

Report on the HUNGARIAN Nationwide Institutional and Expert Survey

1. Survey process and composition of sample

1.1. Survey process

The Hungarian Nationwide Institutional and Expert Survey was – as in the other participating countries – mainly realized as a web-based (online) survey, but due to the very low response rate, and especially the complete lack of some categories of experts (e.g. in connection with law enforcement) we tried to obtain some more responses not only via paper-based but also personal interviews. The web survey was set up in cooperation with the German Police University's Quality Assurance Team. As in other countries, in addition to the web-based version, the opportunity to answer a paper-and-pencil questionnaire (along with an additional post-paid self-addressed envelope) was offered to all the experts in case they preferred this version. The Hungarian survey was conducted between May 18th and December 20th, 2011.

1.2. Response rate and sample composition

In total, 270 potential respondents were contacted and asked to participate in the survey. They were selected on the basis of a detailed search for lists of various pools of experts and relevant institutions.

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

The overall response rate of the survey was extremely low with 15% (41 participants of 270 invitations sent). As in some other countries, there were several unforeseen technical obstacles that occurred during the realization of the survey. Potential participants from various 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. Soon after the reminder was sent out to respondents, we also tried to send the questionnaire by email to all of them as a word document attachment.

Of the 41 responses, 24 questionnaires were filled in online. 2 asked for a paper version by post, 13 sent back a Word document (but some of them following a personal interview) and 2 in person.

The professional background of the experts can mainly be described as practitioners, especially those working in various institutions of the social/welfare services and other, non-specified organisations, dominantly NGOs (cf. Table 1). Some corrections to the coding of the original online questionnaire had to be made as some respondents classified their institution, esp. in child protection as "other", but these responses were re-coded to belong to social/welfare services instead. Policemen and probation officers also answered after a face-to-face interview. Despite some targeted efforts, we received no responses at all from criminal courts or the public prosecutor's office. The professional background of the respondents is very diverse: sociologist, lawyer, therapist, psychiatrist, teacher, psychologist, economist, criminologist, policeman, mental health specialist etc.

Of 41 experts who took part in the Hungarian Nationwide Institutional and Expert Survey, 34% were male and 66% female. The average age was 48,8 years (SD=11, Range 27–73). Only 2 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 experts responded.

Table 1: Professional Background of participating experts: “How would you describe your organisation/institution?”, N = 39

Institutional Background	% (N)
social service / welfare	49 (19)
Other	10 (4)
Police	8 (3)
Correctional facility	8 (3)
Probationary service	5 (2)
Health system	5 (2)
University	5 (2)
counselling/psychotherapy	2 (1)
other research institution	2 (1)
crime prevention organisation	2 (1)
School	2 (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 Hungary.

Table 2: Main target groups of preventive activities, 38<N<41, sorted by means

Target Groups	M	SD
Youths with substance abuse problems	3,24	1,157
Youths in care homes / in foster care	3,15	1,145
Ethnic minority youths	3,05	1,260
Male adolescents between age 14 and 17	2,90	,970
Female adolescents between age 14 and 17	2,78	,962
Semiformal/professional agents of social control (welfare offices, schools, health system etc.)	2,70	1,159
Youths from disadvantaged families/neighbourhoods	2,63	1,135
Formal agents of social control (police, criminal courts etc.)	2,62	1,138
Repeat offenders	2,49	1,023
Boys up to age 13	2,32	,986
Girls up to age 13	2,27	,975
First time offenders	2,25	1,032
Victims	2,23	1,230
Informal agents of social control (family, neighbours, peers etc.)	2,13	,966
Youths with mental health problems	2,10	,970
People/groups at risk of becoming victims	2,03	1,250
Young males (18-24 years)	2,00	,795
Young females (18-24 years)	1,87	,767
Homeless youths	1,82	,970
Witnesses	1,61	,974

From experts' experience, target groups of preventive activities are mainly youths with substance abuse problems and those living in care homes/foster care, together with ethnic minority (Roma) youth (cf. Table 2). Groups who are not in the spotlight of preventive approaches are – from the experts' point of view – young females (18-24 years), homeless youths and witnesses. Only a small minority of experts indicated further target groups, such as: victims of psycho-terror, young adults having left foster care, those under probation.

2.2. Types of youth problem behaviour targeted by current activities

The second question in section two focuses 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, 37 < N < 42, sorted by means

problem behaviour targeted	M	SD
Abuse of illegal substances	3,55	,904
Abuse of alcohol / legal substances	3,20	1,159
Youth violence	2,56	1,097
School-related violence	2,46	1,098
Youth property offences	2,32	1,059
Gender-based violence	2,20	,911
Hate crime / violence against minorities	2,07	1,081
Sexual offences	1,95	,846
School absenteeism	1,95	,972
Bullying	1,78	1,084
Cyber crime	1,74	,950
Use of violent media	1,68	,971
Dating violence	1,63	,952
Knife crime	1,60	,778
Adherence to violence-legitimizing norms	1,59	,966
Political/religious extremism	1,53	,816

From experts' point of view, main categories (cf. Table 3) of youths' problem behaviour targeted by preventive approaches is substance abuse, primarily drug abuse but also the abuse of alcohol or other legal substances. General acts of violence committed by juveniles as well as school-related violence only rank 3rd and 4th, with significantly lower means on the scale. The substance, especially drug abuse is prevalent in many approaches since preventive measures are often carried out in a school context. Problems rarely targeted are political/religious extremism, adherence to violence-legitimizing knife-crime and dating violence. From the answers in this question it seems that most preventive approaches are targeted at widespread youth problem behaviours, especially ones which are perceived to be increasing and also seen as a background factor for other problem behaviours.

School absenteeism does not seem to be in the focus of preventive activities, although it poses a serious problem, especially in vocational schools where it is an important factor related to the extremely high drop-out rates, affecting especially students from disadvantaged family backgrounds and the Roma. The dominance of repressive instead of preventive measures is indicated by the fact that as a "solution" to this problem legal regulations changed so in cases where the child is absent from school over 50 hours without permission, the related family

allowance is denied from the family.

Among additional categories named by experts were a special drug-related problem, that of disco drugs.

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” was 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, 38 < N < 42, sorted by means

Approaches taken	M	SD
Measures with a narrow focus on crime	3,6098	1,11530
Measures based on punishment and deterrence	3,2821	1,19095
Situational approaches (reducing crime opportunities and rewards; increasing offenders’ efforts and risks of detection and prosecution)	2,9000	1,21529
Secondary/targeted approaches (directed at at-risk populations)	2,7805	1,01272
Measures with a focus on social integration	2,5366	,89715
Offender-focussed approaches	2,4634	1,24695
Tertiary/indicated approaches (directed at persons who have already become offenders/victims)	2,4390	1,07352
Measures with a broader focus on individual development	2,4000	,90014
Measures targeted at reducing risk factors	2,2439	,83007
Victim-focussed approaches	2,2195	1,23516
Measures targeted at strengthening protective factors	2,0000	,79472
Primary/universal approaches (directed at anybody)	1,9268	1,21223

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 with a narrow focus on crime and those based on punishment and deterrence are clearly the most dominant ones, followed by situational and targeted approaches. Sadly, primary/universal approaches and measures targeted at strengthening protective factors are considered to be the least widespread.

Only one expert mentioned additional categories, namely diversion in the field of drug prevention,

involvement of peer groups, trainings to enhance prevention, resocialisation trainings for young offenders, dog-therapy.

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, 39 < N < 41, sorted by means

Institutions and professions involved	M	SD
Police	3,68	1,059
Social workers	3,56	1,026
Correctional facilities	3,39	1,181
Probationary service	3,36	1,112
Social services / welfare	3,17	,946
Psychologists	3,02	1,084
Educational system / schools	2,93	1,149
Courts / Public prosecutors	2,49	1,098
Health system / health professions	2,22	1,037

From the experts’ experiences, the main institutions and professions involved are police, social work, correctional facilities, probationary service, to a lesser extent, but above 3, social services/ welfare. Professionals from the educational and school system, who could (and should) be good agents to reach the target group, rank among the very final 3. Courts/ public prosecutors or the health profession are considered to be least involved in prevention and control of youth deviance, violence and crime (cf. Table 5). Additional categories mentioned by several experts were NGOs and one also mentioned, regarding secondary prevention, foster homes for children, and also religious organisations and Sure Start Children’s Houses.

2.5. Significance of interagency and multi-professional approaches

Although multi-agency cooperation and multi-professional approaches that attempt to integrate several institutions are seen as key elements for successfully tackling juvenile deviant behaviour, in practice it does not seem to be frequent enough. 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 = 40

interagency cooperation and multi-professional approaches	M	SD
... are regarded as important in tackling youth crime / violence	3,7	,966
... are common practice in tackling youth crime / youth violence	2,9	,955

Experts had a relatively strong agreement with regard to the importance of interagency cooperation and multi-professional approaches (cf. Table 6), still most experts have the impression that such cooperation is not a very widespread 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”¹ (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, N =41

Who are the sources of funding and financing preventive measures	M	SD
European Union	3,5366	1,02707
Non-profit / voluntary organisations	3	1
Foundations	2,8049	1,20871
(National) Government	2,7317	0,9753
Municipality	2,0976	0,91665
Charities	2,0732	0,95891
Commercial enterprises / companies	1,6341	0,76668

From the experts’ experience, sources of financing and funding in the field of prevention and control of youth crime, deviance and violence are the European Union, followed by non-profit organisations, foundations, then the Government. Private companies were regarded to be by far the least important. Additional categories mentioned by experts were voluntary organisations (although seemingly the same as NGOs) and Churches.

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

Table 8: Experts' views on the reliability of funding of preventive measures in the field of youth crime, deviance and violence, 37 < N < 41

Funding is...	M	SD
sufficient	1,62	,774
predictable	2,02	1,025
stable	2,76	1,344

Mean values in Table 8 indicate that the most serious problem is that sources are not sufficient at all, but unfortunately they are also unpredictable and also not too stable either.

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 = 41

Is there a coherent strategy?	N	%
no strategy at all	19	46,3
only partially	21	51,2
fully developed	1	2,4

The slight majority of experts think there only is a partially developed political strategy (cf. Table 9), but almost another half of them believes that there is no strategy at all. Only one expert considered that there is a fully developed strategy (but did not name it). 7 out of the 41 experts mentioned the National Strategy for Social Crime Prevention (Társadalmi Bűnmegelőzés Nemzeti Stratégiája). Others know of strategies that are laid down by local governments, towns, counties, the police, or refer to specific ones, e.g. the National Drug Strategy. The National Strategy for Social Crime Prevention (2003) is considered to be based on a wide-ranging and thorough situation description, based on multi-agency and multi-institutional approaches and co-operation in tackling, among others, youth crime and violence. Regarding implementation, it should have been done via multi-sectorial cooperation of the police, the educational system, NGOs and several other actors. However some experts mentioned that it has not been realised in practice and nowadays the institutional framework behind it is also significantly modified. In case of local, or smaller, regional strategies, the municipality and its social institutions are responsible for realising the objectives.

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 = 36.

Status of evaluation is...	N	%
extremely poor	14	38,9
below average	10	27,8
average	5	13,9
above average	6	16,7
excellent	1	2,4

Almost 40% of the experts judged the status of evaluation in the field of youth deviance, crime and violence in Hungary to be “extremely poor” and almost another third as “below average”. Only one expert considered evaluation to be excellent. The judgment on program evaluation does not seem to be sector-specific in Hungary. Answers to additional open-format questions² on funding and commissioning of evaluation revealed, that evaluation would be ideally very important but is still neglected too often. As to who is funding and commissioning evaluation research: the EU, NGOs, the government or its various Ministries and ministerial background institutions as well as municipalities, and the National Institute for Criminology or the Hungarian Academy of Sciences were mentioned. Some consider evaluation as an important condition (esp. in case of EU funded projects), but even the small number of experts having an opinion on the issue had doubts regarding the efficiency of evaluation as (if) it is carried out, although they think a good quality evaluation SHOULD be a prerequisite. Obviously this must be related to the fact that no one knows of standards regarding evaluation – some consider that they are non-existent even at an EU level. Current evaluation is overwhelmingly negatively characterised as: hectic, unprofessional, formal, lacking standards, without professional monitoring. Others see it almost impossible to carry out, especially to detect direct impact, or consider it would be disproportionately expensive to do so.

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 information 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 books, some websites specialized in crime and crime prevention matters, databases, journals, and newsletters, however, these were mostly mentioned in general terms and not specified (despite the questionnaire asking for it).

- Specialized websites:
 - www.bunmegelozes.hu

² The four following sub-questions of question 15 were:

- a) Who is funding and commissioning evaluation research in the field of youth crime?
- b) To what extent is evaluation a condition for project funding in crime prevention?
- c) To what extent are there standards regarding evaluation of measures in the field of youth crime?
- d) 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?

- www.police.hu
- Criminology Department of University of Tübingen
- www.okri.hu (the webpage of the National Institute of Criminology (OKRI), Central Europe's major criminological research institute in Hungary. Publications, links to statistical databases, programs)
- ELBIR (Elektronikus Lakossági Bűnmegelőzési Információs Rendszer, in English Electronic Population Crime Prevention Information System)
www.police.hu/brfk/bunmegelozes/elbir
- <http://www.kriminologia.hu> The webpage of the Hungarian Society for Criminology
- Databases:
 - www.ksh.hu
 - local databases of the police
- Journals:
 - KAPOCS
 - ESÉLY
 - Új Ifjúsági Szemle
- Special organisations:
 - International Association for Restorative Justice
- Special conferences/workshops:
 - Child Protection Conference
 - Ferenczi György Scientific Days (conference)
 - Crime Prevention Academy (Bűnmegelőzési Akadémia) organized by the National Police Headquarters Crime Prevention Institute
- Other sources:
 - Accounts and reports of Child Welfare Services

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, Hungarian experts came up with a variety of programmes and approaches, some of them widely used, very general, and some of them with a local or regional or narrow focus. While many respondents provided information on specific programmes, lots of others named none. Most approaches and programmes regarded as “working” can be grouped in the following categories:

- **Early intervention programmes**, mostly the Hungarian version of the British Sure Start Program in so called “Sure Start Children’s Houses” (Biztos Kezdet Gyermekházak)
- **Programmes targeted at preschool children**: Ovizsar (Kindergarten Cop) program, in Veszprém county launched in 2008.
- **Violence prevention programmes targeted at elementary school children**: DADA program, widely known, it has been used for years now, but no sufficient number of instructors (policemen); “Iskola Rendőre” (School Cop) program: since 2008, for primary school students school social work (not widespread and efficient enough), psycho-drama groups for children,

partially efficient in prevention as well. The “Super-bringa” program works well to enhance transport safety.

- **Violence prevention programmes targeted at upper-elementary and secondary school children (10/12-18):** “Bűn küszöbén” and “Diákintő” publications, www.bunmegelozes.eu widely distributed in BAZ county, to all primary, and most secondary schools.³ Peer group support programs are considered to be very effective by experts, however they perceive that school directors do not consider it to be important, so social professionals try to use it with more or less success; "FÜGE" Deviancia Prevenációs munkacsoport (Fig Deviance Prevention Working Group) of the INDIT (Integrated Drug Therapy) Foundation (www.indit.hu) for 7-12 graders, focuses on risk factors of deviant behaviour. Lectures on crime prevention held by experts at schools e.g. “One day at school, one day for safety” (Egy nap az iskolában, egy nap a biztonságért) program
- **Violence prevention programmes targeted at secondary school students:** “Ne tedd, ne tűrd!” (“Do not do it, do not tolerate it!”) program against school violence organised by Budapest Police, “Ne tedd!” (“Do not do it!”) program elaborated by the Esztergomi Szent Jakab Alapítvány (http://tamop.irm.gov.hu/Letoltheto_kiadvanyok)
- **Programmes targeted at special offence or offender categories, mostly DRUG abuse, but also graffiti and for children for disadvantaged families etc.:** Here, a number of programmes were mentioned as effective, e.g. “ELLENSZER” program: against drug use, to enhance law-abiding behaviour in general; preventive informative diversion (www.egeszsegmonitor.hu/dok/eltereleskutatas_2010.pdf) regarding the prevention of illegal drug use, repeat offences and further drug consumption. Wide-ranging survey on effectiveness was prepared in 2010; “Kék esték” (Blue evenings) (kekkocka.hu/index.php?page.../kekestek) for disadvantaged youths in areas of crime- and drug prevention, prevention programs the Váltó Sáv Foundation and Kapocs Ifjúsági Önségítő Szolgálat Foundation for former juvenile offenders and substance abusers, Tájéoló Klub (“Orientation Club”) for children with multiple disadvantages, drug prevention programmes of Kék Pont Foundation. MENTAL-CHAT-PORTAL for those suffering from non-chemical dependency.
- **Programmes at a community level:** youth patrol service (Ifjúsági járőr szolgálat) to seek runaway children, urban rehabilitation programs
- **General social reintegration programmes:** Social Renewal Operational Programme (TÁMOP) measure 5.2.5 to promote the social integration of 12 - 29 year olds.
- **Special services of the social and law enforcement sector:** family care and placing the child under protection is somewhat suitable for prevention purposes, probationary service for young offenders
- **Programmes to strengthen parental skills/knowledge:** Information booklets on drugs (e.g. “Drogokról Szülőknek”), distributed for parents of school children via school parents’ associations

³ Policemen helped to process the information at schools. No formal evaluation only informal feedback from teachers.

- **Programmes targeted at young offenders:** Social Renewal Operational Programme (TÁMOP) measure 5.6.1. and 5.6.2. crime prevention and reintegration programs for juvenile offenders, EQUIP social skills development program for young convicted offenders

II. What's promising?

Answers to the „what's promising“ - question showed considerable overlap with the previous section. Experts believe in integration at schools, early development and training. Peer group support in general in drug prevention especially the at-risk teenage population, but strictly under the supervision of competent adults, is especially effective. Conflict management, aggression-free communication, personality development are considered important, or organising free-time activities, clubs for at-risk youngsters. Drama groups are also seen as a good way to treat aggression, express feelings, knowing oneself. The importance of early childhood development seems very effective (Sure Start Children's Houses for 0-3 year-olds with multiple disadvantages), also regarding improving family cohesion also in the short run.

Restorative justice would be good in practice, but is very rare yet. EQUIP program for young offenders was also mentioned as a promising example.

Experts fear that due to the present crisis resources are cut back which affects negatively the whole society, and also prevention, and will probably result in increasing criminal activity.

III. What doesn't work?

According to some experts, family-centred intervention at its present form, integration into the labour market, the integration of the socially excluded, especially the Roma, in general, does not work effectively, and bad/disadvantaged family background cannot guarantee proper conditions for the young. In case of child offenders (between 12-14) nothing happens after the end of the legal procedure.

The frequent one-time or temporary prevention activities, lectures, presentations are not considered to be effective by some experts in case of teenagers neither in the field of crime prevention, nor in the prevention of drug consumption and the same is considered regarding the solely repressive prevention systems built on control and technical equipment.

Some experts think that the socialization process in both the family and educational institutions are weak nationwide, and it is very problematic because effective education is in fact crime prevention activity as well, from the earliest age on, through the life course.

Regarding special programs, in case of the DADA program (school crime prevention) the lack of sufficient number of trainers as well as the somewhat outdated curriculum was mentioned.

In case of child or teenage victims, they do not get any official support and there is also hardly any data on victims.

Regarding probationary service, some teachers complained that they have never been contacted personally by the probation officer of their students, although they think it would be very important for effective work. There is a lot of pessimism about the efficiency of drug addiction treatments.

Inter-agency cooperation (school-social worker-maybe the law enforcement personnel) would be needed for effective work but it does not exist in practice.

Problems versus practice in Hungary

Having learnt the experts' opinion on existing practices, in the Hungarian version of the survey we additionally added two parts to acquire information about the experts perception of current Hungarian youth problem behaviour and also on actors, who should be active in the field of prevention for youth delinquency. When comparing Table 3 "Youth problem behaviour targeted by preventive activities" with Table 11 "Youth problem behaviour as perceived by experts" we can see that – at least the top first four most important problem behaviour is identical with what is perceived to be the focus of preventive activities, with the slight exception, that according to the ranking of experts legal substance abuse is considered to be an even more significant problem than illegal substance abuse, while the major focus of prevention programs is this latter.

Table 11: Youth problem behaviour as perceived by experts, 38 < N < 41, sorted by means

problem behaviour	M	SD
	M	SD
Abuse of alcohol / legal substances	4,7500	,54302
Abuse of illegal substances	4,5500	,78283
Youth violence	4,5250	,84694
School-related violence	4,3750	,86787
Adherence to violence-legitimizing norms	4,3500	1,05125
Hate crime / violence against minorities	4,2750	,93336
Gender-based violence	4,2250	,94699
Bullying	4,1000	1,03280
Sexual offences	4,0500	,93233
Youth property offences	3,9750	1,07387
Knife crime	3,9750	1,07387
Cyber crime	3,9000	1,03280
Use of violent media	3,9000	1,08131
Political/religious extremism	3,8718	1,12810
School absenteeism	3,8000	1,22370

However, there is no such agreement on who IS and who SHOULD BE doing prevention for the young. Comparing Table 5 with Table 12 one can see, that although at present the police seems to be the primary agent among institutions involved in prevention and control of youth deviance and violence, ideally, it should be the primarily the educational system (which is seen to have a minor role at present), together with the and social/welfare system, which already plays a significant role in the field. This result can also be interpreted as a desired shift from repressive, controlling, punitive approaches toward a more general approach which targets background factors of youth problem behaviour.

Table 12: Institutions and professions who SHOULD BE involved in prevention and control of youth deviance, violence, N = 40, sorted by means

Institutions and professions involved	M	SD
	M	SD
Educational system / schools	4,8000	,46410
Social workers	4,6750	,65584
Psychologists	4,5750	,71208
Social services / welfare	4,5500	,67748
Probationary service	4,5000	,81650

Police	4,1750	1,03497
Correctional facilities	4,1000	1,05733
Health system / health professions	3,8750	,82236

4. Summary/Conclusions

The primary limitation of the survey is its low response rate. There was a strong surplus of respondents who were affiliated with social/ welfare services and it was extremely hard to acquire opinion from institutions of the law enforcement sector.

In the Hungarian Nationwide Institutional and Expert Survey respondents characterized approaches to prevention and control of youth deviance, crime and violence as mainly oriented at youths with substance abuse problems, and other high risk groups such as ethnic minority (which in Hungary means Roma) youths and youths living in care homes/foster care. Approaches and measures mainly seem to be carried out by police and social workers, although experts consider it to be desirable to give a much bigger role to the educational system in the field of prevention.

Experts point out the high value of inter-agency cooperation and multi-professional approaches however, in practice they see only minor signs of that. The primary source of financing comes from EU finds, but in general funding is not sufficient and not stable. Although evaluation is seen as important, experts are not aware of widely accepted established standards and many even doubt, due to the complexity of the issues involved, the possibility of carrying out evaluation, especially in a cost-effective way.

Sources of information indicate that experts use specialized media, especially via the Internet, but also benefit from communication and exchange with colleagues and other professionals, for example at conferences, internal newsletters.

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, however, at present they see a dominance of one-time or very temporary programs which are not seen very effective for this age group. The repressive, punitive tone of some approaches and the institutional focus on deterrence is also criticised.