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Introduction

The Challenge: Preventing Crime and Victimization Among Adolescents

Canada, like most other countries in the world, is concerned with the place of young people in society, their safety and well-being, and their development and future. We are also aware that many young people are vulnerable to victimization, and to becoming involved in crime, and that problems experienced in adolescence can have life-long and costly implications. There has also been increasing awareness of their victimization and the links between offending and earlier abuse in the home or outside.

Much of our day-to-day information about young people’s involvement in crime comes from the media, leading to panics about the rise in youth violence, in youth gangs, or girls’ offending, for example. Some conclude that young peoples’ behaviour is worse than it was in the past, that we are confronted by a generation that behaves very differently. It is important not to assume that this is the case, that all adolescents are the same - untouchable or unapproachable, or that there is little that can be done to reduce youth offending apart from tougher responses. There has been a reversal of increases in youth offending in Canada and other countries, but this does not mean there is no need for concern or action.

Offending and victimization among young people are rarely random or sudden events, but often highly predictable. They are the outcome of a variety of circumstances in the lives of young people, as well as childhood experiences that can lead to serious consequences as they reach adolescence, a time of rapid development, uncertainty, experimentation and risk taking. Social and economic changes in many countries over the past two decades have had a marked impact on the lives of young people. These include growing youth unemployment, changes in family patterns, increasing income disparities between wealthy and poor, increasing migration and immigration, and the virtual exclusion of sections of populations living in inner cities or poor rural areas from the increased prosperity experienced by others.

The youth justice system in Canada responds to law-breaking by those aged between 12 and 18, but there are many preventive measures that can be used to preclude both law-breaking and re-offending, and to protect those who might be vulnerable to victimization. Prevention is in the long-run far more effective - saving considerable emotional and physical damage, time and money - than responding after events. This report is concerned with such approaches. It has been prepared for the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC) as part of its strategy to promote crime prevention through social development, and draws on promising strategies and programmes that have been developed around the world.

The former National Crime Prevention Council produced a number of guides and publications on preventive programmes and approaches for young people in this age group including Mobilizing Political Will and Community Responsibility to Prevent Youth Crime (1995) and Preventing Crime and Investing in Families and Communities: Promoting Positive Outcomes For Youth 12-18 (1997). Youth are one of the four primary target groups of the NCPC strategy; the NCPC is currently
funding a wide range of community projects that deal with this age group in close collaboration with other government strategies such as the National Children’s Agenda, the Youth Justice Renewal Strategy and programmes and research around health and employment.

In their prevention models for youth, the National Crime Prevention Council concluded that there was a need for a holistic view of youth offending, which took account of social and economic factors, and the interests of victims and local communities, examined the comparative costs of prevention and criminal justice intervention, and developed cost-effective interventions. The major message was that we know much about what works. What is now needed is political will, public education and community mobilization to support, rather than exclude, young people and their families through preventive strategies. The Council identified five settings for the development of strategies and programmes: overall social policies, local communities, the family, the school, and peer groups. They also stressed the importance of involving young people in programme development (NCPC, 1997).

Who this Report Is For

This report has been written for those involved in the development of strategies and programmes for young people: both policy makers at the federal, provincial, territorial and municipal level and practitioners in the government and voluntary sector. This includes, for example, heads of social and community services, sports, education, and cultural departments, senior police officers and justice officials, mayors and local authority staff, and youth and community organizations. The report has been prepared for the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC) by the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC) in Montreal, whose mission is to share and exchange experience about community safety and prevention strategies around the world.

Recent International Trends and Developments

This report builds on the work of both the NCPC and the ICPC. It highlights both general trends and specific developments in preventive programmes and strategies targeting this age group from a range of countries. These trends indicate that:

- Internationally, there is a developing consensus on giving greater priority to investing in and supporting young people and their families through preventive approaches, rather than excluding, punishing, or incarcerating them.

- A growing number of countries now have national strategies that include the development of preventive programmes for this age group. These place considerable emphasis on the development of partnerships at the local and community level to plan, implement and evaluate programmes. There is growing evidence internationally of the cost effectiveness of preventive approaches for young people.

- The circumstances placing young people at risk either as victims or offenders, or excluding them from mainstream society, are now widely recognized and appear to be very similar...
across countries. These include the links between physical and mental health, poverty, offending and victimization among young people. These are also points for intervention and protection.

- More programmes now attempt to take account of gender and diversity - of the different needs and experiences of young women and young men, and of those who belong to minority groups in their society. This includes Aboriginal and indigenous peoples, other ethnic and cultural minorities, and those with disabilities or differences in sexual orientation.

- Approaches that recognize young peoples’ rights to public space and that include young people themselves in the planning and delivery of programmes have become much more prominent.

- Prevention practices that are grounded in restorative approaches have multiplied, as well as an understanding of their potential for dealing with youth victimization, offending and re-offending.

Some of these trends are discussed in this report. Additional information on projects and sources can be found in the Annex to this report, which is available on the ICPC and NCPC Internet sites. Overall, this report is concerned with the accumulation of knowledge that points to the long- and short-term benefits of investing in young people and of developing programmes that help build safe and healthy communities for all citizens.
Section I. Targeting Youth: The Peak Years for Offending and Victimization

What Is the Challenge?

Children and young people under 18 make up a major sector of a country’s population, in Canada and the US a quarter. In South Africa and developing countries it is much higher. In many countries, major social and economic changes have affected the lives of young people over the past twenty or more years and future trends indicate continued changes that will have an impact on them. These changes underline the importance of taking preventive approaches much more seriously than in the past.

Young People and Crime

Adolescence Is the Most Common Age Period for Law-Breaking

We know from studies over time in many countries that adolescence is the most common age period for law-breaking throughout the life span (Graham & Bowling, 1995). This is evident from official police and court statistics, as well as reports by young people themselves (self-report studies). For example:

- in Canada, 21% of all persons charged by the police in 2000 were 12-17
- in the United States, 1 in 5 arrests in 1997 involved a 10-17 year-old
- in England and Wales, 1 in 4 young men under 22 have been involved with the law

The Majority of Offending in all Countries Involves Boys Rather than Girls

In Canada, 77% of known young offenders are male, and 23% female (Statistics Canada, 2000c).

Most Offending Involves Minor Property Offences

Most law-breaking involves minor offences against property, including vandalism, shoplifting and theft.

- In Canada, 43% of cases heard in youth court involve property offences, the great majority of them minor, as well as most of those dealt with by alternative measures.
- In the US, over 40% of 10-17 year-olds are charged with minor theft, assault, drug offences or disorderly conduct.

Many Young People Break the Law but Are Never Arrested

Most grow out of law-breaking as they reach adulthood. Such behaviour forms part of the process of growing up in Western countries.
Investing in Youth: International Approaches to Preventing Crime and Victimization

- A study in England and Wales of 14-25 year-olds found 1 in 2 males admitted committing an offence at least once, and 1 in 3 females (Graham & Bowling, 1995).

- An international self-report survey in 12 countries shows high levels of youth involvement in delinquency across those countries.

Serious Offending is Infrequent
Serious youth offending, especially violence, concerns people most and receives the most public attention. However, it is in fact very infrequent in Western countries.

- In many countries, about 7% of young offenders will be charged with violent offences (Fergusson et al., 1996).
- In Canada, youths commit proportionately less violent crime than adults (Statistics Canada, 1999a).
- In all countries, serious violence - including assaults and robberies - is primarily committed by young adults and, to a lesser extent, older adolescent males.

A Small Number of Offenders Are Responsible for Much of the Crime
A very small proportion of offenders is responsible for a disproportionate amount of crime. Surveys in a number of countries show that some 6-7% of young males commit between 50-70% of all crime and 60-85% of all serious and violent crime.

Therefore, these persistent and chronic offenders are a small group, yet they contribute an enormous amount to minor offending as well as being responsible for most serious and violent offending. They also tend to target the same places and victims, so that reducing their activity would reduce the overall extent of victimization considerably (ICPC, 1999a).

- In Canada in 1997-98, 41% of cases brought to youth court had re-offended, and 12% can be seen as persistent offenders with 3 or more previous convictions (Statistics Canada, 1999a).

It is this group that takes up most of the time and energy of their parents, the police, school teachers, social workers and communities. What also distinguishes them is the early age at which they begin to get into trouble. For many countries, targeting such children through prevention programmes as they grow into adolescence has become a major priority.
Recent Changes in Offending by Young People

From the 1980s until the mid-1990s, a wide range of countries experienced *increases* in officially recorded crime by young people, followed from the mid-1990s onwards by a *decline*. This included Canada and the United States, Britain, France, the Netherlands, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, Italy, Poland, Australia and New Zealand (Pfeiffer, 1998; NCP, 1999b; Boni, 1999; Le Blanc, 1999).

In some countries (Canada, US, France, Italy, Germany, Austria, Sweden, Poland), there was a *general* increase in all types of offending by young people from the mid-1980s. In other countries (England & Wales, the Netherlands, Denmark and Switzerland), only violent offending increased. Japan was the only industrialized country that did not witness an increase in youth crime from the 1980s (Haley, 1996). While boys remain the predominant perpetrators, offences by girls also increased in most countries.

Some of the increase in violent crime may reflect greater willingness to report incidents, and most of it consists of minor assaults (Pfeiffer & Wetzels, 1999). This accounts for much of the increase in Canada as well as Germany and other European countries (Pfeiffer, 1998). In the US, the increase in violence has been associated with the use of guns by young people and changes in the drug trade.

In many of these countries, there has been a more recent *decline* in youth offending, including violence:

- Rates of violent crime by young people in Canada have fallen over the past four years (Statistics Canada, 2000).
- In the US, juvenile arrests for violent crimes in 1998 were 19% below their peak in 1994 (Snyder, 2000).

Victims and Victimizers

What have become increasingly clear in recent years are the strong links between young offenders and young victims. Most crime victimization surveys have tended to focus on adult experience of crime and to see young adult populations as those at greatest risk. Little attention has been paid to children and young people or to those at the margins of society (Hartless et al., 1995; Baron, 1997). There are three major issues:

- Levels of victimization among young people are high
- Young people tend to victimize others who are about the same age
- Young offenders are often themselves young victims
Levels of Victimization Among Young People Are High

Evidence from many countries indicates that young people are at high risk of victimization. This includes property offences as well as violence within and outside the home. It also includes school-related bullying behaviour, which has come to international attention in recent years (Smith et al., 1999). Most victimization incidents are hidden from view, they are never reported or detected, and young people are less likely to report them than adults.

- An international survey of 11-15 year-olds in 30 countries found that bullying behaviour was very common across countries and a third of the Canadian children said they had been bullied ‘this term’ (Health Canada, 1999).
- A recent survey of 12-18 year-olds in Alberta, Canada found that over half the sample (54%) had been victimized during the past year at school (Gomes et al., 2000).
- Victimization surveys in the US show that those aged 12-17 are as likely to be victims of serious violent crime as 18-24 year-olds (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). The rate of victimization, abuse and neglect of 12-17 year olds also increased substantially in the early 1990s (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999).
- In England and Wales, young people are more likely to be victims of personal crime than adults, and 16-19 year-olds have the highest risk of being assaulted of all age groups (Audit Commission, 1996).
- In South Africa, those aged 16-25 experience the highest level of violent crime (South Africa, 1999).

Young People Tend to Victimize Others who Are About the Same Age

Young people tend to victimize others who are about the same age or younger and who are known to them. We tend to think of the victims of youth crime as adults or corporations such as businesses and shops. While they are often involved, the majority of individual victims of youth offending, whether property or violence, are likely to be other young people living in the same communities, attending the same schools.

- In 1998 in Canada, of those young people accused of violent crimes, 6 out of 10 were acquaintances of the victims and just over half of those victims were under 18 (Statistics Canada, 1999b).
- Two thirds of adolescent victims of violent crime in the US have said they knew their offender (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999).
- In South Africa, one study found that young people under 18 were responsible for 30% of the violence against youths (South Africa, 1999).
- In Britain, young men have been the primary targets of increases in youth violence (Mirlees-Black et al., 1996).

Similar patterns are found in Australia (Alder, 1991) and the European countries studied by Pfeiffer, who concludes that the increase in violent crime among young people has consisted chiefly of
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offences against others their own age and that the majority of victims are young men (Pfeiffer, 1998: 298).16

Young Offenders Are Often Themselves Young Victims

Young offenders are often themselves young victims. They may have been victimized in childhood and begin to victimize others as they grow older, or their offending behaviour may place them in much riskier situations that invite victimization. The kinds of behaviours and circumstances that lead to law-breaking are often similar to those leading to victimization. Given that young people tend to victimize other people in their age group, those who are isolated or excluded may themselves turn to bullying others, or in some cases to offending e.g. in order to survive on the street.

- A high proportion of juvenile offenders report having been physically, sexually abused, and neglected during their childhood (Schneider, 2000).
- Studies of the young homeless in Canada, who because of their situation are often charged with offences, have shown that many are victimized by their peers (Baron, 1997; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997).
- Similar studies in Australia show that homeless young people are the least likely to report offences to the police and the least likely to seek help for injuries. Young men are at greatest risk of physical abuse, and young women of sexual abuse, from their peers (Alder, 1991; NCP 1999a).
- Levels of family violence among the young homeless are also very high and have often been the major reason for leaving home.

Going out alone or in groups to high-risk areas at particular times, drinking, and acting aggressively all place young people at risk of victimization. Among serious or persistent offenders, their dangerous and risky behaviour places them at greater risk of victimization, too. Childhood victimization can lead to the use of aggressive and conflictual behaviour in adolescence, which results in offending, as well as invites retaliation (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997). The majority of young people convicted of the most serious and violent offences will have experienced physical, sexual or emotional abuse in childhood and as adolescents (Audit Commission, 1996; Pfeiffer & Wetzels, 1999).

Thus, while much past discussion about victims has assumed them to be a very different group from offenders, there is now considerable evidence of overlap in terms of the location of events and the extent to which some offenders may also be victims. This shift in thinking about victims is especially important in planning preventive strategies. It is not productive to see offenders and victims as two very separate groups when their environments and the factors placing them at risk are sometimes very similar. This is not to imply that every victim will become an offender or every offender a

A study of 200 homeless young men living on the street in a Canadian city found that 30% were victims of robbery, 20% of aggravated assault, and 44% common assault. The majority had been victimized repeatedly. There was a strong link between their own offending behaviour and being victimized and those from abusive family backgrounds were more likely to be victimized (Baron, 1997).
victim, but rather to underline the similarities in risk factors and the potential for protecting young people from victimization and offending.

Linking Health and Development

**Early Childhood**
There is now ample evidence that the conditions under which children develop are crucial for both mental and physical health, and emotional, social, and intellectual development. In early childhood, the quality of parental and family relationships and care, a healthy environment, and living conditions are all important. These conditions are heavily influenced by the economic conditions of families. Family disruption, conflict and violence, and poor parenting skills are shaped and exacerbated by poverty, poor housing, and environmental conditions.

Early childhood experiences affect the ways in which children interact with and respond to parents, other children and adults and, subsequently, to school. These experiences are associated with the development of difficult and aggressive behaviour. They affect a child’s risk of ill-health, accidents, learning difficulties, victimization, running away, homelessness, depression, and subsequent offending. As children enter school, those whose behaviour is seen as problematic, or those who have problems adjusting and learning, will begin to experience school as a difficult environment. Prevention programmes that are geared to early childhood have become a major priority for the NCPC as well as governments in other countries.

**Early Adolescence**
Early adolescence is a time of transition emotionally and physically. By the time children reach their teens, the centrality of family and school give way to peer attachments and youth culture. Becoming more independent from parents is part of the growing process but spending too much unstructured time with peers and away from adult oversight increases the risks of offending and victimization. This is a problem among boys and young men in particular, who are much more likely to spend unstructured time with their peers than girls (Graham & Bowling, 1995).

In Canada, the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth (1999) confirms findings from many other countries that children who report using aggressive behaviour at age 10-11 are far more likely to report it at 12-13. Some 40% of the children surveyed reported being in a fight (but without serious injuries): 55% of boys and 27% of girls.

Canada is one of over 30 countries that participate in an international survey of the health behaviour of school-aged children of 11-15 (Health Canada, 1999). This survey examines the links between health and home, school, and peer group experiences. It also looks at behaviours such as smoking and alcohol and drug use. It confirms that those who are well adjusted at school are likely to have positive family and peer relationships and avoid health-risky behaviours. Those who do not have good relations with parents and are not well adjusted to school tend to feel excluded, bullied and criticised. This group is more likely to have physical and mental health problems, feel more anxious or depressed, and develop more serious smoking, drinking and drug habits in adolescence.
Later Adolescence
As children reach their later teens, separation from family and school becomes greater, but awareness, a sense of responsibility, work and organizing abilities also increase. For some, however, patterns of offending can become more serious. Adjustment to school and relationships with parents may decline as peer relationships become even more important.

This should be the time of transition from school to work, but anxiety and depression may lead to truancy, school drop out, homelessness, serious drug and alcohol abuse, offending behaviour, as well as self-injury and suicide. Multiple drug use and alcoholism can be both responses to anxiety and depression, as well as facilitators of aggression and offending behaviour.

- In France, suicide is the second highest cause of mortality among 16-25 year-olds after road accidents (Courdes, 1999).
- Canadian suicide levels are similarly high among young men in this age group, particularly among First Nations communities (Statistics Canada, 1995).
- In Australia, levels of suicide are particularly high among indigenous young men in rural areas and among the young homeless, self-harm, substance abuse, chronic eating disorders, accidents and injuries are very common (NCP, 1999a).

Truancy, problem behaviour at school, and school exclusion are major risk factors for offending and victimization among adolescents. In Britain, offending levels among those who truant or are excluded from school are much higher than for other young people and 42% of those sentenced in youth court have been excluded from school (Audit Commission, 1996).

What a Difference Gender Makes

Boys and young men are much more likely to become involved in offending than girls and young women but, while it is one of the most striking differences in patterns of crime, there has been very little discussion about the importance of this gender difference. Most research on youth crime in the past has been on young men. Most prevention projects have been designed for young males. Recent increases in recorded crime by girls, as well as recognition of the differences in their needs as young women, have led many countries to pay more attention to them. This has resulted in an increasing number of projects that are specifically targeted to the needs and experiences of girls and young women.

While many of the factors placing girls at risk of offending and victimization are similar to those for boys - in terms of poverty, poor environment, family disruption and violence - there are some important differences including in the way girls and boys are brought up by parents. For example:

- there are more controls exercised over many aspects of girls’ lives
- there are important differences in how they spend their leisure time and the kinds of risks this entails - boys spend more unsupervised time away from adults, and in groups, than girls
there are differences in health development, *accidents and risk-taking behaviours* - boys are more risk-taking and prone to accidents than girls. Girls are more prone to self-injury, depression and eating disorders, boys to suicide.

there are differences in the *type and extent of physical, emotional and sexual abuse* experienced by girls and boys growing up - both within family situations and outside.

there are overall differences in the *rate at which girls and boys mature* as they grow up and this influences their *progress at school* - boys are more likely to drop out or do poorly academically than girls. Boys account for two-thirds of children in Canada receiving special education in elementary school.

young women are much *more likely to cease offending* as they reach adulthood than young men.

**Different Pathways into and out of Offending**

What this means is that the *pathways into* offending are somewhat different for girls, as well as the *pathways out*. Some of these differences are striking. A British study of 14-25 year-olds found the peak age for offending in 1992 was 16 for females, but 21 for males. By their early twenties, young women were likely to have employment, partners and children, and to have ceased offending. However, this was not sufficient to change the behaviour of young men. Those who were working, and had partners and children only ceased offending if they also avoided heavy drinking, drug use and friends involved in crime (Graham & Bowling, 1995).

A more recent study has confirmed this difference between females and males. It also illustrates the marked differences in the *types* of offences that girls and boys commit, with less fighting and criminal damage (Campbell & Harrington, 2000).

In Canada, girls similarly start and cease offending earlier than boys (Carrington, 1996). Their peak age for appearing in youth court is 15, but 17 for boys (Statistics Canada, 1999b). Girls are less likely to use aggression as they grow up than are boys, and also to use it in different ways (Pepler & Sedighdeilami, 1998).

**Different Experiences and Risks of Victimization**

Comparing the victimization experiences of girls and boys is difficult since there has been a lack of studies that look at both sexes, and there are also differences in the extent to which males and females are able to recognize, or talk, about those experiences. Victimization studies suggest, nevertheless, that girls and young women are more likely to experience physical and sexual abuse than males as children and as they grow up (Pepler & Sedighdeilami, 1998). American research has suggested that girls are three times more likely to experience sexual abuse as children than boys (Finkelhor, 1997; Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). Australian research also stresses that young women’s experience of violence is very different from that of young men in terms of *who* is involved, *where* it takes place, and the *reasons* for that violence (Alder, 1991). Girls’ experiences of violence are
much more likely to be associated with sexual activity. Outside the home, boys are more likely to be bullied, to bully others, and to be victims of physical violence (Craig, Peters & Konarski, 1998; Alder, 1991). A Norwegian survey of 13-18 years-olds, for example, found that 9% of boys reported being victimized so severely they needed medical treatment, compared with 3% of girls (Pedersen, 2001).

There are also differences in the sense of safety and security experienced by girls and boys, and the extent to which they are vulnerable to physical or sexual harassment and abuse in public places (White, 1998; NCP, 1999b).

All of this means that:

- girls’ experiences of growing up and their patterns of offending and victimization are different from those of boys
- we need to consider masculinity and the ways in which it shapes the behaviour of boys and young men in different cultures
- it is especially important to design preventive projects around the experiences, life-styles, interests and needs of both young men and young women. While some projects can target both, specific projects for girls are also important, given that most programmes have tended to be designed for males.

What a Difference Race and Diversity Make

A major problem for many countries is the over-representation of indigenous and racial and ethnic minority groups in youth offending. This includes Aboriginal and other indigenous populations, Black, Hispanic and Asian populations in countries such as the US as well as more recent immigrant and second-generation minority groups in many countries. Part of this overrepresentation has to do with poverty, since indigenous and minority populations tend to live in much poorer social and economic circumstances than the majority population, but it also stems from colonial policies, and systemic racism and discrimination.

Indigenous Youth Heavily Over-Represented in the Justice System

Aboriginal youth have long been over-represented in the Canadian youth justice system, as inquiries in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba have demonstrated. They are disproportionately held in pre-trial detention and youth custody. The percentage of over-representation varies between provinces, and is higher in Western provinces and Territories with greater proportions of Aboriginal populations. Similarly, in Australia and New Zealand, young people from indigenous and Maori backgrounds are much more likely to be stopped by the police than others, and are heavily over-represented in youth justice systems (NCP, 1999b; O’Connor, Daly & Hinds, 1998; Maxwell & Morris, 1998).

- 5% of Canadian youth are Aboriginal, but in some provinces they account for 34% of all male and 41% of all female young offenders (Justice Canada, 1999).
- In Queensland Australia, 4% of the youth population in 1995 were Aboriginals or Torres Strait Islanders but constituted a third of juvenile court cases (O’Connor et al., 1998).
In New Zealand, 60% of clients in police Youth at Risk programmes are Maori or Samoan (New Zealand, 2000).

Visible and Ethnic Minority Youths Over-Represented
The over-representation of other racial and ethnic minority youths in criminal justice systems is evident for the black population in many countries including the US, England and Wales, and Canada (Donziger, 1996; Commission on Systemic Racism in the Ontario Justice System, 1996; Doob & Roberts, 1997; Social Exclusion Unit, 2000).

- In the US, Black youth accounted for 15% of the population in 1997, but 26% of those arrested (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999).

Victimization rates are similarly much higher among the minority than majority youth population, although there is much under-reporting. Immigrant youth in Canada report bullying, racism and bigotry, especially at school or when looking for work (CCSD, 2000b). By the early 1990s, the homicide rate among African-American youth in the US was eight times that of white youths (Donziger, 1996).

Changing Societies - Poverty, Family Patterns, Youth Populations

Over the past twenty years, in spite of growing prosperity in many countries, there have been rapid economic and social changes. These include family patterns, youth populations, employment, and a growth in poverty, especially among minority populations. This has led to the virtual exclusion of whole sections of societies.

Increasing Poverty and Income Disparity
In spite of increasing overall wealth in many Western countries, levels of poverty have risen and income disparities between families have increased. There is both a growth in the proportion living in poverty and a wider gap between the income of the wealthy and poor. The latter also tend to be concentrated in particular areas.

- In Britain, the numbers of children living in poverty rose from 1.4 million in 1968 to 4.4 million in 1998. While incomes increased by two-thirds for the top 10% of the population, they fell by 8% for the bottom 10% (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998; Woodward, 2000).
- In Australia, the proportion of children living in poverty increased from 7% in 1973 to 18% in 1986, and an estimated 43% of children were growing up in poverty in 1997 (O’Connor et al., 1998).
- In the US in 1997, the number of under-18s living in poverty (14 million) was 42% higher than in 1978 (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999).
- In 1968, 50% of poverty in the US was urban. By 1992, this had increased to 77%, 42% of it in the inner-city cores (Harris & Curtis, 1998).
- In Canada, the number of people living in poverty in big cities rose almost 34% between 1990 and 1995, while one in every three children in cities is now living in poverty (Lee, 2000).
Changing Families and Youth Populations

There have been marked changes in family patterns in many countries, with more divorce, separation, and single parents.

- In Canada, the numbers of children whose parents have divorced or separated has tripled over the past twenty years; those children tend to be young and there are more single parent families than in the past (CCSD, 1998).
- In England and Wales, the percentage of children living with a single parent rose from 11% in 1971 to 19% by 1992 and 21% of children live in families with no work (Audit Commission, 1996; Social Exclusion Unit, 2000).
- In the US, 26% of the population was under 18, yet they constituted 40% of those living in poverty in 1997 (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999).
- American studies indicate that the higher the number of family disruptions experienced by young people, the greater their involvement in drug use and delinquency (Thornberry, et al., 1999).

The quality of parenting is one of the most important factors protecting children and young people from crime and victimization, not the type of family structure itself. Poverty has a marked impact on parenting, and single parents in particular are likely to live in poverty. A disproportionate number of children and young people are now living in poverty in many countries and there have been substantial changes in the numbers of minority children growing up in single parent households.

- In the US, 64% of African American children lived with two parents in 1970 but by 1997, only 35%. For white children, the change was from 90% to 74% (Thornberry, et al., 1999).
- The poorest ghetto areas of Chicago are now predominately African-American and 64% of these households are headed by single females (Harris & Curtis, 1998).
Recent Immigration and Migration
In many countries there have been marked increases in populations of immigrant children and of children born to minority populations. Their involvement in offending, either as victims or offenders, has increased at a greater rate than that of majority populations. This has been the case in a number of European countries.

- In Germany, the proportion of ethnic minorities in youth custody increased from 10% in 1990 to 35% by 1998.
- In Canada the numbers of immigrant children and young people has increased in the 1990s - and by some 230,000 between 1996-1998, most of them from Asia and the Pacific region (CCSD, 1998; 2000b).

While there has been a decline in the numbers of young people in some Western countries over the past ten or fifteen years, increases in minority youth populations are expected in the future. In a number of countries, population trends indicate future increases in the proportions of minorities in the 12-18 age group. In Canada, children and youth now account for 53% of the Aboriginal population, compared with 25% for non-Aboriginals. Increasing numbers of young Aboriginals are now moving off reserves to live in cities. In the US, the proportion of Black, American-Indian, Asian/Pacific and Hispanic young people is expected to increase substantially up to 2015 (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999).

Changing Youth Patterns - Unemployment, Drugs and Homelessness

Youth Unemployment
Changes in labour markets, technological developments and the loss of unskilled jobs in many countries have also had a major impact on youth employment. While definitions of employment vary between countries, it is clear that growing numbers of young people are now out of school, job training, or work. In Canada, levels of unemployment are often higher for young people than for other age groups (NCPC, 1997).

- In a range of European countries, youth unemployment rose from 15% to 20% for young men and from 19% to 23% for young women between 1991 and 1995 (Pfeiffer, 1998).
- In the US, unemployment is especially high among African-American and Hispanic youth who have few educational skills to offer - in one city, 63% of them do not graduate from high school (Rosenbaum, 1998).
- In Australia, full time employment for teenagers fell from 56% in 1966 to 17% by 1993 and education and employment are seen as key needs for non-English-speaking young people (NCP, 1999b).

Youth and Drugs
Drug use, including poly-substance abuse, has become much more prevalent among youth, particularly in areas of high unemployment. An international survey of 14-20 year-olds in 12 countries shows that it has an important impact on property crime and drug trafficking. On average, property crime was ten times higher among users of hard drugs than non-users and three times higher
among soft drug users (Killias & Ribeaud, 1999). The survey also shows some major differences between countries in the prevalence of both soft and hard drug use with rates in England and Wales, Northern Ireland and the US two or three times higher than those in Belgium, Germany, Greece or Italy.

In Canada, drug and substance use by young people has increased in the 1990s. A survey of Ontario secondary schools, for example, found that the use of hallucinogenic drugs had increased from 3% to 14% between 1993 and 1999, cannabis from 13% to 29%, as well as the use of tobacco and alcohol (CAMH, 2000).

**Youth Homelessness**

As a consequence of problems such as unemployment, family violence and disruption, and school exclusion, youth homelessness has also been growing in a number of countries. There are also close links between homelessness and leaving care among young people who have spent periods under child protection. In Australia, coming into care is seen as ‘a clear path to homelessness’ (NCP, 1999a). Placement in foster homes and residential care facilities is one way to remove young people from difficult home environments, but in the UK, up to a third of young people in youth custody institutions have spent part of their childhood in residential care (Kelly, 1999).

- Youth homelessness has increased substantially in Britain since the 1970s. One in five 16-24 year-olds have been homeless at some time (Policy Action Team, 1999).
- Nearly half of young homeless in London are from ethnic minority groups (Policy Action Team, 1999).

**Social Exclusion**

The concentration of social and economic problems in particular areas has led many countries to talk about social exclusion. In Britain, the increasing income disparity and concentration of poverty has been restricted to certain areas of the country. Usually these are public housing estates with the worst accommodation and environmental conditions and the poorest families, including high numbers of immigrants. The term social exclusion has been used to characterize the experiences of these areas and people who are largely excluded from taking part in the employment, health, safety and prosperity enjoyed by the rest of the population.

Young people, living on the streets of Australian cities, have typically exited from home situations saturated with conflict and violence. Ironically, their experiences on the streets are permeated by threats and acts of violence inflicted by other disadvantaged people who inhabit the streets and by street predators and those in authority, including the police. (Davis, Hatty & Burke, 1995:93 quoted in *Living Rough*, NCP, 1999a.)

**Social exclusion** is ‘a shorthand term for what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low income, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health, poverty and family breakdown.’ (Bridging the Gap, Social Exclusion Unit, 1999)
In France, similar concentrations of social problems are found in the satellite housing complexes around the major cities with social outcasts and immigrant families living in far greater poverty and disadvantaged conditions than the rest of the country (Dubet and Lapeyronnie, 1994 in Pfeiffer, 1998).

In the US, there has been a polarization of Black communities in inner cities with increasing levels of poverty, single-parent families, poor housing, drug use and high crime. It is these areas that have experienced the huge increases in youth crime, especially violence and youth homicide (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999; Harris & Curtis, 1998).

In Canada, levels of poverty have risen in the 1990s and are highest in large cities with concentrations of people living in the inner-city areas of Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver (Lee, 2000). In those inner city areas, up to 50% of children are living in poverty. Even among those employed full-time, 1 in 7 families will be living below the poverty line.

Poor health is considered to be a ‘key marker’ of areas of social exclusion in England and Wales, with higher rates of illness and earlier mortality than in other areas. For young people living in these areas, poor education, lack of employment and job training opportunities, high rates of teenage pregnancy and high crime and victimization are all characteristic (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998; Policy Action Team, 1999). The social exclusion of ethnic minorities is particularly marked in many countries:

In Britain, 41% of African-Caribbean, 45% of Indian, 82% of Pakistani, and 84% of Bangladeshi families have incomes that are less than half the national average, compared with 28% of the majority white population (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998: 30).

In Germany, 39% of foreign born Turkish youths experience high levels of deprivation compared with 12% of native born Germans (Pfeiffer & Wetzels, 1999).

Young Aboriginals living in cities such as Regina, Winnipeg and Vancouver are among the poorest excluded youth in Canada.

For residents in such areas, crime, vandalism, drugs, unsupervised young people, litter and dilapidation, pollution, lack of transport and services, all add to the inequalities and lack of safety and security in their lives.

Policies excluding young people from schools or public space have also been of increasing concern in many countries with the privatization and commercialization of shopping malls and commercial centres, for example, and sharp increases in the use of school exclusion. Mutual mistrust between homeless street youth, police and other community members is also seen to increase the problems of exclusion for such youth (NCP, 1999a; Beare, et al., 1996).
Thus Overall:

- Adolescence is the most common period for offending and there are strong links between victimization and offending - levels of victimization among young people are high - they tend to victimize others their own age - and young offenders are often themselves young victims.

- As young people move through adolescence there is a range of interconnected factors linking mental and physical health with accidents, learning difficulties, depression, teen pregnancy, substance abuse, homelessness, and with victimization, offending and re-offending.

- Risk factors include family disruption, violence and poor parenting, poverty, inadequate housing and health conditions, poor schooling, truancy, school drop-out or exclusion, peer group activities and pressures, discrimination, and lack of training and work opportunities.

- Risk factors affect boys and girls, and minority and majority populations, in over-lapping and different ways.

- Since there is often a strong link between poor economic and social conditions and systemic racism, young indigenous, minority, and recent immigrant populations tend to be over-represented in criminal justice systems and as victims in most countries.

- Future increases in minority youth populations in many countries reinforce the importance of establishing preventive programmes that can help ease young peoples’ passage through adolescence in health and safety.

- There have been some major changes in social and economic conditions in many countries leading to greater disparities between rich and poor; future population and other trends point to the importance of developing good preventive strategies for the healthy and safe development of adolescents.

Finally, there is a shift in thinking about youth in a number of countries. There is now an emphasis on the importance of the inclusion of young people rather than their exclusion from schools, employment, and public space. There is an emphasis on their inclusion into decision-making. This represents a positive development in prevention, which moves beyond a focus on situational and community-based strategies that defend and exclude, to those that incorporate and include young people and also look at their strength and competencies. This requires considerable co-ordination and a pro-active approach to prevention. The next section considers the evidence that well-planned community-based prevention does work to prevent crime and victimization.
Section II. Risk and Protection: Common Factors and Points for Intervention

Types of Intervention

There are two broad types of prevention programmes for 12-18 year-olds:

- **Universal** programmes provide services for all young people in a community or school.
- **Targeted** programmes are directed at high-risk groups, those with specific behavioural problems or specific populations (e.g., ethnic minority youth).

This section looks mainly at the latter, based on accumulated knowledge about risk and protective factors, and at promising points for intervention and prevention. In the past ten years, there has been a huge increase in this knowledge (Farrington, 2000). It is this information that helps decide what risk factors we can target, when is the best time to intervene, and what kinds of approaches to use.

Risk and Protective Factors

*Longitudinal, Social Control, Neighbourhood and Victimization Studies*

Studies of families and children in a number of countries since the 1920s have shown that much disruptive, aggressive behaviour and offending is predictable. *Longitudinal* studies track samples of children as they grow up. They have been conducted in Canada (Tremblay, et al, 1992; HRDC & Statistics Canada, 1999), England (Farrington & West, 1990; Kolvin, 1990), the US (Eron, et al., 1991; McCord, 1979; Robins, 1979; Thornberry, et al. 1999), New Zealand (Fergusson, 1996; Silva, 1990), and Sweden (Magnusson, 1997).

Similar patterns of risk factors have been found in these studies showing that children growing up in certain conditions and showing certain characteristics from an early age are much more likely to develop behaviour problems and to offend in adolescence and early adulthood than others. These risk factors include: poor housing conditions and poverty; family disruption and poor parenting; poor academic performance, truancy and dropping out of school; and showing aggressive and impulsive behaviour at an early age. Many other studies of children and adolescents based on neighbourhood and school surveys have added to our knowledge of the factors that place young people at risk for delinquency (Rosenbaum, 1998; Gottfredson, 2001). They include the characteristics of the child as well as their environment.

Crime tends to be concentrated in a few areas of cities and countries. Victimization surveys indicate the risks of living in particular places. For example, in Britain, 4% of victims of crime surveyed in 1992 suffered over 40% of the crimes (Audit Commission, 1996). Another study shows that the *multiplicity* of deprivation measures including unemployment, poor single parent households, poor literacy and school achievement, high mortality rates and child densities, poor housing conditions and high proportions of ethnic minorities are concentrated in some 44 local authority areas across the country (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998).
Victimization studies, which ask people their experience of being victimized, are also conducted frequently in a number of countries and enable us to estimate who is likely to be a victim, of what types of crime, and living in what kinds of environments. From these studies in countries including Australia, the Netherlands, the UK, the US, France and Canada, we have been able to develop a clearer picture of vulnerability. The risk factors for particular kinds of crimes again point to the significance of poor housing conditions and poverty, as well as life-style factors such as going out a lot, drinking a lot, and being young.

**Risk Factors**

Overall, the main risk factors identified can be grouped into four broad areas: family, individual, school and community.

**Family:**
- harsh or erratic parenting skills
- poor parental supervision
- low family income, poverty, isolation
- family violence, abuse and neglect
- parental conflict

**Individual:**
- early aggressive and impulsive behaviour
- spending a large amount of unsupervised time with peers
- having delinquent friends

**School:**
- low achievement
- disruptive behaviour, bullying
- lack of commitment to school
- truancy, school exclusion
- dropping out of school
- disorganized school

**Community:**
- poor housing and neighbourhood conditions
- disorganized neighbourhood, little sense of community
- high turnover of residents
- lack of facilities and services for young people
- lack of job opportunities
- availability of drugs

**Studies of Serious and Violent Offenders**

One of the most recent summaries of risk and protective factors looked at serious and violent male juvenile offenders in the US (Loeber & Farrington (1998). It pulls together current knowledge about risk factors for young men who commit serious and violent crimes, their pathways into offending, and patterns of offending as they grow into adulthood.

This major study concludes that serious and violent juveniles:
are a distinct group of offenders with multiple risk factors usually show minor behaviour problems from age 7 and may commit their first serious offence well before they are 14. Much of their early offending goes undetected. Their serious offending tends to continue and become more serious once it starts. Such offending is highly concentrated in a small number of inner-city areas.

Since many factors put these young males at risk, no single programme targeting a single risk factor is likely to be effective. They conclude that early intervention and an integrated and co-ordinated range of community-based programmes are likely to be the most effective in preventing offending.

**Protective Factors**

Just as we know what factors increase risk of offending as children grow older, we also know that not all children growing up in similar conditions will become involved in such behaviour. Protective factors refer to those factors that seem to protect children from developing aggressive behaviour, drifting into offending, or from dropping out of school. (Some people prefer the term resilience e.g., South Africa, 1999). These are often (but not always) the opposite of risk factors - good parenting, a stable and supportive home environment, good school achievement, etc. (Farrington, 2000).

Thus, if we can strengthen family and individual capacities, if we can improve the ways in which schools deal with students, or local communities respond to young people, we increase the protective factors. This may help to reduce school drop-out, teen homelessness, depression and anxiety, drug and alcohol abuse, teen pregnancy, as well as offending and victimization. As the *Youth LifeStyles Survey* in England and Wales shows, these factors have longer term consequences up to the age of 30 (see box).

### Average Age of Onset of Problem Behaviours and Delinquency in Male Juveniles in the US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor problem behaviour</th>
<th>Moderately serious behaviour</th>
<th>Serious Crime</th>
<th>First Court Appearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Bilchick, 1998 and based on the *Pittsburgh Youth Study*).

### Risk factors for serious and/or persistent male offending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>12-17</th>
<th>18-30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used drugs in the past year</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used drugs at least once a month</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks at least 5x a week</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaffected from school</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truanted at least once a month</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from school</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications on leaving school</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent friends or acquaintances</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents rarely/never know whereabouts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangs around in public</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Campbell & Harrington, 2000)
On the basis of this knowledge, a number of experimental studies over the years have developed treatment and support programmes to reduce the risks of delinquency (Tremblay & Craig, 1995; ICPC, 1999a). These studies target high-risk groups with multiple risk factors. During the 1990s, there has been an enormous increase in influence in... the risk factor prevention paradigm. The basic idea...is very simple: identify the key risk factors for offending and implement prevention methods designed to counteract them. There is often a related attempt to identify key protective factors against offending and to implement prevention methods designed to enhance them. (Farrington, 2000: 1).

Carefully selected experimental groups receive treatment, and their progress is compared over a number of years with control groups with similar characteristics, but no special treatment intervention. Such studies have included projects with pre-schoolers, elementary and adolescent age groups, and focussed on e.g., improving parenting skills, reducing socially disruptive behaviour, or changing thinking patterns. They have been able to show some clear and impressive reductions in problem behaviours and delinquency, improved school attainment, better parent management skills, and in the long term, better employment levels for both young people and their parents. It is these kinds of studies that have added to knowledge of effective intervention strategies.

This work demonstrates, therefore, that risk factors can be turned into points for intervention and prevention by reducing risks and increasing protection. What these studies also show is that:

- the earlier the intervention, the more effective it is
- treatment that lasts a relatively long time is more effective and longer-lasting in effect than short interventions
- programmes targeting multiple problems are more effective than those dealing with only one risk factor

Risk and Protective Factors and Girls... and Minorities

Almost all longitudinal and experimental studies relating to offending in the past have excluded girls, usually on the grounds that there are too few of them. Such studies would have helped in the development of knowledge about what can be done to protect girls from becoming involved in offending and victimization. Similarly, the opportunity to understand why girls are less likely to use aggressive behaviour or offend and how that knowledge might also help prevent male offending, has been missed. This situation is now beginning to change.

Studies of adolescent girls and boys have shown that they have different sets of risk and protective factors. Girls generally have closer ties with their families and school, more parental expectations and controls, and spend less unsupervised time outside the home than boys, and these factors are closely linked.

The Canadian longitudinal survey (NLSCY) includes information on both boys and girls. Early findings up to the age of 11 suggest that when girls are rated as aggressive, although much less common than for boys, they are also more likely to come from families with poor parenting and conflict problems (Pepler & Sedighdeilami, 1998).
to their risk of offending (Riley & Shaw, 1985). For boys, spending considerable amounts of their time ‘hanging around’, poor school involvement, and having delinquent friends are all risk factors for offending.

In the British study of 14-25 year-olds (Graham & Bowling, 1995), the risk of offending for young women was reduced in their twenties as they found employment, partners, and had children. These protective factors were not relevant to young men in similar circumstances. For them, drinking, drug use and criminal friends were the main risk factors and over-rode the protective factors of relationships and jobs. (See also Campbell & Harrington, 2000). An international survey in 12 countries shows that boys use drugs slightly more than girls but they are much more likely to traffic in them (Killias & Ribeaud, 1999).

Little work has specifically looked at the risk and protective factors for minority groups, although this is also now beginning. An Australian study of Aboriginal pathways into crime finds forced removals from home, dependence, institutionalized racism, cultural factors and substance abuse are additional risk factors for those youth, while protective factors seem to be cultural resilience, strong kinship ties, and personal controls (Homel, Lincoln & Herd, 1999).

The kinds of offences, experiences of victimization, relationships to victims, and circumstances leading up to offences are often quite different for minority and majority populations. Aboriginal offenders in Canada, for example, are more likely to be victims of violence or to be charged with violent offences than are non-Aboriginals (Doob & Roberts, 1997). However, violent offending among Aboriginals is much less likely to involve strangers than that by non-Aboriginals, and tends to be associated with drinking.

Alcohol, associated with high levels of poverty and unemployment, plays a major role as a facilitator among indigenous populations. An Australian study of 14-19 years olds suggests that alcohol is embedded in the culture of rural Australia (Williams, 1999). By their early teens, many youths are using alcohol at a harmful rate and more than their urban contemporaries. Drug availability and guns have also been major facilitators of the increases in offending and victimization among minority youth in the US (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999).

Thus, since there are some marked differences in the types of crime, relationships to victims, and the circumstances and facilitators involved in offending between different ethnic groups, prevention programmes should be designed to take account of those factors, as well as being culturally appropriate.

**Targeted Programme Intervention**

As children grow older, additional sets of risk factors are added to earlier ones - poor school performance and school drop out, gang involvement, drugs, a poor local environment - so different preventive strategies are needed to target those new risk factors, as well as the use of approaches adapted to children’s ages and interests.
There is now clear evidence from experimental and research studies of effective intervention to prevent offending, victimization and other problems among young people. This relates to different stages of childhood and adolescence and targets the major risk areas of family, school, community, the individual, and peers. The table below summarizes some of the major types of preventive strategies, which have demonstrated a reduction in risk factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Measures</th>
<th>Risk factors reduced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Parenting programmes</td>
<td>· improve parental supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Family support</td>
<td>· reduce family conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Pre-school education</td>
<td>· reduce early school problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Foster-parent training &amp; supervision</td>
<td>· improve academic skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· improve family and youth relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· School organizational change</td>
<td>· improve school climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Whole school anti-bullying</td>
<td>· reduce truancy, disruptive behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Harassment, racism, sexism, anti-drug curriculum</td>
<td>· increase commitment and bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Mediation/conflict resolution training</td>
<td>· reduce bullying behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Family-school links</td>
<td>· reduce anti-social attitudes and behaviours, drug use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· improve conflict resolution skills, reduce escalation of conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· improve parental/school support and skills/reduce behaviour problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Youth groups, centres, sports and recreation</td>
<td>· reduce risky behaviours, increase skills, bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Summer holiday programmes</td>
<td>· reduce antisocial behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Outreach youth workers</td>
<td>· reduce antisocial behaviour, provide support to at risk youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Youth action groups</td>
<td>· reduce local disorder, crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early adolescence and peer groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Mentoring and education for at risk youth</td>
<td>· improve general abilities to function and develop good school, relations and leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Drug education projects</td>
<td>· reduce drug use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· After-school programmes, homework clubs</td>
<td>· improve school attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Gang prevention</td>
<td>· reduce unsupervised leisure time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· reduce risks of recruitment and offending, victimization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INVESTING IN YOUTH: INTERNATIONAL APPROACHES TO PREVENTING CRIME AND VICTIMIZATION

| Later adolescence | \(\text{Stay in school incentives} \) | \(\text{reduce drop out and unemployment} \) |
| \(\text{Work skills training} \) | \(\text{improve skills and qualifications} \) |
| \(\text{Teen parent programmes} \) | \(\text{improve child caring abilities, and education/work prospects} \) |
| \(\text{Peer support programmes} \) | \(\text{reduce isolation, homelessness} \) |
| \(\text{Youth foyers and housing projects} \) | \(\text{reduce risk of homelessness, crime and victimization} \) |
| \(\text{Wraparound projects for youths leaving care, custody} \) | \(\text{prevent homelessness, victimization, (re)offending} \) |

Examples of Effective Intervention Programmes

Examples of programmes that have been carefully evaluated to demonstrate their effectiveness in reducing offending and other social problems in each of these broad areas are given below. (See also Sherman, et al.,1997; ICPC, 1999a, and Thornton et al., 2000).

**Family Development**
These projects have generally shown the greatest effects since they meet the goal of early intervention. Most target children under 12, however their approach and techniques are also relevant to and used with young adolescents and their families.32

- *Functional Family Therapy* targets high-risk youth of 11-18 who have already been in trouble with the law and their families. It is also used for those released from custodial institutions. It began in the US twenty-five years ago and has been implemented in a number of other countries. The most recent evaluation in Sweden found that two years after the intervention, youths in the programme have a 30% lower rate of recidivism than those in a control group (Elliott, 1998).

**Schools**
Three main approaches have been developed and evaluated: projects that try to change school organization and ethos, whole school anti-bullying programmes, and family-school partnerships (see also ICPC, 2001).

- *Organizational Change.* Since the 1980s, a number of projects have shown that when classroom management, school organization and leadership are improved, there are reductions in school drop-out, truancy, and offending and improvements in educational attainment (Gottfredson, 2001). These projects have usually targeted schools in deprived areas and youth with poor educational skills and motivation. Changes to the school curriculum, using cognitive skill-based training to teach different behaviours, and providing special counsellors for children with multiple risk factors have all been shown to be effective. The PATHE secondary school project in the US found significant reductions in delinquency, drug use, suspensions, and punishments; furthermore, 76% of students in the
experimental schools graduated, compared with 42% in control schools (Catalano, et. al. 1998).

- **Whole School Anti-Bullying Programmes.** These were pioneered in Norway in over 40 schools by Olweus (1990) and combine a combination of approaches such as school rules about bullying behaviour, better playground supervision, anti-bullying classes as part of the curriculum, and encouraging reporting of victimization. They resulted in reductions of up to 50% in bullying behaviour and vandalism, and theft also decreased. Many other countries have developed similar schemes (Smith et al., 1999) e.g., England (Pitts & Smith, 1995) Canada (Pepler, et al., 1995) and Spain (Otrega, 1994). An evaluation of a programme in a UK secondary school showed a 13% reduction in bullying and changes in attitudes towards its use (Pitts & Smith, 1995).

- **Family-school partnerships.** These projects target high risk families and children and aim to reduce disruptive behaviour using a combination of school and home support, training and intervention such as parenting skills and social skills training for children, a home-school phone line and family co-ordinators who provide continuing family support. *Include* is a national charity running 100 projects in the UK to prevent truancy, school drop-outs or excluded teenagers aged 14-16. It aims to reintegrate them or provide further education, qualifications, and work experience. (Crime Concern, 1998a). Average attendance rates of 80% have been achieved and 75% of the involved youth have gone on to further education, training or work.

**Early Adolescence and Peers**

- **Incentives to complete school:** e.g., *Quantum Opportunities Programme* (QOP) is a demonstration project in five US cities, which began in1989, to reduce school drop-out and marginalization. The project offered after-school activities to at-risk youth, for which they were paid, and a matched contribution to a college fund account, together with peer tutoring and homework assistance, computer instruction, college and family skills, job planning and community service. Compared with a matched control group, the youths in the programme were more likely to graduate from high school (63% v. 42%), enroll in post secondary education (42% v. 16%), and were less likely to report being arrested (17% v. 58%) (ICPC, 1999a).

- **Mentoring and education programmes** have been developed very successfully e.g., in the US, England, New Zealand (Baldwin & Garry, 1997; Ave, et al., 1999). *Big Brothers, Big Sisters of America* is a US mentoring programme for 6-18 year-olds usually from single-parent households (McGill, 1997). There are 500 agencies across the country and an evaluation of youth in mentoring relationships shows they were 46% less likely to start drug use, 27% alcohol use, almost a third less likely to use violence, and had better peer and family relations and academic achievement than a control group not in the programme. Crime Concern in England began a similar programme for at-risk 11-14 year-olds and their parents in 1997.

**Later Adolescence**
Many projects for older adolescents focus on getting them back into education, training and work, and into safe housing, or easing the transition into adulthood.

- **Gaining work experience** helps young people get jobs e.g., *Job Corps* is an American programme that began in the 1960s for disadvantaged youth of 16-24. A residential programme in over 100 centres, it offers education, qualifications, trade training, counselling, health care and job placement. After two years out of the programme, participants were one third less likely to have been arrested than youths not in the programme. An evaluation of *Youth Service Corps*, which provides a similar non-residential programme for very disadvantaged youth, found that participants were significantly more likely to get jobs and less likely to be arrested (Rosenbaum, 1998).

- *'Mentoring-plus'* has also been successful with 15-18 year-olds. The *Dalston Youth Project* (Benioff, 1997) in England is an intensive community-based mentoring project for the most disadvantaged youths, established in 1994. It aims to reduce crime and risky behaviour by helping youth back into education, training and work. It uses community volunteers who work with them for a year, as well as provides a special pre-college course and employment training. An evaluation has shown that 73% of those who went through the first programme were in college, training or employment, and arrests were reduced by 61%.

*Community Programmes*

These are usually targeted to high-risk areas and populations.

- *Boys and Girls Clubs of America* is a national non-profit organization, with over 2,340 clubs in the US serving three million 6-18 year-olds. It targets disadvantaged populations in inner cities, public housing, American-Indian reserves, minority (59% of club members) and single-parent families. Clubs provide a wide range of services including family support, mentoring, gang prevention, and teen centres for older youth. Recent evaluation of public housing areas with clubs shows a 13% reduction in delinquency, a 22% reduction in drug activity and 25% drop in crack cocaine activity. Those participating in a homework and tutoring support programme, *Project Learn*, in the clubs had 87% fewer school absences (Schinke, et al., 1991; 1999).

- A good example of a comprehensive summer holiday project, which targeted areas with poor environment, and families and young people at varying levels of risk, is the Bristol *SPLASH!* project in the UK. A multi-agency partnership scheme on a high risk public housing estate, it provided sports and recreation for 250 young people during school holidays, targeted 25 of those most at-risk youths with outdoor field trips, and gave social services support to 17 families experiencing serious difficulties with an adolescent. In addition, situational measures were introduced such as improved building security, lighting and fencing to reduce crime. Crime rates on the estate dropped by 29% during the summer in the year it was run and housing department repairs by 50%, compared with the previous summer. Burglary and theft from cars fell by 64% and 68% (Crime Concern, 1997).
Other Types of Intervention Programmes

Apart from these examples of effective and focused interventions, other recent trends in intervention that use a risk-protective focus include the development of wraparound programmes and comprehensive community programmes.

Wraparound Programmes

These are community-based programmes designed for vulnerable or at-risk individuals and their families. They are used to co-ordinate services and support for families and young people with multiple and chronic needs (Malysiak, 1997). They focus on strengths rather than weaknesses, on collaboration and client involvement in decisions, and on preventive strategies that utilize local agencies and services more effectively. This approach is now being developed for work with at-risk adolescents and those coming out of care or custody, in programmes e.g., in the US, the UK, the Netherlands and Canada. In New Zealand, the Support Worker Demonstration Project is a ‘wraparound’ service using caseworkers and local services to provide a range of recreational, skills training, and confidence-building activities, together with parental support and training, and individual caseworker support for 5-14 year-olds (Shepherd & Maxwell, 1999). The projects successfully met the key objectives of identifying at-risk youth, improving school attendance and behaviour at school and home, and reducing offending. In Canada, Multi-Systemic Therapy, an intensive form of wraparound programme developed in the US, is currently being piloted (1997-2001) in Ottawa and three other communities in Ontario under the co-ordination of the London Family Court Clinic. It works with high-risk children and youth and their families.

Comprehensive Programmes

In the 1990s, what are termed comprehensive community programmes have been developed. These are risk-focused programmes within a community (e.g., a city, neighbourhood, or public housing complex). Communities That Care in Seattle, Washington began in 1988 (Wong, et al., 1996). It is modelled on community public-health programmes developed to reduce illnesses such as heart disease (Hawkins & Catalano, 1992). Its main goals are to reduce delinquency and drug use, and it combines knowledge about risk and protective factors and effective interventions with carefully planned community mobilization. This brings together a community board of key local leaders, residents, and agencies. They undertake an assessment of the key risk and protective factors and develop a strategy for intervention i.e., a series of programmes to suit their needs based on knowledge about what has been effective. Similar programmes are now being developed in the UK (Nuttall, et al., 1998) Scotland and the Netherlands (Junger-Tas, 1997) as well as all states in the US.

In 1993 the US also funded the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders (Wilson & Howell, 1993). This recognized that only a small proportion of children become serious offenders, and that early intervention prevention programmes targeting the key risk factors and individuals can be effective. Its principles are to strengthen the family, school and other social institutions working with youth, promoting prevention as a cost-effective approach, intervening immediately and effectively, and identifying those most at risk. The second component of the strategy emphasises ‘graduated’ sanctions and treatment to rehabilitate those in the justice
system. Based on evaluation of effective programmes in the project, detailed guidelines for assessing needs and developing a comprehensive strategy have been published (Howard, 1995).

Another major initiative is the Comprehensive Communities Programme (CCP) that began as a demonstration programme in 16 cities in 1994. Its rationale is that co-ordinating resources at local, state, and national government levels and in the private sector is the most effective way to develop effective prevention programmes. Many of the sites have developed community youth programmes including Boys and Girls Clubs, sports and leisure, job training, and youth and family counselling (Kelling, et al., 1998). Local and national evaluations of the programme are in progress.

In England and Wales, Youth Include is a comprehensive programme being developed around the families, schools, and communities of the most disaffected 13-16 year-olds in about 50 deprived housing estates. (See the next section and the accompanying Internet Annex for information on some of these projects).

Costs and Benefits

The costs of dealing with youth offending are enormous. Over $488 million a year is spent in Canada on the youth justice system. This says nothing about the immediate costs to victims, businesses, or the families of offenders. Nor does it deal with the long-term costs for all concerned.

In Jack’s Troubled Career (Hepworth, 1997), the author estimates that up to $511,500Cdn will have been spent by the time a chronic and persistent offender reaches the age of 18. Most of it will have been spent since the age of ten on an uncoordinated series of interventions including welfare, special education, psychological services, police investigations, court appearances, group homes, and open and closed custody. From his infancy when he began to show problems in development, Jack now seems established for an adult criminal career, complete with all the huge social, psychological, and economic costs that it will entail.

The costs of adolescent crime have also been estimated in the US (Cohen, 1998). This study calculated the costs of a high-risk youth dropping out of school, including costs of juvenile and adult careers in crime for the justice system and for victims, lost wages and productivity, and the health and other costs of drug abuse. A total loss of $2.2-$3millionUS is estimated and, as before, this excludes other costs to victims, families, and local communities and intangible costs such as emotional costs, increased fear, and decreased quality of life (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>$1.5 - 1.8million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>$200,000 - 448,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school drop out</td>
<td>$470,000 - 750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total loss</td>
<td>$2.2-$3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of studies have calculated the economic benefits of social prevention programmes (ICPC, 1999a). It has been estimated that youth programmes for 12-18 year-olds in the US, such as *Job Corps* and *Quantum Opportunities*, produced benefits of $1.45US and $3.68US respectively for every $1 invested. Compared with the criminal justice system and other costs of offending and victimization, these programmes clearly are highly cost-effective.
Summing it up: What Research on Risk and Protective Factors Tells Us

- young people face different risk factors at different stages of their development
- interventions need to be targeted to these different stages
- the earlier the intervention, the greater the impact
- risk factors are cumulative - those exposed to many at an early age are likely to develop other problems later including offending behaviour - although this is not inevitable
- those with multiple risk factors tend to live in high-risk areas
- comprehensive programmes that target multiple risk factors are likely to be more effective than single interventions
- interventions need to take account of gender, ethnic, and cultural differences and needs
- interventions that have long- as well as short-term goals are likely to be more effective
- interventions that are based in community partnerships are needed to achieve these goals
- such approaches have been proven as effective in reducing offending and other problems, in improving the quality of life of those involved, and as being cost-effective

Historically, our society has been unwilling to fully endorse the idea of flexible, individualized, intensive, and professional services because of the cost and time implications. In the long run, however, effective prevention programmes should be substantially cheaper than what we have now...

Overall, therefore, the goal of preventive programmes with 12-18 year-olds is to reduce risk factors, to strengthen protective factors or resilience, and to reduce the opportunities for offending and victimization.
Section III. Strategic Approaches

National Strategies and Initiatives

This section highlights recent developments and specific strategies concerned with the prevention of youth crime and victimization in a number of countries. An increasing trend is the development of national strategic plans to tackle youth offending through social prevention. These are often developed through a crime prevention body located in a national or federal government department and responsible for the development of an overall crime prevention strategy (see ICPC, 1999a and the Internet Annex for more information).

In Canada, the National Crime Prevention Centre plays a leadership role in the development of strategies to prevent crime by and against youth. (See Introduction.) Children and youth constitute two of the Centre's four priority target groups. There are also important aspects of the third (personal security of girls and women) and fourth priority target groups (Aboriginal peoples and communities) that support this work. The Centre has, within the child and youth areas, identified certain key problems and specific behaviours for focused attention. The Centre is seeking to draw on all components of the National Strategy on Community Safety and Crime Prevention so that its policy role, research findings and program experience can be most effectively directed. One key strategic focus is on schools, and this sector's vital role in fostering crime prevention generally, and in promoting school safety specifically. Sexual exploitation of children, and child witnessing of violence are also areas of emphasis. Another key area of focus bridges children and youth, and seeks to mobilize communities to support those children whose conflicts with police, school authorities and others place them at high risk of entering Canada's youth justice system once they attain the minimum age of criminal responsibility, which is 12 years old. This work is a key component of the Youth Justice Renewal Initiative that is underway, as prevention is one of the three main pillars of reform.

The National Crime Prevention Centre is also working collaboratively within the federal sphere, and with Provinces and Territories on other national priorities such as homelessness and fetal alcohol syndrome/effect, which are led by other ministries nationally. The Centre has provided funding to support projects on these and other issues identified by communities. Outlines of all funded projects can be found on the NCPC Web site (organized by Province or Territory, and target group).

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (Canada's national police force) has also identified youth as a strategic priority in 1999, and launched the National Youth Strategy in 2000. The RCMP objectives in this area are to deal effectively with young people who commit offences, and to focus on preventing criminal behaviour among youth by addressing with community partners the root causes of crime. In this context, the RCMP is engaging youth at national and community levels, and supporting youth involvement in making healthy lifestyle choices.

Australia
Australia established (what is now called) National Crime Prevention in 1994 in the Attorney General’s Department. It works in equal partnership with State and Territorial governments as well as with the National Anti-Crime Strategy. Recent initiatives include two detailed studies of current practice and recommended approaches for preventing youth crime. These focus on youth in public spaces and youth homelessness (NCP, 1999a & b). Developing programmes that respond to the needs of the Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander, and recent immigrant youth populations is a particular concern. There is a strong emphasis on partnerships with local governments, non-government, academic, business, and community groups and on developing programmes that are holistic, community-based, and involve young people directly. Two other national initiatives are also specifically concerned with this age group: The National Campaign Against Violence and Crime (NCAVAC) and The Australian Youth Foundation (AYF) Social Intervention Strategy. A recent summit brought together young men to consider their personal experiences of violence and what they felt needed to change to prevent it (Cameron, 2000).

Denmark, Finland, Norway, & Sweden
In Nordic countries, there is a strong emphasis on social and health policy in crime prevention, with the primary focus on preventing marginalization and exclusion, rather than just preventing crime (Takala, 1999). Community crime prevention at the municipal level has been part of the Danish response to youth crime since 1971 when its National Crime Prevention Council was set up, establishing local school, social service, and police committees (SSPs). These 275 municipal committees bring together social, health, education, and recreation services with the police to develop local projects and strategies (Kyvsgaard 1996 in Pfeiffer, 1998). These provide a range of universal programmes and leisure activities but there is now increasing focus on at-risk youth and areas such as satellite towns, as well as on individual programmes for marginalized youth.

Sweden also has a long-established national crime prevention council and a strong emphasis on project development through local partnerships. Norway has pioneered whole-school bullying programmes, and Finland has undertaken extensive police-city partnerships to reduce social exclusion. Overall, there is a strong emphasis on the problems of exclusion - and the dangers of crime prevention approaches which exclude young people, and weaken a community’s capacity to deal with problems (Takala, 1999).

England and Wales
In England and Wales, significant changes in policy and practice relating to youth offending have occurred. A major report on youth crime, Misspent Youth (The Audit Commission, 1996), recommended a shift in focus from processing young offenders through the justice system, to dealing with their behaviour and its causes. In particular, it recommended shifting resources from the Youth Justice System to proactive, preventive work with children and young people at risk of offending; better co-ordination between local authority agencies in developing preventive work; and targeting deprived areas with high crime rates by using carefully evaluated pilot projects.
The Social Exclusion Unit was set up by the government to investigate the problems of excluded areas and communities across the country, but also to encourage greater co-ordination between government ministries. The Unit has developed a national strategy to tackle social exclusion, of which prevention projects for children and youth form a major part (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998). Youth Include (see box) is one of these major initiatives, and also forms part of the government’s Crime Reduction Strategy. The Unit has completed a series of 18 Policy Action Team reports, including one on Young People, which form the basis for developing local community-based strategies over a range of interrelated problems including housing, schools, employment, and health.

All local authorities and the police are now responsible for developing multi-agency Community Safety Partnerships. They are to conduct a safety audit and develop a planned strategy to deal with crime problems in their area which must also incorporate a Youth Action Group. Youth Action groups are part of another national initiative to involve young people directly in community safety activities, usually around a local problem such as drug use or bullying. Community safety partnerships are also supported by a number of other funded national programmes targeting education and health, jobs, parenting, and truancy and exclusion. There is an overall emphasis on working horizontally, both at the national level between ministries and at the local level through partnerships - what is referred to in the UK as ‘joined-up-thinking’.

France

Since 1945, France has placed a strong emphasis on education and prevention, rather than punishment, in dealing with youth offending (Blatier, 1999). In the 1980s, a new strategic approach to preventing youth crime through city initiatives was developed and led to the creation of a National Crime Prevention Council in 1982 (ICPC, 1999a). Emphasising community consultation, this facilitated the development of a network of local and departmental crime prevention councils across the country. They have been responsible for a range of prevention projects for adolescents which stress social prevention, funded by the national government through a system of contracts with cities. Local mayors, schools, and other local professional and community organizations now work together rather than independently and, among other programmes, provide a range of youth projects for holiday periods. The holiday programme Operation Summer Prevention (Opération prévention été), which has been co-ordinated nationally, expanded considerably e.g., over 280,000 young people living in poor urban areas were involved in 1992 (CNDV, 1992).

In response to two major enquiries, a system of local security contracts was established in 1997 by the national government to create stronger local problem-solving partnerships. The contracts require the creation of 15,000 new security and 20,000 social mediation jobs which will be filled primarily by youth from disadvantaged areas where levels of unemployment are high. The role of the latter is to work in locations where conflicts often arise, such as around schools and in public

Youth Include is a multiple intervention package targeting at-risk 13-16 year-olds in highly deprived areas (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000). Up to 70 such schemes will be developed by local youth action teams under the management of the Youth Justice Board. They aim to reduce neighbourhood crime, school exclusion, and truancy through interventions with the school, family and community, modelled on successful interventions developed elsewhere.
places, to defuse and mediate disputes. Some 720 local security contracts now exist. Belgium has also adopted the city contract system to finance local prevention projects targeting youth, including the training of young people for social mediation jobs.

In France a new national policy on youth offending has also been established. This outlines clear responsibilities for families and schools, including: emphasising parental responsibility for children and providing support to high risk families; reinforcing the preventive role of all schools; improving youth employment opportunities and youth employability; developing youth cultural and sporting activities; countering the negative impact of the media; ensuring a systematic, quick and clear response to delinquent behaviour and greater co-ordination between ministries at all levels.

Germany
Responding to concerns about increasing youth crime after reunification, rapid increases in immigration and the marginalization of minority youth, there is considerable activity within States as well as at the federal level. The Federal Youth Ministry has established a Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Office at the German Youth Institute. It also initiated 25 model projects which target youth prevention across the country to stimulate local initiatives. These include ‘sports and safety’, ‘living on the streets’, and action programmes against aggression and violence. Over 100 model projects are now in operation, and networking and community collaboration is being encouraged. A number of States and cities have established youth prevention programmes such as the Wetzlar Model project to reduce violence and crime in schools, developed by a police-school-community partnership in Giessen, Hesse. The report on a recent German-Dutch conference on ‘Youth at Risk’ illustrates policies, strategies and programmes which target youth (Bendit, Erler, Neiborg & Schäfer, 2000) and the growing European network on youth crime prevention.

The Netherlands
Three national departments are concerned with youth crime prevention in the Netherlands and there has been a long history of developing targeted crime prevention projects involving youth through local partnerships in cities. An initiative to reduce youth violence was announced in 1998. The strategy focuses on reducing social exclusion and improving healthy development among ethnic minority youth; a structured programme of action to prevent school drop-out and unemployment for at-risk youth; and a healthy start programme for children and youth. An Integral Programme on Safety and Security was established in 1999 based on the concept of co-operation at the central, provincial, and municipal levels, across agencies, and with community and business groups. Youth and safety forms one of its specific themes.

New Zealand
Since the 1980s, there has been a strong movement to develop preventive alternatives for youth offending in New Zealand because of the heavy over-representation of Maori and other indigenous youth in the welfare and juvenile justice systems. The 1989 Children, Young Persons and their Families Act emphasizes both social and criminal justice responses. The use of family group conferencing based on traditional Maori dispute resolution for welfare and justice issues has inspired many other countries, including Canada, to use restorative approaches with young people.
includes their use in resolving school conflicts, family violence and child protection issues, as well as justice interventions.

The National Crime Prevention Unit was established in 1993 modelled on the French contract approach, setting up a network of 62 Safer Community Councils (SCCs) (Hamilton, 1999). In 1996, a series of targeted demonstration projects for children of 5-14 at risk of offending was launched by the Council. They target children not currently involved in the justice system who meet the criteria for being ‘at-risk’ in terms of family, psychological, social and demographic indicators. A multiple, holistic programme approach is seen as more likely to be effective for ‘at-risk’ youth than a single programme. The demonstration projects (including mentoring, support workers, and teen parent education) are nationally funded in up to six sites across the country. The implementation of the projects has been evaluated, but long-term outcomes are not yet available (Ave, et al., 1999; Shepherd & Maxwell, 1999; O'Regan Lynch, 1999). The initial evaluations illustrate the importance of adapting programmes to local circumstances and needs.

A new Youth Services Strategy, announced in 1999, will focus on co-ordinated inter-agency and community-based action to prevent youth offending and re-offending. This will include targeting resources to high-risk populations, dealing with care and protection needs, as well as with offending, and providing intensive wraparound services and a continuum of care.

**South Africa**
South Africa established a National Crime Prevention Council in 1995 which sets national and provincial priorities but with local government as the main level of planning. There is a strong emphasis on community control, co-ordination across agencies, and working in partnership with the community. Interpersonal violence between young men is a priority area. A joint intervention strategy on school violence has recently been set up by the Department of Education, the National Youth Commission, and the Secretariat for Safety and Security: Youth Violence in Schools (1999/2000). The initiative argues that youth violence in schools is changeable - and requires a three-pronged approach: tackling the underlying causes, reducing the ‘space’ for violence within the school, and more effective deterrence.

**United States**
No single government organization is responsible for crime prevention in the US but federal leadership in youth prevention comes primarily from two sectors of the Department of Justice. The Bureau of Justice Administration (BJA) provides major project and research funding and training and technical assistance to state and local governments and community justice agencies. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) provides similar funding. Its Special Emphasis Division funds replications of projects which have been successfully developed elsewhere. Much recent BJA and OJJDP funding for youth crime prevention is in partnership with other federal departments, state and local governments, and private foundations.

Responding to the large rise in youth violence, crack cocaine activity, and inner-city deterioration in the late 1980s, there has been a shift towards social crime prevention. Youth offending is seen as a public health and social problem which can be influenced strategically by developing preventive
approaches rather than legal ones. Such approaches focus on poverty, lack of educational opportunities, unemployment, and racial inequalities (Bilchik, 1999). Funding programmes include family support services for vulnerable youth (e.g., teen pregnancies and teen parents); community youth programmes (targeting schools, peers, and neighbourhoods); and programmes directed at specific groups such as American-Indian youth and inner-city minorities or specific issues such as drugs, serious and violent offenders, and school violence. Responding to recent school violence, for example, a national demonstration project *Safe School Healthy Students* was funded by OJJDP in 1999 in 54 schools.

**Summary**

These national strategies are closely linked to state, provincial, regional, and local strategies. Overall, they have a number of characteristics:

- not just ‘top down’ but also ‘bubble-up’ approaches - funding from government for ideas developed by communities on the ground
- encouraging partnerships both vertically (federal, state, municipal) and horizontally (between government ministries, agencies, community organizations, business partners)
- both single issue projects and those which target multiple social problems
- pilot and demonstration projects to test ideas and impacts
- careful replication across a number of sites
- technical assistance and training
- careful project design and implementation
- good monitoring and evaluation

Middle levels of government have begun to develop their own strategies, as have city associations such as the *Federation of Canadian Municipalities* (FCM), the *Conseil national des villes et du développement social urbain*, and the *European Forum on Urban Safety*. New South Wales, Australia, for example, surveyed all local councils on youth consultation and developed a check-list for consultation and participation with young people. Queensland, Australia has developed its own guide to policy, planning, and participation involving young people at the local government level (1997). In Canada, the Waterloo Region Community Safety and Crime Prevention Council conducted a comprehensive *Youth Survey* to assess the needs and experiences of local young people (McClinchey, 1997).
Section IV. Working with 12-18 year-olds

Targeting age and development

As this report has outlined:

- Young people generally reach the most crime-prone age in adolescence. We know that most of those who become involved in offending during this period will cease their activities as they grow older. Yet they are still at a vulnerable juncture in their lives which makes preventive programmes an excellent investment.

- Youth at risk - of both victimization and offending - include those living in areas of poor social and economic conditions, both rural and urban, and those in disruptive family circumstances. They include those likely to be identified early in their lives as having a number of developmental difficulties, and others living in high-risk environments, or who develop problems with parents and schooling as they reach adolescence.

- Youth in care, those with mental or physical health concerns, and homeless youth are especially likely to be at risk of victimization and offending in adolescence. As a sub-set of those at risk, their early childhood development will have shown clear indications of distress, disadvantage, and disruption.

- Youth already involved in the justice system have the greatest likelihood of re-offending. They present a major challenge and opportunity to the community in terms of pre- and post-sentence planning and support, especially for those returning from custodial institutions.

Thus, within the 12-18 youth population both universal and specific programmes and strategies need to be developed which are appropriate to:

- age and development
- gender
- ethnic and cultural background
- levels of risk
- specific needs
This section provides examples of promising programmes from a number of countries which are universal, or target specific ‘at-risk’ groups, specific populations such as girls and ethnic and cultural minorities, or particular crime problems. They have varying potential to prevent offending, victimization, and social exclusion. Many of the projects overlap in the sense that they cater for more than one group, or have a number of aims and use multiple types of intervention. Additional information on some of these approaches and practical guides will be found in the Annex to this report, which is available on the Internet. Information on school safety and school violence prevention can be found in an ICPC monograph for the US Bureau of Justice Assistance (2001) and other projects in the ICPCs best practice compendium, 100 Crime Prevention Programs to Inspire Action Across the World (ICPC, 1999b). A US guide Best Practice of Youth Violence Prevention: A Sourcebook for Community Action (Thornton et al., 2000) provides other examples.

**Key features of intervention programmes for 12-18 year-olds**

Some of the key requirements for working with young people are:

- involving young people themselves
- stressing strengths rather than weaknesses
- setting clear objectives and goals
- expecting problems but having strategies to deal with them

**Youth and Public Space**

Much youth activity and crime takes place in public space such as shopping malls, downtown cores, parks, and on public transport. It is often highly visible. For other people, it can contribute to feelings of insecurity. There may be fears expressed by the elderly, women, parents concerned about the safety of their children, minority groups, or local residents and businesses.

There may be general concerns about the presence of young people in shopping centres or public parks. They may include activities such as skating and skateboarding in public space or more specific concerns about litter and graffiti, harassment, vandalism, shoplifting, or alcohol and drug use. Considerable work in Australia (White, 1998; NCP, 1999b; Cameron, 2000) and in England and Wales (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998; Policy Action Team, 1999) has been done to explore the following issues:

- the increasing privatization and commercialization of public space e.g., shopping malls
- the exclusion of young people or their over-policing (e.g., by police or security guards)
- the recognition that young people also have rights to access and use public and commercial space

When street youth in Canada were asked how police could best respond to them they placed ‘great emphasis on the human relationships between the police officer and young persons. Mutual respect is highlighted by most as the fundamental core of any relationship between police and youth gang/group members.’

(Mathews quoted in Beare, et al., 1996).
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- the need to plan and design public and private space with youth needs, as well as those of local residents and business, in mind and to establish rules for management and maintenance, as well as intervention
- the importance of providing for the interests of diverse groups and the specific needs of special groups (e.g., young women, ethnic minorities)
- the importance of including young people in the planning of such developments

Youth Design - Involving Young People Directly in Programme Development

Involving young people themselves in the diagnosis of problems and the construction of plans and projects is essential. There are a number of important reasons for doing so:

- as Crime Concern points out, young people know far more about crime in their area than most adults
- it is essential to understand youth points of view and concerns, especially if they feel victimized or excluded
- young people have rights to use public space as members of the community
- when allowed input, interventions are more likely to respond to the interests of young people
- young people have a lot of energy, time, and commitment
- young people have particular insights into the way services work (e.g. youth in care)

Some clear guidelines for developing youth-inclusive plans are laid out e.g., in the Australian guide Public Spaces for Young People (White, 1998) and in Crime Concern’s guide, Reducing Neighbourhood Crime (1998a). Young people can be consulted through youth clubs, in schools, on the street, and in places where they hang out such as shopping malls and clubs. This can be done in groups or individually; using surveys, informal taped discussions, or video cameras; and by young people themselves or ‘unattached’ street youth workers.

A number of youth projects have used a Youth Forum to consult young people or have ongoing youth panels as part of city and local authority councils. Reaching marginalized and homeless young people, Aboriginal youth and minority groups, as well as consulting girls specifically, are especially important. Canadian examples of consultation with young people include the National Youth in Care Partnership, the youth representative on the Yukon Advisory Management Committee for the Canadian Mobilization Fund, and the National Youth

Young people know much more about local crime problems than most adults.

The Youth Spaces Consultation Project in Launceston City, Tasmania used Forums, questionnaire surveys, ‘out-and-about’ stalls, and a video camera to seek the views of young people on the use of public spaces. This resulted in a Youth Advisory Council, a Youth Development Officer, and a range of facilities from sports to under-age activities, a youth service centre and a café. (White, 1998)
Forum in March 2000 in Vancouver, which was designed and run by youth with experience in sex trade (CCSD, 2000a).

Projects in Public Spaces

The kinds of public space projects developed using these approaches respond to many of the problems of vandalism, shop theft, and incivility experienced in commercial centres. They include creative use of existing places, art and drama projects in public space, planning transport to meet young people’s needs, commercial site management, and new project development. All projects involve young people directly in their development and implementation. Examples include:

- **Project X**, South Australia: An outdoor performance project for 13-25 year-olds developed and performed by local young people, including minority and excluded youth (White, 1998).

- **Champs by the River**, South Australia: The project consulted young people on their mental health needs. This led to the development of a recreation centre for 13-18 year-olds that was safe, free, and alcohol-free. They took part in its design and construction, which also gave them a sense of ownership and belonging (White, 1998).

- **Glebe Re-Development**, NSW: A new development complex designed with extensive youth consultation resulting in e.g., a specific youth budget, a full-time youth services coordinator, a youth worker, and a youth space/meeting place and protocols (White, 1998).

- **Steering Committee of Youth**, Damme Belgium: A local community partnership established to deal with youth crime and insecurity among residents. It conducted a local safety audit, consulting residents and local youth on problems and solutions, both of which were developed collaboratively. ‘The insecurity in this district has completely disappeared.’ (ECPA, 1999).

- **Mission locales**, France: Youth training centres for 16-25 year-olds that have been developed by young people themselves through government grants and contracts with local professional workers and employers (Policy Action Team, 1999).

Youth Action Groups
These have been successfully developed e.g., in the UK (around 1200 now exist), Canada and the US. In British Columbia, Youth Action Teams have been established in more than 65 communities with eight regional co-ordinators (NCPC, 1997). They foster peer mentorship, conflict resolution and community leadership, and undertake anti-violence projects, youth forums, neighbourhood clean-ups, etc.

In the UK, Youth Action Teams are now part of all local authority safety plans. Crime Concern has worked with community partners (including business partners) to develop 1,200 groups involving 20,000 young people. They aim to empower young people to take action on issues such as bullying, personal safety and travel, drugs, vandalism and shoplifting. This helps not only to reduce crime problems, but also to develop new friendships, increasing their confidence, self-esteem, counselling, organization or presentation skills, and their knowledge and awareness. A national Youth Action Network has also been established to provide advice, support, information, and certification to local teams (Crime Concern, 1998b).

**Targeting Girls**

- *Girls in Space* (White, 1998), Australia: This project consulted young women about their use of, and concerns about, public space. They felt they had less leisure-time satisfaction than young men, partly because they were more restricted by parents, but also because young men tended to dominate recreational space and activities. They also reported fear and risk of victimization, which curbed their access to public space.

- *Boys and Girls Clubs of America* has developed some programmes specifically for girls, including a specially funded sports programme (‘Nike Girls Sports’), and ‘Smart Girls’ for 10-15 year-olds. Smart Girls provides health, fitness, and prevention education. It is designed to encourage girls to develop healthy life-styles and attitudes through adolescence and to enhance their self-esteem.

- *TERF (Training and Employment Resources for Females)*, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada: A community-based programme to help young women move from the streets by providing substance abuse counselling, housing, skills training, and work experience (NCPC, 1997).

- *Adolescent Sexuality and Pregnancy Prevention Programme*, US: A programme set up by the Children’s Aid Society in 1985 and now operating in 20 states. It starts at age 12 and continues through high school. It integrates sexuality and family life education with academic support, health and career training, counselling, sports and a guarantee of college admission for those completing the programme. Community groups receive training and support to develop the programme, usually within an existing youth organization or

The Dufferin Mall project in Toronto was a local partnership programme to reclaim the shopping mall and reduce insecurity and delinquency. It included improved policing and security to develop changes in behaviour, alterations to the mall layout, and youth programmes offering storefront counselling and community supports to ‘at-risk’ youths and their families. Shoplifting fell by 38% from 1991 levels after the programme was established (Hall, 1997).
programme. Evaluation shows young women in the programme have a 1 in 25 risk of teenage pregnancy, compared with the average of 1 in 10, and have higher school and college rates than their peers.

· Youville Centre, Ottawa, Canada: The Centre has been in existence for over ten years and is now being evaluated as an Investment Fund project. Clients are teenage mothers and their children living in poverty and isolation, often with experience of physical and emotional abuse, subject to child protection intervention and/or conflict with the law. It provides shelter and a range of educational, counselling and parenting support programmes for teenage mothers. Legal aid, access to pediatric and general health care and other support services are also made available.

· Prevention and Early Intervention of Sexually Exploited Children and Youth Project, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: This Investment Fund project targets 12-18 year-olds, primarily girls, newly recruited into, or at risk of entering, prostitution. A Youth Outreach Operations Team (which includes an Aboriginal member) offers immediate resources to youth, ranging from secure housing, counselling and support, substance abuse programmes and health treatment to training, education, and employment. It also liases with youth courts to provide protection for those at risk and provides information to youth, schools, social workers and others on sex trade recruitment.

Other projects include educational packs and US school curriculum programmes on gender equity e.g., Raising the Grade (Education Development Centre, 1998), or violence against women as part of whole school bullying prevention programmes e.g., a teaching kit developed for secondary schools in Montreal, Quebec, Trousse de prévention de la violence au secondaire (Philippe-Pinel, 1996).

Meeting Minority Needs

The primary requirement for projects targeting minority groups is inclusion of young people themselves as well as the involvement of their own communities. In Germany, there is an attempt to embed projects in minority communities using an inter-cultural focus that recognizes the reality of their lives rather than seeing minority youth projects as ‘education for foreigners’ (Bendit, et al., 2000).

· Stop the Violence, Frankfurt, Germany: Developed in 1992 following confrontation between Turkish, Moroccan and African-American youths from a US military compound. US administrators, the Turkish community, and the City Council developed workshops run by professional musicians to produce rap texts about the lives of the migrant and minority youths. Numerous stage performances for youth are given and inter-group violence is declining (Bendit, et al., 2000).
· **OuttaSpace Youth Speak**, Adelaide, South Australia: Resulting from findings and recommendations given in the youth survey: a strategic plan and youth forum were set up, a ‘perceptions and reality’ booklet to break barriers, a police-youth services protocol, a youth reconciliation project to reduce ethnic intolerance, youth panel in police training programmes, and dedicated facilities and performance space (White, 1998).

· **Cyber Café**, Northern Territory, Australia: Established and managed by youth, it is an Internet site at a high school that acts as an actual or virtual drop-in centre after school hours for isolated rural youth. It has involved computer and network training, management skills, development of a project booklet, a newsletter, and the ‘linking-up’ Aboriginal schools (White, 1998).

· **Hip-Hop Writing Workshops**, Gent, Belgium: These target groups of 12-23 year-olds (most are of North African origin) who are at-risk. It is a three-phase project to write and develop, record, and market their own CDs, as well as perform their work in public. It has two full-time staff (Poisson, 1998).

· **U-Turn**, Sydney, Australia: This project worked with Indo-Chinese minority youth. It developed activities, a peer ‘buddy’ system, and targeted 23 of the most at-risk youths and their families for casework, counselling, mentoring, and skills and behaviour training.

· **Vietnamese Community Association, Western Australia** (VCAWA): Set up in response to heavy involvement of young Vietnamese youth in substance abuse, offending, and school drop out, as well as conflict between Western culture and parental expectations. A Vietnamese youth worker works with the local youth agency and police. They have developed a multi-agency strategy, primarily for 13-18 year-olds at risk, to break down cultural barriers and distrust between youth, police, and professionals and to integrate youth into work training or employment (Policy Action Report, 1999).

· **Nieuwe Perspectieven**, Amsterdam, the Netherlands: The project works with at-risk youth mainly of Moroccan, Surinam, and Turkish origin to get them back into school or work, stabilize family situations, and provide positive leisure-time pursuits. Clients are matched with a youth worker, usually of similar ethnic background, who works with them intensively and is available on a 24-hour basis, seven days a week. After developing a good relationship, plans are developed with focus on the strengths of the clients, working collaboratively to resolve basic problems such as debts or housing, as well as initiating longer-term projects. Links are made with other young people who act as supporters after the youth worker phase ends. A network of youth workers has now been established to support each other (Bendit, et al., 2000).

**Targeting Specific Crime Problems**

*Gangs and Violence*
A number of anti-gang programmes have been developed in the US (Howell, 1998) and elsewhere that focus on reducing adolescent entry into gangs.

- An OJJDP (US) Comprehensive Community Programme for Gang Prevention, Intervention and Suppression has been set up as a demonstration model programme in five sites. It is concerned with the prevention of youth gangs and provides community leaders with training to assess the origins, extent, and nature of local gang and drug problems in their neighbourhoods. Different types of gangs need different preventive approaches and these programmes encourage a range of school-based and other projects that discourage gang recruitment as well as intervene to defuse existing gang networks (Thornberry & Burch, 1997).

- Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) US: A national school-based gang prevention programme operating in over 47 states. Police officers teach a nine-week curriculum to 13-14 year-olds (Esbensen & Osgood, 1997). A national evaluation found changes in attitudes and lower rates of delinquency, gang membership, and drug use among programme students compared to groups not in the programme.

- Aasha Project, Brick Lane Youth Development Association, UK: Grew out of a major gang fight between Bengali youth aged 16-18. Members of rival gangs meet on a monthly basis with staff of the local youth organization to mediate street problems and disputes and to prevent gang fights. So far, 55 fights with potential for extreme violence have been resolved. The agenda and direction has been set by the youth, a residential meeting held, and links with local police, schools, and other local organizations have been established (ECPA, 1999).

- Together Against Violence, Skane, Sweden: A training programme and docu-drama for secondary schools. A series of seven modules given by different organizations based around a fictitious gang beating and a docu-drama presented by 30 organizations (health and emergency specialists, etc.) to 14-16 year-old students, parents and others (ECPA, 1999).

- PYN Program for Young Negotiators and SERA Skills Managing Anger, US: Programmes developed for use with 12-15 year-olds that train young people in mediation and conflict resolution skills and understanding and managing aggression and anger. Programmes include educational packages, video instruction and manuals and are supported by training seminars.

- Children at Risk (CAR), US: A specifically targeted project that was set up in 1992 in five areas. It was designed as an experimental drug and delinquency prevention project for high-risk adolescents of 11-13 years living in very poor neighbourhoods. Each programme targeted the neighbourhood, peer group, family, and individual. Case managers co-ordinated the integration of services for youths and their families; a range of casework, mentoring, after-school, education, and incentive strategies were used. There were significant
improvements in family and youths’ lives after the programme and much less drug or violence involvement compared with control groups (Harrell, Cavanagh & Sridharan, 1999).

· *The Labyrinth of Drug Addiction*, Huy, Belgium: A drug addiction education/awareness project visited by 1,800 secondary education students, teachers, and professionals. It created a world of sensations using light and sound followed by discussion sessions (ECPA, 1999).

· *CASCADE*, Solihull, UK: A peer education drug awareness programme run by and for young people aged 14-25. Groups of young people receive training and run workshops and activities in schools, hostels, youth clubs, etc. It is supported by a hotline and a confidential counselling service providing appointments within 48 hours as well as parent and professional training (ECPA, 1999).

· *The Midwest Prevention Project*, US: A US Blueprint project. A comprehensive, adolescent drug prevention project combining school, family, and local community education, awareness, and social learning techniques. It targets whole school populations in early adolescence and has shown significant reductions in drug use in many evaluations in different sites (Elliott, 1997).

**Targeting Homelessness and At-Risk Youth**

Past projects to deal with the homeless have tended to target symptoms such as offensive or offending behaviour rather than considering victimization of homeless youth or the more systemic reasons for homelessness. For example, this is the conclusion of a recent review in Australia (NCP, 1999a). Australian projects for homeless youth have a four-fold focus: personal development, relationship and network development, systems information, and protective interventions (NCP, 1999a). They are built around preventing homelessness and effectively responding to homeless youth based on the view that underlying disadvantage should be the point of intervention rather than just crime prevention.

· *Currawong Sexual Assault Counselling & Consultation Service*, Australia: A short- and long-term counselling service for 15-25 year-olds who have been sexually assaulted (NCP, 1999a). Provides individual and group counselling and case plan development linking them to local housing or other services.

· *Navigator Pilot Project*, Adelaide, Australia: A police and youth services consultation project to enable destitute at-risk youths to leave the inner city at night with transport to safer locations (NCP, 1999a).

· *Sosjales Joesnits*, The Netherlands: Some 60 youth advisory centres provide support and advice to 11-25 year-olds on housing, employment, substance abuse, social security, etc. They work closely with the police to target at-risk youth including the homeless, runaways, and unemployed. There is an emphasis on ‘self-help’ e.g., young people must complete a
survival skills course before hostel acceptance in order to enhance their self-esteem and decision-making skills.

- **Stichting Jeugdhulp**, Maastricht, The Netherlands: A project providing counselling and practical assistance with housing, finance, education and work, life skills, and health training to homeless youth (ECPA, 1999).

- **Building on Capacities**, P.E.I., Canada: An Investment Fund project for at-risk 12-15 year-olds (e.g., school drop-outs or those with delinquent peers, behaviour and aggression issues, long-term family problems, or substance abuse). Three schools are involved in the coordinated and comprehensive school-community-based model. Multi-Service Access Teams (MASTs) receive referrals from school, family, police or other services and work in close collaboration with the range of services and supports needed for individual cases. Specific attention is given to the needs of Aboriginals and girls.

- **Together We Light the Way**, Whitby, Ontario, Canada: An Investment Fund project in four 'at risk' schools for students of 4-14 years. The Durham District School Board covers an industrial urban and rural area with rapid population growth and a high child density. The schools have problems of instability with high turnover rates, behavioural and family difficulties and low educational achievement. Pupils in these schools are at risk of school failure, and anti-social and offending behaviour. The school-based project is based on a successful model developed in the region in the 1990s (Dean, 2000). It combines six components: teaching morals and values, learning play and interaction without bullying, parental involvement, healthy breakfast, early reading, and reward, recognition, and community volunteerism. The school-based program requires the development of strong community-school partnerships.
Section V. Is it that Simple? Recognizing and Overcoming the Problems

If one major lesson has been learned from over 70 years of developing prevention projects, it is that each setting and project is unique. There are many pitfalls to developing good programmes. The ideas may be excellent, but the implementation poor. Project partners may find they disagree about the purpose or scope of a programme. There may be issues of confidentiality in sharing information important for the project. Conditions and circumstances may change during a project and alter the needs. Many projects have shelf lives. Some are developed to fulfil specific goals and intended to be short-term. Youth consultations, for example, may be short-term projects leading to other initiatives. Other projects may cease to meet the needs of the local population or target group after a few years. Funding is almost always going to be an issue.

The growth of inter-agency and community-based projects in a number of countries in the past fifteen years has provided much practical experience on the problems of developing partnerships and plans, implementing programmes, sustaining them, and monitoring and evaluating them. There are now a number of written guides and a growing network of practitioners for anticipating and avoiding some of these problems.

Problems Relating to Most Project Development

These include:

- inflexible local or provincial policies
- over- and under-ambitious goals
- time-tables
- lack of initial funding
- lack of on-going or sustaining funding
- difficulties in transfer of projects
- unwillingness to share information e.g., between agencies or community groups
- lack of attention to monitoring and evaluation
- lack of funding for monitoring and evaluation

Inflexible Local Policies and Information Sharing

These are often major hurdles. Municipal, state or provincial policies, or differences between the goals and practices of organizations may make it very difficult to develop good community-based partnerships. The local fragmentation of policies and services, different geographical boundaries of agencies and services, conflicting statutory requirements, and unwillingness to share information are particular problems.

Setting Goals

Many projects may either be vague about expected outcomes or too ambitious in their expectations of an intervention. Some countries now establish clear targets for projects and a range of expected outcomes. This is especially the case with projects that address risk factors and are inspired by
established programmes that have already shown success. Projects also need to plan for both short- and long-term goals or expected outcomes.

**Funding**
A major problem for community-based projects is lack of funding. This includes sufficient money and resources to set up a project and sustain it over time, as well as to provide for project monitoring and evaluation. A recent review of promising projects in Australia between 1996-97 (White, 1998) notes that many projects are no longer in operation for these reasons, although most organizations had histories of youth service or advocacy - and the projects were part of an on-going commitment to youth matters. The experience of many inter-agency and partnership projects has been that there is a lack not only of integration between services for young people, but also of local community coordination of funding. Combining funds from different sources is one way in which communities can begin to deal with this issue.

**Transfer of Projects**
Transferring projects from one country or culture to another can be difficult. The New Zealand experience of trying to develop mentoring projects for Maori youth illustrates the importance of adapting projects to the cultural needs of a country or community (Ave, et al., 1999). Their mentoring programme was modelled on that developed in the US by *Big Brothers, Big Sisters*. A major source for the recruitment of mentors in the US is the corporate sector. In New Zealand, the recruitment of corporate sector mentors proved to be very difficult. In addition, some Maori communities were resistant to the idea itself and, in poorer areas, it was difficult to find adults without their own stresses to act as mentors. One response has been to develop group mentor-youth leadership training that is more suited to Maori culture in place of the individual-based approach to mentoring youth used in the US and elsewhere.

**Evaluating Projects**
Projects can be evaluated at a number of stages: in terms of immediate outcomes, were the right targeted clients recruited?; short-term outcomes, did vandalism or bullying in the school go down this term? did project clients complete the programme and get their certificates?; in terms of longer-term outcomes - were project clients able to stay out of trouble over the next few years? has there been a long-term reduction in the problems targeted? have project clients been able to achieve and sustain better education, employment or living conditions? Projects can also be evaluated in terms of their costs and benefits.

While we now know much more about risk and protective factors and interventions that work, the current trend is to develop multiple-intervention projects such as comprehensive community programmes. A major disadvantage with this approach, however, is the difficulty of measuring exactly which of the different interventions are effective when they are all being applied together.
This means that strategies that are likely to be the most effective are also going to be the most difficult to measure.

Some researchers argue that the better the design of a project, the more it will be able to show that it has been effective in reducing delinquency and other social problems - even if the precise causal factors cannot be isolated. They have outlined five levels of project research design that provide increasingly reliable measures of project outcomes (e.g. Sherman, et al., 1997). Other researchers stress the importance of looking at the process of programme development and implementation, rather than just outcomes such as reductions in crime or victimization - what helped the programme work? what contributed to its failure? They see this as an essential part of developing more successful, locally-tailored projects.

An approach that is increasingly being used for planning, implementing, and evaluating complex community-based projects are Logic Models. These link project outcomes with suggested causal factors and their implementation requirements (Clairmont, 1999). Under each of these three dimensions (measures, a set of standards, and a linked set of ways in which measures will be obtained) are listed. The approach is a way of organizing logically and methodically e.g., what information is needed, how it is going to be measured and obtained, and who is responsible for its collection.

Problems Especially Found with Youth Projects

Implementing projects for youth presents its own range of problems. These are likely to be greatest with those most ‘at-risk’ and they include:

- motivating young people to participate
- a lack of existing youth networks on which to build
- the difficulties of contacting and consulting at-risk groups and keeping them involved
- the need to counter negative views or fears about young people

The guide to setting up a mentoring project, produced by Crime Concern in England, provides some excellent guidance on motivating ‘at-risk’ youth to take part and to maintain their involvement (Benioff, 1997). Referrals through teacher and youth workers or others are supplemented by distributing flyers with ‘tag’ lines such as ‘what have you got to lose?’, ‘Bring a friend’, ‘Free Pizza’, as well as providing a clear map and offer of refreshments. More than one introductory meeting is held, at different times of the day or evening, with videos, photographs, and leaflets about the project. To maintain attendance at project events, young people are asked what stops them from coming, and donated prizes and refreshments are offered. Stipends, training allowances, and a points system are also used to reward and encourage participation, as well as the reimbursement for travel.

Factors Associated with Success in Working with Young People
In a number of countries, there is an emphasis on working with the strengths and abilities of young people, not focusing solely on their problems or their risky behaviours. Good project implementation depends heavily on the knowledge and skills of community and inter-agency organizations. The preferred approach in the US is ‘embedding’ projects within a strong, viable existing organization that already has a good ‘track record’ for developing and evaluating programmes. Thus, inter-agency and community partnerships that have already set up and successfully run a project will have gained skills and learned from mistakes. This suggests that community partnerships should start with small projects to gain experience before tackling more complex projects such as comprehensive community programmes. National organizations, such as *Boys and Girls Cubs of America*, also provide a range of specialized programmes within their overall structure.

Another approach in New Zealand, ‘programme nesting’, suggests that small or specialist programmes are likely to be more viable and successful if they are ‘nested’ within an existing organization with a history of youth services (Ave, et al., 1999). Thus, the major characteristics of successful projects seem to be:

- having a track record in developing community partnerships
- commitment by local partners
- good leadership
- committed and experienced staff
- strong agency support for their workers especially for intensive ‘wraparound’ type services

An Australian study of agencies working with marginalized and at-risk youth concludes that the key characteristics of agencies with successful interventions are (NCP, 1999a: 65):

- *planning and evaluation* - including research-based planning, self review, monitoring and evaluation
- *philosophy* - including a clearly articulated philosophy throughout the organization beginning with ‘youth rights and needs’ and recognition that young people are likely to be both victims and offenders
- *staffing* - workers who actually like young people, are willing to work with them as they are, and understand the difference between friendly and friend, are culturally appropriate and able to work in mainstream and indigenous organizations
- *collaboration* - strong external networks, wide referral links, consultation to develop collaborative referral and action, clear roles and values between agency and its network so that they build on strengths and differences, support from community leaders and stakeholders
- *flexibility* - internal and external change focus, openness in thinking through inter-agency issues
- *management* - multi-disciplinary, multi-functional approach, a range of options for young people, firm management, structure and staff support, three-five years guaranteed funding
- *tools to enhance success* - including training in management, developing focussed strategies, evaluation, and collaborative partnerships.
Programmes that Work, Travel and Support

As this report indicates, successful project development is now being fostered by supportive training and practical assistance from governments and networks of community-based organizations or research-based centres. The Dutch-German network of practitioners and policy makers concerned with at-risk youth is one example (Bendit, et al., 2000). Other examples include:

- **Copping On**, Maynooth, Co. Kildare Ireland: A residential training programme for local multi-agency groups working with school dropouts and at-risk youth. They provide a resource package and follow-up support.

- **Youth Action Network**, UK: The network provides advice on setting up youth action teams, funding, training and support services to local community partnerships, as well as resources and a manual (Crime Concern, 1998b).

- **The BC Coalition for Safer Communities**, Vancouver, Canada: An organization that helps communities design and implement community-based prevention strategies, including those around youth, provides training and assistance, and provides a link and information network for prevention experts.

- **Safe Communities Safe Schools**, Boulder, US: Began autumn 1999. A violence prevention project with short- and long-term strategies, developed by the Centre for the Study and Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado. This will be a long-term systematic and comprehensive process. Strategic plans for individual schools will involve analysis of problems, the development of plans for programmes and training, technical advice, school support teams, and links into a resource network. (CSVP, 1999).

- **Crime Reduction in Secondary Schools** (CRISS) England and Wales: A pilot project involving 38 secondary schools in urban and rural areas across England and Wales, supported by £12m in funds to develop programs, and £1.5m for evaluation. Each school is initiating a set of agreed programmes to reduce truancy, school exclusion, bullying and local crime. They are supported by a local project implementation team to aid project development and monitoring, a local evaluation team, and a national evaluation team.

- **Blueprints for Violence Prevention**, US: Have been developed since 1996 at the Centre for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado. This was in response to the serious increase in violence and the lack of tested and evaluated preventive programmes - given that much state and national project funding failed to fund evaluation - and the accumulating evidence on risk and protective factors. Each Blueprint provides step-by-step plans for replication of projects. Potential users are offered technical support in setting up and developing that programme, which must meet the high standards set by the original programme, as well as monitoring and evaluation.
Prevention programmes identified must meet four selection criteria: strong research design; significant evidence of deterrence of violence and aggression; replication of results on multiple sites; and evidence that the effects are long-lasting. So far, 10 Blueprint reports have been published, seven of them targeting youths at varying degrees of risk. They include: Bullying Prevention Programme; Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies; Big Brothers Big Sisters of America; Quantum Opportunities; Multisystemic Therapy; Functional Family Therapy; Mid-West Prevention Project; and Life Skills Training. The Blueprints ‘constitute a complete package of both programmes and technical assistance made available to states, communities, schools, and local agencies attempting to address the problems of violence, crime and substance abuse in their communities.’ (Elliott, 1997).

Universal or Targeted Prevention?

An important issue is deciding the most effective or cost-effective strategy (Farrington, 2000). Is it better to use energy and funds to develop programmes for high-risk youth in high-risk areas, or to develop programmes for all young people in different types of areas? The argument for targeting high-risk areas and individuals is that this offers scope for reducing the greatest amount of crime and other social problems. It is also likely to provide the greatest cost savings and benefits over time. Universal programmes are more difficult to evaluate and to measure in terms of costs and benefits.

On the other hand, working with at-risk youths in areas with multiple problems is much more demanding and requires a lot of professional and community energy and persistence. These are often the most difficult groups and areas to involve in intervention programmes, and may also require a great deal more of on-going support, which can wear project staff down. Targeted prevention clearly requires a lot of careful planning and financial and in-kind resources. Some communities may decide that both universal and targeted prevention is needed, and providing a range of preventive projects and programmes.

Pulling it all Together - the Importance of Working in Partnerships and Using Strategic Approaches

These are all issues that need to be argued out locally on the basis of the results of careful local analysis through safety audits, action plans, and a clear assessment of community strengths and resources. Many of the problems identified in project development can be anticipated and worked through more systematically when such an approach is used. At the local level, strategic approaches are needed to guide successful project development. Individual programmes will be more effective if they are based on a clear analysis of the problems and possible solutions, take account of the range of influences in young people’s lives - parents, schools, friends, youth and social services, police, local environment - and bring together the relevant agencies and individuals. Projects are also more likely to be successful if they target appropriate interventions to high-risk areas and individuals and build on experience of successful interventions. The multi-agency community safety partnerships and local Youth Action Teams mandated in England and Wales are clear examples of locally-based approaches for developing strategic interventions.
The Basic Requirements - Partnerships, Safety Audits, Action Plans, Evaluation

There are five main requirements for developing successful intervention projects and they require a different - more collaborative and targeted - way of working than has been common in the past (see ICPC, 1999a for a more detailed account):

- coordinated local partnerships that bring together key people concerned with young people in the area or community
- pooling information between agencies on risk and protective factors as well as other resources
- a careful analysis of the problems in the area and what seem to be their main contributing causes - this may include safety audits56 to locate area and places with particular problems involving youth
- developing and implementing an integrated plan of action that matches intervention projects to the problems and needs identified
- monitoring and evaluating the interventions

One example of such a strategic approach is the *Brent Crime and Disorder Audit* (UK). This provides a detailed analysis of problems associated with crime and disorder in this London Borough. It has been followed after extensive public consultation by a strategy paper, *A Crime and Disorder and Community Safety Strategy for Brent 1999-2002* (Brent, 1999), which includes a specific focus on youth and outlines three-year targets and goals. Other examples include:

- *Aberdeen Youth Strategy*, Scotland: This sets out the city council’s plans for improving services to young people and involving them in community life. A Youth Action Committee of young people advised the city Working Group. Services for youth were reviewed, workshops were held with youth agencies and young people, and a Youth Strategy was drafted for 16-24 year-olds, with links to younger teenagers and the Children’s Strategy. It stresses: *co-ordination* of services for young people, *participation* of youth, encouraging their involvement in their community, *equal opportunities*, to deal with exclusion of at-risk youth, and a *voice*, establishing youth representatives. Task forces on employment and training, crime, and participation have made recommendations for implementation in a Youth Strategy Action Plan.

Communities should not look at any one agency to solve youth issues in their community. Many of the resources necessary are already in the system... because of lack of awareness and poor communication, and sometimes professional territoriality, local resources are often not used effectively. Adequate support is essential if programmes are to be operated successfully, but support need not always be financial. (from *Youth Recreation: Make it Happen*. BC Ministry of Small Business, Tourism and Culture. In NCPC, 1997).

---

56 Safety audits
Bikes Bands and Strategic Plans Resource Manual (1997), Queensland, Australia: This state-wide youth initiative is a practical manual with clear guidelines for local councils to incorporate youth needs and concerns into local planning. It considers a range of local planning issues: formulating policies affecting youth, youth participation in local community decisions, and practical guidelines on incorporating youth needs and concerns directly in local government. Their work and action planning matrix for local councils provides an illustration for their comprehensive approach to planning:
### Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council Area of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Potential strategies

#### Role of council

#### Potential financial cost

#### Need for links with other debts

#### Participation of young people

#### Possible difficulties + implementation

#### Likely outcomes

#### Benefits to council, community, young people

(Source: adapted from Queensland Guide reprinted in White, 1998)
The leadership role

Overall, support for the development of local youth strategies and projects needs to come from all levels of governments with the exercise of their leadership role:

- in initiating action across ministries and agencies with the private sector and local community leaders to develop strategies for young people
- funding and evaluating pilot projects and best practice
- strengthening the tools for undertaking community analysis and youth consultations
- providing training and support for project development and evaluation
- initiating best practice seminars and training to build on successful projects and experience
- supporting local youth strategy co-ordinators

As this report has shown, countries such as France, South Africa, Britain, the Netherlands and Australia argue strongly that isolated youth projects are not going to make a huge impact. What are needed are clearly established links and strategies - horizontally as well as vertically - at national, regional, provincial, municipal and local levels. This will enable partnerships to be developed, which can establish a range of integrated projects targeting high-risk areas and vulnerable groups and are tailored to the particular needs of communities. These partnerships need to be representative of the different cultural groups and other specific groups in a community, as well as young people themselves.

Recognizing the links for young 12-18 year-olds between mental and physical ill-health, poverty, homelessness and exclusion, risky behaviours, substance abuse, school failure, teen pregnancy, and offending and victimization; involving young people directly in planning and developing programmes; and taking account of their specific needs and circumstances are important steps to tackling these problems effectively. It is the best way to ensure the inclusion and support of young people and their families and to develop healthy communities.
Additional Resources and Addresses

National Crime Prevention (Australia)
Attorney General’s Department
Robert Garran Offices
National Circuit
Barton Act 2600 AUSTRALIA
Tel: 61 02 6250 6711
Fax: 61 02 6273 0913
Web site: www.ncp.gov.au

Permanent Secretariat for Prevention Policy (Belgium)
Ministère de l’Intérieur
26, rue de la Loi – Box 19
Brussels 1040 BELGIQUE
Tel: 32 2 500 49 47
Fax: 32 2 500 40 87
E-mail: info@vspp.fgov.be
Web site: www.vspp.fgov.be

BC Coalition for Safer Communities (Canada)
Suite 605 – 318 Homer Street
Vancouver, British Columbia
V6B 2V2 CANADA
Tel: 1 877 802 5228 (Toll Free); 1 604 669 2986
Fax: 1 604 689 2719
E-mail: info@bccsc.com
Web site: www.bccsc.com

Ministère de la Sécurité Publique du Québec (Canada)
Direction des Communications
2525, boulevard Laurier, 5e étage
Tour du Saint-Laurent
Sainte-Foy, Québec
G1V 2L2 CANADA
Tel: 1 866 644 6826 (Toll Free); 1 418 644 6826
Fax: 1 418 644 3194
E-mail: info@msp.gouv.qc.ca
Web site: www.msp.gouv.qc.ca/prevention

National Crime Prevention Centre (Canada)
Department of Justice of Canada
123 Slater Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H8 CANADA
Tel: 1 877 302 NCPC (Toll Free - English)
1 877 302 CNPC (Toll Free - French)
Fax: 1 613 952 3515
E-mail: info@prevention.gc.ca
Web site: www.crime-prevention.org

Beaver House
147-150 Victoria Road
Swindon Wiltshire SN1 3BU
ENGLAND
Tel: +44 (0) 1793 863 500
Fax: +44 (0) 1793 514 654
E-mail: info@crimeconcern.org.uk
Web site: www.crimeconcern.org.uk

Crime Prevention Agency (England)
Home Office – Crime Reduction
50 Queen Anne’s Gate, 7th Floor
London SW1H 9AT
ENGLAND
Tel: +44 (0) 8700 001 585 (H.O. general enquiries)
Fax: +44 (0) 2072 732 026
E-mail: public.enquiries@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk
Home Office Web site: www.homeoffice.gov.uk/crimeprev/cpindex.htm
Crime Reduction Web site: www.crimereduction.gov.uk

Social Exclusion Unit (England)
Cabinet Office
35 Great Smith St.
London SW1P 3BQ
ENGLAND
Tel: +44 (0) 20 7276 2055 (general enquiries)
Fax: +44 (0) 20 7276 2056
E-mail: jan.parsons@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk
Web site: www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk

Délégation interministérielle à la ville
194, avenue du Président Wilson
93217 La Plaine-Saint-Denis
FRANCE
Tel: + 33 1 49 17 46 46
Fax: + 33 1 49 17 45 59
E-mail: liv-info@ville.gouv.fr

Institut des Hautes Études de la Sécurité Intérieure (IHESI)
19, rue Péclet
75015 Paris, FRANCE
Tel: + 33 1 53 68 20 00
Fax: + 33 1 45 30 50 71
E-mail: hesi@cedocar.fr

European Forum for Urban Safety
38, rue Liancourt
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75014 Paris
FRANCE
Tel: 33 1 40 64 49 00
Fax: 33 1 40 64 49 10
E-mail: esu@urbansecurity.org
Web site: www.urbansecurity.org

Department of Justice (The Netherlands)
Information Department/Directie Voorlichting
Ministerie van Justitie
Postbus 20301
2500 EH Den Haag
THE NETHERLANDS
Tel: 31 070 370 68 50
Fax: 31 070 370 75 94
E-mail: voorlichting@best-dep.minjust.nl
infodesk@wodc.minjust.nl
Web sites: www.minjust.nl:8080 (English)
www.justitie.nl/publiek/criminaliteit_en_preventie

Crime Prevention Unit (New Zealand)
Ministry of Justice
Charles Fergusson Building
Bowen Street
P.O. Box 180
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +64 (0) 4 494 9700
Fax: +64 (0) 4 494 9917
E-mail: reception@justice.govt.nz

Secretariat for Safety and Security (South Africa)
SOUTH AFRICA
Tel: 27 012 339 15 86
Fax: 27 012 339 25 36

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
(USA)
US Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
8th Floor
Washington DC 20531
USA
Tel: 1 202 307 5911
Fax: 1 202 307 2093
E-mail: askjj@ojp.usdoj.gov
Web site: http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org

Bureau of Justice Assistance (USA)
US Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
4th Floor
Washington DC 20531
USA
Tel: 1 202 616 6500
Fax: 1 202 305 1367
E-mail: askbja@ojp.usdoj.gov
Web site: www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA

National Center for Hate Crime Prevention (USA)
Education Development Center, Inc.
55 Chapel Street
Newton, Massachusetts 02458-1060, USA
Tel: 617 969 7100
Fax: 617 527 4096
E-mail: hatecrime@edc.org
Web site: www.edc.org/HHD/hatecrime/id1.htm

National Crime Prevention Council (USA)
1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW
13th Floor
Washington DC 20036
USA
Tel: 617 969 7100
Fax: 617 527 4096
Web Site: www.ncpc.org
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Endnotes

1. The four priority groups identified by the NCPC are children, youth, Aboriginal peoples and communities, and women’s personal security. Other national government strategies include the Youth Employment Strategy, the Family Violence Initiative, the Prenatal Nutrition Programme, the Federal Action Plan on Gender Equality, the Aboriginal Head Start Programme, and the Aboriginal Action Plan.

2. Two recent ICPC publications provide additional information on crime reduction and best practices: *Crime Prevention Digest II* (ICPC, 1999a) and *100 Crime Prevention Programmes to Inspire Action Across the World* (ICPC, 1999b).


4. E.g., In South Africa, 53% of the population is under 25 years of age (South Africa, 1999).

5. Recorded or official statistics on youth offending refers to police and court data. Self-report studies ask samples of young people whether they have ever committed a range of criminal offences. These two methods of measuring youth crime give very different estimates of the extent of offending, since so much is unreported or unnoticed. Self-report studies suggest that those from better-off backgrounds, and girls, commit more offences than official data suggests. Police records and court data, therefore, underestimate the amount of offending by young people, but they also over-emphasise the more serious offences and the involvement of children from disadvantaged backgrounds. Victimization surveys are a third way of estimating the amount of offending that takes place. Such surveys usually ask people whether they have experienced a range of criminal offences against themselves or their property over the past year.


8. The 1998/9 *Youth Lifestyle Survey* in England and Wales found that a fifth of 12-30 year-olds admitted one or more offences in the past 12 months (Campbell & Harrington, 2000).

9. The International Self Report Delinquency Survey (ISRD) included national samples from The Netherlands, Switzerland, England, Portugal, and selected sites in Belgium, Spain, Germany, Northern Italy, Ireland, Finland, Greece, the USA and New Zealand (Junger-Tas; Terlouw & Klein, 1994). More recent analysis has shown some marked differences between those countries in levels of drug use by young people, however (Killias & Ribeaud, 1999).


11. This is particularly true of burglary, with the same houses being targeted repeatedly (see ICPC 1999a).
12. Estimating changes in youth offending in Canada in the 1980s is very difficult since the 1984 *Youth Justice Act* established a uniform age-range for young offenders (12 to 17 inclusive). This meant that 16 and 17 year-olds who had previously been dealt with as adults in some provinces were now included as young offenders, creating an apparent ‘increase’ in youth offending. In addition, new sexual offences have been created, increasing the numbers of offences that are classified as violent.

13. Boys are responsible for the majority of offending, especially violence. The very small numbers of girls involved in youth offending in most countries result in large percentage increases when numbers rise. This accounts for the apparently much greater increase in offending among girls found in a number of countries up to the mid-1990s. For e.g., in 1992-93, girls accounted for 16% of Youth Court convictions in Canada; by 1999, this had increased to 20% (Statistics Canada, 2000). A recent survey in England and Wales, however, found no change in the amount of self-reported offending by girls between 1992 and 1999 (Campbell & Harrington, 2000).

14. The British Crime Survey, for example, includes those aged 16 or older, while the Canadian General Social Survey (GSS) starts with the age category 15-24. This situation is now changing. The US, for example, now compiles national information on the victimization of children and young people from its annual National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) and other sources (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999).

15. For example, in the US the NCVS found that in 1996, 48% of serious violent incidents against 12-17 year-olds were not reported by them to the police or other authorities (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999).

16. Most victimization surveys have dealt with street and household crime rather than domestic violence and violence against young women, especially sexual abuse and violence in the home have not been measured. This issue is discussed later in the paper.

17. See, for example, the work of Richard Tremblay and his colleagues at the University of Montreal (e.g., Tremblay & Craig, 1995).

18. 80% of all suicides in Canada are committed by males. Among Aboriginal youth, the rates are over 100 per 100,000, compared with an overall male rate of 22 per 100,000.

19. Some of the difference in the rate of official offending by girls and boys is explained by the different ways in which the police and the courts have traditionally dealt with them. Recent increases in the rate at which girls and women are charged and sentenced reflect a change from a paternalistic view, but it may also reflect cultural changes in girls’ behaviour.


22. This study was based on self-report interviews with 14-25 years-olds in England and Wales.

24. A recent UNICEF report on child poverty in 23 industrialized nations placed Mexico and the United States at the bottom with the highest rates (26% and 22%) of children living in poverty. Canada was ranked 17 out of 23 with 16% (Globe and Mail. June 13, 2000. A8).

25. Parenting is also something that can be changed with the help of supportive programmes.

26. Young Canadians under 25 are now a much more ethnically and culturally diverse group than older generations (CCSD, 2000).

27. These are issues the National Youth In Care Network in Canada (a group formed by youth who have been in care) and Youth Net (a group founded to assist young people with mental health problems) have been trying to address.


29. For example, 25% of all juvenile homicide offenders live in five counties, which are in inner city areas of major metropolitan cities in the US (Loeber & Farrington, 1998: 28).

30. In the US, a series of longitudinal youth studies began in the late 1980s in Pittsburgh, Denver and Rochester. These studies all excluded girls. Other longitudinal studies in England and Canada have also excluded girls. A longitudinal study of girls funded by the US National Institute of Mental Health and the Office of Research on Women’s Health began in 1998 (Loeber, et al., 1998), and girls are included in the Canadian National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth which began in 1994.

31. This table is adapted from Graham (1998). See also the youth model proposed by the National Crime Prevention Council (1997).

32. E.g., Early home visits and pre-school training, Perry Preschool Programme, and Project Head Start: These projects began in the US in the 1960s and targeted high-risk families. They have had impressive long-term results in reducing delinquency and improving the quality of life of both parents and their children, as well as demonstrating large cost-savings (Sherman, et al., 1997). Canada and other countries are now replicating the approach. Home care and family preservation programmes aim to keep families together, rather than removing children and placing them into foster or residential care e.g., Families First. The most effective projects appear to be those that increase parents’ self-esteem and build on their strengths (Graham, 1998). Family therapy and parent training: Children showing early behavioural problems and their families have been offered a range of support and training to improve their child-rearing capacities and reduce disruptive behaviour patterns. Successful programmes have been developed in the US and Canada (Patterson, 1992; Tremblay, et al., 1995) and others are currently underway e.g., in the UK (Graham, 1998).

33. In the US, the OJJDP has funded the Alternative Education Initiative in 17 schools in high crime areas; the PATHE Project in 8 mainly Black inner-city schools; and the Effective Schools Project. All of them showed some effects on delinquency as well as other factors (Gottfredson, 1997). See also Tremblay & Craig (1995) and Catalano, et al. (1998) for a discussion of other experimental school-based studies.

34. The Norwegian programme targeted elementary school Grades 4-7.
35. The strategy was evaluated by a series of reviews that looked at programmes targeting 0-6 years, childhood and adolescence, graduated sanctions, and risk assessment. This work is included in the 1995 Guide edited by James Howell.

36. Other national programmes that have stressed comprehensive and community approaches include Operation Weed & Seed, Pulling America’s Communities Together (PACT) and SafeFutures. The OJJDP also established a Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders (see Loeber & Farrington, 1998: 4).

37. In 1996-97, total spending on the criminal justice system was just under $10 billion, 5% (c. $500 million) of which was for youth justice and corrections (Statistics Canada, 1999c).

38. The author adjusts the total cost to what is termed the present value - the amount of money that would be needed today to cover a future case. This gives an overall cost of $1.7 - 2.3 million US.

39. See also Crime prevention in the Nordic Context. The Nordic Model. Published collectively by Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland and Iceland. (Undated).

40. The Unit was set up as part of the central Cabinet Office by the new Labour government in 1997, in recognition that many social and economic problems require coordinated analysis and action across a range of government ministries. This is often referred to as ‘joined-up thinking’. Its remit was ‘to develop integrated and sustainable approaches to the problems of the worst housing estates, including crime, drugs, unemployment, community breakdown, and bad schools etc’ (Social Exclusion Unit, 1998).

41. The three initiatives are Sure Start, which targets early family and child development, On Track: Children and Families at Risk which focuses on children of 4-12 and their families, and Youth Include, which targets 13-16 year-olds. Youth Include is based on a project developed by Crime Concern, which successfully reduced crime and exclusion among high-risk youth in high-risk housing estates in three cities.

42. The Crime and Disorder Act (1998) made it mandatory for local authorities to establish Community Safety Partnerships. There are currently about 1200 Youth Action Groups in the UK, part of the PRU Youth Action Network run by Crime Concern and funded by Prudential.

43. These national programmes are: Education and Health Action Zones; Sure Start, which support children and families in their early years; New Deal for Communities; Positive Parenting Programmes; Millenium Volunteers; Life Long Learning; and funding for Truancy and Exclusion programmes. All of the pilot projects for these initiatives target disadvantaged areas.

44. These were reports on urban policy (Sueur, 1998) and on juvenile delinquency (Lazerges & Balduyck, 1998).

45. A detailed practical guide to the establishment of local security contracts has been published (IHESI, 1998). The French model of crime prevention illustrates the value of having strong central leadership that is able to co-ordinate local partnerships of key agencies under city mayors.

46. The 6th German Crime Prevention conference in November 2000 focused on youth violence and prevention strategies and programmes (see: www.praventionstag.de).

48. Department of Social Welfare Youth Services Strategy Briefing Paper, September 1999. This national strategy is linked to youth initiatives in other government departments including justice, health, education, and police crime prevention strategies.

49. Its National Crime Prevention Strategy was established in 1996. A manual on community based crime prevention Making South Africa Safe was produced in 1999 (Lieberman, et al.).

50. These include federal departments of Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human Services, Education, and Labour.

51. The FCM has recently published a guide for municipalities wanting to set up a local crime prevention council.

52. The extraordinary powers given to some private security guards to remove young people is an issue of considerable concern in Australia, for example (Hanging Out. NCP, 1999b).

53. Crime Concern is a national non-profit crime prevention agency in the UK that develops new approaches and offers technical and training assistance to communities.

54. These range from showing a correlation between a prevention programme and crime at a given time; measuring crime levels before and after an intervention in an experimental group or area, compared with a comparable control group or area; measuring before and after changes for experimental and control groups that have been carefully matched for their similar characteristics; and randomly assigning individuals to experimental and control groups.

55. For more complete information, see Annex: Investing in Youth: International Approaches for Preventing Crime and Victimization www.crime-prevention-intl.org or www.crime-prevention.org

56. The terms safety audit or safety diagnosis are both used to refer to this systematic process of analysis of local community problems.