

Bernd Holthusen/Sabrina Hoops

ZJJ 1/2012

## **Crime prevention in childhood and youth – on the role, contribution and importance of child and youth services**

This article begins by outlining the development of crime prevention in recent years, particularly in relation to childhood and youth. The focus is on the role of child and youth services and their relationship with the other actors in crime prevention. From this perspective, the article examines the current state of crime prevention targeted at children and *juveniles* (the 13-17 age-group, subsequently referred to here as ‘young people’). Attention will then be turned to the opportunities, challenges and also problems that the prevention of child and youth delinquency seems likely to face in the next few years.

Starting from the insight that deviant behaviour in childhood and youth is part of the process of growing up, and delinquency is ubiquitous and (almost always) transient at this age, this article argues consistently for a pedagogical approach to delinquency. In keeping with this, the aim of child and youth services in the context of crime prevention is not to prevent delinquency in general – a goal that would not be attainable –, but to assess its significance with regard to individual cases, in order to avoid any resulting risks for children and young people.

### **The development of crime prevention**

In recent decades, crime prevention in Germany has been expanded and consolidated in various ways. The institutions originally responsible for public safety, the police and the judiciary, have been supplemented by additional actors, in particular child and youth services. Crime prevention has increasingly come to be defined as the duty of society as a whole.<sup>1</sup> This also explains the prominent position now held by inter-institutional cooperation in crime prevention, which is the object of an ongoing process of development.

If we focus on crime prevention in childhood and youth, the first noteworthy fact is that this is a core area of crime prevention, which receives constant attention, and involves numerous actors and institutions. Child delinquency and juvenile crime are the phenomena that are most often the target for prevention strategies. The second observation to be made is that, over the last twenty years, a consensus has developed across different institutions that prevention strategies in this area need to be mainly pedagogical in focus. The idea is that children and young people who are at risk of committing or have already committed unlawful acts should be deterred from possible future

---

<sup>1</sup> The increasing number and diversity of the actors is, for example, regularly demonstrated at the annual German Congress on Crime Prevention (GCOCP). At the 16th GCOCP in Oldenburg (2011), the organizers counted over 5000 participants and 200 exhibitors.

criminal offences by means of educational methods.<sup>2</sup> Another reason why children and young people are becoming a primary target group for crime prevention is that they are still in the process of development, and are therefore more able to be influenced – leading to an expectation that potential criminal careers can be prevented at an early stage. Children and young people are therefore ideal candidates for the basic premise of preventive thinking, which is to effectively respond to problematic developments before they actually manifest themselves. This helps to explain a tendency that has been observable for some years: preventive strategies have been “shifted forward”, focusing on younger and younger age groups, and “less problematic” situations. The basic premise behind this is: “The sooner the better”. At the same time, however, the risk inherent in this development is that (crime) prevention will become broader in focus, more and more unspecific and thus less and less effective. The third fact to be noted is that strategies for the prevention of violence make up a major part of crime prevention activities relating to childhood and youth, even though violent crimes constitute only a small proportion of criminal offences. An obvious explanation for this is that a considerable proportion of delinquency in childhood and youth can be classified as petty, and there is less perceived need for action here, while acts of violence are seen by both the public and the professionals as a serious problem, which definitely requires a response.<sup>3</sup>

The focus on children and young people in crime prevention has increased the importance of the institutions of child and youth services, school, and even childcare. Here practitioners not only have the pedagogical qualifications necessary to implement educationally oriented strategies; they are also increasingly likely to have “special knowledge related to crime prevention”.<sup>4</sup>

The dynamic development in the field of crime prevention – in terms of both the scope of the activities and the diversity of the approaches developed – has been facilitated by the *project/programme format*. Programmes have been announced, new concepts developed and projects tested. The label of “prevention”, with the implicit promise of preventing problems before they occur, has allowed relatively easy access to public resources in the various (and in some cases new) areas of activity. The great variety and differentiation of approaches to prevention in the different areas of activity must not, however, lead us to the erroneous conclusion that these services are universally available – this is by no means the case.

---

2 The educational orientation carries through into the *Jugendstrafrecht* (Juvenile Penal Law) (cf. Section 2 Clause 1 JGG).

3 In relation to violence, there is evidence of a marked increase in awareness within society in recent decades, which may also explain the increasing importance accorded to the prevention of violence. This increased awareness is reflected not only in legislation (e.g. the *Gewaltschutzgesetz* (Protection from Violence Act), the right to a non-violent upbringing), but also elsewhere, e.g. in people’s willingness to report of acts of violence or in the recent media coverage on abuse in institutions.

4 This is manifested, for example, in new courses of study, such as the master’s course in “Preventive social work with a special focus on criminology and crime prevention”, or in advanced training programmes such as the Beccaria Programme. New terms and concepts are also being created in the area of continuing professional development, e.g. “Präventionsfachkraft” (prevention practitioner). These developments in the training and development sector can also be interpreted as a sign of the consolidation of the field of crime prevention, even if there is still a major need for training and professional development.

In the recent past and the present, some German federal states have decided on their own programmes against juvenile crime and/or violence, combining various activities, mostly preventive in focus.<sup>5</sup> These programmes, usually conceived as cross-departmental, are also an indicator of the continuing development of delinquency prevention, in the sense of a linking up of individual projects and schemes into a prevention policy. The overall concept of these programmes usually includes an evaluation, for support and monitoring purposes.<sup>6</sup> The initiative for these programmes seldom seems to come from child and youth services, i.e. from the youth departments; instead the impetus tends to come from the interior or justice ministries. This is evidence of a new development, in which child and youth services are included in the planning as important partner agencies, but do not play a proactive and formative role. A possible reason for this might be the shortage of resources in many places. Unlike the police and judiciary, child and youth welfare services are funded by the local authorities,<sup>7</sup> which are in such financial hardship in some regions of Germany that budget consolidation plans are part of everyday life, e.g. in North Rhine-Westphalia.<sup>8</sup>

In terms of the professional and academic discourse, it can be observed that crime prevention in the form of projects and programmes attracts a great deal of attention, and defines the debates, while less attention is paid to the contribution made by those agencies that deal with youth crime on a regular basis: the offerings provided by child and youth services, the Allgemeiner Sozialer Dienst (General Social Services), *Jugendhilfe im Strafverfahren/Jugendgerichtshilfe* (youth services in juvenile court proceedings) – or custodial centres for young offenders and the probation service. In these areas, prevention is only one of many tasks which have to be managed within the limited resources available locally. It is harder to produce success stories in these areas, and there remains a – sometimes substantial – risk of failure, yet it is especially important not to neglect the institutions that deal with young people who have already committed offences.

---

5 To name just a few: in Hamburg: “Handeln gegen Jugendgewalt” (“Action against youth violence”) ([www.hamburg.de/handeln-gegen-jugendgewalt/](http://www.hamburg.de/handeln-gegen-jugendgewalt/) (1 October 2015)); in Bremen: “Stopp der Jugendgewalt” (“Stop youth violence”) ([www.kriminalpraevention.bremen.de/sixcms/media.php/13/Stopp\\_der\\_Jugendgewalt\\_Handlungskonzept.pdf](http://www.kriminalpraevention.bremen.de/sixcms/media.php/13/Stopp_der_Jugendgewalt_Handlungskonzept.pdf) (1 October 2015)); in North Rhine-Westphalia: final report of the NRW commission of enquiry: Prävention von Kinder- und Jugendkriminalität (Prevention of child and juvenile crime) ([www.landtag.nrw.de/portal/WWW/GB\\_I/I.1/EK/EKALT/14\\_EK\\_III/Abschlussbericht/EK\\_Praevention\\_Abschlussbericht.pdf](http://www.landtag.nrw.de/portal/WWW/GB_I/I.1/EK/EKALT/14_EK_III/Abschlussbericht/EK_Praevention_Abschlussbericht.pdf) (1 October 2015) and [www.kurvekriegen.nrw.de](http://www.kurvekriegen.nrw.de) (1 October 2015)); resolution of the Berlin senate S-3716/2011: Entwicklung eines Gesamtkonzeptes zur Reduzierung der Jugendgewaltdelinquenz (Development of an overall concept to reduce violent juvenile delinquency) ([http://www.berlin.de/imperia/md/content/lb-lkbgg/praevention/rechtsextremismus/arbeitsstelle/beschluss\\_senat.pdf?start&ts=1323165196&file=beschluss\\_senat.pdf](http://www.berlin.de/imperia/md/content/lb-lkbgg/praevention/rechtsextremismus/arbeitsstelle/beschluss_senat.pdf?start&ts=1323165196&file=beschluss_senat.pdf) (1 October 2015)).

6 The evaluation carried out for the Hamburg programme is already available: cf. Richter, 2010.

7 According to the Social Code Book (SGB) VIII, the federal states (*Länder*) have the tasks of continuing professional development and supervision. The German state at federal level (*Bund*) has the competence to make suggestions (*Anregungskompetenz*) regarding the development of the field, and fulfils this functions with its child and youth plan, for example through the Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (Centre for the Prevention of Youth Crime), based at the Deutsches Jugendinstitut (German Youth Institute) in Munich.

8 This means that a local authority may be subjected to external budgetary supervision.

For child and youth services, *cooperation* with schools, the police and the judiciary is an essential requirement, particularly at the points where the responsibilities of different institutions intersect, for example when children and young people attract the attention of the school authorities, or when illegal acts become known. This is another area where impressive developments have occurred in recent decades.<sup>9</sup> Local cooperation committees in various shapes and forms have been established nearly everywhere, and the need for cooperation per se is no longer questioned. Developments in this cooperation often relate to the regular offering structures. In some cases, however, new approaches are also tested in projects, e.g. in the *Häuser des Jugendrechts* (Juvenile Law Centres), in which police, public prosecutor's office and child and youth services can be found under one roof. In some federal states, different variations on inter-institutional case conferences are being tested for particularly difficult cases.

On the socio-political level, there is a broad consensus that concepts of prevention are the best way to combat crime, a conviction that goes largely undisputed in the organizations involved in crime prevention. For child and youth services, which will be discussed in more detail below, this only applies to a limited extent. And indeed, the (crime) prevention activities of child and youth services have repeatedly been the object of political debates in recent years. One thing that is striking here is that these discourses have found very little resonance in *professional practice*, while the use of the term "prevention" has increasingly appeared in more and more concepts, programmes and titles.<sup>10</sup>

### **The contribution of child and youth services to crime prevention**

In order to be able to identify the place of child and youth services in crime prevention, we first need to consider the statutory mandate of child and youth services, and the premises on which they act.

Child and youth services fall into the remit of the local authorities. They are responsible for all children and young people, but especially for those whose development is adversely affected or who are growing up in unfavourable conditions. The organization and selection of the services offered to children and young people and their parents are negotiated by local public and independent providers of youth services, taking into consideration the principle of subsidiarity, specific local requirements, and the framework provided by the Social Code Book (SGB) VIII. This leads to a considerable variety, sometimes even an enormous variety of services on offer – and this also applies to the area of crime prevention. There is a wide spectrum, ranging from work on individual cases to group services for children and young people, and community work. These have very different methods, forms and themes, and in some cases different partner agencies, and are aimed at specific target groups, which are associated with different risks. Typical examples here are social group work with children, conflict mediation in schools, youth social work, open youth work in socially deprived areas, outdoor education services, anti-aggression management courses – the whole spectrum up to

---

<sup>9</sup> This is particularly evident in the relationship between youth services and the police. In the 1980s, cooperation was sometimes categorically ruled out by both sides. Today collaboration is everyday practice, and its possibilities and limits are the subject of a nuanced and sometimes heated debated (cf. Möller, 2010).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *DJI-Impulse*, 2/2011: The bulletin of the Deutsches Jugendinstitut (German Youth Institute) recently devoted a special issue to the topic of prevention. Cf. also Wohlgemuth, 2009.

and including measures involving the deprivation of liberty. There are, in particular, numerous services available in connection with violence.<sup>11</sup>

Prevention is a basic principle of child and youth services, whose legal framework is established in the Social Code Book (SGB) VIII. According to the Social Code Book VIII, children and young people should be supported in their development, and disadvantages should be avoided or eliminated. Thus averting risks and dangers, if possible before they arise – in other words, prevention – is a *structural principle*, and was one of the demands formulated in the Eighth Youth Report of the German federal government in 1990.<sup>12</sup> At the same time, the Eighth Youth Report also emphasizes the inherent meaning or purpose of the tasks of youth services, and thus already reflects on problems associated with prevention: “Preventive orientation is not a general concept for the structure of youth services, but one element in them.”<sup>13</sup>

When child and youth services, following their statutory mandate, support the development of children and young people into independent and socially adjusted personalities, this activity – as mentioned above – always includes a preventive element of averting dangers. Regular services such as open youth work, youth social work, community work, youth work in schools, and the whole area of *erzieherische Hilfen* (educational support) make an important *contribution* here. Prevention of violence or crime can thus be either a *peripheral effect* or *side effect* of the actions of youth services, or their *main objective*. The regular services offered and their contribution to crime prevention often receive less attention in the debate about prevention than more high-visibility projects and programmes, although they have an important connecting function in work with delinquent children and young people. The following section will therefore focus on the role that regular youth service practices play in work with delinquent children, young people, and their families.

### **Delinquency in children and young people – the regular work of child and youth services**

The Social Code Book (SGB) VIII, which sets the parameters for child and youth services, focuses on the young person and his or her family, without distinguishing between children and young people. The procedures and principles are, in the first instance, the same for both.

For child and youth services, delinquency may be the *initial reason* for contacting a family, or it may become an issue in the *context of a pre-existing contact*. When it comes to dealing with delinquency, however, the distinction between those above and below the age of criminal responsibility (14 years) is relevant in several respects:

- for *children*, child and youth services are the institution with primary responsibility,
- in the case of *young people*, child and youth services have the additional task of providing *youth services in juvenile court proceedings*, so the judiciary becomes an important partner agency,
- the (penal) consequences associated with the capacity for criminal responsibility can be serious for the young people, and are therefore also relevant for child and youth services.

---

11 A systematic description of the different violence prevention strategies of child and youth services, focusing on youth, can be found in Holthusen/Schäfer, 2007.

12 BMJFFG, 1990, pp. 85f.

13 Ibid., p. 86.

When a child or young person comes to the attention of the police with an illegal act, the responsible youth office (*Jugendamt*) is also informed as standard practice.<sup>14</sup> Delinquency on its own is not a compelling reason for youth services to establish contact with the children or young people and their families. The first step is to check whether there is a *need for educational input*: this may be done by offering the parents counselling or advice. Here the child and youth services always take a pedagogical approach, not focusing solely on the illegal act, but on the child or young person as a whole: his or her *resources* and *lived-in world* become the starting point for pedagogical action. The aim is to work with children, young people and parents, on the basis of the voluntary principle, to deal with possible problems for which delinquency might be a sign or symptom. The same applies to the way delinquency is dealt with when child and youth services are already in contact with the family (for another reason). As children grow older, their same-age peers assume greater significance in comparison to their families, and youth services therefore focus more attention on peer contexts.

Delinquent behaviour is often associated with other behavioural issues and difficulties, which may themselves be grounds for support. Here we can observe interactive processes which are relevant for pedagogical interventions. Repeated offending (*Mehrfachauffälligkeit*) can also be a sign that educational input is needed or that a child's welfare may be endangered.

Public youth services have a position of guardianship (*Wächteramt*), which entails a duty to protect. If a child or young person's delinquency gives specific indications that he or she is endangered, this duty to protect may necessitate an intervention in the family, beyond the limits of the voluntary principle, to avert an *endangerment of the child's welfare*.

Since *children* under 14 are incapable of criminal responsibility in Germany, as stipulated in Section 19 of the German Penal Code (StGB), child and youth services have a special importance when it comes to the institutional reaction to delinquency. Along with the public prosecutor's office, the child and youth service is the only institution that is officially informed by the police within the framework of incident reports. The judiciary has no further responsibility here. Retrospective analyses of unreported crime cases have shown that delinquent acts are by no means unusual, especially in childhood, but are widespread. If children get in trouble with the law, this is – apart from certain exceptions – usually petty in nature, and can be understood as a transient, age-typical developmental hurdle, which, in the majority of all cases, is successfully resolved in the framework of processes within the family, or with short-term institutional support.<sup>15</sup>

When *young people* aged 14 and over commit criminal offences, the first response of child and youth services (as with children below the age of criminal responsibility) is to check whether educational input is needed. Child and youth services also participate in juvenile criminal proceedings, as stipulated in Section 52 of the Social Code Book (SGB) VIII, contributing a pedagogical perspective. By informing the juvenile court about the personality of the young person, and proposing possible measures, youth services play a key role in ensuring that any sanctions imposed by the juvenile court are tailored to the young person in such a way that further criminal offences become less likely. At the same time, youth services also provide a diverse spectrum of educationally focused non-custodial measures designed to avoid the harm done by the deprivation of liberty. Thus child and youth services are an indispensable partner agency for the juvenile courts, as shown, not least, in the

---

<sup>14</sup> This is stipulated in Police Regulation (PDV) 382; the actual implementation, however, seems to vary considerably.

<sup>15</sup> Hoops, 2009.

debates over the clarification of decision-making responsibility, triggered by Section 36a of the Social Code Book (SGB) VIII.<sup>16</sup>

## Current challenges

Pedagogical crime prevention has become well established in the last two decades – particularly in *project-based forms of organization*, but also in *regular offerings*. A variety of approaches and concepts have been developed. The challenges consist in securing the long-term provision of services and also extending service coverage, so that the necessary approaches are available as regular services, in accordance with local needs. In addition to this, crime prevention in childhood and youth is faced with a number of areas for development on various levels, relating to specific issues, structures, and politics.

Key challenges are mainly to be found in the development of *target-group-related approaches*: in many cases there are access problems for specific groups, e.g. those from ethnic backgrounds, which can contribute to a higher risk of criminalization for these groups.<sup>17</sup> There is also a substantial need for development with regard to (potential) victims. This mainly concerns the victims of violence, who are mostly, but not exclusively, male. The shifting roles of victim and offender have been described in criminological studies, but too little attention is paid to this in practice. Moreover, special challenges face youth services in juvenile court proceedings, which are responsible not only for the defendant, but also for the injured party, if he or she is also a young person. One relatively new sphere of activity in which youth services have little experience so far is the internet and the new media. New risks of criminalization and victimization may potentially be emerging here for children and young people, risks for which there are as yet no adequate prevention strategies. There is also still potential for development with regard to efforts to reflect on gender roles. There are services that are provided only for boys or girls, or only taken up by one group, but often no reflection about this takes place or is included in the pedagogical concept.

Alongside these issue-specific challenges, further challenges present themselves on a *structural level*. As seen above, youth services in juvenile court proceedings provide a regular service and constitute a crucial link with the police and the justice system, helping to devise a solution that is pedagogically appropriate, suitable for the individual young person, and accepted by him or her. Unsuitable measures or conditions are often not fulfilled or are abandoned, potentially resulting in further escalations. These may culminate in the deprivation of liberty, e.g. in the form of *Ungehorsamsarrest* (non-compliance detention) – an outcome which is to be avoided if at all possible. Empirical results show that non-compliance detention makes up a substantial proportion of all custodial measures, and around one third of youth services in juvenile court proceedings report an increase in this area in recent years.<sup>18</sup> This development shows, firstly, that the necessary resources must be available in order to propose a suitable penalty, tailored to the young person, and secondly, that this service must then be available.

---

<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, the youth services providing support in juvenile court proceedings rate the cooperation with the juvenile courts as good, as shown by the “Jugendgerichtshilfeb@rometer” in 2010, see Arbeitsstelle/JHSW, 2011, pp. 46ff.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Walter, 2007: in this context, he describes the over-representation of ethnic minorities in the penal system.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Thalmann, forthcoming; Arbeitsstelle/JHSW, 2011, p. 76.

Structural challenges are also apparent with regard to cooperation. The continuing development of cooperation between the institutions is a central concern, especially in the case of the regular services. Collaboration between child and youth services, schools, the police, the judiciary, and, where relevant, other actors, e.g. from the healthcare system, is not only required for specific cases, but is a structural necessity – recognizing and taking into account the different rationales and social mandates of these institutions. Changed parameters in the partner agencies must also be taken into consideration, e.g. those that have occurred as a result of the change from half-day to full-day schools.

From a *political* perspective, one matter for concern is the excessive and in some respects unreflective use of the term “prevention”. Here a situation has developed in which this label is applied to nearly everything that supports the development of children and young people, and may thus potentially – but not primarily – have crime-preventing effects, such as support for pregnant minors or language courses for children from ethnic backgrounds in children’s day-care centres. The label “crime prevention” is always associated with an attribution: the target groups of violence prevention are at least indirectly assumed to have the potential for violent behaviour. This inevitably brings the risk of stigmatization, which could in turn trigger exactly the behaviour that was supposed to be avoided. Not only would the measure to prevent violence not have the desired effect; it would have the opposite effect.

A further challenge in terms of politics and/or policymaking becomes evident in efforts to verify the effectiveness of pedagogical prevention strategies. For years there have been frequent demands for *evaluation* in the field of crime prevention, but so far these demands have seldom been met. At the same time there is increasing pressure – both for financial and professional reasons – to secure legitimation by demonstrating positive effects. This, however, presents evaluation practice with problems that are as yet unresolved, especially in the relatively unformalized settings in which youth services carry out their pedagogical work. There is, for example, uncertainty about whether an observed effect can actually be ascribed to the intervention or whether other factors played a decisive role.<sup>19</sup> What is needed here is the (further) development of appropriate evaluation methods, and the necessary resources for evaluation, in order to contribute to the ongoing development of this field.<sup>20</sup>

One question that remains open is to what extent the few available findings from evaluations of crime prevention strategies are transferable. The use of American and other international evaluative studies fails to take into account the different local conditions; but the question of transferability must also be asked for the existing German studies, albeit to a lesser extent.

---

19 In order to find a suitable method for dealing with the question of attributability, a new model called the “Logic Model” was tested in the framework of the Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (Centre for the Prevention of Youth Crime) to verify the effectiveness of crime prevention. Cf.

[www.dji.de/bibs/jugendkriminalitaet/Logisches\\_Modell-Zentrale\\_Ergebnisse.pdf](http://www.dji.de/bibs/jugendkriminalitaet/Logisches_Modell-Zentrale_Ergebnisse.pdf) (12 February 2012).

20 An example of the importance of evaluation for the field is shown by Linke’s study (2011) on a diversion scheme (*Diversionstage*). The study made it clear that the intended aims of the project were not being achieved.

## Conclusion

Delinquency in childhood and youth is a phenomenon that will not disappear, and crime prevention will therefore continue to consolidate its position. As a concept, prevention is highly attractive for both politicians and practitioners: for politics, because it does not simply react to problems after they have arisen, but can present itself as forward-looking and effective. For practitioners, it has positive connotations not only because it is a means of accessing additional financial resources, but because it secures recognition even when they are working with difficult target groups. These positive associations, however, should not misguide us into excessive use of the label 'prevention', just to achieve short-term successes in project funding. In the long term, in the interests of all the actors in the field, and of the children and young people concerned, we need to avoid a "prevention bubble" – which will burst when reckless promises about solving problems cannot be kept in the medium term. What is needed here is precise use of terminology and realistic goal-setting.

The role required of child and youth services in crime prevention is to continually insert the pedagogical perspective into the professional and academic discourse, in the interests of the children and young people concerned, and to ensure that this perspective is not outweighed by considerations of public safety. Child and youth services must also make sure that they retain their independence. Despite the budget problems still faced by many local authorities, child and youth services must be in a position to fulfil their duties in the area of deviant behaviour. The acceptance of the police and judiciary which has been achieved in many places would be put at risk if youth services were to withdraw here. The other actors in the field would then be forced to assume parts of these duties, without having the statutory mandate, the professional expertise, and the organizational prerequisites. For the interests of the children and young people concerned, this would have disastrous consequences. The dynamics of the field should not be underestimated here. The importance and recognition that child and youth services (especially their regular services) have gained in the field cannot be taken for granted; they have to be continually recreated on the ground in everyday cooperation and communication with the other institutions involved. At the same time, however, these services must follow their *professional pedagogical standards*, which go far beyond averting danger and avoiding or reducing delinquency. This gives child and youth services a unique and distinctive status in relation to the other institutions of crime prevention.

Bernd Holthusen and Dr Sabrina Hoops work as research associates in the Youth and Youth Services division of the German Youth Institute (Deutsches Jugendinstitut e. V.) in Munich.

## References

Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (ed.) (n.d.). *Evaluation in der Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention. Eine Dokumentation.* (vol. 9 of the publications of the *Arbeitsstelle*). Munich: Deutsches Jugendinstitut.

Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (ed.) (2007). *Strategien der Gewaltprävention im Kindes- und Jugendalter. Eine Zwischenbilanz in sechs Handlungsfeldern.* (vol. 11 of the publications of the *Arbeitsstelle*). Munich: Deutsches Jugendinstitut.

Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention/Projekt „Jugendhilfe und Sozialer Wandel“ (eds.) (2011). *Das Jugendgerichtshilfeb@rometer. Empirische Befunde zur Jugendhilfe im*

*Strafverfahren in Deutschland*. (vol. 12 of the publications of the *Arbeitsstelle*). Munich: Deutsches Jugendinstitut.

Der Bundesminister für Jugend, Familie, Frauen und Gesundheit (BMJFFG) (ed.) (1990). *Achter Jugendbericht. Bericht über Bestrebungen und Leistungen der Jugendhilfe*. Bonn.

Bundesministerium des Innern/Bundesministerium der Justiz (eds.) (2006). *Zweiter Periodischer Sicherheitsbericht der Bundesregierung*. [n.p. (Berlin)].

Holthusen, B. (2011). *Projekt: Polizeilich mehrfach auffällige Strafunmündige. Ergebnisbericht für die Fachpraxis*. DJI October.

Holthusen, B.; Hoops, S. (2011). Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention. Handlungsfelder, Chancen und Risiken. In: Deegener, G.; Körner, W. (eds.). *Aggression und Gewalt im Kindes- und Jugendalter. Ursachen, Formen, Intervention*. Weinheim and Basel: Beltz, p. 54-69.

Holthusen, B.; Hoops, S. (2011). Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention. Zwischen Mogelpackung und Erfolgsmodell. In: *DJI-Impulse. Das Bulletin aus dem Deutschen Jugendinstitut 2/2011*, pp. 12-14.

Holthusen, B.; Schäfer, H. (2007). Strategien der Gewaltprävention in der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe im Jugendalter. In: *Arbeitsstelle 2007*, pp. 131-168.

Hoops, S. (2009). *Was hilft bei Kinderdelinquenz? Familien als Experten*. Weinheim and Munich: Juventa.

Linke, A. (2011). Diversionstag in Nordrhein-Westfalen. Zentrale Ergebnisse und Schlussfolgerungen der Begleitforschung. In: *ZJJ 3/2011*, pp. 296-304.

Möller, K. (ed.) (2010). *Dasselbe in grün? Aktuelle Perspektiven auf das Verhältnis von Polizei und Sozialer Arbeit*. Weinheim and Munich: Juventa.

Richter, H.; Sturzenhecker, B. (with contributions by Braband, J.; Buddeberg, K.; Karolczak, M.; Olschok, J.). Evaluation des Handlungskonzepts „Handeln gegen Jugendgewalt“. Abschlussbericht, September 2010, <https://www.ew.uni-hamburg.de/ueber-die-fakultaet/.../evaluation.pdf> (14 October 2015).

Sturzenhecker, B.; Karolczak, M.; Braband, J. (2011). Ergebnisse der Evaluation der „Gemeinsamen Fallkonferenzen“ im Rahmen des Hamburger Handlungskonzeptes „Handeln gegen Jugendgewalt“, in: *ZJJ 3/2011*, pp. 305-312.

Thalman, D. (2012 forthcoming). Jugendarrest – Eine kritische Bestandsaufnahme. In: Schriftenreihe der Deutschen Vereinigung für Jugendgerichte und Jugendgerichtshilfen e.V. (ed.). *Achtung für Jugend! Dokumentation des 28. Deutschen Jugendgerichtstages vom 11. - 14. September in Münster*. Mönchengladbach: Forum.

Walter, J. (2007). Überrepräsentation von Minderheiten im Strafvollzug. In: *Neue Kriminalpolitik*, no. 4, vol. 19, pp. 127-133.

Wohlgemuth, K. (2009). *Prävention in der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe. Annäherung an eine Zauberformel*. Wiesbaden: VS.