 10: Experts' opinions on the status of evaluation in the field of youth deviant behaviour, crime and violence, N = 71.**

Status of evaluation is...	N	%
extremely poor	16	22,5
below average	22	31,0
average	25	35,2
above average	8	11,3
excellent	0	0

More than half of the experts judged the status of evaluation in the field of youth deviance, crime and violence in Germany as “below average” or even as “extremely poor”. No experts stated evaluation was excellent and only 8 said it was above average – 7 of them were practitioners and only 1 worked in the field of research. This may hint at the diverging standards for evaluation of people from different professional backgrounds. Answers to additional open-format questions<sup>2</sup> on funding and commissioning of evaluation once more stressed the insufficient status of funding and financing of crime prevention measures – in this case especially in conjunction with a lack of evaluation of measures. Answers to open-format questions also revealed that from most of the experts' points of view, evaluation is a prerequisite of quality prevention but is still neglected too often. Concerning the standards for evaluation, most of the experts state that there are no standards or that – if there are any – they do not know of them, or that standards are only followed partially – although there is a minority of experts who think evaluation is carried out often enough and the standards are clear. Hence, there are two groups of opinions to be found in the last of the four open-format questions of question 15: 33 of the experts characterize the current status of evaluation as negative and insufficient while 13 experts also mention at least well-acting institutions or certain evaluation projects.

## 2.9 Sources of information on prevention of youth problem behaviour

The last question of section 2 asks the experts where they “turn to in order to find quality infor-

---

<sup>2</sup> The four following sub-questions of question 15 were:

- Who is funding and commissioning evaluation research in the field of youth crime?
- To what extent is evaluation a condition for project funding in crime prevention?
- To what extent are there standards regarding evaluation of measures in the field of youth crime?
- If you were asked to characterize the current status of evaluation of youth crime / youth violence measures in just one or two sentences, how would you say it?

mation on prevention of youth deviance / youth violence / youth crime”.

Experts mentioned various sources: On the one hand they use professional networks and keep themselves updated by attending conferences, exchanging knowledge with colleagues and specialized professionals, participating in working groups and taking part in continuing education. On the other hand they use a broad range of media. These media included websites specialized in crime and crime prevention matters, databases, journals, and newsletters.

- Specialized websites:
  - Deutscher Präventionstag ([www.praeventionstag.de](http://www.praeventionstag.de)): Website of the German Crime Prevention Council
  - Beccaria (<http://www.beccaria.de/>): Website of the so-called Beccaria project of the Crime Prevention Council of Lower Saxony; its main focus is on quality improvement and evaluation in crime prevention
  - Kriminologisches Forschungsinstitut Niedersachsen e. V. ([www.kfn.de](http://www.kfn.de)); Website of the Criminological Research Institute of Lower Saxony, one of the leading criminological research institutions in Germany
  - Deutsches Forum für Kriminalprävention (<http://www.kriminalpraevention.de>): Website of the German Crime Prevention Forum, a federal foundation for matters of crime prevention
  - Polizeiliche Beratungsstelle (<http://www.polizei-beratung.de/>): Website of the “Programme for Police Crime Prevention”, offering media for the public and for police forces
  - Police intranet (not available to the public)
  - Weißer Ring (<http://www.weisser-ring.de>); Website of the leading German association for victim assistance and advocacy for crime victims
  - Gewalt Akademie Villigst (<http://www.gewaltakademie.de>): Academy in North Rhine-Westphalia offering various trainings on non-violent conflict solution, anti-racism, mediation etc. and providing continuing education for trainers
  - Deutsches Jugendinstitut ([www.dji.de](http://www.dji.de)): Website of the „German Youth Institute“, a federally funded research institution for matters of childhood and adolescence
  - Kriminologische Zentralstelle ([www.krimz.de](http://www.krimz.de)): Website of the Centre for Criminology (KrimZ), the centre’s focus is on documentation of literature and research, own empirical research projects, and dialogue between research and (judicial) practice
  - Vandagraf (<http://www.vandagraf.de/>): a website dedicated to matters of vandalism and graffiti.
  
- Databases:
  - Databases of the Criminological Institutes at universities in Bochum<sup>3</sup>, Hamburg<sup>4</sup>, Greifswald<sup>5</sup>, and Tübingen<sup>6</sup>)

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.kriminologie.com/>

<sup>4</sup> [http://webis.uni-hamburg.de/webis/index.php/Kriminologie\\_und\\_Kriminalistik\\_%282.1%29#Datenbank\\_KrimDok](http://webis.uni-hamburg.de/webis/index.php/Kriminologie_und_Kriminalistik_%282.1%29#Datenbank_KrimDok)

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.rsf.uni-greifswald.de/duenkel/gis.htm>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.jura.uni-tuebingen.de/einrichtungen/ifk/krimdok/uebersicht>

- NiMaP(<http://www.lpr.niedersachsen.de/nano.cms/de/nimap>): Prevention database maintained by the Crime Prevention Council of Lower Saxony
  - SPIN (<http://www.gruene-liste-praevention.de/nano.cms/datenbank/information>): Database maintained by a German version of the “Communities that Care” programme; including a database of best practice prevention projects
  - Praevis (not active anymore): Praevis was the documentation system of the German Crime Prevention Forum and was shut down in late 2010
  - Infopool of the German Federal Criminal Police Office (<http://www.infopool-polizeikonzepte.bka.de/>): database listing projects in the field of crime prevention, law enforcement, and traffic safety
  - Campbell reviews (<http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/library.php>): Website of the Campbell Collaboration providing systematic reviews with the aim “to sum up the best available research on a specific question”
- Journals:
    - Zeitschrift für Jugendkriminalrecht und Jugendhilfe
    - Kriminologisches Journal
    - Prevention Science
    - Kriminalistik
    - Bewährungshilfe
    - forum kriminalprävention
    - Deutsche Jugend. Zeitschrift für die Jugendarbeit
    - die kriminalprävention
    - Neue Kriminalpolitik
- Newsletters
    - Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes - ProPK (<http://www.polizei-beratung.de/newsletter.html>): Newsletter provided by the “Programme for Police Crime Prevention”
    - Rat für Kriminalprävention Schleswig-Holstein ([http://www.schleswig-holstein.de/IM/DE/InnereSicherheit/RatKriminalitaetsverhuetung/Publikationen/Newsletter/Newsletter\\_node.html](http://www.schleswig-holstein.de/IM/DE/InnereSicherheit/RatKriminalitaetsverhuetung/Publikationen/Newsletter/Newsletter_node.html)): a newsletter provided by the Crime Prevention Council of Schleswig-Holstein

### **3 Experts’ views on effects and efficiency of measures in youth crime prevention and control**

#### **I. What works?**

When asked for measures/programmes that can be regarded as “working” in the field of youth crime / youth violence, German experts came up with a multitude of programmes and approaches, some of them widely used, some of them with a local or regional focus. While many respondents provided information on specific programmes, others named more general approaches.

Most approaches and programmes regarded as “working” can be grouped in the following categories:

- **Early intervention programmes** like the German version of the Nurse Family Partnership Program (NFP) or the so-called Coordinating Child Protection Services in Bavaria.
- **Behavioural programmes targeted at preschool children:** Programmes like “Papilio”, “Echt stark” or “Kindergarten plus” aim at prevention of early-onset behavioural problems in pre-school children.
- **Violence prevention programmes targeted at pre-school and elementary school children:** “Faustlos” is a violence prevention curriculum fostering social and emotional skills of pre-schoolers and school children in first grade.
- **Programmes targeted at school violence and bullying in schools:** Here, a host of programmes was mentioned as effective. Among them are programmes imported from other countries (and tested internationally) like the Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme, the Good Behavior Game or the No Blame Approach against bullying in schools. Other programmes mentioned as effective are more locally focused or have been adapted to local or regional conditions (dispute settlement programmes like the “Bensberger Mediations-Modell”, programmes like “Cool in School” (Hamburg), or „Cooool it!”, approaches to build and train crisis teams in schools, or programmes like “Konflikt-KULTUR - Soziale Kompetenz und Prävention” aiming at violence prevention in schools via social skills training.
- **Behavioural training programmes for adolescents:** These programmes usually aim at strengthening participants’ positive social skills, discouraging use of violence and building a positive peer culture. Among the approaches regarded as working is the German language adaptation of the PATHS curriculum, anti-aggressiveness trainings, positive peer culture approaches, a so-called buddy-programme, a social skills training (Hamburg) or de-escalation trainings for situations of conflict.
- **Programmes to strengthen parental skills:** Here, especially the so called EFFEKT training was mentioned positively (*Entwicklungsförderung in Familien: Eltern- und Kindertraining*); EFFEKT is a programme that works both at the level of parent and children skills.
- **Programmes integrating multiple problem areas (health, drugs, social skills, violence),** usually for use in a school context (like “Klasse2000” or “ProPp - Programm zur Primärprävention von Sucht und Gewalt an Schulen und zur Förderung der Sozialkompetenz von Schülerinnen und Schülern”).
- **Other programmes and approaches considered as „working“ include measures targeted at bystander intervention** („Gewalt-Sehen-Helfen“; “Wer nichts tut, macht mit”), alcohol abuse by minors (“Keine Kurzen für Kurze”), traffic safety (so called guardian angel projects), security in public transport (“Bus-Coach-Projekt”), fairplay in sports (“Fair ist mehr”), or media literacy (“Mit Sicherheit durchs Netz”).
- **Programmes at a community level,** including a systematic analysis of problems, strengths and weaknesses in a community (like SPIN, the German adaptation of the Communities that care programme).
- Regarding **criminal justice approaches** in the field of youth crime, some were described as successful. These include police prevention programmes targeted at repeat offenders („PROTÄKT - Projekt täterorientierte Kriminalitätsbekämpfung“ in Hamburg, “Initiativprogramm Junge Intensivtäter” in Rhineland-Palatinate, J.I.T (Jugendliche Intensiv-Täter) in North Rhine Westphalia, or TOP TEN in Brandenburg) and programmes aimed at juveniles and even children at risk of becoming repeat offenders (“Initiative Kurve kriegen” in North

Rhine Westphalia). Other approaches valued positively by respondents include so-called Houses of Juvenile Law („Häuser des Jugendrechts“) where police, courts and other relevant institutions work closely together, projects to keep the time span between juvenile offence and judicial response as short as possible (so called "Neuköllner Modell") as well as approaches to limit criminal law sanctions for juveniles to a minimum and to help juvenile offenders with school and vocational integration. Some respondents also stressed the need for an integrated police strategy against juvenile crime and for projects where police cooperates with schools, social work etc. (Prävention im Team [PiT] – programmes in different German federal states; prevention programme „Kinder- und Jugenddelinquenz“ in Hamburg, and others).

Apart from specific programmes, respondents stressed the need to tailor interventions to individual risk factors and to make use of cognitive behavioural interventions. They made clear that measures need to be targeted at the family (strengthening parents' educational skills, providing support as early as possible for at risk households) and at schools and at the problem of school absenteeism, at special support for children from migrant families. Specific trainings were regarded as helpful in the fields of alternatives to violence, social skills, empathy, conflict management, measures against bullying at schools. Young people at risk need support with regard to drug abuse problems, vocational career, and media usage. With regard to judicial processing of juvenile crime, respondents spoke in favor of a timely and at the same time moderate response, considering alternatives to punishment, including victim-offender-mediation and social skills trainings mandated by court orders. The need to bring police, courts, schools, and welfare together with regard to repeat offenders was strongly supported.

## **II. What's promising?**

Answers to the „what's promising“ - question showed considerable overlap with the previous section. They included some programmes that are still fairly new and for which more evaluation data are needed. These included the so-called NETWASS project (Networks Against School Shootings), the „Jugend macht Stadt“ project integrating juveniles in urban and community planning processes, the Canadian Roots of Empathy project, a Berlin based training programme for young migrant men called „Heroes“, a project called "Team Mex" on prevention of right-wing and Islamist extremism, architectural crime prevention strategies taking up DOC (Designing out Crime) and CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) concepts, and other measures related to alcohol-induced violence, perspective-taking and moral judgment, and short-term incarceration.

Some respondents supported the implementation of a European youth crime monitoring system. Others stressed the need for early onset preventive measures, prevention of school absenteeism and school failure, cooperation of police and social work and a strong role of social workers in prevention. They made clear that uniform police standards for working with juvenile offenders are important and that police work should be based upon a systematic analysis of local problems.

## **III. What doesn't work?**

With regard to „what doesn't work“, respondents were quite clear in their statements. They disapproved of measures/activities/programmes characterized by the following attributes:

- Short-term measures stipulated by specific events

- Measures lacking a conceptual basis
- Measures designed and launched by a single institution, lacking a systemic perspective
- Social work approaches without a well-defined at risk target group (targeted at “everybody” instead)
- Late onset measures (when criminal careers are already well established and the young person is well accustomed to a delinquent lifestyle)
- Media campaigns scandalizing specific behaviours and demanding norm-abiding conduct
- Prevention based only on deterrence by punitive policies.

Beyond these general features, experts regarded the following possible actions and measures as ineffective or damaging:

- Lowering the age of criminal responsibility
- Harsher sentences in juvenile criminal law
- Projects confronting juveniles with possible consequences of misbehaviour (similar to “Scared straight” programs; also in the field of drug prevention).

In general, a punitive strategy in dealing with juvenile offences was regarded as ineffective. While most experts were critical of prison sentences or boot camps, opinions were split with regard to timely criminal justice reactions to juvenile offences and to the so called (multi-agency) “houses of juvenile law”.

Other experts voiced their critical attitude to specific programs and approaches. These include self-assertiveness trainings for children, midnight sports, anti-aggression trainings (especially non-certified ones), a boxing camp for at risk youths, the buddy-programme mentioned above, and crime prevention via CCTV. Still others argued in favour of a withdrawal of preventive efforts from young people committing only benign offences and for a focus of police efforts on secondary but not on primary prevention.

#### **4 Summary/Conclusions**

In the German Nationwide Institutional and Expert Survey respondents characterized approaches to prevention and control of youth deviance, crime and violence as mainly oriented at “typical” or “classical” youth crime, committed by young males and repeat offenders with offender-specific measures. Approaches and measures mainly seem to be carried out by police and social workers.

Experts point out the high value of inter-agency cooperation and multi-professional approaches but add that strategies should be more systematic, financing and funding need to be more stable and evaluation should follow established standards and become an integral part of implementing measures.

Sources of information reveal that experts do not only use specialized media but also benefit a lot from communication and exchange with colleagues and other professionals, for example at conferences.

When assessing measures and approaches of prevention and control, the majority of experts agree that measures should intervene at an early age, aim at reducing risk factors and strengthen competencies and follow a multi-professional approach. Experts point out that what does not work are short-term measures which are not directed at specific subpopulations of recipients, which are only repressive, punitive or only focus on deterrence; they also criticize measures which lack a

conceptual basis.

The primary limitation of the survey is its low response rate. Furthermore, there was a strong surplus of respondents who were affiliated with police.