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Content and aim

• Aim
  o Impression of research on young people in the Flemish Community of Belgium
  o Illustration of a growing imbalance between ‘youth at risk’ vs. ‘youth as risk’
Introduction
Research line Youth Criminology

Leuven Institute of Criminology
Research line Youth Criminology

- Leuven Institute of Criminology (LINC)
  - Research centre at Faculty of Law, KU Leuven
  - 10 research lines

- Research line Youth Criminology
  - Research and teaching on youth crime and juvenile justice
  - Team
    - Johan Put and Stefaan Pleysier
    - +/- 14 research and teaching assistants

Research line Youth Criminology

- Research topics
  - Phenomenological and etiological research on offending, victimization and fear of crime of young people
  - Research on processes of criminalization
  - Research on policy and practices in juvenile justice
Research line Youth Criminology

• Approach
  o Multidisciplinary
  o Theory and methods
  o Criteria of ‘good criminology’
    • Quality
    • Autonomy
    • Responsibility

cf. address delivered by Lode Walgrave on the occasion of his receipt of the 2008 European Criminology Award of the European Society of Criminology, Edinburgh, 5 September 2008
“My plea for a socially responsible criminology does not oppose purely scientific emphases in criminological work. But if it were only that, criminologists would behave like chickens.

Chickens lay their egg without concern about how it will be used. Whether used for an omelet, or boiled hard, scrambled, or laid out to hatch, chickens do not care. Likewise, some scientists lay their ‘egg of knowledge’ and do not care how it will be used. (…) Their only mission is, they claim, to produce knowledge. Just as the chickens’ mission is to produce eggs.

I view criminology’s mission as higher than laying eggs.”
Youth Research Platform

Policy Research Centre, Flemish Government
Youth Research Platform

• Youth Research Platform (JOP)
  o Policy Research Centre by Flemish Government (1 of 21)
  
  o Third generation
    • 2001-2006
    • 2007-2011
    • 2012-2015
Youth Research Platform

- Youth Research Platform (JOP)
  - Interuniversity and multidisciplinary cooperation
    - Research line Youth Criminology, KU Leuven
    - Department of Social Welfare Studies, Ghent University
    - Research group ‘Tempus Omnia Revelat’, Vrije Universiteit Brussel
  - ~ criminology and juvenile justice
  - ~ educational sciences
  - ~ sociology
Youth Research Platform

- Youth Research Platform (JOP)
  - Needs
    - Lack of youth research
    - Lack of overview and alignment of youth research
  - Aims
    - Inventory of youth research
    - Development and administration of a ‘youth monitor’
    - Platform for youth research and policy, both at national and international level

more on [http://jeugdonderzoekspaltform.be/eng/index.htm](http://jeugdonderzoekspaltform.be/eng/index.htm)
Youth Research Platform

• Developing a youth monitor
  o JOP-monitor
    • Point of comparison
    • Monitor of evolutions
    • On ‘conditions, convictions and conduct’ of Flemish youth
  o Method
    • Repeated cross-sectional surveys
    • General (postal) survey and school surveys
Youth Research Platform

• Developing a youth monitor
  o Fieldwork postal survey
    • JOP-monitor 1 (2005-2006)
      • Flemish youth 14-25y
      • general postal survey (sampling National register)
      • N=2503 (response rate 53%)
    • JOP-monitor 2 (2008)
      • Flemish youth 12-30y
      • general postal survey
      • N=3710 (response rate 46%)
  • New JOP-monitor 3 in 2013
Youth Research Platform

• Developing a youth monitor
  o Fieldwork school survey
    • JOP-monitor Brussels (2010)
      • Brussels youth 12-20y
      • School survey (Flemish community in Brussels)
      • N=2502 (response rate 76%, 89%)
    • JOP-monitor Antwerp-Ghent (2012)
      • Antwerp and Ghent youth 12-20y
      • School survey
      • N=3867 (response rate 63%, 88%)
  • New school survey in Brussels, Antwerp and Ghent in 2013
Belgium and its structure

Crash course
Belgium and its structure

• Federal state
  ○ Structure
    • Federal level
      • Parliament (legislation), King and ministers of government (executive power)
    • 3 Regions
      • Flemish region
      • Walloon region
      • Brussels capital region
    • 3 Communities
      • Flemish community
      • French community
      • German community
    • Provinces (10) and communes (589)
Belgium and its structure
Belgium and its structure

- Flemish community
  - Powers
    - Culture
      - theatre, libraries, audiovisual media, etc.
    - Education
    - Health policy
      - curative and preventive medicine
    - Assistance to individuals
      - protection of youth, social welfare, aid to families, immigrant assistance services, etc.
  - Scientific research (in relation to their powers)
  - International relations (associated with their powers)
Belgium and its structure

• Political context
  o Carrousel of media, political speech and public opinion
  o Crime and public safety
    • Liberal, neo-conservative rhetoric
      • tough on crime
      • tough on antisocial behaviour and public nuisance
Belgium and its structure

• Political context
  o Youth crime and juvenile justice
    • Focus on young delinquents rather than ‘youth at risk’
      • MOF: + 5%
      • POS: + 17%
      • MOF >< POS
    • Focus on ‘usual suspects’
      • urban youth (specific neighbourhoods)
      • ethnic minority groups
  o French vs. Flemish community
    • New constitutional reform
      • youth law transferred to community level
      • new legislation to tackle antisocial behaviour for cities and communes
First study: Young people and violence

commissioned by the Flemish Peace Institute
First study

- Young people and violence
  - Commissioned by the Flemish Peace Institute
    - Independent institute hosted by Flemish Parliament
  - Questions
    - Balanced report
      - on offending and victimization of young people
      - on ethnic background and delinquency
    - Counterbalance some ‘popular myths’

First study

- Young people and violence
  - Research on offending *and* victimization
    - Separate etiological traditions
      - little on young people as victim
      - less on linking offending and victimization
    - Theory
      - importance of routine activities and lifestyle
      - move from offender or victim towards ‘criminogenic’ settings
  - Empirical research
    - lack of data both on offending and victimization
First study

• Young people and violence
  o Research on offending *and* victimization
    • Consistent observation
      • remarkable (strong) relation between offending and victimization
    • Exploring the relation: theory
      • thin line between offending and victimization
      • complex interaction
      • direct and indirect relation
First study

- Young people and violence
  - Research on offending *and* victimization
    - Exploring the relation: research
      - JOP-monitor 2 and JOP-Brussels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed freq. of victims - offenders</th>
<th>Expected freq. of victims - offenders</th>
<th>Chi²</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>153.7</td>
<td>148.2*</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theft</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>180.4</td>
<td>102.6*</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical violence</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>112.8*</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carrying a weapon /</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>320.5*</td>
<td>21.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threatened by weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealing drugs /</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>123.1*</td>
<td>20.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offered drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: JOP-monitor 2

* p < 0.001
First study

- Young people and violence
  - Research on offending *and* victimization
    - Exploring the relation: research
      - JOP-monitor 2 and JOP-Brussels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Observed freq. of victim-offenders</th>
<th>Expected freq. of victim-offenders</th>
<th>Chi²</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vandalism</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>35.11*</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theft</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>24.25*</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical violence</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>197.13*</td>
<td>8.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carrying a weapon / threatened by weapon</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>207.77*</td>
<td>10.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harassment / being harassed</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.24*</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: JOP-Brussels
*p < 0.001*
First study

- Young people and violence
  - Research on offending and victimization
    - Exploring the relation: research
      - similar profiles for victims and offenders (JOP-monitor 2)

% offenders of physical violence and carrying weapon by age and gender

% victims of physical violence and carrying weapon by age and gender
First study

- Young people and violence
  - Research on offending and victimization
    - Exploring the relation: research
      - similar profiles for victims and offenders
      - similar explanatory factors in (logistic) regression models:
        - gender
        - education
        - self-esteem
        - family situation
        - relation with parents (mother)
        - lifestyle: night time activities
    - final analyses
      - does ‘offending’ adds to explaining ‘victimization’?
# First study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.052*</td>
<td>1.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (ref cat: boys)</td>
<td>.360***</td>
<td>.233***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (ref cat: bso)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aso</td>
<td>.586**</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tso</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic situation</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offending (violent related offences)</td>
<td>5.87***</td>
<td>3.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness mother</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness father</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental supervision</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family situation</td>
<td>.500*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School success</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation with teachers</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction at school</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.976**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle: home oriented</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifestyle: night time activities</strong></td>
<td>1.93***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke $R^2$</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p>.001
First study

• Young people and violence
  o Conclusion first study
    • Complex relation between youth offending and victimization
      • victims ~ offenders
      • direct and indirect
      • lifestyle and routine activities
      • ‘usual suspects’, but ‘ideal victims’ as well…
    • Recent analyses JOP-Brussels
      • negative binomial and SEM
      • +/- confirmation
      • victim ~ offenders
      • lifestyle risk ~ offending
      • complexity
      • need for further refining and disentangling relation
Second study: Young people and public safety
Second study

- Young people and public safety
  - Cf. ‘new legislation to tackle antisocial behaviour’
    - Petty crime, public safety and antisocial behaviour
      - powers of federal level
      - ‘outsourced’ to local level
      - local legislation and system of administrative sanctions (~ ASBO)
    - Judicial and criminological reflection
      - critical comments on system
      - precarious positions of minors and young people
Second study

- Young people and public safety
  - System of administrative sanctions
    - In general
      - federal legislation as frame
      - local police or community codex
      - issued by police officers, authorized civil servants and public transport servants
      - administrative sanction = fine (<250€)
      - appeal to police court
    - Specific rules for minors
      - minimum age 16y
      - maximum fine 125€
      - offer of mediation (cf. national youth law and international principles)
      - appeal to youth court
Second study

- Young people and public safety
  - System of administrative sanctions
    - Future changes
      - new federal legislation
        - lowering age to 14y
        - higher fines
        - other sanctions: community service, banning orders…
        - broadening list of intolerable behaviour
    - background
      - cf. political context
      - community council elections in October 2012
      - political bid and populist manoeuvring
      - topic in media and public opinion
  - fundamental critique
Second study

• Young people and public safety
  o System of administrative sanctions
    • Legal issues
      • pressure on separation of powers
        - local authorities as legislator, police, prosecutor, judge, victim…
        - para-judicial chain at local level
      • legal certainty and equality before law
        - 589 communes, 589 set of rules?
        - absurd situations: e.g. Brussels with 19 communes
      • position of minors
        - compliance with youth law and international principles?
        - principles of mediation?
        - alternative sanctions at local level
        - net-widening
Second study

- Young people and public safety
  - System of administrative sanctions
    - Social and ethical issues
      - concept of disorder and public nuisance
        - vague legal definition
          "… behaviour… threat to the harmonic coexistence and normal pressure of social life… quality of life"
        - level of tolerance
        - large discretionary power
          "If each of us has a different assessment of behavioural acceptability, and this may change in different contexts, then who decides?" (Millie, 2011: 281)
    - gateway to criminalization of behaviour
      - guided by principle of ‘early intervention’
      - administrative sanction in early stage to prevent worse from happening
      - ‘usual suspects’: young people, ethnic minority groups…
Concluding remarks
Concluding remarks

• Youth as risk vs. youth at risk
  o Position of young people in society
    • A punitive turn?
      • hybridization of logics
      • young people as ‘usual suspects’ >> ‘ideal victims’
    • From post-crime to pre-crime
      • omnipresence of pre-caution principle
      • early intervention and criminalization of behaviour
      • shift from crime to risk to potential risk
      • emergence of ‘repressive prevention’ or ‘pre-pression’
        “It is a pro-active repression that attempts the timely suppression of certain forms of life” (Schinkel, 2011: 373)
Concluding remarks

• Youth *as* risk vs. youth *at* risk
  o Position of young people in society
    • Disfigured balance between protection and retribution
    • Evolution from ‘youth at risk’ to ‘youth as risk’
Thank you! Questions?