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ADAM GRAYCAR

"Dealing with Delinquency: Diverse Challenges"

This presentation will focus on a mixed approach to dealing with juveniles. Noting the importance of preventing crime in the first place, dealing well with young people and processing offenders to deliver satisfactory outcomes. This presentation will move along this spectrum using three illustrative examples – the role of sport in crime prevention; police relations with young men; and restorative justice.
The challenge before us is to find the right set of interventions to prevent criminal behaviour among young people, and prevent that behaviour becoming a lifelong activity. The two main strategies are on the one hand to reduce the supply of motivated offenders, and on the other to make crime more difficult to commit.

In exploring these strategies we confront policy and practice agendas of considerable complexity. We also find ourselves confronted by boundaries, which on the surface can be easily mapped, but which, in reality sometimes appear convoluted and unconquerable.

- To deal with the first objective, reducing the supply of motivated offenders, I could outline a catalogue of policies relating to intervening in the lives of individuals, families, schools and communities, and in particular at the important transition points. At the other end of the spectrum, but dealing with the same issue of reducing the supply of motivated offenders, the institutions of diversion and incarceration also play a role. There are activities which occur in the justice domain, and activities which occur outside the justice domain.

- To deal with the second objective, we can unpack the conjunction of criminal opportunities, and test policies about designing for safety, community policing, protective behaviours and so on, within a context of situational crime prevention and a legal framework.

Crime is the result of complex changes in economic, social and cultural factors such as unemployment, dysfunctional families, child abuse, poor education, community breakdown, economic inequality and substance abuse. If crime prevention is to succeed it should focus on broad social outcomes, for example reducing social exclusion. Compelling evidence suggests that those who feel excluded from participation in community life are more likely to offend against that community. Addressing this sense of exclusion can reduce the risk of offending.

Crime prevention is guided by strategic intentions and approaches but is ultimately defined by results. The hard strategic framework involves policies to prevent crime, improve safety and reduce disorder while recognising that there is no one single, definable cause of crime. While the financial costs involved with crime are staggering, significant human costs are also involved, for example, the effects on young people with reduced life options and the impact on the next generation.

The issues I want to deal with today are issues of domain. By domain, I mean the spheres of policy and practice that achieve social objectives. Most of us here today are interested in the criminal justice domain - and that includes institutions such as police, courts, prisons, and the activities that surround these. What we know, however, is that the criminal justice domain plays only a small part in crime prevention and in limiting the supply of motivated offenders.
The most successful crime prevention agency is the family. It is in families that violent and aggressive behaviour is learned and practised, and it is in the family that it is most commonly mitigated and prevented. The family instils many values, but its primary role is not crime prevention. We have a domain issue also when we examine activities such as education, sport, child care, public housing, community health, for example. They all have a prime purpose that has very little to do with delinquency, yet their impact on potential delinquents can be enormous. Understanding how to get the most out of the justice domain, and how to build supportive partnerships with other domains is the difficult task confronting us. It is both a conceptual and strategic issue—having good theories and ideas and the ability to turn policy into practice.

Sometimes there is a domain shift. Responding to the use of illicit drugs, for example, has been a key feature of the criminal justice domain, in that it was seen primarily in terms of law violation, but in recent years has moved into the health domain, and the responses are seen as coming in terms of rehabilitation and treatment. Things move from one domain to another if there is public consensus about their location.

We have to understand clearly what it is we wish to achieve, and even more clearly to understand the domains within which the protective and preventive behaviour occur. Many domains link to develop social capital to aim towards outcomes such as:

- Improved feelings of confidence, pride and safety within communities
- Enhanced access to employment and training opportunities
- An increase in average levels of education
- Accessible and relevant local services.

If we can find the domains to process and deliver these then we are on the way to a safety culture, built on a basis of strong social inclusion, and a place in which young people feel integrated, and wanted, and older people are not afraid of, nor disparaging of our youth.

However, we have to realise that it all starts very early, and it is here that we must take note of the important work done on identifying *Pathways to Prevention*. This is the name of a significant report completed recently for the Australian Government, and written by Professor Ross Homel from Griffith University, in conjunction with several eminent colleagues. The report identified Risk Factors and Protective Factors, which move across many domains, and a summary is in the appendix to this paper.

In my task today I want to focus on three domains, two in the justice field and one outside, that have a role in trying to reduce the supply of motivated offenders, and making crime more difficult to commit. They are:

- Policing, which is a domain clearly within the criminal justice domain, and its focus on young people poses challenges for practice.
• Diverting young offenders from the criminal justice system. The process redefines some activities to lie outside the criminal justice domain, and that domain diverts young offenders away from its core.

• A domain that is not seen as linked to the criminal justice domain, and the illustration I shall use is sport, which could be focussed as a crime prevention measure. Sport is only one illustration, and any other domain in the appendix could be used to extend our thinking.

Police and Young People

The relationship between young people and police must be informed by the nature of the transgressions, and the framework within which they occur, as well as the responses within the domain.

Understanding the context of disorder and incivility shape our understanding of local policing. In their famous work on ‘Broken Windows’ Wilson and Kelling (1982) argued that indicators of incivility, such as broken windows, litter, abandoned motor vehicles, and general disrepair – fortunately not something we see in Singapore - communicate a message that no one is in control of a location and that no one cares - “one unrepaired broken window is a signal that no one cares, and so, breaking more windows costs nothing”. Wilson and Kelling’s theory is that the begging drunk or the offensive youngster, is the first broken window.

This in turn tends to invite behavioural incivility, which Albert Reiss (1985) once dubbed “soft crimes”, such as disturbing the peace, public drunkenness, loitering, and rowdyism, which reinforces the message that predatory criminals and louts/ yobbos/ rascals can move in with little worry of being challenged. If the community cannot keep an offensive individual from annoying passersby, real villains could believe that they could act with impunity.

The reaction is that police respond to “broken windows” with stern measures, and operating within the police domain, their behaviour can be plotted on a spectrum from “zero tolerance” to community renewal.

It must be pointed out, however that 100 years ago inner city life was worse both in the level of predatory crime and disorderly behaviour (Grabosky, 1977; Skogan, 1990). Today, it is suggested there is less tolerance for disorder and interpersonal violence. “Over a long term urbanisation has had a settling, literally a civilising effect on the population involved” (Skogan, 1990: 6).

Behaviour is restrained either by morality or by the enforcement mechanisms of the state. Both have to be equally valued. The agenda for developing civility as a pervasive and valued social goal is before us. There is a combination of family policy, school policy, crime prevention, health care, urban planning, employment opportunities and better policing, all of which must come together to make people feel safer and be safer. This of course transcends many domains.
In much of the western world young people’s contact with the police is frequent and there appears to be a level of mistrust between police and youth. Researchers have observed that police deal with young men differently compared to the rest of the community. A degree of resistance to authority has always been characteristic of youth, particularly those from dysfunctional families. The conflict between police and young people is often fuelled around issues of authority. For example, Blagg and Wilkie (1995: 23) explain that police challenge young people to defer to authority, while young people often fail to show respect. Contact with police can be based on very trivial issues, yet it results in young people’s further involvement in the criminal justice system.

Indeed, in a recent project conducted by the Australian Institute of Criminology, (Cameron, 2000) young men perceived antagonistic relationships existing between themselves and police. The project focused on violence in young men’s lives. When the young men came in contact with police over issues of violence they often exacerbated the situation. The young men reported feeling poorly understood, especially by people in authority, particularly the police. The young men identified police attitude as a problem. They believed that most police officers did not understand youth culture and had a closed mind on youth issues. The young men said that they often socialised in shopping centres and on the street, and hung out “being themselves,” but police did not understand this. They considered that police tended to hassle or harass the young men. They considered that police did not believe them - even when telephoning 000 in an emergency.

A very promising area of crime prevention concerns police adopting a more legitimate approach, especially to high-risk juveniles, that may lead to effective long term outcomes (Sherman 1997: 8.1). Lawrence Sherman has argued that the means police use to communicate with young people may have the effect of alienating young people not well integrated into society. He has developed a theory of defiance to explain situations where young people respond with outrage, and may even re-offend as a consequence of what they regard as unfair policing.

According to defiance theory, young people exhibit defiance under four conditions:

1. The offender defines a criminal sanction as unfair.

2. The offender is poorly bonded to or alienated from the sanctioning agent or the community the agent represents.

3. The offender perceives the action as personally stigmatising and rejecting, rather than as a response to a lawbreaking act.

4. The offender denies or refuses to acknowledge the shame the sanction has actually caused him to suffer (Sherman 1993: 460).

Young men may determine the sanctions are unfair under either of two conditions.
1. The sanctioning agent behaves with disrespect for the offender, or for the group to which the offender belongs, regardless of how fair the sanction is or substantive the grounds.

2. The sanction is substantively arbitrary, discriminatory, excessive, undeserved, or otherwise objectively unjust (Sherman 1993: 460-1).

According to Sherman, the outcome of unfair sanctioning of poorly integrated young people is re-offending.

Understanding this orientation and acting upon it may have important crime prevention outcomes. While young people contribute to conflict, inevitably police are in a position to change the nature of relations. Research has shown that people stopped in Chicago by police developed a negative attitude toward them. However, if those stopped were treated well and professionally they had a substantially more positive view of police (Skogan & Hartnett, 1997: 217). Fairness should be a part of encounters with police and in criminal justice procedures. The benefit of legitimate policing can be seen in the area of domestic violence where it has limited the amount of repeat offending (Paternoster et. al. 1997: 192-3).

The process of policing may have implications for how people see themselves in the broader society, and may result in compliance if they are considered to share values (Braithwaite 1989: 184). The issue of procedural fairness is currently being tested in Canberra (Sherman et. al. 1998; Strang et. al. 1999). A focus on police conducting themselves professionally, and with fairness and respect, observing their rights, and listening to what they have to say could have long term effects as a crime prevention strategy.

**Enforcing Trusting relationships**

Putting in place regulatory mechanism can enforce changes in practices. John Braithwaite argues that when people are trusted by those in authority and in government, their trustworthiness increases (Braithwaite 1998: 346). So, by treating young people with fairness and respect, trust rather than antagonism may grow, and characterise how police and young people relate. Building trust has positive effects. Braithwaite contends that by establishing a committee of young people, police and other interested parties, who sit down and discuss issues in an open problem-solving style, negotiated solutions to problems will result. The knowledge gained by young people, and their capability to advocate outside the meeting, imposes a structural constraint on the action of police (Braithwaite 1998: 355). Thereby, trust and responsiveness is enforced upon police by the deterrence represented by the operation of the committee.

The challenges then, are for police to see a community approach to their work and to build bridges as a fundamental part of policing. Police would then enjoy opportunities to learn
about the people on their beats and about the places in which they are likely to be called upon to defuse difficult situations.

**Diverting young offenders from the criminal justice system.**

In many countries the court domain has been seen as less than optimum in structuring the life chances of young people. There has been a move for diversion for at least three main reasons.

*First*, courts in many countries are overloaded; *second* there is a perverse unproductive and stigmatising consequence of most outcomes, as courts operate within the criminal justice domain. *Third*, diversion is an opportunity for a second chance, an opportunity to do something effective by moving domains.

As in many countries, Australia has a separate justice system for juveniles. In recent decades the court handed over responsibility for young offenders who were deemed vulnerable and in need of care to state social welfare departments.

In the 1990s new legislation was introduced in most jurisdictions which marked a shift to restorative justice and the provision of an increased range of pre-court options for processing young offenders. Included is community conferencing which is an alternative to conventional sentencing designed to divert young offenders from the potentially stigmatising and alienating effects of juvenile justice system processing (Hayes et al. 1998: 6).

The process of restorative justice involves bringing together victims and offenders, and others who may have an interest in a particular offence to deal collectively with how to resolve the impact of the offence, and to chart a path for the future.

In addition to the victim and the offender we might see family members and other members of their communities who may be affected or who may be able to help prevent a recurrence of the offence. These meetings are facilitated by a mediator who helps bring about a collective resolution. The goals of meetings are to heal the relationship between the victim and offender, provide restitution and healing for the victim, reassure the community, and encourage acceptance of responsibility and healing for the offender through apology and reparation.

The principles underlying restorative justice are:

- Crime is primarily an offence against human relationships and secondarily a violation of a law.
- While recognising that crime is wrong, restorative justice recognises that retribution can lead to the further alienation of the offender from society and therefore increase the likelihood of continued anti-social behaviour. Restorative justice focuses on the recognition of opportunities provided through this process to create a safer, more respectful and cooperative relationship between the participants and society.
- Restorative justice seeks to ‘make things as right as possible’ for all parties involved.
• Offenders are encouraged to learn new ways of acting and participating in the community, as soon as the safety concerns of the victim, community and offender are satisfied.

• Restorative justice seeks maximum voluntary cooperation and minimum coercion, from all parties involved.

• When offenders are uncooperative the intervention of an outside authority may be necessary. The actions taken by this authority must be reasonable, restorative and respectful for all those involved (victims, offenders and communities).

• Uncooperative offenders should be placed in an environment that emphasises safety, values, ethics, responsibility, accountability and civility; the goal being to encourage offenders to attain the necessary skills to become cooperative members of society.

• As much as possible the natural community should be setting for restorative justice - it is through community institutions that moral and ethical standards are developed. (Alliance of Non-governmental Organizations in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice 2000).

There are many types of restorative justice practices.

**Diversion** is the channelling of an offender or suspect away from the criminal justice process. This may take the form of a caution or warning, diversion at the pretrial stage for resolution of the case by some informal procedure, or alternatives to conviction or sentence following a trial.

Another restorative justice practice is **family group conferencing** which can be conducted in a variety of ways. All include the young offender, the family, and the victim in the conferencing process. Some also include other people chosen by the family or other people from the community affected by the offence. A facilitator is always present. In New Zealand a Youth Justice Coordinator adopts this role while in other places a police officer is used. During the meeting the participants are encouraged to express their feelings about the offence. Agreement is then sought on appropriate forms of restitution and reparation.

An alternative to this approach is **victim-offender mediation** in which only the victim and offender meet in the presence of a mediator. Although family members may be present they are not active participants in the meeting.

**Reintegrative shaming** is an important component of restorative justice. While specific disapproval of misbehaviour is expressed it is done so in a way that does not further alienate the offender from society. This is done through the expression of general social approval, combined with encouragement to adopt alternative patterns of behaviour. (Alliance of Non-governmental Organizations in Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice 2000)
In Canberra, the Australian National University, is conducting The Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE) Project. Police-run conferences are conducted during which the focus is on expressing shame at the offenders’ acts rather than the offenders. The project compares the effectiveness of conferencing with court hearings for certain kinds of offences. Results show that there is less likelihood of repeat offending when the conferencing approach is adopted rather than a court hearing (RISE project).

In Australia most jurisdictions have opted for a multi-tiered diversionary system, incorporating informal and formal police cautioning for trivial and minor offending, and family conferencing for the more serious matters (Wundersitz 2000).

In a conference the victims are given the opportunity to confront the young offender, express the hurt and anger that they feel and play a key role in deciding what needs to be done by the youth to make up for the harm caused. Conferencing is attractive because it entails the ideals of healing and restoration, and of empowering offenders, victims and families. It sees young people as integral members of a family and a community, rather than as social isolates. Concerns about this approach, however, include:

- the lack of legal safeguards;
- the lack of proportionality and equality of outcomes;
- the potential for revictimising the victim if the youth fails to express remorse or fails to complete the undertaking;
- the improbability of achieving family and community reintegration for offenders who are homeless, unemployed and have no community ties; and
- the various power imbalances that are embedded within a conference which potentially renders the notion of consensus decision-making unachievable (Wundersitz (2000)

Recent evaluation on youth justice conferencing in Queensland found that participants experienced high levels of satisfaction.

- Between 96.7% and 100% of young people, parents/caregivers and victims were satisfied with conference agreements and felt the conference was fair.
- Between 91% and 99% of young people, parents/caregivers and victims felt the conference was ‘just what [they] needed to sort things out’ (Hayes et al. 1998: 6).

However, there was no evidence of youth justice conferencing diverting cases away from the courts, as there was an increase in the number of young people appearing before the courts examined in this research (Hayes et al. 1998). The introduction of conferencing could be viewed as evidence of net-widening – resulting in more and more young people coming into contact with the criminal justice system. Recidivism rates were not considered within the scope of this research (Hayes et al. 1998).
Diversionary programs introduced in Aboriginal communities in Australia show potential. The continued over-representation of Indigenous people in custody, and particularly Aboriginal young people, has led to the development of the Local Justice Initiatives Program. The program recognises that it is the members of Aboriginal communities themselves who are best placed to plan and implement effective strategies to address these problems in ways appropriate to their particular needs and circumstances.

**Sport and crime prevention**

Sport is an interesting domain area in which any crime prevention activity is a by-product rather than a prime objective of the activity.

One key assumption about this domain is that of energy diversion, assuming that if a youngster is occupied doing one thing, they won’t do crime. Of course we have examples of young people who do sport and crime, and enjoy them both. On the other hand this may be a very small minority of those at risk, and the pay-off might be there in that many youngsters may want to do only one, and that one, hopefully, is sport. However we structure the issues, they are not empirically settled.

A recent Australian Institute of Criminology paper (Cameron and Macdougall 2000) brings together literature on crime, crime prevention and young people, and provides contemporary examples of sport as a means of intervention. The evidence is encouraging and suggests that with careful planning sport and physical activity has crime prevention potential, and that young people can personally benefit from these programs. The paper outlines some processes by which this might occur, and concludes:

1. Sport and recreation can combine with other interventions to reduce crime in particular groups and communities.
2. It appears that sport and recreation can reduce crime by providing accessible, relevant activities in a supportive social context. In other words, sport and recreation must be connected positively into the social fabric of groups and communities.
3. Sport and recreation based interventions must be conducted in collaboration with a range of other strategies and sectors.
4. It is essential to consider how the design, location and funding of sporting and recreational infrastructure contributes to social cohesion and does not take sport and recreation out of its social context.
5. The cases do not suggest “one size fits all” strategies, but instead represent the value of community development approaches to tailor programs to particular needs. Nevertheless, this should not prevent us from suggesting common strategies and processes and collecting examples of good practice.
6. Elite sporting bodies can be involved in programs directly aimed at particular crimes or communities.
7. The promotion of elite sport in isolation is unlikely to lead directly to crime prevention.
8. Sports administrators and facilitators should plan programs that espouse desired values.
Situational crime prevention, community crime prevention and developmental crime prevention have relevance for conceptualising sport and physical activities that have a crime prevention focus. There are examples of sports programs that have been introduced with the intention of limiting crime. Others have potential to make crime prevention an unintended outcome.

While programs have been introduced with an explicit or implicit crime prevention outcome, it should be noted that very little is known about their effectiveness (Robbins 1990). It is important that, along with identifying potential programs, that we focus on evidence of success, and rigorous scientific methods of evaluation (Sherman et al. 1997: 2.18 – 2.19).

At this moment in Sydney, Australia the opening ceremony of the 2000 Olympic Games is taking place. Leading up to the Games there has been plenty of evidence of the financial rewards that flow to elite athletes, but this does not flow throughout the community. For many ordinary people however, sport and physical activity is plain fun, or a fantasy that allows one to escape from day to day reality of family conflict, homelessness, or the temptations to use alcohol, drugs or sniff petrol. By donning a uniform young people can be equal, regardless of their diverse backgrounds. Sport and physical activity can give people a sense of belonging, which may mean that suicide, truancy, and pregnancy amongst young women is no longer viewed as an option.

The potential for sport could be in its long-term benefits of the social development of young people. It may also have immediate outcomes; police and communities may witness an immediate benefit that coincides with the duration of the sporting or physical activity. Indeed, reported levels of assault, malicious damage, receiving or selling stolen goods, shoplifting goods, break and enter, or motor vehicle theft may drop. The benefits of sport and physical activity may vary from one social setting to another. In Australian Aboriginal communities there is strong evidence to support the contention that Aboriginal-organised and operated sporting carnivals produce remarkable behavioural changes and give Aboriginal people a sense of control (Tatz 1995: 297-339).

An interesting Canadian example that has been evaluated is a program known as PALS (participate and learn skills). The program was implemented in a housing complex where 417 children between the ages of 5 and 15 years lived. The program offered skill-development programs, including guitar, ballet, judo and swimming to young people living in a housing complex.

The program was effective as a crime prevention strategy. During the course of the PALS program, compared with prior to the program, children committed fewer serious offences and security violations at the housing complex. The program was also cost-effective; the cost of the program was much less than the money that would have been spent policing and cleaning up graffiti. The study demonstrates the importance of on-going programs (Jones and Offord 1989).
Programs that appear to be effective have been implemented at a swimming centre in Canning, Western Australia, to overcome the problem of vandalism and theft. In one program young offenders ordered to undertake community service worked on maintenance at the pool. Those who did a good job could secure up to two weeks paid work. The pool also ran a scuba diving program for 130 children. Those aged 6 to 11 took part in a lifesaving course in the shallow pool, while those aged 12 to 16 learnt to use goggles, snorkel and the breathing apparatus.

According to the manager, as a result of the programs, over a two year period vandalism and theft dropped by 85%. One of the young people participating in community service said the vandalism and theft had dropped because he had asked his friends and others to stop doing it inside the pool complex. The manager considered that because of the programs young people used and maintained the pool “as if it were their own”.

Other programs have been established to show that live gigs and dance parties can be held in a drug and alcohol free environment. These programs aim to actively demonstrate that young people can have a great time without drugs and alcohol.

At a much broader level communities can benefit from the leadership of professional sporting bodies. The Liverpool Football Club in England is one of the biggest, richest and most successful teams in world soccer. The club has confronted violence and other problems. Particularly in Europe, soccer has been associated with hooliganism and organised violence, often with racist motives and outcomes. As part of its response Liverpool Football Club established a community development and public relations program.

Through purposive partnerships building on the club’s position in the community there have been numerous examples of community based activities with relevance to crime prevention. They are as diverse as football camps which promoted quit-smoking and anti-drug themes. They involved high-profile players. Coaching programs were run for children with physical and intellectual difficulties; joint programs between Liverpool and Italian cities were organised to reduce racist inspired violence.

Liverpool Football Club established a classroom at the club to run a Learning Through Football program whereby at-risk primary school children learned about subjects, such as geography, fitness and lifestyle, and focussed on issues of self-esteem, and class and racial equality. A program addressed truancy, whereby children with a history of truancy who attended school for increasing periods of time received a Liverpool Football Club sticker and certificate, and, for improved attendance, attended the club for a presentation. As a final payoff, hoax calls received by the local fire brigade diminished after the club produced a video starring senior players to send the message to schoolchildren.

Sporting activities can transcend many domains, and the support, promotion and sponsorship of sport can occur in domains as diverse as government departments responsible for community development, or sport, or parks and gardens; high profile clubs,
commercial sporting equipment or clothing manufacturers, health agencies, food companies etc.

A catalogue of potential crime prevention activities of sport is presently being compiled by the Australian Institute of Criminology but the success of recreational activities as a means of stopping violence has not been evaluated in Australia. A few programs have been assessed internationally and they show strong effects on the reduction of offending and drug use (Sherman 1997: 3.26 – 3.27).

**Concluding comments**

When we work in crime prevention it is not always easy to state categorically what works and what does not. The building of an evidence base demands methodological skill, data that is not always easily obtainable, and long term evaluation. In recent times, criminologists have made significant progress in evaluating the effects of various types of programs.

This paper has floated the idea of domains, but there is also a persuasive case that the criminal justice system can have a protective and retributive effect on young offenders. Clearly if the goal is retribution, then incapacitation keeps an offender out of circulation and thus unable to offend in the wider community, while serving to satisfy a community desire for punishment. There are regular calls in the community to get tough, not to give persistent offenders a slap on the wrist, and to implement programs such as “three strikes and you’re in”.

While incarceration in prison has virtually no redeeming features, the community must be protected by way of the incapacitation of offenders who will continue to commit serious crimes at a high rate and who are not at the end of their criminal careers.

However, locking up those young people who are not high-rate, serious offenders or those who are at the end of their criminal careers is extremely expensive, and probably counter-productive.

This takes us back to the issue of domains. The criminal justice system can certainly have an effect on behaviour, but the risk factors of whether the long term behaviour will be productive or counterproductive can rarely be predicted.

I have tried today to outline activities in three domains, all of which have an impact on young people.

Police have a significant role to play within the criminal justice system. They are often the front line contact with transgression, but they have not always dealt with young people in the most supportive way. Many police work hard at being an integrative and supportive part of their communities, and the results show in good police/ youth relations. As a front line agency police can moderate behaviour if there is trust and communication, and while
in the criminal justice domain, their role can prevent young people from progressing in the system.

While firmly within the criminal justice system, restorative justice has enormous potential for being the endpoint for many offenders. Diverted from the courts, and spared incarceration, young people can jointly come to terms with the consequences of their transgressions, and plan collaboratively to move down more constructive paths. There are many forms, and a lot of evaluation still to take place, but this is an example of calling upon other domains (family, school, sporting team or whatever) to keep young people away from the more unpalatable components of the criminal justice system.

Any crime prevention benefits from sport are clearly by-products. Sport is generally fun, and sporting institutions command respect and wide support. Participation can have both an integrative and diverting effect, and strategies can be built in this domain, not only to enhance the main outcomes of sporting activity, but to lay a base for long term positive behaviours. The strategies will need to be planned carefully as sport and physical activity take many forms, involve many different types of commitments, and have many objectives. This however, is an example of a supportive domain.
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Risk and Protective Factors Associated with Anti-Social and Criminal Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK FACTORS</th>
<th>PROTECTIVE FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childhood Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• birth injury</td>
<td>• social skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• disability</td>
<td>• good coping skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• difficult temperament</td>
<td>• internal locus of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• insecure attachment</td>
<td>• attachment to family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• poor social skills</td>
<td>• empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• low self esteem</td>
<td>• school achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• hyperactivity/disruptive behaviour</td>
<td>• easy temperament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• impulsivity</td>
<td>• problem solving skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• single parents</td>
<td>• supportive caring parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• teenage mothers</td>
<td>• family harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• poor parental supervision and discipline</td>
<td>• responsibility for chores or required helpfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• substance abuse</td>
<td>• strong family norms and morality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• family violence and disharmony</td>
<td>• secure and stable family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• father absence</td>
<td>• supportive relationship with other adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• long-term parental unemployment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• rejection of child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• abuse/neglect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• school failure</td>
<td>• positive school climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• normative believes about aggression</td>
<td>• prosocial peer group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• deviant peer group</td>
<td>• responsibility and required helpfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• bullying</td>
<td>• sense of belonging/bonding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• peer rejection</td>
<td>• opportunities for some success at school and recognition of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• poor attachment to school</td>
<td>• school norms re: violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• inadequate behaviour management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• divorce and family break up</td>
<td>• meeting significant person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• war or natural disasters</td>
<td>• moving to new area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• death of a family member</td>
<td>• opportunities at critical turning points or major life transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community and Cultural Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• low income and poor housing</td>
<td>• access to support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• population density and housing conditions</td>
<td>• community networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• neighbourhood violence and crime</td>
<td>• attachment to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lack of support services</td>
<td>• participation in church or other community group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• social or cultural discrimination</td>
<td>• a strong cultural identity and ethnic pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• medial portrayal of violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>