

***Expert Report for the
15th German Congress on Crime Prevention 10th & 11th
of May 2010 Berlin***

by

WIEBKE STEFFEN

From: Marc Coester and Erich Marks (Eds.):
International Perspectives of Crime Prevention 4
Contributions from the 4th and the 5th Annual International Forum 2010
and 2011 within the German Congress on Crime Prevention
Forum Verlag Godesberg GmbH 2012, Page 59-122

ISBN 978-3-942865-00-5

Wiebke Steffen

Expert Report

for the 15th German Congress on Crime Prevention

10th & 11th of May 2010 Berlin

“Education – Prevention – Future”

Learning and Living Spaces of Children and Juveniles as Places of Education and Prevention of Violence

0	Summary
1	Life circumstances and life opportunities in Germany
1.1	Growing up in post modernism
1.2	Opportunities in life in precarious life circumstances
1.3	Education, integration, participation: What about justice?
2	Education is more than school
2.1	Education and places of education
2.2	Places of education as locations for the prevention of violence
3	Places of education and prevention of violence
3.1	Family as places of education and prevention
3.1.1	Family as a place of education
3.1.2	Family as a place of prevention of violence
3.2	Child day-care facilities as places of education and prevention
3.2.1	Growing up in public responsibility
3.2.2	Child day-care facilities as places of prevention of violence
3.3	School as place of education and prevention
3.3.1	School as place of education
3.3.2	School as place of prevention of violence
3.4	Child and Youth Welfare as place of education and prevention
3.4.1	Child and Youth Welfare as place of education
3.4.2	Child and Youth Welfare as place of prevention of violence

Bibliography

0

Summary

The main topic of discussion at the 15th German Congress on Crime Prevention “Education – Prevention – Future” follows up on the problem which had already become apparent in the expert report pertaining to the main discussion topic of the 14th German Congress on Crime Prevention 2009, “Live Solidarity - Secure Diversity”. In this congress it became apparent that, at least for Germany, the educational success of the following generations is significantly determined by social class and background. However, education and qualification are the prerequisites for individual opportunities in life and participation in society. Equal opportunities regarding access to education promote integration and participation, and as such also contribute toward the prevention of violence and crime.

The **expert report** on the main topic of the 15th German Congress on Crime Prevention: “Learning and Living Spaces of Children and Juveniles as Places of Education and Prevention of Violence” starts off by taking a look at:

1.

Societal prerequisites and chances which determine education and educational opportunities in Germany and which have particularly detrimental effects on children and juveniles of the lower social groups and those with a migrational background. It goes on to look at the challenges and requirements related to social modernisation processes as well as the disintegration and exclusion experiences owing to the deterioration of life circumstances, which questions educational justice and social participation, and thus can also constitute a risk for violent crime in childhood and adolescence.

2.

It then also touches on the discussion that **education is more than going to school**, to wit a continuous process in the course of life, and that, consequently, the educational formation processes of children and adolescents transpire at numerous locations in the course of growing up: at places of learning and living, the (educational) performances of which can evidently be taken for granted less and less for all adolescents, which is why these children also cannot draw on the relevant educational resources needed to ensure academic success.

These places of education, upbringing, supervision and care can also be **places of violence and prevention of violence** in the course of childhood and adolescence – and the strategies aimed at avoiding or reducing violence can also be defined from an educational angle. On the one hand, all forms of prevention focussed the individual place demands on education and are targeted at the development of the personality, the formation of identity and the acquisition of the ability to act. On the other hand,

the predominant part of the strategies developed in recent years can be described as pedagogical strategies, which also consider violence in the course of childhood and adolescence as opportunities for learning and, as the case may be, also as an opportunity for providing pedagogical support.

3.

Thereafter, seen from the angle of “Places of education and prevention of violence” the **four places of education** that are relevant for the upbringing of virtually all children – namely family, child day-care facilities, school, and offers and educational establishments of child and adolescent welfare – are analyzed with regard to their performance, opportunities and risks as well as with regard to their importance concerning the presence of **violence** and their strategies for the **prevention or reduction of violent crime**. These places are of equal importance and complement one another in their effects, which is also the reason why they are related to one another and should cooperate with one another.

3.1

Without a doubt, the **family** represents the primary lifeworld of children and adolescents. Although virtually all children do grow up in families, precarious developments are also to be found, as well as a great number of new challenges for fathers, mothers and children. These challenges also include the tasks of the family in the **educational process** of children. Never before has the central role of families been as evident as now. Not only was this clearly displayed by the PISA studies, but also the extent to which this success is dependent on their social situation and living conditions. Especially children from lower social classes and with a migrational background are underprivileged. Here the influence of the family is so great that it is extremely difficult to subsequently equalise inequalities by means of supportive systems and educational institutions. This gives rise to questions of whether and how the public responsibility can be strengthened with regard to the education of children, with the objective of supporting parental, relationship and educational competences – without intervening in the educational right of parents to raise their children.

Family upbringing and education does not always run smoothly and without any deficits – also at the risk of children becoming victims and perpetrators of **violent crime** or victims of violence within the family, owing to neglect, mental, physical and/or sexual abuse (“endangerment of welfare of children”).

This violence toward children can give rise to significant subsequent problems which sustainably impact children’s development. Thus, especially within the context of the family, programmes and measures aimed at **early prevention** are of considerable importance: statutory regulations such as the “condemnation of violence law”, family planning offers and early assistance. However, also of importance is the fundamental

fostering of parental competences and behaviour by means of supportive and intervening measures, as well as the standard programmes for child and youth welfare.

3.2

The **child day-care facilities**, growing up in public responsibility, is one way of equalizing disadvantages by providing early access to publicly organized and operated places of education and education facilitating lifeworlds outside of the family. In recent years a fundamental change with regard to the assessment of the significance of **early childhood education and care** outside of the family has been noted. In the meantime, the child day-care facilities represent a lifeworld, which virtually all children in Germany experience – eventhough this might vary greatly with regard to the scope and quality.

One also cannot fail to note that, in the meantime, extremely high expectations are placed on child day-care facilities, which the facilities and the teachers working therein are presently unable to do justice to, when considering the currently applicable framework conditions. What definitely is true is that significant efforts will be required should one wish to attain child day-care facilities that are even remotely able to live up to the requirements and expectations placed in them. Apart from this, parents have to become increasingly and systematically more involved in the educational and upbringing processes of the child day-care facilities, for instance by means of the additional expansion of the number of child day-care facilities towards integrated and low-threshold accessible service and support systems (“Family Centres”, “Early Excellence Centres”).

As the first publicly organised and operated authority outside of the family, the child day-care facilities also represent a venue for the **prevention of violence**. This is particularly because they foster and support children and families in a very early stage as well as providing help. Additionally, they are in a position of providing protection against (potential) violence. For it is not violence among children or toward the caregivers that is the reason for measures of prevention of violence: in fact, there shouldn't be any “violence problem” present in child day-care facilities – not to mention the fact that even the use of the term “violence” for describing child behaviour is problematic and inappropriate.

Regarding (violence) prevention in child day-care facilities, the primary objective is to promote social competences; prevent or remove disadvantages and to support the integration and social participation of children. Apart from this, the target of the skilled personnel is to take over preventative tasks within the context of social early warning systems that have the purpose of recognising potentially problematic constellations with regard to the care and upbringing of a child as early on as possible.

3.3

Even though education is more than school, and successful life choices such as social integration build on the upbringing processes in families, child and youth welfare establishments as well as vocational education, there can be no doubt that **school** is the **central public place of learning** for children and adolescents in the process of growing up. The education gained in the course of school age plays a key role for the individual development; for participation in society and for imparting competences.

Not least because of this significance, school at the same time is also a strongly criticised place of education: the German school system does not appear to be providing the educational performance it should and which is expected of it. Neither is the entitlement to equal opportunities realized, nor that of a comprehensive general scholastic education.

Children and adolescents from socially weak classes are disadvantaged – and in recent years these “risk” classes have increased. A migrational background is a risk class that leads to disadvantages in all classes of the school system. The gender-specific discrimination against girls has in the meantime been abrogated; however, now there are new problem classes for boys. On the whole, the German school system is producing too many **educational losers**. Regardless of the aforementioned, all problems cannot be blamed on school, but also the upstream or complementing places of education such as the family, child day-care facilities and offers provided by child and youth welfare establishments. School, as the formal place of education can only function if the (non-formal) places of education function upstream and alongside it.

An answer to the undeniable problems of school education, which is the central educational political hope per se, is seen in the creation and expansion of **all-day schools throughout Germany**, not only in extending the number of hours in which the conventional schools are open, but also to complement these with other curricula and forms of learning. To which extent, however, the chance can be utilized of combining the strengths of the school with the strengths of other educational players, in particular with those of the **Child and Youth Welfare** is still largely unresolved. Just as unclear as the duration (and extent) of the conversion of the school system to all-day schools and the implementation of the “vision” of developing local alliances for education or communal educational landscapes

One of the demands placed on school as a public place of education is that it should do something about **violence** and the propensity of children and adolescents to violence. While school is seldom the “crime-scene” for juvenile violence, and there has been no general increase in physical violence and/or an increased level of brutality at school, it still is the place where children and adolescents dependably spend plenty of time and thus also, in principle, can also be reached by preventive measures and programmes.

Thus, on the one hand, strategies aimed at the **prevention of violence** at school have the objective of preventing violence or of reducing the violence which might flare up between school pupils. On the other hand they aim at having a positive influence on violence (or readiness to make use of it) among children and adolescents as a whole. Prevention of violence and the promotion of social competences are ongoing elements of school education and upbringing and are closely linked to **scholastic development**.

Here, in particular, it must be said that there is both a research gap and a need for research: to date, in the empirical studies concerning “violence at school”, virtually without exception, research has only been done on violence of school pupils, and prevention programmes were only developed and deployed that were related hereto. Only rarely, if at all, has **violence of teachers** toward school pupils and the prevention hereof, been an issue.

3.4

Offers by the **Child and Youth Welfare** represent significant involvement in the educational trajectories of children and adolescents in the course of school-going age. This is in line with the mandate of Child and Youth Welfare for the fostering of personality development as well as contributing toward preventing or decreasing disadvantages and initiating and promoting educational processes.

Within the Child and Youth Welfare, it is especially the offers of the **Child and Youth work** that play a central role in the everyday life of children and adolescents, as extracurricular, predominantly non-formal learning locations. These enable educational processes based on active involvement and participation. Voluntariness and participation are firmly anchored fundamental principles of Child and Youth Welfare and can definitely impede cooperation with other partners, for instance with the school.

Within the context of youth work, the educational effects of **voluntary commitment**, by means of active cooperation in clubs, associations and initiatives are of importance. However, class-related differences can also be noted when use is made of these extracurricular learning locations. Indeed, the probability that adolescents will use these voluntary opportunities through active participation increases with their formal education.

Prevention is one of the structural principles of Child and Youth Welfare: Youth Welfare does not wait for impairments and injuries before it acts, but attempts to avert endangerment and dangers early on. **Prevention of violence** is just one of its tasks alongside others.

Here too the specific approach of Child and Youth Welfare is to be found in the principles of voluntariness and participation. Apart from this, it can also be seen in tying into the **resources and** not the deficits of young persons. Furthermore, it does not only focus on violent behaviour, but also looks at young people as a whole, who are accepted as persons. This does not, however, imply that their violent behaviour is

also accepted. It is not unusual for Youth Welfare to come into a conflict between the different interests of adolescents and adults. One of their core tasks is to support adolescents in the event of such conflicts and to deescalate them, in particular with the purpose of viewing the adolescents' behaviour as appropriate for the age group and not to label it as "violence" too hastily. Also in the case of adolescents, who have already drawn attention to themselves with violent behaviour or have become delinquent, Youth Welfare does assume that educational approaches can contribute toward preventing violent behaviour.

Preliminary remark

"Education and qualification are the prerequisites for individual opportunities in life and participation in society ... for this reason, in a democratic state, educational justice must be given ... in Germany, however, this educational justice is not present: here educational success is highly dependent on one's social class and background."

The statement in the expert report pertaining to the main topic of the 14th German Congress on Crime Prevention 2009 "Live Solidarity - Secure Diversity" is based on findings of the social reporting at federal level, and here it particularly relies on the reports on education.¹ The problem of inequality owing to different backgrounds that was ascertained in these reports and in other empirical studies, and the associated discussion regarding equal opportunities and educational justice in Germany, was the occasion for making "Education – Prevention – Future" the main topic of the 15th German Congress on Crime Prevention in 2010, inasmuch as providing equal opportunities regarding access to education promotes integration and participation and thus also contributes toward the prevention of violence and criminality.

1

Life circumstances and opportunities in life in Germany

Today, as a result of societal modernisation processes, children and adolescents in Germany are growing up in a society which, owing to increasing disintegrational phenomena, is characterised not only by pluralization of lifestyles and attitudes toward values and objectives, but also by a growing socio-economic division, as well as an increasing scope of diversity with regard to social and ethnic-cultural aspects.

All reports and analyses, for instance on the risk of poverty because of the educational situation and the integration of migrants and their children, clearly show that the life circumstances have deteriorated significantly in recent years and decades for large parts of the population in Germany. More and more, society is drifting apart and the social disparities are becoming larger. Furthermore, problems with integration are increasing, and the social participation of entire parts of the populations is questioned.²

¹ BBE 2006 and BBE 2008

² Comprehensive details concerning the expert report on the main topic of the 14th German Congress on

1.1

Growing up in late modernism

The modernization of our society, characterised by

- functional differentiation
- individualisation and
- social disintegration

has brought chances as well as risks not only to society as a whole, but also to individuals. An individual's life and his or her private, professional and other opportunities are much less pre-determined at birth than used to be the case in the centuries before. In the **functionally differentiated** society there are no longer such clear roadmaps by which life courses are determined.

This **individualisation** provides individuals **chances** for personal independence and autonomy and offers the opportunity to actively shape their own lives. It does however also involve **risks**: breaking out from traditional ties can also result in uprooting, isolation and disorientation as well as increasing distances in social relationships – and it definitely does entail increasing **pressures to make choices and decisions**. Not only can individuals, to a great extent, determine their lives by themselves, they also have to – but not everyone is able and in a position to do this.

This is especially true if the individual's actual living circumstances (drastically) limit his or her respective **life circumstances**, social participation, integration into society – or, to be more precise: integration in the various societal functional areas and consequently also limit the chances that individualisation fundamentally brings.³

Children and adolescents are thus growing up “in a society which is characterised by the pluralization of lifestyles, attitudes toward values and goals and in which the social-structurally given objective opportunities in life present themselves in extremely different ways ... the associated requirements for successful life skills, as well as the learning and educational expectations placed on the subjects, pose new challenges for all children and adolescents as well as their families and pedagogical environ-

Crime Prevention 2009 “Live Solidarity - Secure Diversity” (Steffen 2009c) and, in the following, the “Hanoverian Declaration” of the 14th German Congress on Crime Prevention.

³ **Disintegration phenomena** are also highly visible at the social level. With growing commitment the question is being discussed as to how a society, which increasingly orients itself toward values such as self-realization and emancipation of individuals, can still be able to realise cohesion as a community of solidarity. In particular, there has been a rediscovery of **social inequality** and the associated destabilisation of life circumstances (Steffen 2009c). Against the background of the results of his current study on “German conditions”, *Heitmeyer* expressly points out that numerous people fear that society will break apart and that social division as well as political resignation will increase. In particular, he sees opportunities to shape policy and to change these conditions in the municipalities in which these problems become visible (www.swp.de/hechingen/nachrichten/politik/art4306,421629 ? of 27 March 2010).

ments. However, one must say that a great number of children and adolescents are capable of coping with the challenges without any major irregularities.” But there is also a “... number of children and adolescents who cannot utilize the chances, who fail because of the risks and who are overtaxed” (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2009a, 45).⁴

1.2

Opportunities in life in precarious life circumstances

Although Germany continues to be one of the most prosperous countries in Europe, here too life circumstances are deteriorating; not only is income but also education and health increasingly unevenly distributed, disintegration experiences are also increasing, while the chances for social participation and integration are decreasing.

So, according to the third **Poverty and Wealth Report** the chasm between rich and poor has deepened; the uneven distribution of income has increased – and, particularly for children, also the risk of growing up in relative poverty. One quarter (26%) of the German population was affected by the risk of **income poverty** in 2005; social and family political transfer payments decreased this risk to 13%.⁵

The highest risk groups with regard to poverty are the unemployed, persons without completed vocational training, single parents and persons with migrational background – in each case this includes their children. Income and wealth do however have a decisive influence on the individual’s options for action in society.

This is confirmed both by the **educational report** as well as the **health report**⁶: educational success, health prospects and the risk of children and adolescents contracting diseases still significantly depend on the social class and background. Especially adolescents of lower social groups and those with a migrational background are disadvantaged.⁷

⁴ *Keupp* (2009, 215) notes that “80 percent of adolescents integrate themselves well into life”, asks “why actually?” and mentions “seven opportunities that children require”: the sense of basic trust that is needed for living; dialectic of relatedness and autonomy; development of life coherency; creation of social resources by means of network formation; material capital as a prerequisite for relationship capital; democratic everyday culture by participation; self-efficacy experiences by means of commitment.

⁵ On the basis of his evaluations, the British social researcher Richard Wilkinson came to the conclusion that inequality is the cause of virtually all social problems in wealthy industrial countries and the greater the differences between rich and poor, the greater the social problems as well. Growing inequality divides society and wears it out – and politics contributes decisively to this development ((www.zeit.de/2010/13/Wohlstand-Interview-Richard-Wilkinson), of the 26th of March 2010. In this regard, please also see the analyses and demands of the 8th Austrian Poverty Conference, which was held on the topic of “Social Investments Pay Off, for Everyone!” and took place in Salzburg on the 23rd/24th of February 2010 (www.ots.at/presseaussendung/OTS_0145/ergebnisse), dated the 25th of February 2010)

⁶ Especially in terms of the aspect of equal chances, the “Health of Children and Adolescents in Germany” has most recently applied itself to the 13th Children and Youth Report (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2009a).

⁷ In Germany, almost one fifth of the entire population has a migrational background, which need not be their migrational experience: Germany is the European nation with the most immigrants. Characteristic is the large degree of heterogeneity among the approximately 15 million people with a **migrational**

As it is, this **deterioration of life circumstances** exerts its **negative impact primarily on children and adolescents**. Income, education and integrational poverty lead to developmental disorders. Social class and background determine educational success and consequently integration and social participation. Disintegration and

Exclusion experiences can however facilitate violent crime. Or, in the accusatory words of Worten *Meyer-Timpes* (2008): “Poor children are highly endangered on their future way: poverty makes people sick; poverty keeps people stupid; poverty can turn a person into a criminal.”⁸

Despite the aforementioned, one has to agree with *Keupp* (2009, 214), when he warns against scaremongering with regard to the adolescent generations and points out that the living conditions of families today, when compared to those of twenty or fifty years ago, have improved enormously. However: one group is hardly able to profit from the progress made in education and health and the improvements regarding safety and the opportunities in life. This is the group of children at the lower range of society; the families in which poverty, unemployment and neglect loom. And, this risk group includes one quarter to one fifth of all children.

Accordingly, the *13th Children and Youth Report* (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2009a, 45) stated the following: “Within the current societal changes one can see looming contradictory tendencies and this results in a situation in which “growing up today” becomes a constellation of “risky chances” ... this is because the prerequisites for self-determined utilization of these chances ... presupposes resources that are unattainable for numerous adolescents. Currently, the institutional resources from the educational system, the Child and Youth Welfare as well as the health system are only insufficiently able to compensate the person and

background, regardless of whether they are Germans or foreigners. Their life circumstances, possible integrational deficits and thus resulting integration needs differ significantly. If **successful integration** is understood to be the convergence of the living conditions of persons with migrational background to those of the native Germans in the sense of equal chances and equal participation, and if the persons with migrational background are classified by place of origin then these groups have clearly different levels of success. However, nowhere in Germany could one say that migrants are truly satisfactorily integrated (detailed, with further references, Steffen 2009c, Chapter 1.2.4).

⁸ At the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention Ulrike Meyer-Timpe** will report on the topic of “What does Poverty mean within the Context of Educational Opportunities. The Consequences of Child Poverty burden Germany’s Future – Perspectives and Concrete Proposals for Action.” A study of the OECD on the quality of children’s lives draws the conclusion that, despite high government spending, child poverty in Germany is still very high in international comparison; here, every sixth child lives in relative poverty; in the OECD average it is only every eighth child (report in the *Süddeutsche* newspaper of 02.09.2009).

However, according to the Bundesjugendkuratorium (Federal Youth Board), in its statement on child poverty in Germany, child poverty does not inevitably have to lead to impediments. Numerous parents are successful at creating good prerequisites for their children’s development, even though they might have a trying financial situation, and in virtually all such families the parents then cut down on their own spending to benefit their children (BJK 2009, 10ff.; also see FN 10).

milieu-related inequalities and to facilitate resources in such a manner that one would be in a position to speak about resource justness. Thus these resources also unintentionally contribute to increases in risk.”

With the objective of creating such resources, on the 16th of February 2005, the federal cabinet adopted the **National Plan of Action** “For a Child-Friendly Germany 2005 – 2010” (NAP) and in spring 2008 launched the initiative “For a Child-Friendly Germany” in order to increase the political and public attention for child justice. Among other things the federal government sees a need for action in six areas of activity, including “Opportunity Justice by Education” and “Development of an Appropriate Living Standard for all Children.”

In the 2008 interim report on the NAP, it was noted that the Federal Ministry for Family, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth had already been able to attain “decisive success on the road toward a child-oriented Germany”.⁹ *The Bundesjugendkuratorium (Federal Youth Board)*,¹⁰ however, has a different view on this (2009, 4 and 16ff)¹¹: despite political memoranda of understanding, a range of measures and political initiatives, until now, by no means could child poverty be sustainably reduced. The following measures for reducing child poverty are suggested¹²: the integration of mothers and fathers in the employment market, social transfers that move in the direction of ensuring basic security of children, the re-assessment of the Hartz-IV-standard rates¹³, sustainable facilitation of disadvantaged children and families by means of infrastructure services and furthering of education, linkage of the great number of different local and regional providers of social services and educational measures for preventative networks.¹⁴

⁹ www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/kinder-und-ugend,did=31372,render=renderPrint.html of 11.05.2009 (query output: 28th of March 2010).

¹⁰ The Bundesjugendkuratorium (Federal Youth Board)(BJK) a committee of experts that has been deployed by the Federal Government to advise it in fundamental questions pertaining to Child and Youth Welfare and in cross-cutting issues of children and adolescent politics.

¹¹ *Cathrin Kahlweit* is also critical: it is very difficult to reconcile the so-called “successes” with reality. “If the family minister were honest, she would admit that the National Plan for Action was already doomed to fail on the very day of its proclamation ... Can it be that when the National Plan of Action was drafted, child welfare was not the central concern? Many things that, theoretically at least, should be child-oriented are actually predominantly work-oriented ... everything purely economical considerations, which only marginally have anything to do with child welfare.” (SZ Magazine No. 12 of the 26th of March 2010).

¹² Similar suggestions have been made by the “Alliance for Fighting Child Poverty” (NRW state associations 2010).

¹³ In the meantime – with its ruling of the 9th of February 2010 – the Federal Constitutional Court decided that the regulations of the Social Security Code SGB II (“Hartz-IV-Law”), which determine the standard benefits of adults and children, do not comply with the constitutional right to provision of a humane existential minimum (press release No. 5/2010 on the 9th of February 2010).

¹⁴ An example for such a “chain of prevention” is the project “Mo.Ki – Monheim for Children”; in this regard see Hübenthal 2009.

1.3

Education, integration, participation: what about justness?¹⁵

Several years ago, the *Bundesjugendkuratorium* (Federal Youth Board) challenged educational policy to prepare itself for the (aforementioned) societal changes and their social impacts. They said that the education of the following generations is a key task for the future and that comprehensive education increasingly determines the degree of participation in society (BJK 2004b, 10). The *Federal Ministry for Education and Research* agreed to this by introducing the qualification initiative of the Federal Government's "Advancement through Education" (of January 2008) with the following words: "Education and qualification are the prerequisites for individual opportunities in life and participation in society" (BMBF 2009a)¹⁶. And in the *coalition agreement* between the CDU, CSU and FDP, dated 26 October 2009, the following was stated in chapter II. Education Republic of Germany: "Education is the prerequisite for comprehensive participation of the individual in the modern information society. Therefore, education is a civil right for us. For this reason we declare war on educational poverty." (2009, 59).

In the 21st century, education has become the most important key for social advancement and as such for the participation in social prosperity – in the meantime there is political consensus on this.¹⁷ For this reason, in a democratic state such as Germany "educational justice" must be present: all members of our society must have the same opportunities regarding access to education in accordance with their abilities, regardless of their affiliation to certain groups. This educational justice is, however, not present in Germany: here the educational success is highly dependent on the social class and background - and this has a tradition.¹⁸

¹⁵ Thus the headline of the DJI Bulletin 81 PLUS (DJI 2008)

¹⁶ With regard to this "qualification initiative" two "educational summits" have already taken place between the Federation and the federal states: on the 22nd of October 2008 in Dresden and on the 16th of December 2009 in Berlin. The results were commented by Professor Wassilios Fthenakis, who is president of the Didacta association of education sector association as follows: "The educational republic of Germany is a poor country – poor regarding its political will to pay for the measures that are urgently required so as to secure the future of our children and to adapt the German educational system to international standards." (<http://educationsklick.de/pm/71450/arnes-reiches-land/> print version; query date: 29th of January 2010)

¹⁷ Education does not however only determine the development and prospects for action of every individual at work, in private life and as citizens, but also the sustainability of our society (BBE 2008, 6). According to a prognosis of the *CEPS* (Centre for European Policy Studies) in Brussels, when looked at from an economic viewpoint, Germany will fall behind significantly in international comparison. Shying away from reform and investments in education endangers prosperity: too many adolescents, especially migrant, leave school without having obtained their graduation certificate; today every fifth 15-year old German no longer goes beyond primary school niveau; this will not turn Germany into a high-tech state, but rather to a country of unskilled workers – Germany needs an expeditious education initiative (taken from an interview of the *Süddeutsche Newspaper* of 16 March 2010 with Daniel Gros, CEPS-head and co-author of the book "Nachkrisenzeit" ("Post Crisis Era")).

¹⁸ Educational justice is the antonym of educational discrimination. It's about equal educational opportunities, equal access to education, not about equal education. In this regard, please see "The DJI Bulletin 81" (Book 1/2008), which focuses on the topic of the 13th German Children and Youth Welfare Day

It is not just since PISA, IGLU and TIMMS¹⁹ that the correlation between social origin and status in the educational system – or rather, the dependency of scholastic success on social class has been heatedly discussed in Germany: even though there can be no doubt that the expansion of education since the 1960s²⁰ has led to a rise in niveau in educational participation of the population, the “problem of inequality owing to origin and the thus ensuing discussion regarding equal opportunities and educational justice in Germany is a central theme in the education-sociological and educational-scientific discourse. On the basis of empirical studies, one can regularly prove significant differences in educational participation and scholastic success of children and adolescents, depending on gender, social origin, region and nationality, or migrational background” (Bos/Wendt 2008, 47).

But first and foremost, owing to the international educational-comparative studies (the so-called “PISA-Schock”), this topic has once again gained significance in the public discussion: although it is true that no participating country succeeded in decoupling school pupils’ performance from their social origin, nevertheless, in none of the participating countries was the correlation between social origin and, for example, reading competence as large as in Germany. This is particularly the case for children of migrants, who are identified as a special “risk group” by all these investigations time and again.²¹ pronounced in Germany, in comparison to other societies. Then there are the difficulties of bi-cultural migrational situation, growing up and life in “another”, “strange” cultural and social environment.”

(18th – 20th of June 2008 in Essen) “Enable justness in Growing Up” and presents empirical results on the areas of “Education – Integration – Participation”.

The view of Kraus (2008, 9f.) is similar: “At the start of their educational career everyone should – apart from their genes – have the same chances, but the same goal chances cannot exist ... anyhow, in education it is not about distributional justice in the sense of chances distribution, but rather about utilizing chances.” In this regard, also see the annual expert report 2007 “Educational Justice” of the Action Council for Education, in which is stated: “educational justice is understood ... as the objective of organising the participation of society’s members, regardless of disparities. Educational justice should not be confused with social justice ... educational policy must oppose the impression that educational justice leads to social justice.” (2007, 135, 145).

¹⁹ PISA: Programmes for International Student Assessment (www.mpib.berlin.mpg.de/pisa/); IGLU: Internationale Grundschul-Lese-Untersuchung (International Primary School Reading Study) (www.iglu.ifs-dortmund.de/); TIMMS: Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (www.timms.mpg.de/).

²⁰ The protagonists of the debate on opportunity inequality and educational justice included Georg Picht and his work published in 1964 – or rather: pamphlet – “The German Education Catastrophe”, Ralf Dahrendorf and his plea “Education is a civil right” (1965) or also Hansgert Peisert and his analysis “Social Class and Educational Opportunities in Germany” (1967).

²¹ *Geißler and Weber-Menges* (2008, 22) have come to the following conclusion in their analysis of the available data: “The children of migrants have a particularly difficult time in the German educational system: they are doubly disadvantaged. Owing to the strong tendency of segmentation of German society by migrants, many of them encounter the same problems with which native German children from socially weak families have to contend and which are especially strongly pronounced in Germany, in comparison to other societies. Then there are the difficulties of bi-cultural migrational situation, growing up and life in “another”, “strange” cultural and social environment.”

The findings of the *1st World Vision Children Study*²² likewise document the increasing “culturalisation” and “inheritance” of inequality: “The weaker start chances of children from the lower social classes runs through all areas of life and is like a vicious circle. The risks of poverty and lacking resources are experienced as a burden and limit the possibilities of participation: in the family, which frequently is overtaxed by material pressure and existential concerns; at school, where the time and possibility for individual facilitation and promotion as an equalisation of disadvantages is generally lacking, as well as in the living environment or during leisure activities.” For the *Bundesjugendkuratorium* (Federal Youth Board), the development of the educational system with regard to strengthening the principle of individual facilitation and support; the increase of the number of all-day school offerings and the link-up of forms of formal and informal education provide an “additional starting point for overcoming the inheritance of social inequalities” (2009, 30).²³

2

Education is more than school

2.1

Education and places of education

If one follows the definition of the *12th Child and Youth Report*, education is “a comprehensive process of the development of a personality in the confrontation of oneself and one’s environment. The subject is formed in an active co-construction or co-production process, adapts to the world and is dependent on educational opportunities, suggestions and encounters in order to develop and unfurl cultural, instrumental, social and personal competences” (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 31).²⁴

²² The first World Vision-Children Study “Children in Germany 2007” is based on a representative random sample of 1,592 children ranging in age from 8 to 11 years. The children were personally interviewed and in addition there was a parents’ questionnaire on the family background. The children’s study complemented the Shell Youth Studies (www.shell.com/de-de/jugendstudie/), which are used at the age of 12 years and compiled by scientists of the University of Bielefeld and TNS Infratest Social Research in Munich. Conceptual foundation and contentual alignment of the study: Klaus Hurrelmann and Sabine Andresen. Commissioned by the world-wide operating children’s aid associating World Vision Germany e. V. (<http://www.worldvisionkinderstudie.de/die-studie-2007.html>). In this regard also see Klaus Hurrelmann: socially weak children feel disadvantaged at an early age. Results of the 1st World Vision children’s study (<http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/gesundhw/ag4/projekte/worldvision.html>)

²³ Against the background of his investigational results, *Heitmeyer* also demands equal opportunities in educational policy, which we are still a long way away from attaining. The worst is the finding that education in Germany is still inherited - and at the same time he warns against increasingly judging people according to their economic utility ([www.swp.de/hechingen/nachrichten/politik/art4306.421629?](http://www.swp.de/hechingen/nachrichten/politik/art4306.421629?on27March2010) on 27 March 2010).

²⁴ Or, in the viewpoint of the coalition agreement between CDU, CSU and FDP (2009, 59): “Education is the prerequisite for internal and external freedom of mankind. It leads to intellectual independence, powers of judgement and awareness of values. Education is the prerequisite for comprehensive participation of each individual in today’s modern knowledge society.”

To form young persons in this manner was and is not the sole responsibility of school. Even though this institution does play a central role, education reaches far beyond school. The educational processes of children and adolescents take place at numerous **places of growing up**, both formal and non-formal²⁵: Not only at school, but also in the family, at facilities and offers provided by the Child and Youth Welfare; in the group of persons of the same age; in the use of media, but also when visiting commercial recreational facilities; at tutoring services institutions; when travelling abroad or at a job (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 32).

Education is thus (much) more than school; education is a continual process in the course of life.²⁶ Therefore the abilities a child brings along when it starts at school, are, among others the result of educational processes in the family and/or in establishments of child day-care facilities, which children can then draw on (DJI Bulletin 81 PLUS 2008, 1) – or, as the case may be, not.

For the forms of upstream education or non-formal or daily education that supplement school²⁷ are busy “becoming the actual key and future problem in the matter of education”, given that their performance “can evidently be ensured less and less as a matter of course for all adolescents,” (Rauschenbach 2009a, 87) – which is why these children then also cannot access the necessary education-relevant resources needed for success at school.

Successful all-day education (no longer) can be accepted as being self-evident. Formal education, school, can however only function if the education worlds upstream and alongside also function: “numerous things that are attributed to schools – both positive as well as negative, successes as well as failures – can in actual fact by no means exclusively or predominantly be attributed to it” ... “At any rate, one cannot simply deny that it is not formal education, but *everyday education*, which to date has hardly been taken into account, *which creates the chasm between privileged and the socially disadvantaged, between the educational beneficiaries and the educational losers*” (Rauschenbach 2009a, 86, 89).

In 2002 already, in its “Leipzig Theses” and also in 2004, in its position paper “New places of education for children and adolescents”, the *Bundesjugendkuratorium (Federal Youth Board)* pleaded for a new understanding of education and pointed out

²⁵ Formal education is conducted in educational and schooling facilities and generally culminates in a recognised degree. Non-formal education takes place outside of the educational and schooling facilities for general and vocational education and does not lead to the acquisition of a recognised degree (BBE 2008, VIII).

²⁶ Thus, for example BJK 2002 and 2003; BBE 2008, 6; Rauschenbach 2009a, 25

²⁷ This is what Rauschenbach (2009a, 76, 83ff.) calls this important, but in its significance unrecognized, “other side of education.” For him, **every-day education** is the part of the life-world bound educational event, in which it does not only refer to other educational venues, but also other learning modalities and educational contents.

the equal importance of the various kinds of places of education, both of the formal, non-formal and informal kind, as well as their complementary effects in the process of growing up – and raised the claim that every child should experience educational establishments such as child day-care facilities, school and offers of Youth Welfare organisations as spaces for learning and living, in which children’s development – closely coordinated with the family – is promoted (BJK 2004b, 5, 13).²⁸

For the *12th Child and Youth Report*, the findings that objectives, problem diagnoses as well as practise-oriented and political reform proposals for an improved exhaustion of societal education potentials no longer solely focus on the process of growing up *in*, but also *upstream and alongside school*, is the result of a cumulation of societal developments in the field of demography, economy and the employment market. Against the background that it is the duty of state and society, within the “public responsibility for growing up”, to make it possible for adolescents to develop their lives themselves on the basis of their needs and to open up opportunities for acquiring competences, deliberations on converting and extending the system of education, care and upbringing have to link the requirements of society with subjective needs and abilities as well with the life circumstances of children and adolescents (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 51f.).

2.2

Places of education as places of prevention of violence

Places of education, upbringing and care, and here in particular referring to family, child day-care facilities, school, Child and Youth Welfare offers and establishments are at the same time also venues where violence transpires and where violence can be prevented. As such they are strategic spheres for the prevention of violence²⁹ in childhood and adolescence.

Also understanding places of education as places of prevention applies without limitation to the three public sector instances, whilst the family as a private living space holds a special position. Given the development toward a (careful) strengthening of the public responsibility for the upbringing of children and the efforts undertaken in recent years for supporting familial education, also with the objective of condemning violence, the family as place of education is also analysed and discussed as a field of action for the prevention of violence.³⁰

²⁸ In this context, the *Bundesjugendkuratorium* (Federal Youth Board) points out in particular the necessity of cooperation between Youth Welfare and school, since such a comprehensive educational understanding can hardly be realised by the school in its classic form, as a teaching facility (more details on this in chapter 3.3).

²⁹ Of course they also are fields of action for the prevention of crime in the course of childhood and adolescence in general. Owing to the considerable – also medial – significance given to “juvenile violence” and subsequent to the existing expert report for the German Congress on Crime Prevention, in particular with reference to the statement in the expert report for the 14th German Congress on Crime Prevention 2009 that violence is an indicator for social disintegration and lack of social participation, the focus will once again be on the prevention of violence.

³⁰ So too the decision and explanation in the report of the *Arbeitsstelle* (place of work) Child and Adolescent Crime Prevention of the German Youth Institute, which – as already in the preceding expert report – serves as

It might be surprising to describe strategies, programmes and measures for prevention of violence from the educational viewpoint. However, on the one hand, all forms of prevention focussed on the person **place demands on education** and are focussed on the development of the personality, the formation of identity or on acquiring the ability to perform. On the other hand, the greater part of the strategies developed in recent years can be characterised as being **pedagogical strategies**. This approach takes account of the fact that the prevention of violence in child and adolescent age has to do with people who are growing up, and who still have to develop their identity and moral awareness.

For that matter, for the most part, strategies are also then “pedagogical” and without a controlling or punishing focus when they bear on the behaviour of adults, for instance with regard to prevention of violence in the family.

The “pedagogic” view on violent actions also means understanding actual violence or the threat thereof, in the course of childhood and adolescence, as a **learning opportunity** and also, as the case may be, as an opportunity for pedagogical support. This does not, however, mean that this violence is to be accepted or that it should be downplayed. It does however mean that, in the first instance, prevention of violence is to be understood pedagogically and as a co-productive process: violence during childhood and adolescence primarily can and must be overcome by means of education, learning as well as acquisition of competency, and the sustainable prevention of violence can only be successful in cooperation with children and adolescents, with peers, parents, other responsible grownups or, as the case may be, the relevant social environment (Arbeitsstelle (Place of Work) 2007, 281ff.).

Closely linked to this pedagogical viewpoint is the predominant position in specialist fields of practise to view acts of violence by children as only one and not the central aspect of their behaviour and rather to focus more closely on their competences, resources and the training of protective factors; in addition to take account of the respective social and cultural milieus, scenes and social areas (Arbeitsstelle (Place of Work) 2007, 282).

However, this “pedagogical view” on violence and the prevention of violence harbours the danger of a “virtually inflationary extension of the understanding of crime and prevention of violence” per se, a dissolution of the boundary between the notions of violence and prevention, which among others could lead to general promotion programmes and measures of universal (also primary or social) prevention being re-labelled to violence prevention programmes and measures. This “constriction” does not do justice to the significance of these programmes – and can have a discriminating impact on the target groups, which then again could compromise the use and effect of the programmes (Arbeitsstelle (Place of Work) 2007, 16ff.).

Therefore, strategies, programmes, measures or projects are described as being **violence preventative** only if they directly or indirectly have the objective of preventing or reducing violence in the course of childhood and adolescence. Strategies for prevention of violence must justifiably and explicitly have the primary purpose of preventing or reducing violence in childhood and adolescence – either on the foundation of convincing empirical evidence, experience or by means of plausible theoretical assumptions (Arbeitsstelle (Place of Work) 2007, 17f.)

Thus strategies, programmes, measures and projects that are “violence preventative” can constitute **selective prevention** (also: situative or secondary) for special subgroups, individuals or even situations that are marked by relatively high risk factors, so that these persons stand under a heightened risk of becoming offenders or victims (“endangered persons as offenders and victims”) or for situations where they are in danger owing to the fact that violent crimes might transpire (“opportunity for committing a crime”).

Alternatively, they can have the purpose of **indexed prevention** (also: tertiary) and be aimed at those persons who have already become offenders and for whom, by means of the programmes and measures, an improvement of their future development is sought, or pertaining to situations in which criminal offences have already transpired more frequently (“criminal hot spots”).³¹

3

Places of education and prevention of violence

If equal opportunities in education – educational justice – are viewed as one instrument for the **prevention of violence** and criminality among children and adolescents³² then this would mean that, firstly, one would have to analyse the **learning and living spaces of children and adolescents** as places of education with regard to their performance, chances and risks, and that this is to be done in particular in terms of the aspect of successful/unsuccessful education. Secondly, this would mean demonstrating their relevance for the occurrence of violence, as well as their function as **fields of activity for** the prevention or decrease of violent crime during childhood and adolescence.

However, in doing so, one cannot go into detail with regard to all the abovementioned formal, non-formal and informal places of education – as that would go far beyond the scope of this expert report. Thus the four places of education have been selected that are relevant and of the same importance for the upbringing of virtually all children and which complement one another regarding their impact³³, which is also the reason

³¹ For a more detailed report, see Steffen (2009c). This definition is also in accordance with the conviction that violence prevention strategies are only then justifiable if – at least when referring to public intervention – a threat or dangerous situations are at hand or substantiated, or that there is reason to fear that they might occur.

³² So for instance in the programme “Innere Sicherheit, Fortschreibung 2008/2009” (Inner security, Update).

³³ Regarding the future perspectives for a publicly run, coordinated system of education, support and upbringing,

why they should bear upon one another and cooperate with each other: family, child day-care facilities, school and the offers and establishments of child and Youth Welfare organisations.³⁴

3.1

Family as a place of education and prevention

The primary lifeworld of children and adolescents is the family. Regardless of the historical expansion of institutional and state-operated schooling and educational influences, the family is accorded a central role in the upbringing of children and adolescents ... Thus observation and analysis of the societal transformation of family structures and familial relationships is the central starting point for a future-oriented design of development and educational processes in the course of childhood and adolescence.” (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 52).

3.1.1

Family as place of education

Virtually all children grow up in families. However, within society (not however in the official statistics) today the definition of “family” is much more encompassing than used to be the case still a few years ago: in comparison to survey results of the year 2000, in 2007 more people also consider unmarried parents and their children as well as single parent mothers or fathers as family (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2009b, 32). According to *Peuckert*, the word “family” describes a life form that comprises at least one child and one parent and which displays a lasting relation, which is internally characterised by solidarity and personal closeness (2007, 36).³⁵

In Germany, according to official statistics,³⁶ 13.8 million children live in 12.3 million families with children. More than half of the families (53%) have just one child, 11% have three and more children. Almost three quarters (74%) of the families living in Germany are married couples (with families with a migrational background, it is even 82%, with the families without migrational background, 71%). Of the families with

please see the remarks made in the 12th Child and Youth Report, in particular chapter 7 (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2005a) and here, in this expert report, chapter 3.3.1.

³⁴ There, for instance, the educational processes which result in the utilization and usage of **media** are not dealt with, even though the media have long already been a highly powerful (co)educator and, especially with regard to their impact on violence, have provoked heated discussion. However, firstly, media do not constitute a part of the aforementioned “aligned system of education, support and upbringing” and secondly, the “media topic” is so extensive that it alone could be the main topic of a future German Congress on Crime Prevention.

³⁵ Also for the 12th *Child and Youth Report* these “close relationships”, in which persons described as “family” live are a central criterion for constellations in which children grow up (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2005a, 113).

³⁶ Micro-census 2007 of the Federal Statistical Office, quoted in Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2009b, 32 ff.

more than one child, 85% of the parents are married, with the one-child families it is 66%. For approximately 100 years already, the share of the children growing up with both of their biological parents has remained constant at more than 80%.

Behind these findings one notices a change in the lifeworlds of children and a variety of family forms that is not insignificant.³⁷

While for the most part, children in Germany do grow up in familial situations that are in accordance with the traditional “normal concept”; increasingly however also in deviating family forms as well as in alternating familial constellations (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 54; Bertram 2009).³⁸

According to *Rauschenbach* (2009a 117f.), altogether, a rather **precarious development** is to be found in which the so popular picture of the happy and functional family is displaying first cracks: “the shrinking household sizes, the decreasing number of families, the decline in the number of children per family and the number of married couples with children; the undeniable instability of marital partnerships, the decreasing number of new marriages and birth figures, which has been a trend for many years already ... In the meantime, family as a life form has changed from a cultural matter of course to an individual choice.”

The individualisation of lifestyles and the pluralization of lifeforms owing to the modernisation of society is “responsible” for this development.³⁹ Then there also are the “inner-family processes of change”, primarily owing to the changing role of women, which is reflected in the increased share of female labour participation, especially in the share of labour participation of mothers.⁴⁰ In the meantime, the alleviation of the burden of combining family and job has become one of the family-political priorities of society (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2009b).⁴¹

Hence, according to *Rauschenbach*, in the 21st century too, no alternative to the lifeform family is becoming apparent in contemporary society or has even established itself to a significant extent. Holding on to traditional images of families does however prevent finding the right answers to the new challenges of fathers, mothers and children (2009b, 3).

³⁷ This already makes clear the differences between East and West Germany (in this regard, see Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2005a, 53).

³⁸ Thus, at the beginning of the 21st century for instance, the modern small family, as represented by the community of married parents with their biological children is only one of numerous family forms, even if it is the most important (Peuckert 2007, 36).

³⁹ See above chapter 1.1; and also Peuckert 2007, 36,48; Rauschenbach 2009a, 121 and 2009b; Schwind 2009.

⁴⁰ Data and figures regarding this can be found at Peuckert 2007, 48ff.

⁴¹ In this regard also see the demands of the time researcher *Ulrich Mückenberger* for a “contemporary political change”: mothers and fathers have to be granted the legal right to temporarily reduce their working time – without having to forego career opportunities (2009, 10).

Among these challenges are also the tasks of the family in the **educational process of children**. For: it is within the family where everything starts for children – also as regards education (Rauschenbach 2009a, 124). Within this context, the *12th Child and Youth Report* stated that family offers the decisive context for cognitive, emotional and lingual development of most children, for their social and personality development as well as for their physical and psychological health. Thus the family has a decisive influence on the course of development of the educational processes of children (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 114).

However, parental relationships and educational competences, and their development and implementation in concrete daily educational measures cannot be detached from the conditions in which families do, want to or have to shape their lives: to be mentioned in this regard are their economical and time resources⁴², the organisation of care-taking arrangements for children outside of the family or in cooperation with the school (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005b, 15).

Not only did the **PISA-studies**⁴³ make the central role of family on the success of the following generations' learning and educational processes clearer than ever before, but also the extent to which this success depends on their social class and living conditions. In Germany, more than in any other country that participated in the PISA studies, the pupils' success is dependent on their **social background**. And not only with regard to the thus involved economical and time resources, but also on the equally dependent familial bonding and educational processes of the family environment (socio-spatial), of the facilitation within and through the family.⁴⁴

Especially disadvantaged are adolescents of lower social groups and those with a migrational background.⁴⁵ Children with at least one parent born abroad, and even if these families have the same socio-economical status, less frequently attend high school and are more frequently to be found in the lower-qualified kinds of schools than native

⁴² Regarding the impacts of invisible working relationships, competitive pressure or the fear of social decline on everyday family life, see Lange/Jurczyk 2009.

⁴³ See above FN 19.

⁴⁴ The *12th Child and Youth Report* stated as follows: "There are significant differences in the life circumstances of children, depending on their family background, level of education, socio-economic position, cultural and ethnic affiliation as well as the regionally given circumstances. A great many dimensions thus determine the life circumstances, in particular the education and training level, employment status, health, living situation and environment, the family situation and the social networks, as well as income and wealth." (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 118).

⁴⁵ In this regard, see above, Chapter 1 on the "influence of particular life circumstances" such as income poverty, migration and socio-spatial conditions, also see Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2005b, 118ff. On the living conditions of adolescents with a migrational background, in particular regarding their everyday life, also see Uslucan 2009 and Thiessen 2009. **Haci-Halil Uslucan** will speak at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of "Unrecognised Potentials: Educational Participation and Facilitation of Education of Adolescents with a Migrational History."

German pupils (BBE 2008, 62 f).⁴⁶

This disadvantage also becomes apparent with regard to the pupils' level of cognitive competences (in the areas of reading, mathematics and natural sciences).⁴⁷ While it appears that there has been some success in somewhat reducing the competence-level differences owing to the children's background, school children with a migrational background are still clearly lagging behind: "All in all, ultimately, the facilitation of children and adolescents with a migrational background remains insufficient." (BBE 2008, 85)⁴⁸

The family is not only of central importance – both positively as well as negatively – with regard to the educational process of children, but, according to *Rauschenbach* (2009a, 123), this "course-setting influence of family" obviously has a much more significant impact on the life and educational opportunities of adolescents than can subsequently be evened out by supporting systems and educational institutions. Or, in the words of the *Scientific Advisory Board for Family Issues*: the family has to be recognised and strengthened as a place of education if subsequent measures of educational promotion and facilitation are not to be in vain (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005b, 5).

This intensity of the family as a place of education makes it difficult to subsequently even out inequalities – at least with the means offered by the current-day education and social policies – and this is especially owing to the fact that the family represents the primary relationship and educational context (BMFSFJ, 2005b, 9), the "first, longest-lasting and least thematically selective, whilst at the same time most time-intensive place of growing up", in which, additionally, the triad of *care-taking, upbringing and education* are anchored. Since, for children, family is the place where everything comes together, deficits and risks in the course of care-taking, upbringing and education can also have grave effects (Rauschenbach 2009a, 124ff.).

In view of the established deficits and disadvantages, *Rauschenbach* (2009a, 133f.) advocates carefully strengthening **public responsibility** for the upbringing of children, with the objective of "thus supporting families and integrating them into a learning, care-taking and education network so as to place them in a position of doing

⁴⁶ Such background-based differences can also be recognised with regard to the **utilization of learning locations outside school** – for instance with the offers provided by child and youth work and in particular with regard to the participation (voluntary commitment) in clubs, associations and initiatives (BBE 2008, 80). Thus the learning locations outside school do not fulfil the expectations placed in them pertaining to the equalisation of disparities with regard to equal access to learning opportunities in school settings. In this regard, also see Chapter 3.4.

⁴⁷ Since the mid 1990s there have been systematic investigations in Germany regarding which learning results are attained at the "central hinges" of the schooling system. Statements regarding this were already contained in the Education Report 2006, with a chapter on the "Significance of Migration on Education".

⁴⁸ How one can ensure equal opportunities for children with a migrational background, is illustrated by the education authority in Toronto / Canada (Article "World Champion of Integration" in DIE ZEIT (newspaper) No. 35 of 21 August 2008).

justice to their fundamental responsibility of bringing up their children, even under the significantly changed conditions of current societies, and that this can be done without them being burdened by the ever more unfulfillable expectation that they should and have to be able to take care of everything themselves ... therein lies the actual challenge of the state and society: not to relieve families from their responsibility, but to empower them ... The family should be recognised as a life form which one can best strengthen by firstly, pragmatically, taking note of its actual situation, yet at the same time, secondly, also realising that its stability, which has been regarded as eternal, has sufficiently often become fragile and, thirdly, in particular, that one can assist the family by creating and expanding family-friendly infrastructure services.”⁴⁹

The *Scientific Advisory Board for Family Issues* also advocates the strengthening of parental relationships and educational competences, does however expressly refer to the “natural” right of parents to bring up their children, which has constitutional status,⁵⁰ which is why the state also cannot impose a certain educational style on parents, but can only recommend and facilitate a certain educational behaviour. The advisory board sees it as promising to develop **educational offers** for parents and to make these easily accessible; what is however of importance for the advisory board is the principle of **voluntary** participation in these offers. The role of national institutions can only relate to the expansion of the offers and the guarantee of their diversity, not however to making their contents binding⁵¹ Further, the advisory board also advocates the formation and care of **upbringing partnerships**, for the coordinated cooperation of all persons and institutions involved in upbringing, in particular of the educators at child day-care facilities and teachers at schools. For the advisory board, **participation** is of importance as well as the possibility for parents (and also for children) of being able to give their opinion in the respective establishments and to have a firm place in the processes involved in decision-making (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005b, 24ff.).

However, according to the Board, the **dilemma** is that the very parents who should most urgently take a self-critical look at their educational skills, normally have poor prerequisites for doing this – and that there are problematic situations in which experts should actually intervene, which then results in parents occasionally no longer being the key actors in the educational process of their children, be it for a limited or perhaps even indefinite period of time (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women

⁴⁹ In this regard, also see Bertram 2009 and Chapter 3.2.

⁵⁰ In Article 6, Paragraph 2 of the Constitutional Law of the Federal Republic of Germany the following is stated: “care and upbringing of children is the natural right of parents and the duty that first and foremost is incumbent upon them.”

⁵¹ “Parental testimonials, even such that are connected with sanctions in the event of “insufficient” performances (e.g. cuts in child allowances) are an unsuitable and also quite tenuous tool for improving parental competences and attaining more responsible parenting.” (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005b, 26)

and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005b, 29).

3.1.2

Family as place of prevention of violence

Hence, upbringing within the family is not always free of trouble and deficits. The *12th Child and Youth Report* has even come to the conclusion that, less and less, it can be assumed that the right and duty involved in the upbringing of children by their parents is implemented as ably as it is deemed to be self-evident (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 49).

As shown, the developments within society have an impact on families and their care and support, upbringing and educational performance. In our society, which is highly differentiated socially, ethnically and culturally, deficits and problems can jeopardise the development of children as autonomous persons with the capacity of acting in a community – also with regard to the risk of them becoming victims or perpetrators of (violent) crime (Steffen 2009a).

In order to prevent or at least alleviate this risk, the support of public instances such as child day-care facilities, Youth Welfare, school, police and justice is needed. Clearly they are responsible for the prevention of violent crime in the course of childhood and adolescence, whilst the family, as a private sphere, plays a special role. However, within the context of the aforementioned demand for the careful strengthening of the role of public responsibility in the upbringing of children, apart from the private responsibility of the parents, more focus should be placed on increasingly viewing the **“public responsibility for the prevention of violence”** as a responsibility and challenge for the entire society. This too before the background that, in recent years, a multitude of endeavours have been undertaken to support upbringing within the family, also with the objective of “condemnation of violence” (Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention 2007, 15).

Deficits in respect to familial support, upbringing and education can not only contribute toward children and adolescents becoming victims and perpetrators of violent crime during the process of growing up. They can also have the effect of children and adolescents directly and proximately becoming victims of violence within the family by means of (parental) neglect or physical, psychological and/or sexual abuse (“endangerment of the child’s well-being”) and/ or indirect victims of the acts of violence between the parents or legal guardians (“endangerment of the children’s well-being with cases of intimate partner violence”).⁵²

⁵² Regarding the definition, scope, impact and prevention of these forms of violence within the family see Galm and others 2007; Heynen 2007; Kindler 2007; Buskotte 2007. Also see “Facts and figures on child neglect and abuse”, Nationales Zentrum Frühe Hilfen (www.fruehehilfen.de/3334.98.html) (National Centre for Early Help) and Wetzels 2009.

Investigation findings indicate that the majority of endangered children are not exposed to only one form of violence, and also that children who have already become victims of violence run a high risk of being victimised once again. Other significant risk factors are partner violence⁵³, affirmative support of harsh punishment and rejection of the child (Galm and others 2007, 35f.).

It goes without saying that violence against children is to be condemned as a matter of principle. This also holds true because violence can lead to considerable **follow-up problems**, which “can display a variety of different forms, depending on the type and severity of the endangerment of the children’s well-being within the context of the child’s further life reality.” As has been demonstrated, among other things, there are adverse effects on the child’s emotional and cognitive development and the development of its interests, and these in turn can induce conflicts in child day-care facilities and schools, as well as school achievement disorders. Especially with boys, experiencing violence can form the backdrop for a boy’s own delinquency and propensity to use violence himself (Galm and others. 2007, 37f.; Heynen 2007, 62).

Neuro-biological research has drawn attention to the extent to which early childhood experiences, particularly severe psychological stress in early childhood can impact the subsequent physical and social-emotional development, right up to psychological illnesses or violent crime, and in some cases even irreversibly (Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft 2009, 13; Lucas 2009; Roth 2008, 11). This research has also fundamentally substantiated that, independently of such stress experiences, it is especially the early years that are of decisive importance for the further development (Hüther and others 1999).

Hence, especially within the familial context, the **importance of early prevention** is obvious – in order to prevent a situation arising in which the children’s well-being is at risk or at least to improve the protection of children and adolescents regarding risks for their welfare.⁵⁴ In this regard one should distinguish between universal prevention strategies that have their principal focus on all parents; selective strategies aimed at

⁵³ For a long time, hardly any attention was paid to the situation of children and adolescents who have been affected by domestic violence (partner violence), be it directly or indirectly. In the meantime, however, domestic violence is seen as a serious criterion for threats to a child’s well-being, and even the lawmakers have extended the possibilities for protection: the police laws of the Federal states regulate the powers of the police to remove violent persons or order them to leave, the law providing protection against violence enables, for example, the assignment of joint living quarters to one of the parents or guardians, and stalking legislation can also have a positive impact. One of the tasks of the Youth Welfare office is to investigate a possible threat to the child’s well-being owing to having witnessed violence, to mediate further help and, as the case may be, also to initiate proceedings before a family court (Heynen 2007, 64ff.; Buskotte 2007).

⁵⁴ Thus the amendment of § 8a of the Social Security Code VIII, which came into force on 01.10.2005, “Protection mandate regarding endangerment to children’s well-being” dealt with the elaboration of the process for prevention of a directly threatening risk for children’s well-being, for which “important indications” already exist and as such no longer refers to the early recognition of risk factors and threats (Galm and others 2007, 40)

parents with low relationship and upbringing competences as well as those that have already developed an inappropriate parental rearing practice and finally, indicated strategies are employed when disorders or deviations that are to be evaluated critically have already occurred within the child's upbringing and are related to problematic parental upbringing practice (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005b, 22f). However, these distinctions cannot always be drawn clearly: the boundaries between the prevention strategies are fluent in the same manner as are those between normality, stress and threats to a child's development. The parents' need for support can range from providing information, offering targeted support and guidance right up to the prevention of threats to the child's well-being, and the respective programmes and measures can indeed pursue different prevention strategies.

The *universal prevention strategies* include, for example, the "Law on Condemnation of Violence in Upbringing", which went into effect almost ten years ago, on 02.11.2000⁵⁵. The thus amended §1631, Paragraph 2 of the German Civil Code clearly now reads: "Children have a right to non-violent upbringing. Physical punishment, mental abuse and other degrading measures are not permitted." The order commissioned by Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) and the Federal Ministry of Justice (BMJ) for *accompanying research* on the impacts of the this law on condemnation of violence, constitutes a positive change in the attitudes on non-violence which has to date, however, only established itself to a limited extent in everyday upbringing. In particular, in the families burdened by violence, the use of physical violence has not decreased and the number of these families has also hardly changed (Bussmann 2005).

This is in line with findings by the *KFN-surveys of school children (KFN: Criminological Research Institute of Lower Saxony)*, according to which parental violence toward their children has not consistently decreased; especially the severe forms of violence were still just as prevalent in 2005 as in 1998 (Baier and others 2006, 43). However, the surveys conducted by KFN in 2007 and 2008 were able to establish that fewer adolescents had to endure parental violence and that, in particular in cities, the quota of children being brought up in an entirely non-violent manner had clearly increased (Baier and others 2009). For *Erthal/Bussmann*, the results of a European comparative study that was conducted by them in 2007/2008 suggest that "a law banning corporal punishment does have an influence in decreasing violence"; for Germany, since 1996 a continual decline in the legal approval of violence in the course of upbringing could be observed (Erthal/Bussmann 2009, 53).

⁵⁵ Again, ten years before that, in 1990, a corresponding regulation was already demanded by the "Violence Commission" of the Federal Government (Schwind/Baumann and others 1990). Internationally, the right to a non-violent upbringing was already codified in 1989 in Article 19 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Children. Already ten years prior to this, in 1979, Sweden was the first European state to anchor such a right in law (Erthal/Bussmann 2009, 37).

There is also a variety of offers with rather universal appeal for the **education of families**.⁵⁶ Thus, for example, **parent training programmes** have the purpose of facilitating parental rearing practise, are for the most part offered in group rounds and include a structured sequence of training sessions that frequently deal with exercises pertaining to positive educational practises, mediation of social rules and manners to deal with problematic children behaviour.⁵⁷ On average, the parent training programmes do display a high level of efficiency and in part also achieve better effects than the so-called social training programmes for children.

However, with regard to these programmes, the problem frequently occurs that it is very hard to win over parents from high-risk families and burdened contexts to participate in such programmes or that they frequently drop out of the courses (Beelmann 2009, 261f.).⁵⁸

The *selective prevention strategies* – at least for the most part – include the so-called “**early help**”⁵⁹ systems; which are local and regional supporting systems with coordinated offers of assistance for parents and children, starting with pregnancy, and continuing into the early years. Here the special focus is on the age group of 0 to 3 year-olds. These strategies have the objective of sustainably improving the possibilities for the development of children and parents in family and society early on in life.

Apart from support in the field of everyday practical skills, early help particularly wants to contribute toward facilitating the relationship and rearing competence of (expectant) mothers and fathers. Thus it provides a significant contribution for the healthy rearing of children and secures their rights to protection, fostering and participation ... Fundamental are offers that are aimed at all (expectant) parents with their children, in the sense of health support. In addition to this, early help is particularly aimed at families in problematic situations (selective prevention). Of central significance for the practical implementation of early help is ... close networking and cooperation of institutes and offers in the fields of pregnancy counselling, the public health sector, the interdisciplinary early support programmes of the Child and Youth Welfare and additional social services ...”⁶⁰

⁵⁶ Examples of this, with short descriptions, can also be found at Sann / Thrum 2008 and at Lösel 2006.

⁵⁷ Examples of this are the Triple-P-Programm (www.triplep.de) and the programme “EFFEKT – development facilitation within families: parents and children training”, to-date the only combined development and prevention study in Germany (University of Erlangen-Nürnberg) Lösel and others (2008 and 2010).

⁵⁸ In this regard, also see the “Inventory and Evaluation of Offers in the Area of Parental Education”, which Lösel conducted on behalf of the Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ), (status November 2006); available via publikationen@bundesregierung.de

⁵⁹ Definition according to www.fruehehilfen.de/4010.0.html

⁶⁰ For a critical view of “early help as a perfected controlling system” see Keupp 2009. See also Sann/ Schaefer 2008.

Since March 2007, within the context of the Programme of Action of the Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ), the Federal Centre for Health Education (BZgA) and the German Youth Institute (DJI) have been providing “early help for parents and children and social early warning systems” in joint sponsorship with the *National Centre for Prevention of Neglect and Maltreatment in Early Childhood (NZFH)*.⁶¹

The centre provides practical support in recognising familiar burdens earlier on and more effectively and by providing supporting offers in accordance with demand. The NZFH’s higher ranking goal is to better protect children against danger earlier on by means of an effective networking of early help systems of the public health sector and the Child and Youth Welfare, whereby this goal is to be attained primarily by improving the accessibility of risk groups.⁶²

The supported pilot projects have been evaluated; initial results are available. Owing to the short duration of the evaluation, a sustainable impact cannot however be proven yet. But it has become apparent that far fewer families can be reached by the pilot projects than was originally planned (DJI 2009d, 46).

Already prior to the establishment of the NZFH, both at *community as well as at state levels*, it was possible to recognize definite activities with the aim of increasingly focussing on providing early and preventative help; in the meantime these offers have been expanded even more.⁶³ Most of these approaches are selectively applied, thus are aimed at families with an increased risk of abuse and neglect. With these so-called (high) **risk families** the living conditions are already burdened by numerous negative conditions and risks, which evidently still mutually complement and reinforce one another. These risks include, for example, poverty, lacking social support in the family, biographical burden of the parents (for instance that the parents themselves had been abused or neglected in their childhood) psychological illnesses and alcohol and substance abuse (Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft (Federal Work Group) 2009, 12).

⁶¹ www.fruehehilfen.de/3232.98.html; in this regard, also see a first rating of this centre by von der Leyen 2009.

⁶² In this regard, also see the expertise commissioned by the NZFH on the international status of research of impact (Lengning/Zimmermann 2009), the extremely informative statement of the German Youth Institute on the topic “New Concepts Early Help” (DJI 2009d), as well as the symposium “Interdisciplinary early support in the system of early help” from the 22nd to the 23rd of March 2010 in Kassel-Wilhelmshöhe.

⁶³ In this regard, see Galm and others 2007; the magazine 1-2/2005 of the IKK-news “Violence against Children: Early Recognition – Early Help” (Information Centre Child Abuse / Child Neglect of the German Youth Institute e.V.) as well as the National Action Plan “For Germany, Fit for Children 2005 – 2010”, in which the topic of “Growing up without violence” is in focus. Already in the coalition agreement of November 2005, the coalition fractions of the CDU, CSU and SPD have already thematised the early support of children who are at risk. In the coalition agreement of the new Federal Government of 26 October 2009, in Chapter III “Social Progress” the issue of “children protection and early help” was mentioned and the intensification thereof is given as an objective.

Family-oriented **early prevention concepts** pursue the aim of recognising problematic careers as early on as possible and, in the tradition of the socio-pedagogical early support and compensatory pre-school upbringing, they consist of different offers of help and support for children up to the age of six, and their families. Pertaining to the effectivity of these programmes, there are evaluations, some of which are very comprehensive with long follow-up periods of time, where, among other things, the subsequent delinquency and criminality served as criteria for defining success (Beelmann 2009, 262).⁶⁴

Apart from these strategies that are focussed on early recognition and support, there also are numerous **support and intervention measures** aimed at basic facilitation of parental competences and behaviour. These approaches, which are focussed on parents and families, try to reduce the risk of a dissocial development of children and adolescents, by means of systematic education, support and assistance for parents and families.

The *indicated prevention strategies* include, for example, the *standard offers of the child and Youth Welfare*: aids for upbringing that aim to guide and support parents in an appropriate manner, say in the context of educational and family counselling support or social-pedagogical family support.⁶⁵ Child-related support focuses on individual support and/or needs for treating children or adolescents and should even out negative impacts in the course of their development in addition to strengthening their psycho-social and cognitive competences. If parents are not willing or able to accept the support offered or to alter their style of upbringing, steps can be initiated to involve the Family Court (Galm and others 2007, 42).⁶⁶

⁶⁴ One of the best known programmes of this kind is the **Perry Preschool Study**, for which “particularly disadvantaged” children in the age bracket of 4-5 years were selected in Ypsilanti, Michigan, USA in 1962. It was possible to establish that almost 35 years after going through this programme, the children who were a part of it displayed, among others, a significantly lower number of convictions and imprisonment for criminal offences (Beelmann 2009, 262). However, not only are these effects known, but also the cost-benefit-analysis to which the Perry Preschool Study was subjected: For each preschool child, there was a net profit of almost 250,000 dollars (in this regard also see the script of the broadcast “Research and Society” in Deutschlandradio Kultur of 26 February 2009; Sybille Salewski: learning pays off. The economist James Heckmann calculates the value of early childhood education). **Peter Lutz** will speak at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Preschool education pays off – the example of the Perry Preschool Project”. **Meinrad Armbruster** will speak at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “ELTERN-AG: a prevention programme of early parents’ education for the socially disadvantaged”.

⁶⁵ Criticism regarding the - insufficient – personnel situation in Child and Family Guidance Counselling Menne 2009

⁶⁶ Sanctions are also being considered by, for example, the *CDU Baden-Württemberg* at their party conference in November 2009, where they demanded that the state aid for parents who neglect their children be decreased. Hartz IV-recipients, who do not look after their children well enough, should be subjected to sanctions (Süddeutsche Zeitung of 23 November 2009). An opposing attitude is taken by the *Scientific Advisory Board for Family Policy Issues*, and does not deem “parent testimonials, even combined with sanctions” as the appropriate measure for increasing parental competences (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005b, 26; also FN 51

With regard to the **effectivity** of the programmes and measures of the **selective and indicated prevention strategies** *Beelmann* comes to the overall appraisal that: “with due caution, we can state that development-psychological and evidence-based programmes on the prevention of violence and criminality do exist such as, say, social training programmes for children, parent training programmes or early family-oriented measures for high-risk groups.” (2009, 269).⁶⁷

3.2

Child day-care facilities as place of education and prevention

“Elementary education is the task of the family, but not only a private matter ... elementary education is a task for society and thus also requires public accountability.” (BJK 2004a)

3.2.1

Growing up in public responsibility

If the development and educational chances of children are significantly determined by their family background, the facilitation of educational justice can also imply that the disadvantages are to be evened out by early access to publicly organised and operated places of education and education promoting lifeworlds outside of the family. Then, growing up in public responsibility means that all children are afforded access to optimal perspectives – regardless of how much they acquire at home.⁶⁸

The first publicly organised and operated places of education outside of the family are the **child day-care facilities**⁶⁹; these include the day-care facilities for children such as crèches, kindergartens and the like as well as child day-care.⁷⁰ Visiting these establishments for early childhood education should contribute to more justice *among*

⁶⁷ However, it is especially the aids used by the Child and Youth Welfare in the event of suspected or actual intra-family violence against children **that have not been systematically evaluated** (Galm and others 2007, 43). Hence the statement to be found in the *coalition agreement* between the CDU, CSU and FDP of 26 October 2009 is to be welcomed (S. 71): “We shall review the Child and Youth Welfare system and its legal bases in the Social Security Code (SGB) VIII with regard to its accuracy and effectivity. We want early, speedy and unbureaucratic accesses to assistance by highly qualified service offerings and the elimination of interface problems between the Youth Welfare and other systems that provide assistance. This applies particularly to the early help systems and other help systems for young persons with disabilities. We shall evaluate the quality of the Child and Youth Welfare and, as the case may be, perfect and develop standards.”

⁶⁸ In this regard see DJI Bulletin 80, 2007, 33 and Bock-Famulla 2008, 6.

⁶⁹ Child day-care belongs to Child and Youth Welfare and is a part of social legislation, as regulated in the Social Security Code (SGB) VIII, the Child and Youth Welfare Law. Child day-care falls within the jurisdiction of the municipalities through the local Youth Welfare offices; de facto, however, it is rendered with a share of way over 60% by non-governmental sponsors, the so-called “private sponsors”, frequently denominational sponsors of the Roman Catholic and Evangelical churches in Germany (Sommerfeld 2007, 74f.; Rauschenbach 2009, 138f.).

⁷⁰ Child day-care is a family-based, flexible type of care by day care attendants – for instance a child minder – especially for children under the age of three (DJI Thema 2009/02). Regarding status and challenges also see Jurczyk/Heitkoetter 2007.

children and by means of early facilitation it should also increase the future chances for *all* children (DJI Bulletin 81, 1/2008, 11).

Not only is this assessment of the significance of **early support of children** in line with the insights of neurobiology⁷¹, but also with those of the economics of education.⁷² Since the early access to education and education promoting lifeworlds can have a positive influence on the entire educational biography, it would definitely make more sense and be more efficient to invest early on, rather than paying for repairs and follow-up costs later on (Bock- Famulla 2008, 6).

The 12th *Child and Youth Report* also focuses on the “obvious backlog demand” in Germany “with a view to its offer for public education, care and rearing”: “for too long and too one-sidedly has the former Federal Republic virtually exclusively relied on family and school as the unquestionably given supporting pillars of childhood and adolescence. In doing so, the family in particular was responsible for the care and upbringing of the children and the school for the education” (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 28 f).

In recent years, however, the publicly organised and operated place of education “child day-care facilities” has experienced so much transition that a **fundamental change in the understanding of the significance of early childhood education and care outside of the family** can be established: “For Germany the child day-care facilities have proven to be a child-political setting of course” (DJI Bulletin 80, 2007, 33).⁷³

⁷¹ In this regard see, e.g. the remarks by Bergmann/ Huether 2009 and Huether 2009 “Why does the brain become the way one uses it.” Only in the last 10 years have brain researchers and development psychologists been successful in proving the extent in which the structuring of the brain depends on how and for what purpose a child uses its brain. At the time of birth the human brain is still highly unfinished. Virtually everything that impacts later life still has to be learnt and stored within the brain as a new experience (Bergmann/Huether 2009, 68f.). Our brain creates networks, thinks and works in the manner in which we use it and new connections are always then created very quickly and are extremely tightly linked together, when the things we intensively occupy ourselves with, are of particular significance for us (Huether 2009, 59)

Gerald Huether will speak at the opening plenary session of the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “What shapes us, knowledge or experience?”

⁷² According to insights of the **economy of education, by trend**, the yields of investments in education tend to decrease with increasing age. Especially for children from socially disadvantaged classes the yields have a tendency of being higher in the early childhood (Wößmann 2008). In this regard also see the research results of *James J. Heckmann*, American Nobel laureate for Economics in the year 2000, who sees the cheapest measure by far in providing qualified early pedagogical offers, so as to integrate persons into society and qualify them for the employment market (DJI Bulletin 81 PLUS 1/2008, 1)

⁷³ For Rauschenbach (2007, 5), in recent years, the following has been introduced in a “family-political triple jump”: each child’s legal right to a place in a kindergarten (1996), the introduction of parenting money (2007), the agreed upon legal right of each child to a place in a child care facility as of the age of one (beginning in 2013).

Hans Rudolf Leu will speak at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Child day-care facilities’ development and expansion. Quantitative and qualitative foundation for early childhood education”

Given the historical development of the public child day-care facilities in Germany, this was not necessarily to be expected.⁷⁴

In Germany, ever since the year one, the care of one's own children was considered to be a *private matter*: hence, still at the end of the 1980s, which is not even two decades ago, in West Germany 99% of the children under the age of three and 88% of the three to six-year old children were cared for in their private environments when the mother was not working; in the event that she was working, the share of private caretaking did decrease, but it was still at 88% or 75% respectively.⁷⁵

In the meantime the child day-care facilities as a place of upbringing is a lifeworld that is experienced by virtually all children in Germany – albeit very differently in scope and quality.⁷⁶ In 2002, in the Western federal states, except for the city states, the percentage of **children under the age of three years** in care outside the home was merely 2%; in the Eastern federal states it was 37% and in the city states it was 26%. In the year 2008 this percentage had increased to 12.2% in the Western states (including the city states) and in the Eastern states to 42.4%. Because, as of August 2013, owing to the *Kinderfoerderungsgesetz* (children fostering law)⁷⁷, children will have a legal right to a day-care place, the development of day-care accommodations for under three-year olds (still) has to be increased considerably.” (DJI Thema 2009/2) This also applies against the background of the currently low number of hours per day in which children are looked after in the facilities: in the Western states, one third (33%) of the children are looked after outside of the family for a mere 5 hours per weekday; in the Eastern states this low caretaking time applied for fewer than half the children (16%); here 63% of the children are looked after for the whole day (more than 7 hours) (DJI Bulletin 81, 11).

The caretaking percentages for the **three to six-year old children were and are considerably higher**.⁷⁸ In the Eastern states anyhow, but also in the Western federal states, other than the city states, the number of available places corresponded to a caretaking quota of 69% in the year 1990, and this rose to a utilization quota of 91% in the year 2008. This expansion especially benefited children in the ages between three and four years: in 1992,

⁷⁴ See in this regard, Rauschenbach 2009a, 138f.; also the Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2005a, 37 and Sommerfeld 2007, 74.

⁷⁵ In contrast, since the 1960s the child day-care facilities have been consistently expanded in der GDR, so that can speak about an “institutional” childhood in the East (Rauschenbach 2009a, 141).

⁷⁶ In this regard also see the report issued by the Bertelsmann Foundation – “Country report on early child educational systems 2008” (Bock-Famulla 2008).

⁷⁷ KiFöG – “Law on facilitation of children under three years of age in day care facilities and children day care centres” - in force since 1 January 2009; German government, federal states and local communities have agreed that, on average, until the year 2013 across Germany there would be a place in a child care facility for every third child under three years of age. One assumes that this will suffice to fulfil the legal claim for a place for children as of one year of age, which goes into force in 2013.

⁷⁸ For this age group there has already been a legal claim to a kindergarten place since 1 January 1996.

31% of the three-year olds attended a kindergarten, in 2008 this figure was 81%; with the four and five-year olds the figure increased from 78% to 95% (Rauschenbach 2009, 142ff.)⁷⁹ However, in the Western federal states only 20% of the children utilized the offer of whole-day education, upbringing and caretaking; in the Eastern countries, by contrast, it was 63% (DJI Bulletin 81, 11); according to the expert commission for the *12th Child and Youth Report* (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2005a) an offer that fulfils the needs will only be attained when 50% of places available for child-care can be provided for full-day care. At the present time, though, parents' demand for full-day care for children under the age of three as well as for school children still lies far above the number of available places (Gragert and others 2008, 31).

All in all, the child day-care facilities have now become a **matter of course**: with regard to their expansion "one could notice a change in mindset in a breathtakingly short space of time." It is "no longer a question of *whether*, but especially of *how* to expand the number of publicly offered child day-care facilities." (Rauschenbach 2009a, 145) According to the insights of neuroscientists and psychologists, an educational offer in the kindergarten both meets the educational needs of children as well as their need for education (Schneider 2009, 32).⁸⁰ However, as before, not all families, and thus not all children, make use of the non-compulsory offer of early education, upbringing and caretaking. Thus, for example, lower percentages of children with a migrational **background**⁸¹ attend a child day-care facility, and these children also only start later on, that is, fewer start before the age of three. Children under the age of three from families that draw **social security benefits I** likewise make less frequent use of this offer (DJI Bulletin 81, 11).⁸²

⁷⁹ According to the findings of the *National Report on Education 2008*, in 2007 up to 95% of the 4 and 5 year-olds attended **child day-care facilities** – "although the utilization of the offer for child day-care facilities and child day-care is voluntary, it is increasingly becoming normal within the educational biography of children ... in the course hereof there still are significant regional differences with a view to the hours of care and the age in which children first make use of these offers" (BBE 2008, 50).

⁸⁰ Fundamentals on caretaking, on the effects on the development of the children, on the satisfaction of the parents, also see *Heitkötter* 2009. In 2004 the Conference of the state Education Ministers (KMK)/Youth Minister Conference adopted a framework for early education with the objective of not only providing education in primary school, but already making this obligatory in early childhood education. In the meantime all of the 16 federal states have elaborated education plans for the child day-care facilities, which are determined by the paradigm of equal footing and interdependency of upbringing, caretaking and education (Schneider 2009, 32).

⁸¹ In the kindergartens of Western Germany, 29% of the children have a **migrational background**, but only 6% in Eastern Germany. Noticeable – and obviously more widespread than in the schools – is the unbalanced distribution of children with a migrational background in the facilities: more than 60% attend facilities in which an above-average number of children with migrational background are looked after – not a particularly favourable circumstance for the social integration of these children. "One can assume that these facilities with such a high share of children with migrational background need additional personnel resources, if the high expectations placed on these facilities as places of integration for different cultures and early-lingual facilitation are to be met (BBE 2008, 53).

It goes without saying that the ability to speak German properly is of considerable importance for the educational processes. Since 2005 the DJI-project "**Language Training in the Kindergarten**" has been working on supplying the corresponding materials for practical use in the field of preschool learning. In the meantime a tried-and-tested concept for integrated lingual groundwork has arisen (www.dji.de).

⁸² Interesting, within this context, is the "atmospheric picture" gained in a study conducted by the German

Due to the demand for equal opportunities for all children⁸³ and the insight that the early educational processes in child day-care facilities play an important role that is not to be underestimated with regard to preparing children for school,⁸⁴ the question of whether it should be **compulsory** for children to attend a **kindergarten** as of the age of four or five, analogous to compulsory school education, is now under discussion.⁸⁵ This too is indicative of the change in mindset: “the public day-care facilities of the past, which used to be viewed as a fifth (emergency) tyre on the vehicle of early education of children, have now changed to an offer of early education for *all* children, without exception, because this is indispensable for their futures.” (Rauschenbach 2009a, 145f.)

In the meantime, the *Bundesjugendkuratorium (Federal Youth Board)* even believes that the child day-care facilities are **overloaded with expectations**. The following is expected of them: they should activate educational reserves by means of early and targeted facilitation and support; provide an effective contribution to the creation of equal opportunities in the field of education; provide a contribution to an improved reconciliation of family and employment by providing a sufficient number of places

That are flexible with regard to the opening hours; compensate limitations and restraints in familial socialisation, for instance by giving children the opportunity of gaining group experiences or providing them with possibilities for activation that lie outside consumption of the media; improve societal integration, especially of people with a migrational background; take over tasks of a preventative social nature by means of early recognition of possible problematic constellations in the care and upbringing of some particular child. Certain requirements are associated with these expectations, which the facilities and the personnel working therein cannot comply with, given the currently applicable framework conditions. There is a “great **danger** that the child day-care facilities will fail, owing to requirements that are diffuse but complex at the same time.”(2008, 10ff.)

Telekom Foundation (2010), which interviewed parents and non-parents on the importance of early childhood education, in particular with regard to their expectations pertaining to the role/function of the kindergarten/child day-care facilities.

⁸³ On the polarisation of life and educational opportunities of children and families and the challenges for child day-care facilities, also see Meier-Graewe 2009 (DJI Thema 2009/02) and the expert report for the 14th German Congress on Crime Prevention.

⁸⁴ Although the specific performance potential of the child day-care facilities should actually not be that of pre-emptive scholastic education, but rather a consistent individualisation of childlike learning (Rauschenbach 2009a, 153; BJK 2008, 19ff.), the – as yet not solved – conflict between “individual facilitation” and “reaching a level of being ready for school” cannot be denied.

⁸⁵ The *Action Council for Education*, for instance, is in favour of mandatory kindergarten attendance, when it made the following recommendation to politics in its annual expert report in 2008: “As of the end of their second year, it is recommended that all children should be able to attend a kindergarten; this should be mandatory for children with a particular need for support; a mandatory preschool attendance as of the age of four years as well as an academic training of the preschool personnel so as to comply better with the educational mandate of the preschool field.” (2008, 146).

At any rate, considerable **effort** will be required if the child day-care facilities should even remotely be placed in a position to meet the demands and expectations placed in them. These efforts include, in particular: the continued expansion of the child day-care facilities, especially for children under the age of three and this in particular in the Western federal states; the improvement of the personnel infrastructure, regarding the available personnel resources and the qualification of staff as well as the improvement of their professional image and status, whereas not only one quality offensive would be required, but – with the foreseeable lack of teachers trained for pre-school pupils – also an increase of educator training capacities.⁸⁶

These efforts should also include the necessity of systematically and more strongly involving **parents** in the upbringing and educational processes of the child day-care facilities. Since, despite the “increase of publicly operated caretaking, education and upbringing, the comprehensive support and facilitation of children still remains a co-productive performance between the family, public care offerings and the broader social environment” (Heitkötter 2009, 21). Children day-care facilities should develop in the direction in which the consideration of families as contact groups should be expanded, moving toward becoming **centres for integrated and easily accessible service and support systems for** children and families (BJK 2008, 27; Stöbe-Blossey 2010, 95).

In this regard projects such as “Family Centres”, “Children and Family Centres”, “Parent-Child Centres” are being discussed and tested.

Examples of such centres are the British “Early Excellence Centres (EEC)”, which were started in 1997 by the government, by means of a pilot programme. In the meantime there are more than 100 such centres. Their objective is to respond to the complex needs of families by providing offers coming from just one source. At the centre hereof is the involvement of the parents in the educational work and the children’s development. By means of offers for further training and education the competences and confidence of parents are strengthened, so that they are better able to stand up for the interests of their children (Stöbe-Blossey 2010, 96).⁸⁷

An approach to systematic implementation of such concepts over a large area has been pursued in the state of North Rhine-Westphalia in the form of **family centres** since early 2006. By 2012 one third of the roughly 9,000 child day-care facilities shall be expanded

⁸⁶ See in this regard DJI 2009a; DJI Bulletin 80, 2007; Bock-Famulla 2008; Komdat Jugendhilfe (Youth Welfare) Number 2/09 “Increasing the educator training capacities for teachers of pre-school children is necessary”; Heitkötter 2009 or also the article by Jeannette Otto in the ZEIT (weekly newspaper) No. 28 of 2 July 2009 “The child day care lie” or by Markus Wehner in the Frankfurter Allgemeinen Sonntagszeitung (weekly newspaper) No. 26 of 28 June 2009 “Too few goals, too little money – the expansion of child day-care is not progressing well”.

⁸⁷ In Germany for instance, since 2000, the Heinz and Heide Dürr Foundation have been supporting the first Early Excellence Centre, with the pilot project “children and family centres – Schillerstraße”, which is an establishment of the Pestalozzi-Fröbel-House, located in Berlin (www.early-excellence.de and www.heinzundheideduerrstiftung.de).

to become such family centres, in which children and families are assisted jointly and sustainably supported. The objective is to merge education, upbringing and care as the task of child day-care facilities, with counselling offers and assistance for families. The development of children and the support of families can thus go hand in hand.⁸⁸

3.2.2

Child day-care facilities as place of prevention of violence

As the first publicly organised and operated instance outside of the family, the child day-care facilities also represent a place for the prevention of violence, and this is particularly valid for the day-care centres: they can offer both children and families “encouragement, assistance and support at a very early stage and have the effect of potential protective factors against the inclination to use violence.” (Sommerfeld 2007, 82)⁸⁹

However, the reason for this is not the violence between the children or toward the caretaking persons in the child day-care centre itself: although, since the 1990s “violence in kindergartens” has been an issue for specialists and also for the media (“monster kids” and “kindergarten rambos”),⁹⁰ there is not really a “violence” problem in the child day-care centres (Sommerfeld 2007, 82).

At least there is hardly any data on this: in the police crime statistics this is not disclosed – in total, for the entire country, in 2007 there were only 83 children under the age of six who were registered for accounts of bodily harm – and according to the information of the Statutory Accident Insurance in the year 2004 there were 3.4 so-called “scuffling-accidents” per every 1.000 children in day-care facilities, of which two thirds occurred with children as of age 5 or older. The figures have stagnated since they were first recorded in 1990.⁹¹

Besides, using the “violence phrase” for child behaviour is problematic at any rate and also not appropriate, in particular for children of preschool age: “bodily conflict resolutions are appropriate within the preschool age bracket and in respect to child development, ... “Violence” is a “container” phrase for a broad range of socially undesired and yet age-typical behaviour right up to destructive behavioural patterns,

⁸⁸ Quoted from the internet entry “Family Centre NRW” www.familienzentrum.nrw.de; in this regard also see the presentation by Stoebe-Blossey 2010, 95ff

⁸⁹ This order has already resulted from the KJHG: day-care facilities for children have the public mandate of fostering and supporting every child in his/her development toward an independent and socially-adapted personality and to counter (the development of) disadvantages

⁹⁰ In this regard also see the documentation of a hearing of the Bundesjugendkuratoriums (State Youth Board of Trustees) 1998 on the “Mythos of the Monsterkids” (Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention 1999).

⁹¹ Information by Sommerfeld 2007, 78. While the statistics of the German Statutory Accident Insurance (DGUV) on the school children accidents of 2008 are available and differentiate between the types of child day-care facilities, they do not differentiate between “scuffling accidents” and other incidents (www.dguv.de).

which hardly can be dealt with appropriately within normal facilities.” (Sommerfeld 2007, 77f.).⁹²

Hence, **prevention** within the “child day-care facilities as place of education” rather has a **universal** alignment. Its primary objective is to foster social competences, to prevent or reduce disadvantages, and to promote the integration and social participation of children – and thus also to oppose the appearance of societal disintegration and precarious life circumstances, which emerge in the everyday life of child day-care facilities as the increase of childlike behavioural patterns and parental upbringing difficulties and which might cause the caretakers considerable problems.

The approaches aimed at prevention are as manifold and heterogeneous as the supporting structure of the child day-care facilities with their variety of institutional forms and pedagogical concepts. Traditionally, the field of action is characterised by projects of individual facilities or sponsors at local or regional levels. The clientele is not only the children within the day-care facilities themselves, but also their parents and the skilled personnel (see Sommerfeld 2007, 84ff. on this and the following).

Apart from situative interventions – for instance in handling conflicts or facilitating participation – the pedagogical staff also initiates offers and projects. Since child educational processes are always also characterised by the child’s independent interaction with its own environment in which children actively have to get to know their surroundings, every child thus becomes an actor and co-producer in the course of its education (Rauschenbach 2009a, 154). It’s not about “teaching” children something, but about perceiving and following up the themes of the children in dialogue with them by observing their playing and interaction processes (Sommerfeld 2007, 86).

In this regard, **themes** are, for instance, the strengthening of the self-esteem of children, also and especially with regard to dealing with **differences**: in the day-care facility each child’s family culture, gained from its parents and family, comes into contact with a variety of different cultures – not only pertaining to the ethnic background, but also regarding the greatly varying life-concepts and familial life circumstances. Broadly speaking, for the professional staff, intercultural competence is becoming a factor of decisive importance as they increasingly find themselves in an highly heterogeneous, socio-economic but also ethnically-culturally divided society, which is drifting further and further apart.⁹³

⁹² In this regard also see the remarks in the expert report on the focal topic of the 12th German Congress on Crime Prevention “Violence as a learning opportunity: on the necessity and benefits of age-appropriate understanding of violence” (Steffen 2008, 255ff.).

⁹³ Regarding the concept of intercultural competence, see, for example, the theses paper of the Bertelsmann Foundation (2006).

In the meantime there are standardised curricula of social training programmes for kindergarten children that are focussed on the improvement of social competences – thus, making friends, resolving social conflicts, recognising and regulating emotions⁹⁴ are available in standardised curriculum form. They are intended for a fairly long timeframe and focus on the entire kindergarten group – universal prevention – not merely on individual “difficult” children, and are conducted by pedagogically skilled staff. For this, as for other prevention programmes, the qualification of the staff is of key importance.

This is the case in particular for strategies aimed at **selective and indicated prevention of violence**, which are then used if child day-care centres, as described in above, are to perform preventative work within social **early warning systems** and be placed in a position to recognise possibly problematic constellations in the care and upbringing of a child as soon as possible. Given the current structural conditions, the educators neither have the requisite leeway nor the required additional training: “The work with families that are in particular problem situations requires a degree of professionalism that cannot be assumed to be present either on the part of heads of staff or the teaching staff.” (Sommerfeld 2007, 98f.)

3.3

School as a place of education and prevention

*“Increasingly, scholastic success is regarded as a relevant factor in the distribution of societal opportunities and risks.”*⁹⁵

3.3.1

School as a place of education

Although education is more than school and leading a successful life is built on social integration as well as on educational processes within families, as well as establishments of the Child and Youth Welfare and vocational training, school is without a doubt “the central public place of educations for children and adolescents in the process of growing up” (Rauschenbach 2009a, 166). Education in school age plays a key role for individual development, both for social participation and for conveying competences (BBE 2008, 61).⁹⁶

Not least because of this significance, school at the same time is a severely criticised place of education: “School pupils speak about their fears of school and their aversion to attending school; parents and parents’ representatives mention reservations

⁹⁴ For instance www.papilio.de, (in this regard also Scheithauer/Mayer 2008 and 2009) or www.faustlos.de; both programmes for prevention of violence have been evaluated. According to the findings by Beelmann (2009, 261) the social training programmes for children, however, show less impact than the training programmes for parents.

⁹⁵ DJI Bulletin 81, 1/2008, 11.

⁹⁶ The central role of school also is expressed in the compulsory school attendance.

and criticism pertaining to school. Employers complain about the education levels of a considerable number of adolescents that are (too) low, calling it a problem of education and training. Virtually ten percent of adolescents leave school without a qualifying degree. Scholastic performance studies such as PISA, TIMSS and IGLU⁹⁷ confirm that the German school system does less than schools in many other countries and, in particular, it does not even out differences owing to the social and migrational background of school pupils, but rather reinforces them.” (BJK 2004b, 5)⁹⁸

Hence it appears that the German school system does not render the **educational performance that is and ought to be expected of it** – for instance in view of the constitutional right to equal opportunity in education or in view of the right to a comprehensive general school education that is proclaimed, for example, in school curricula.⁹⁹

In international comparison, with regard to the right to **equal opportunities**, it was the PISA-studies in particular that pointed out the significant disadvantages of children and adolescents with a socially weaker background. Gaining access to higher education and high-school graduation remains a central barrier for adolescents from families of the lower social classes. A consequence of a higher socio-economic status is a high-school quota that is up to five times higher and a secondary general school quota that is up to three times lower.

Risk situations lead to a significant deterioration of educational opportunities – and these risk situations have increased in recent years: In 2006, more than every tenth child under the age of 18 years lived in a family in Germany in which no parent was working. 13% of the children grew up in families in which nobody had a qualification of the secondary stage I. With 23% of the children, the family’s income was below the “risk of poverty” line. 4.2 million, or 28%, of the children are affected by at least one of these risk situations.

Migrational background is a “risk situation” that leads to disadvantages in all levels of the school system – and in some regions young people with migrational background represent a share of more than half of their age group. More than 40% of the

⁹⁷ See above FN 19.

⁹⁸ Whereby there is no such thing as a *German* school: cultural sovereignty, which includes responsibility for all public schools, lies solely with the federal states and, in accordance with the federalistic structures, the design of the German school systems is highly heterogeneous and multi-faceted. The question of what the right school structure is has been a matter of controversy for many years. Presently, once again, there is heated discussion of questions such as the duration of primary school, whether or not to have independent secondary modern schools, and who has the final say regarding whether a given pupil may enter academic high school, etc. In this regard see, for example, the article “Auf neuen Bildungswegen” (On new educational paths) in the *Sueddeutsche Zeitung* (newspaper) of 19 January 2010 or also the verbal dispute “We need a new culture of learning” by the Culture Ministers of Bavaria, Hamburg and Saxony in the *Sueddeutsche Zeitung* of 10 March 2010.

⁹⁹ See in this regard and in the following the Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 280ff., BBE 2008, 10ff., Action Council for Education 2007, 135ff.

adolescents of both immigrant generations but only 14% of the adolescents without migrational background belong to the so-called risk group with low reading competence. Even with the same social status, school pupils with a migrational background less frequently attend an academic high school (college preparatory school), are more frequently to be found in the types of schools offering a lower level of qualification, leave schools of general education (secondary school) twice as often as native German school pupils without having obtained at least a secondary modern school qualification and have delayed and less successful transitions into vocational training¹⁰⁰ (there are no such disadvantages after vocational training, once this has been reached and successfully concluded).

What can be noticed, however, is the reversal of **gender specific disadvantages** of girls: girls and young women are becoming increasingly more successful; in contrast, new problematic situations are to be found with boys. The risk of boys and young men failing in the educational system is increasing. This is particularly the case for those with a migrational background. Boys also more frequently repeat a school year.¹⁰¹

All in all, the German school system produces too many **educational losers**: “repeaters”, children who refuse to go to school and dropout pupils. According to the PISA-study 2003, almost one quarter (23%) of all fifteen-year olds had repeated at least one school year in the course of their time at school.¹⁰² The number of children who refuse to go to school – those who do not attend for more than ten school days per half-year – is estimated at 300,000. In addition, there are the so-called “truants”. This is particularly prevalent at secondary general schools and schools for children with learning difficulties.¹⁰³ The number of dropouts – school students leaving school without a secondary general certificate – is decreasing somewhat throughout Germany, however, in 2008 it still was at a level of 7% (or 64,400 adolescents).¹⁰⁴

According to the results of the international **performance studies**, the German school system obviously does not succeed sufficiently at imparting a basic training or educational minimum in language, mathematics and scientific competences for all school

¹⁰⁰ **Joerg Dittmann, Sandra Heisig and Jan Goebel** will speak at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Prevention Strategies at the Transition from School to Vocational Training – Approaches in the Work with Disadvantaged Adolescents”.

¹⁰¹ **Klaus Hurrelmann** will speak at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Competence Deficits of Young Men – a Challenge for Preventative Work”.

¹⁰² A study conducted on behalf of the Bertelsmann Foundation, on the costs for repeating a school year in Germany ascertained the following: “Repeat years – expensive and ineffective”. Repeat years for pupils who had not been promoted, neither led to an improvement of their cognitive development, nor did the pupils who remained in the original class benefit from this instrument. With striking differences regarding the types of schools and state-dependent differences regarding the repeater quota, each and every year more than 931 million euros are spent for repeating a class in Germany (Klemm 2009).

¹⁰³ SPIEGEL interview of 7 October 2009 with Karlheinz Thimm “One has to fight for difficult pupils”

¹⁰⁴ SPIEGELONLINE report of 11 November 2009.

pupils. In a longitudinal cut, improvements in performance have been established, however, according to the PISA studies, approximately one quarter of the 15 year-olds has to be considered a risk group, as, owing to clear lacks in reading competence and in dealing with mathematical procedures and models, they might have significant problems with commencing vocational training. Particularly strongly represented among these risk school pupils are adolescents from workers' families as well as from families with a migrational background (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2005a, 282).¹⁰⁵

This confirms the aforementioned supposition that the German school system does not render the educational performance that it should and that is expected of it. However – this has already been pointed out – the high degree of social selectivity of the German educational system, the particular disadvantages for children from the poorly educated social classes in which education is not considered as being so important, or for children of people with a migrational background, cannot only be blamed on the schools. Obviously, the other upstream or supplementary places of education such as “family”, “child day-care” and “offerings by the Child and Youth Welfare” are not (any longer) or not (yet) sufficiently able to render the educational performance for adolescents that is required for their educational success at school.¹⁰⁶

In this regard the family plays a key role. Inability of the family to fulfil their duties with regard to care-taking and support, upbringing and education, results in disadvantages for the children which subsequently can only be evened out with a lot of effort. Early help and early facilitation, supplementing private family care with public caretaking offers could even out such disadvantages and promote educational justice. “School is a joint responsibility of teachers, parents and, moreover, the pupils themselves. We must focus on drawing parents’ attention to their responsibilities for their children.” (Lenzen 2009, 9)¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ An additional indicator for the weaknesses of the German school system is the frequency of private coaching: “Teaching and learning outside of school is a part of everyday life for families in Germany” (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 283). A study conducted on behalf of the Bertelsmann Foundation on “Expenses for **Private Coaching** – Expensive and Unfair Equalisation for Lack of Individual Attention” concluded that the high degree of private coaching in Germany is not only indicative of a lack in the educational system, but is, above all, also unjust, as not everyone can afford it. This worsens the equal opportunities of the educational system (Klemm/Klemm 2010).

¹⁰⁶ Lenzen (2009, 7) on this finding: “From a national economy point of view, one can also say: this part of the upcoming generation is being systematically held back from the national economy.” The Stanford Professor Eric H. Hanushek, the Munich educational economist Professor Ludger Wößmann and the international PISA-coordinator Andreas Schleicher have conducted the study “The High Cost of Low Educational Performance” for the OECD, which also conducts the PISA studies,. According to their calculations, earnings in Germany would be correspond to five times that of the entire annual economic performance or an additional annual growth rate of 0.8%, if the children in German schools could be brought up to the level of the children in Finnish schools (www.zeit.de/gesellschaft/schule/201001/oecd-educationsausgaben? page=all&print vom 21.1.2010)

¹⁰⁷ Liv Berit Koch and Maria Macher will speak at the 15th German Congress on Crime Prevention on the topic of “District Mothers in Berlin-Neukoelln – Presentation of the Project and First Evaluation Results”.

At any rate, the problems of social, cultural and also education-related segregation represent a central challenge for educational policy. An answer for this challenge – “the central hope of educational policy per se” – is the nationwide establishment and expansion of **all-day schools**.¹⁰⁸

With a share of only 5% of all schools in Germany, all-day schools have been an exception¹⁰⁹ and, for a long time, they were a taboo topic in Western Germany and regarded there as a massive assault on the family and the parents’ rights to bring up their own children.

In the meantime this image has changed. For some years now, all-day schools have come to be viewed as a contemporary reply to the changing needs of parents, which require finding ways in which to reconcile work with the upbringing of children, reacting to new demands and expectations regarding the children’s education and enabling a better facilitation, in particular for children and adolescents who have an educational disadvantage (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 305f.) – the analogy to the development and evaluation of the child day-care facilities is impossible to overlook.

An important impetus for the expansion of all-day schools has been provided with the investment programme “**Zukunft Bildung und Betreuung**” (**Future Education and Care**) (IZBB), which is presumably the largest education-political reform programme currently being carried out. With this programme, the Federal Government, which has no competence of its own in cultural and educational policy), supports the federal states’ demand-oriented build up and expansion of all-day schools.¹¹⁰ All decisions on which schools and types of schools are to be supported, as well as the contentual and staffing arrangements for these schools, fall within the competence of the federal states. According to the annual reports of the federal states, a total of 7,129 schools were supported or scheduled for facilitation between 2003 and 2009. The all-day school programme is accompanied and evaluated scientifically.¹¹¹

Establishment of all-day schools in Germany will not only provide the opportunity to expand the number of hours of the conventional teaching schools and traditional half-day schools, but also to supplement them with **other educational contents and forms of learning** (Rauschenbach 2009a, 177).¹¹² The debate concerning the all-day

¹⁰⁸ Rauschenbach (2009a, 177), who sees all-day schools as a chance for the future.

¹⁰⁹ Internationally, Germany is virtually the only country that allows itself the luxury of a half-day school; according to current data by the Ministry of Education and Arts, the half-day model is still valid for approximately two thirds of all school administration units (Stecher u.a. 2009).

¹¹⁰ On 12 May 2003, the administrative agreement to this investment programme was jointly signed by the Federal and State governments. A total of four billion euros were provided for the years 2003 to 2007, and these funds can still be spent until the end of 2009 (www.bmbf.de/de/3735.php)

¹¹¹ At the centre of this is the “Study on Development of All-Day Schools” (StEG) under the direction of a consortium (www.projektsteg.de); in this regard also see Stecher and others 2009.

¹¹² **Christian Pfeiffer** will speak at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Dai-

school has also once again stimulated the discussion about an **opening** of the school toward a lifeworld and about the **networking** of the school with other pedagogical institutions, in particular from the field of **Youth Welfare** – to utilize the chance of combining the strengths of the school with the strengths of the other educational players (BMFSFJ 2005a, 282). For the afternoon programmes can be provided by outside sponsors¹¹³ – and here “the Child and Youth Welfare will assume a prominent position” (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 306).

However, it still has not been clarified whether and how this “prominent position” should actually be occupied; how school and Child and Youth Welfare can cooperate. For “in view of its own decidedly anti-school tradition, in the horizon of its consistent participation-oriented self-image in dealing with the children and adolescents” (Rauschenbach 2008, 7), the **Child and Youth Work** still has a hard time in getting along with the topic of education.¹¹⁴

At any rate, the *Bundesjugendkuratorium (Federal Youth Board)* is pursuing the discussion about the establishment of all-day schools and the attempts of Child and Youth Welfare to assert themselves as partners of schools “with scepticism” (2004b, 9).¹¹⁵ From the perspective of the Bundesjugendkuratorium (Federal Youth Board of Trustees) **new places of education** are required as “places of public responsibility” and a new overall concept of all-day education, behind which “a supporting alliance of all institutions involved in matters concerning education and upbringing must stand” (2004b, 17)¹¹⁶ – and a new understanding of education, for which Child and Youth Welfare can provide “an indispensable contribution” (2004b, 20). Namely: “to promote a different kind of education that is actually centred around the children and takes them seriously as subjects of their educational process” (2004b, 20).¹¹⁷

ly fitness training at school. The way toward better performance at school and less violence –concept for a pilot trial”

¹¹³ School and external sponsors must reach an agreement on a joint concept; the school administration has the overall responsibility.

¹¹⁴ On the educational performance of child and youth work, the area of Child and Youth Welfare, which is the first candidate for cooperation with the schools – to convey social and personal competences – and the typical “learning settings” for this – such as the non-compulsory nature of participation, view of the whole person, topicality and reality-reference of the learning experience – see the remarks in the 12th Child and Youth Report (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 303).

Vera Bethge, Irina Neander and Marita Stolt will speak at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Joint Responsibility for Education and Upbringing – School and Youth Welfare in Cooperation”.

¹¹⁵ Although, fundamentally, the *Bundesjugendkuratorium (Federal Youth Board)* has a very positive view of all-day schools: they offer all participants a great variety of options, bring school learning and extracurricular forms of educational and rearing processes together, enable the involvement of social-cultural and athletic organisations and as such offer the foundation and time for intensive facilitation of individual talents (2003, II.)

¹¹⁶ An understanding that is only based on cooperation is not enough (BJK 2003 IV.)

¹¹⁷ Owing to their value orientation and participative structures, Youth Welfare and youth work “are particularly qualified to commit themselves to an understanding of a new integrative education that is oriented

So that changes within the meaning of forward looking concepts are actually accepted at the schools, and so that cooperations arise there structurally and not just sporadically, the *Bundesjugendkuratorium (Federal Youth Board)* considers that it is “urgently necessary that *comprehensive concepts for education and upbringing are developed on location, and that these can be brought together and bundled by local alliances for education* and further developed both conceptually and in respect to contents.” (BJK 2004b, 6f.)

This objective – or rather vision – is described as follows by the *12th Child and Youth Report*: “The interplay of various education players and matters is to be developed socio-spatially and organised in municipal responsibility. The objective is to build up a municipal educational landscape as an infrastructure for children and adolescents which is supported by services and facilities of the school, Child and Youth Welfare, cultural facilities, clubs and associations, institutions for the promotion of health, as well as private and business players on location” (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 351).

Given that high objectives and expectations are connected with all-day schools and that these go far beyond a school reform and as such are correspondingly difficult to realise owing to the fact that this is a matter of creating all-day public educational, care and upbringing offerings for children and adolescents of school age with the involvement of several players, in particular players from Child and Youth Welfare, then this complex of problems will apply to a much greater extent with regard to the development of **municipal educational landscapes**.

The “**Learning On-Location**” programme which is a joint initiative of the Federal Ministry for Education and Research and German Foundations, is the attempt at creating such educational landscapes that was begun in 2008. This programme, which runs through 2012, promotes the build-up of a model local education management (system) in 40 selected county towns and independent cities for an improved interlocking of existing offers and institutions. Municipal education management should enable inter-agency control with the involvement of all educational players and include civic commitment. The objective is that the municipalities will develop into excellent educational locations, in which citizens can go through a successful educational biography in a convincing and clear educational system, starting in early childhood and continuing through adult education.¹¹⁸

to justice, solidarity and participation.” (2004b, 20)

¹¹⁸ Learning On Location” is a central component of the Federal Government’s “Advancement through Education” qualification initiative; see the BMBF 2009 a and b; coalition agreement 2009, 59. **Siegfried Haller** will speak at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Project of the BMBF – “Learning On Location – an Approach to Prevention”.

3.3.2

School as a place of prevention of violence

The demand that schools, as places of public education, should also do something about violence and the propensity of children and adolescents to use violence, is not new.¹¹⁹ Hence, particularly for the first half of the 1990s, there was a veritable “boom” in research and prevention on the topic of “violence at schools”, which, however, abated in the second half of the decade. In the meantime, however, the debate has become clearly more objective, but always flares up again every time there are spectacular acts of violence at schools (in this regard, on the occasion of the “**rampages**” of Winnenden or Ansbach 2009).¹²⁰

It is especially these and similar isolated cases of spectacular acts of violence, which attract enormous medial as well as political attention, that contribute to the view that violence by school pupils at the crime scene “school” is on the rise.¹²¹ However, this is a perception that is not in agreement with the existent empirical findings: an increase in physical violence at schools cannot be backed up by criminal or other statistical data or by repeatedly conducted surveys designed to expose undetected, unreported crime.¹²²

Insofar as the **police criminal statistics** of the federal states allow for the corresponding analyses – such analyses are not possible at the Federal Statistics level – the data regularly shows that only a small portion of the acts of violence committed by adolescents (and also other offences) transpire at school; that these criminal offences have hardly, if at all, increased in recent years – and that such increases have definitely not been “dramatic”. Rather, the progression of these statistics is “wave-like” over time: that is, the numbers go up a bit and then they come back down.

The relatively insignificant importance of the crime scene “school” for the scope and development of juvenile violence is all the more remarkable because children and adolescents spend a large part – the largest part – of the day there.

¹¹⁹ See also *Schubarth* 2010, 9ff., 57ff., whose book “Gewalt und Mobbing an Schulen” (Violence and Mobbing at schools) is well worth reading and provides a factual and empirically based overview regarding the dimensions, various forms and causes of violence and mobbing at schools, as well as the possibilities of prevention and intervention.

¹²⁰ “**Rampages**” at German schools are extremely rare isolated cases; there are no clusters or series in the data. As far as can be judged, the perpetrators also do not fit into the usual pattern of juvenile violence, as they previously were outwardly inconspicuous and not considered as having a tendency toward violence – and therefore do not provide any occasion for preventing violence. The recently published book by *Britta Bannenberg* (2010) on rampages, the recognition of warning signals and the prevention options is highly recommended.

Herbert Scheithauer will speak at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Dealing with the Leaking and Threats to use Serious Forms of Violence at German schools. The Berlin Leaking-Project and NETWASS”.

¹²¹ The significance of the media for the public thematisation and perception of “juvenile violence” was presented in detail in the expert report on the main topic of the 12th German Congress on Crime Prevention (Steffen 2008); also see *Schubarth* 2010, 9ff.

¹²² See also explanations in Steffen 2008, 249ff.

These findings are regularly objected to on the grounds that there is more violence and in particular more brutality at schools, but the schools do not report it for fear of damaging their “image”. This may apply in individual cases – although certainly not in cases of such brutal violence. However, that this is not the rule in general is backed up by the results of repeatedly conducted surveys as well as analyses by the German Statutory Accident Insurance Company on scuffling accidents at schools, which are insured.

Thus, surveys conducted in 1994, 1999 and 2004, with the same survey instruments, with representatively selected school pupils of Bavarian schools in the 5th to 13th grades, show that there was no increase in physical violence during this period. On the contrary: physical violence between school pupils and against physical objects also decreased – marginally by 1999, significantly by 2004 – as was the case with psychological violence; verbal aggression was however stated as being more frequent. There were no indications that the “violence situation at schools” might have gotten worse in general.¹²³

In 2004, a survey that was conducted with school pupils of all grades in the state of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania and was comparable to a survey conducted there in 1997 showed a significant decrease in violence. The remarkable thing was a considerable increase in the willingness of the school pupils and teachers alike to report such incidents to the police.¹²⁴

Another analysis, coming from a different approach and thus of particular interest, confirms these empirical findings: the analysis of the German Statutory Accident Insurance company (DGUV). As it is relatively unlikely that schools would not report damages covered by insurance, this data may be assumed to be quite reliable. According to current statistics of the accident insurers – they insure school pupils against accidents happening during school attendance and on the way to and from school – the frequency of so-called **scuffling accidents decreased by approximately one quarter between 2000 and 2007**. Statistically seen, every tenth accident at schools providing a general education is due to an act of violence. Annually, one out of every hundred school pupils has to receive medical treatment after a skirmish.

In one out of every 7,000 cases (the rate was slightly less), an act of violence resulted in a fractured bone.¹²⁵

¹²³ Fuchs and others 2005

¹²⁴ State criminal police Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania /Bornewasser 2004.

¹²⁵ The insurance companies for school children’s accident insurance receive reports on scuffling accidents that necessitate a visit to a doctor. Cases in which this was not necessary, as well as forms of psychological violence, such as chaffing, bullying, mobbing are not recorded for statistical purposes. In 2008 there were a total of 1.3 million reportable school accidents – 78/1000 school pupils – and 118.000 reportable accidents on the way to or from school – 6.9/1000 school pupils (www.dguv.de). According to an earlier analysis, the number of reportable cases resulting from “scuffling accidents” decreased from 1993 to 1995, then increased until 1998 and has since then been decreasing continually. This applies to all types of schools, whereby the secondary modern school has proven to be the school with the greatest amount of violence. The percentage of reported scuffling accidents that entailed frac-

Contrary to the perception of “increased violence at schools”, all empirical findings show that there has been no general increase in physical violence and/or brutality in the past few years. On the contrary: despite increased sensitisation toward school violence and an increased willingness to report incidents to the police, the figures on incidents are tending to go down.

If, despite this, school is one of the central places for the **prevention of violence**¹²⁶, then not because it is the venue at which particularly many and/or severe acts of violence transpire, but rather because school – analogous to the child day-care centres – is the one place at which children and adolescents reliably spend time and are therefore accessible in principle for preventive measures and programmes.¹²⁷

Hence, strategies for the prevention of violence at school are targeted on the one hand at preventing or reducing violence that can occur between school pupils at or on the way to or from school and, on the other hand, at positively influencing children’s and adolescents’ actual use of or readiness to use violence. After all, within the context of its upbringing and educational responsibility, school has “the social mandate of safeguarding the personal integrity and dignity of each and every school pupil. Owing to its status as a public educational facility, each school is obliged in principle to fulfil this responsibility with the appropriate pedagogical professionalism and competence.” (Schubarth 2010, 101)

Moreover, school is also a central place for the prevention of violence because school itself is involved in the “production” of violence and can exert an influence on the development of violence through appropriate organisation of the school and learning culture (Melzer 2004; Schubarth 2010, 51).¹²⁸

Albeit only to a certain point: violent behaviour with “school” being the reason is dependent on a multitude of factors that can only be influenced by the school to a certain extent, if at all. School-related framework conditions such as the school buildings or the size of the class can be changed, albeit not easily. The same applies for the framework set by the school system: compulsory education, grading pressure, the division into different types of schools. Then there are the changed conditions for growing up

tures went down too. Thus an increase in brutality cannot be established on the basis of this data either (Federal Association of Accident insurers 2005).

¹²⁶ On strategies for the prevention of violence at schools also see Hanke 2007.

¹²⁷ All prevention programmes targeted at the class use this option; some of them focus on the non-compulsory nature of participation, whereby violence preventative learning can presumably be intensified (Hanke 2007, 119).

¹²⁸ See also Melzer, who points out the many correlations between violent behaviour of school pupils and school culture variables, but also the difficulties of interpreting a causation link from such correlations (2004, 40).

Siegfried Arnz will be speaking at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “New chances for successful prevention by reforming the school structure”.

and the social behaviour brought along by the children, the lack of perspective with regard to availability of vocational training or subsequent job opportunities or also the living and integrational conditions of school pupils with a migrational background (Hanke 2007, 106).

Hence, strategies for the prevention of violence at schools are targeted at various players and groups, as follows:¹²⁹ at the **school administration** – ministries for culture and education, academic supervisory officers, heads of school, all of whom create the structural framework for the prevention of violence at school; at the **school** as a whole, for instance by means of strategies aimed at the qualification of the staff for violence prevention in upbringing and educational work¹³⁰; at the **school pupils**, for instance the numerous conflict mediator programmes (peer mediation)¹³¹; at programmes against mobbing¹³² or also curricular programmes¹³³, of which however, as far as is evident, none have been developed in coproduction together with the respective school; at the **parents**, who are however frequently only integrated into the violence prevention work once a corresponding problem is already at hand; at the **public**, not least with the purpose of cultivating the school's image per se¹³⁴; at players **outside of the school**, who have designed and developed virtually all of the concepts or programmes that are applied in the school; and at the training and further education of **teachers**.

Presently, the **central strategy** is to be found in the **further education** of teachers, in order to strengthen the prevention of violence at schools at the different levels of action. Further education tries to compensate for that which did not find sufficient

¹²⁹ See on the following Hanke 2007, 112ff.; a short overview on prevention programmes for the school can be found at Melzer 2004, 45. On the “multi-modal prevention of violence with children and adolescents” Lösel 2004 An informative, comprehensive overview of school prevention and intervention programmes is provided by Schubarth 2010, 113ff.

Hartmut Pfeiffer and Peter Wetzels will be speaking at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “PaC - Prevention als Chance’ - Implementation and Evaluation of an integrated Programme of Municipal Crime Prevention”.

Ria Uhle will be speaking at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Change, Upheavals, Crises - Prevention of Violence at Schools undergoing Change”

¹³⁰ An example for this is the Constance training model (KTM); Information on this, e.g. to be found at www.friedenspaedagogik.de. The “Abseits?!?” media package (off-sides) was developed by the police crime prevention of the federal and state governments and then placed at the schools’ disposal. The purpose: making recommendations to the teachers for their work in the classrooms on six topics pertaining to the prevention of violence.

¹³¹ This also includes the “mediate” programme developed by the WEISSER RING; additional information on the programmes at www.bmev.de (Federal Association Mediation e.V.) and www.mediation-partizipation.de.

¹³² Probably the best-known of these programmes, which has successfully been deployed for years already in numerous countries, is the anti-bullying-intervention programme according to Olweus (Schubarth 2010, 142ff. and www.clemson.edu/olweus/).

¹³³ For instance “Faustlos”, www.faustlos.de. (without fists)

¹³⁴ Prominent example: the Rütthli-school in Berlin. **Cordula Heckmann** will be speaking at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Campus Rütthli CR2 – from a school with a dubious reputation to a pilot project”.

consideration in the course of regular training;¹³⁵ to provide teachers with the basic qualification that can place them in a position of, apart from the educational responsibility, also meeting their not less important upbringing responsibility. Currently at least, functional prevention of violence at schools significantly depends on the personal, rather coincidental commitment of the responsible persons, especially in the field of school administration. (Hanke 2007, 125f.)

Apart from these programmes and measures which, within the meaning of selective crime convention, directly or indirectly have the objective of preventing or decreasing violence in childhood and adolescence, schools also apply **generally supportive measures** of universal prevention, which can have a violence prevention effect, but do not have this as their primary objective and hence cannot be described here as violence preventative strategies.¹³⁶ Such prevention programmes, which are not specific to violence, promote, for example, social and communicative competences, moral development, dealings with the media, intercultural learning, or democracy and human rights education.¹³⁷

With regard to the **effectiveness** of prevention and intervention programmes *Schubarth* (2010, 183) sums up as follows: to date, of the numerous programmes and measures in **Germany**, only a part has been scientifically evaluated. Thereby, predominantly positive results were attained. However, for the most part, the evaluations pertained to the introduction or pilot phase – little is known about the long-term effects – and in part were conducted by the authors themselves.

On average, the **international evaluation findings** display positive effects, especially dependent on the age of the children, their risk burdens, the quality of implementation, and the integration of the measures within the school context. However, evaluation findings cannot be transferred, say from the USA to Germany, without further work.

All in all one can establish that the prevention of violence and the facilitation of social competences are ongoing tasks of school education and upbringing and closely linked to **scholastic development** (Schubarth 2010, 189 ff; similar Melzer 2004, 46 and Melzer/Schubarth/Ehninger 2004). While scholastic development cannot be equated with successful prevention of violence, prevention of violence and mobbing are particularly promising if they are implemented in a multistage school development process. Successful violence preventative programmes and activities can thus also activate scholastic development programmes, which then in turn create positive conditions for anchoring violence preventative measures (Hanke 2007, 128; Melzer/Schubarth/Ehninger 2004, 255ff.).

¹³⁵ Because: “Teacher training probably displays the most sluggish reaction to the prevention of violence in the area of school” (Hanke 2007, 123).

¹³⁶ On understanding prevention of violence, see the remarks in chapter 2.2.

¹³⁷ **Harald Weilnböck** will be speaking at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Education in Times of Extremism”.

And another point that has to be noted: the striking finding that virtually without exception the empirical studies on “violence at school”, only examine violence committed by school pupils and only develop and use prevention programmes and measures directed against this violence. The **violence of teachers** toward school pupils and the **prevention** thereof is a topic much less frequently, if at all. However, there is evidence that such psychological, physical and also sexual violence have occurred and do occur; however there are no proven empirical findings on the scope and forms of this violence.

The best source for this would be representative school children surveys, but in the studies conducted in recent years, as far as is apparent, the topic of “teacher violence” has not been broached. The reasons for this, according to study commissioned by the European Union 2001 on “Measures against Violence at Schools: a Report from Germany” is that investigations of teacher violence against scholars are hardly possible here, since the officials that have to authorise such investigations are at the same time the highest superiors of the teachers.¹³⁸

In the German speaking area, *Volker Krumm* (University of Salzburg) appears to be the only person who has frequently grappled empirically with the topic of teacher violence. Thus, for instance, within the framework of the Austrian part of the TIMMS-investigation in 1995, a representative random group of approx 10,000 school pupils from all kinds of schools of the 7th and 8th grades as well as the graduating classes of the 10th, 11th or 12th grade of the various secondary schools were surveyed as to which extent they were victims of violence by school pupils and teachers (treated unfairly? Feelings hurt? Galled in any other way?), or had observed this. “The prevalence investigation showed: ‚violence‘ (‚mobbing‘) of teachers against school pupils is just as common as ‚violence‘ of pupils against pupils” (Krumm and others 1997). In a further investigation (in 1997?) in Austria, Germany and Switzerland, almost 3000 students were surveyed as to whether they had experienced hurtful behaviour by teachers in the course of their schooldays. 78% answered this question in the affirmative (Krumm/Weiß 2006).

The results of a school pupil survey conducted at 191 *Bremen schools* in 2003, confirms violence by teachers: not only the “everyday derision” but also physical violence und sexual assaults.¹³⁹

Also impressive is the report on cases of violence by teachers, compiled by *Bachmann and Wolf* (2007), even though it does not meet scientific standards or claim to do so. On the occasion of experiences of their children with violence by teachers, these lady authors sought contacts with other affected families and founded a self-help initia-

¹³⁸ www.stern.de/panorama/schlaege-beleidigungen-mobbing-tabuthema_ehrgewalt-616481.html 8. April 2008.

¹³⁹ www.stern.de/panorama/schlaege-beleidigungen-mobbing-tabuthema_lehrgewalt-616481.html of 8 April 2008 and www.emgs.de/literatur/default.html (request date: 8.3.2010).

tive in which they conducted numerous conversations with school pupils who were victims, and their parents. The summary of this report: even today, school pupils are put in a bad light, ostracized, subjected to psychological pressure and, in the worst case, physically abused by their teachers.

Clearly, there is a research gap and **need for research** with regard to the “taboo topic of violence by teachers” not only but also in the interest of the teachers and the schools. Only when this topic is directly and methodically addressed, will one have a chance to cast light on this dark field, compare “observations” with empirical findings and develop concepts for preventive measures.

3.4

Child and Youth Welfare as Place of Education and Prevention

“Offers and Facilities of Child and Youth Welfare (are) not insignificantly involved in the educational processes of children und adolescents of school age.” (BMFSFJ 2005a, 233)

3.4.1

Child and Youth Welfare as place of education

As a further place of growing up and every-day upbringing, Child and Youth Welfare – with its areas of youth work, youth social work, children and youth protection, counselling in educational matters, support for young adults who have attained full age, appointment of an advisory guardian and custodianship as well as scope for interventions in the case of danger for children – addresses all persons under the age of 27, to lend them support in addition to that available from family and school and to contribute toward avoiding or eliminating disadvantages.¹⁴⁰

The task and aspirations of Child and Youth Welfare are indisputable: they should and do wish to contribute to the facilitation of personality development and initiate and promote educational processes (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2005a, 233). Because: in Germany, all young people have a right to support of their development and upbringing to become independent and socially-adapted persons (§ 1 Social Security Code (SGB) VIII).

Youth Welfare is structured by the subsidiarity principle: at the local level, the officially recognised private entities of Youth Welfare with their offers take precedence over the Youth Welfare offices. The latter may not become active as public bodies with ultimate responsibility unless the private entities provide only insufficient offers or none at all to the young person in question. That the private entities of Youth Welfare in the municipalities get the first crack at solving any and all problems has supported the development and deployment of a heterogeneous offer of projects and

¹⁴⁰ The place of education “child day-care”, which likewise lies in the area of responsibility of Child and Youth Welfare, is discussed in more detail in chapter 3.2.

programmes, for which the Child and Youth Welfare law just provides the framework (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 133).

Within the Child and Youth Welfare, it is particularly the offers of **Child and Youth work**¹⁴¹ that play a key role in the everyday life of children and adolescents as predominantly non-formal learning locations outside school which enable the educational processes on the foundation of active involvement and participation.¹⁴²

The publicly subsidised youth work focuses on children and adolescents in school-going age and among others encompasses the public youth work in youth leisure-time facilities, the offerings and activities of youth organisations as well as international youth initiative projects (BBE 2008, 78). Describing the tasks of the **youth work**, § 11, Par. 3 of the KJHG states the following: “general, political, social, health, cultural, natural and technical education”, but also “sport, play and sociability” as well as “international youth work”. More than 80% of the publicly subsidised measures in youth work are rendered by clubs, associations and initiatives, as private sponsors of the Youth Welfare.

Rauschenberg (2009a, 183f.) quite rightly points out that this other place of education, which has no direct affinity to school, does however have significant biographical relevance: “For many, youth work played a certain role in childhood and youth; perhaps it also represented an important station on the way toward becoming an adult ... the one or other politician, businessman and manager; the one or other professional sportsman, musician or artist and also the one or other scientist (might) have gained essential, perhaps even decisive impulses and suggestions for their subsequent careers, far away from school, in peer groups or in Youth Work.”

Within this context, the “educational effects” of **voluntary commitment**, by means of active participation in clubs, associations and initiatives, deserve special mention¹⁴³: in 2007, approximately 36% of the 16 to 21 year olds took on responsibilities in clubs and associations and an additional 32% took part in activities at least once a week. Even more widely spread is participation in “social interaction clubs”: approx. 56% of the 16 to 21 year olds regularly participated in the offerings of sport clubs, hometown

¹⁴¹ In the entire range of services of Child and Youth Welfare, the services of youth and youth social work are the services directly related to educational tasks, however they are directed to the respective specific target groups as well as needs and interests (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2005a, 234).

¹⁴² **Volunteer services** is another sector of non-formal education where, among others, the volunteer social year and volunteer ecological year have been in demand more and more in recent years: in 1996/97 approx. 9,950 young adults completed such a year; in 2007/08 it was more than 18,000 (BBE 2008, 79).

¹⁴³ In this regard and concerning the importance of voluntary commitment in general, also see the expert report on the main topic of the 13th German Congress on Crime Prevention 2008 “Committed Citizens – Safe Society” (Steffen 2009b).

Nils Neuber will be speaking at the **15th German Congress on Crime Prevention** on the topic of “Educational Potentials in Sports”.

clubs, citizens' groups and the like or took on different functions or administrative duties. Correspondingly lower, with a share of 22% of this age group – was the commitment in special interests and public welfare oriented clubs and associations (BBE 2008, 79). However, with the regard to utilisation of these learning locations outside school, differences owing to the **background of the persons** can be recognised: All in all, the greater a person's level of formal education, the greater the probability that this person actively participated in the educational opportunities of voluntary commitment (BBE 2008, 80).

Nevertheless: voluntary commitment is an important and sustainable societal learning field for young people. Here adolescents can have learning experiences which are not available anywhere else in this form. Adults who were active in an honorary capacity in their youth have more competences, are politically more committed and also consider themselves to be more successful professionally than those who were not active in an honorary capacity in their youth.¹⁴⁴

However, there is a trend pointing to an unmistakable **decrease in significance** of youth work: the offer of publicly subsidised measures has declined and the number of measures per person, as well as the money spent on youth work, has gone down. It "remains to be seen to which extent the expansion of the extracurricular offerings at all-day schools will be at the expense of traditional child and youth work." (BBE 2008, 78; see above Chapter 3.3.1)¹⁴⁵

Within the scope of Child and Youth Welfare an additional educational offer is provided by **youth social work**, with its school and career-related offerings. In the holistic and lifeworld-oriented child and Youth Welfare, youth social work plays a central role in conveying key qualifications as the prerequisite for successful, individual and societal integration. Its offerings should cover a broad basis: "The main target groups are disadvantaged adolescents who are limited in their societal participation possibilities owing to individual or social reasons. Youth social work helps school-weary adolescents, vocational training dropouts as well as adolescents without school and vocational training qualifications." (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ)2005a, 262). **School-related social work**¹⁴⁶, should contribute

¹⁴⁴ Thus the result of an empirical study on the learning potential of voluntary commitment, conducted between 2003 and 2007, in the DJI/TU Dortmund research association (DJI topic 2008/08).

¹⁴⁵ *Rauschenbach* (2009, 189) is somewhat more optimistic regarding the role youth work is able to play in the present day as well as in future, stating that this has not yet been clarified, and he rather tends to see the expansion of the extracurricular offerings at all-day schools positively: while it is true that youth work is at risk of "clearly losing social significance for children and adolescents, in the face of social change," it could definitely also have a future: within the context of the all-day schools, as a "contact point regarding school cooperational partnerships," linking this to their "education-related roots."

¹⁴⁶ **Dieter Doelling and Dieter Hermann** will be speaking at the **15th German Congress on the Prevention of Crime** on the topic of "Social Work at School – Crime Prevention Impact and Opportunities for Improvement".

toward enabling school success-stories for adolescents with individual problems or in socially disadvantaged life circumstances – in the course of their schooltime, it is presumed that every fourth child has some kind of problem with school (Federal Ministry for Family, Seniors, Women and Youth (BMFSFJ) 2005a, 262). Whether and how school-related social work functions, which specific educational services it is able to perform: to date there is no clear evaluation on this. However, this is hardly possible in the strict sense of research of impact, since education is also always self-education, a subjective performance that is built up in a biographically-cumulative manner and cannot be causally attributed to any individual place of learning (BMFSFJ 2005a, 269).¹⁴⁷

3.4.2

Child and Youth Welfare as place of prevention of violence

From the areas of Child and Youth Welfare, **youth work** addresses all children and adolescents, without requiring that some kind of danger or threat be present or even just discernable. Hence, according to the understanding of what crime prevention means that is advocated here, youth work does not belong to the strategic approach with regard to the prevention of violence (see above chapter 2.2), but rather is to be viewed as universal prevention, and as such is one of the strategies and measures which can also have a crime prevention effect, but should not and ought not to have its primary focus on this, nor should it be reduced to this crime prevention aspect. This also applies precisely because of the development that has been noted for numerous years now in which normal, conventional youth work is now conducted under the label of “crime prevention” – because only then will it receive financial support!¹⁴⁸

However, apart from this, **prevention** is one of the **structural principles** of Child and Youth Welfare work.¹⁴⁹ Youth Welfare does not wait for impacts or harm to occur before it acts, but tries to ward off threats and hazards early on. In this context, the **prevention of violence** is just one task alongside others, but its greatest “flaw” and disadvantage¹⁵⁰ is its dependence on individual spectacular events and the ensuing public discussions: “In times of low “violence levels”, the violence prevention approaches of the Child and Youth Welfare are under greater pressure to justify their work

¹⁴⁷ *Rauschenbach* (2009a, 208ff.) asks whether youth social work is not rather about reparation than about education; that its task does not lie in education but primarily in re-alignment to education and draws the conclusion that youth social work, with its tasks ranging from school social work to the work with pupils refusing to attend school and integrational support as well as the offerings for adolescents with migrational background, right up to measures concerning youth vocational assistance, is “relatively” clearly “interwoven” into the formal, non-formal and informal education.

¹⁴⁸ In this regard, see Steffen 2002, 8 and Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 140 “in the meantime, some offerings which are normally called youth education or sports are also ‘sold’ as measures for preventing violence.”

¹⁴⁹ Here and in the following, see Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 134ff.

¹⁵⁰ Another problem is the great number of sponsors of Child and Youth Welfare in the municipalities and the corresponding heterogeneity, time limitations, discontinuity and dependence on extraneous considerations of the programmes and projects (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 133f.).

than, for example, are schools, the police and the judiciary. However, subsequent to dramatic events with powerful media echo, the “prevention of violence” label once again makes it easier to obtain financial support.” (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 134)

With prevention, the **specific approach** of the Youth Welfare is on the one hand to be found in the principles of non-compulsion and participation, which are firmly anchored in Child and Youth Welfare – and with the cooperation with other partners, which not infrequently leads to irritations; on the other hand, the approach is to progress on the basis of the young person’s resources and not to focus on his or her deficits. Not to focus one’s attention just on violent behaviour but on the young person as a whole, and to accept this individual as a person, which, however, does not mean that this person’s violent behaviour is accepted (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 135f.; Heitkötter and others 2007, 263).

On the basis of this approach, the Child and Youth Welfare strategies can be classified as non-specific strategies with a violence prevention element and as selective, or indicated, strategies, or also “strategies for target groups with a direct proximity to violence” (according to the description by Holthusen/Schäfer 2007).

Non-specific strategies with a violence prevention element¹⁵¹ are individual, group and community work that tend to focus on young age groups as well as legal guardians, that are oriented to the social area, that are in line with the resources of children and adolescents and organised in projects, which implies that they are limited both in content and duration. Apart from the curricular programmes that are, for the most part, standardised,¹⁵² numerous projects build on the active participation and cooperation of the children and adolescents. Cooperation is primarily with the child day-care centres and the schools. For the most part, the lack of gender-specific alignment of the offerings is disappointing, as well as the finding that the cultural and social differences of the children are not consistently taken into account (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 143).

Selective or indicated strategies for target groups with a direct proximity to violence are on the one hand targeted at adolescents with a potential for violence, and on the other hand at adolescents who have already drawn attention to themselves with their violent behaviour. In both cases, though, violence is only seen as “a moment in the behaviour of children and adolescents. It can be an indicator for an educational need and this then is decisive for the selection of suitable offers” (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 143).¹⁵³

¹⁵¹ This also includes **youth media protection**, which aims to protect children and adolescents from media that endanger youth, that is, in this case, media depicting and glorifying violence. Educational youth protection is becoming more significant here: (media-) pedagogical offerings should enable children and adolescents to deal with the new media and their offers, and, should this be required, to obtain help (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 142).

¹⁵² For instance “Faustlos” (without fists) (www.fautlos.de), where adolescents only have limited participation regarding participation in its design.

¹⁵³ With problematic family constellations the Youth Welfare can select **Help with Upbringing** from the

The **strategies focussed on endangerment** are aimed at young persons in situations in which adults suspect high risks of violence – here, not infrequently does Youth Welfare come into conflict with the different interests of adolescents and adults. One of Youth Welfare’s core tasks is to support adolescents in such conflicts and to deescalate conflicts, in particular with the objective of viewing the adolescents’ behaviour as typical for their age and not to label it as “violence” too soon. So, for instance, mobile youth work is focused “on adolescents, who are regarded from the perspective of public order as being disturbing, dissocial and thus in need of care ... a normalising and non stigmatising look at young people and their formations of groups should become possible.” (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 145f)¹⁵⁴

The targeted groups of these projects tend to be adolescents rather than children and boys rather than girls, whereby there are hardly any boy-specific approaches. But in the meantime, there are more and more offers for adolescents with migrational background in which specialists or volunteer workers with a migrational background get involved, using their (inter-)cultural competences. Preference is given to work done in groups; the focus is not primarily on violence but particularly on the lifeworlds of minors, led by the thought of **participation**, which specifically simplifies access to “hard-to-reach” adolescents and youth groups (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 148).

Also with the strategies focussed on adolescents who have already drawn attention to themselves with their **violent behaviour** – or have become criminal – “Youth Welfare assumes that the pedagogical approaches can contribute toward reducing violent behaviour.” (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 149)¹⁵⁵ In principle, providing help is preferred to punishment, educational support has preference over penal sanctions, informal procedures are preferable to formal procedures and ambulant measures should be used rather than stationary measures. Regardless, with strategies that are strongly aligned to the individual case, one can rather establish a deficit than resource-oriented approach and also the principles of non-compulsion and participation are (partially) given up – already owing to the requisite cooperation with the sanction system (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 151ff.).

All in all, though, in recent years, the development of Child and Youth Welfare, particularly also in the area of prevention of violence, has been characterised by efforts aimed at implementing the general principles of “non-compulsion” and “participation” – and “in future their success will also greatly depend on the extent to which they are able to make non-compulsion of participation and involvement of children and

entire spectrum and introduce the required measures (see Chapter 3.1 “Family”)

¹⁵⁴ Examples for such strategies are e.g. the approach “We look after ourselves” (www.wir-kuemmern-uns-selbst.de) or also the fan projects (www.kos-fanprojekte.de).

¹⁵⁵ Examples for this are the **social training courses** where “integration” and “confrontation” are seen as key principles or also **Anti-Aggression training**, which also emphasizes “acceptance” and “confrontation” (Holthusen/Schäfer 2007, 151f.).

adolescents a continuously effective requirement which is accepted and recognised from all sides.” (Heitkötter and others 2007,263).

Bibliography

- Aktionsrat Bildung (Hrsg.)(2008): Bildungsrisiken und –chancen im Globalisierungsprozess. Jahresgutachten 2008. Wiesbaden.
- Aktionsrat Bildung (Hrsg.)(2007): Bildungsgerechtigkeit. Jahresgutachten 2007. Wiesbaden.
- Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (Hrsg.) (2007): Strategien der Gewaltprävention im Kindes- und Jugendalter. München.
- Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (Hrsg.) (1999): Der Mythos der Monsterkids. Strafunmündige „Mehrfach- und Intensivtäter“. Dokumentation des Hearings des Bundesjugendkuratoriums am 18. Juni 1998 in Bonn. München.
- Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung (Hrsg.)(2008): Bildung in Deutschland 2008. Ein indikatorengestützter Bericht mit einer Analyse zu Übergängen im Anschluss an den Sekundarbereich I. Bielefeld 2008.
- Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung (Hrsg.)(2006): Bildung in Deutschland 2006. Ein indikatorengestützter Bericht mit einer Analyse zur Migration. Bielefeld 2006.
- Bachmann, Angelika/Wolf, Patricia (2007): Wenn Lehrer schlagen. Die verschwiegene Gewalt an unseren Schulen. München.
- Baier, Dirk u.a. (2009): Jugendliche in Deutschland als Opfer und Täter von Gewalt. Erster Forschungsbericht zum gemeinsamen Forschungsprojekt des Bundesministeriums des Innern und des KFN. Forschungsbericht Nr. 107. Hannover.
- Baier, Dirk u.a. (2006): Schülerbefragung 2005: Gewalterfahrungen, Schulschwänzen und Medienkonsum von Kindern und Jugendlichen. KFN-Materialien für die Praxis – Nr. 2.Hannover.
- Bannenber, Britta (2010): Amok. Ursachen erkennen – Warnsignale verstehen – Katastrophen verhindern. Gütersloh.
- BBE siehe Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung
- Beelmann, Andreas (2009): Prävention von Kinder- und Jugendkriminalität: Aktuelle Probleme und Ergebnisse der internationalen Erfolgsforschung. In: BMJ (Hrsg.) 2009, S. 257-274.
- Bergmann, Wolfgang/Hüther, Gerald (2007): Computersüchtig. Kinder im Sog der neuen Medien. Düsseldorf.
- Bertelsmann-Stiftung (Hrsg.)(2008): Integration braucht faire Bildungschancen. Gütersloh.
- Bertelsmann-Stiftung (Hrsg.)(2006): Interkulturelle Kompetenz – Schlüsselkompetenz des 21. Jahrhunderts? Gütersloh.
- Bertram, Hans (2009): Familienwandel in der Erziehung. In: Schwind/Steffen/Hermann (Hrsg.) 2009, S. 30-33.
- Betz, Tanja/ Rother, Pia (2008): Frühe Kindheit im Fokus der Politik. In: DJI Bulletin 81, S. 11-12.

- BJK siehe Bundesjugendkuratorium BMBF siehe Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung
- BMFSFJ siehe Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend
- BMJ siehe Bundesministerium der Justiz
- Bock-Famulla, Kathrin (2008): Länderreport Frühkindliche Bildungssysteme 2008. Hrsg. von der Bertelsmann-Stiftung. Gütersloh.
- Bos, Wilfried/Wendt, Heike (2008): Bildungsungerechtigkeit in Deutschland. Zur Situation von Kindern und Jugendlichen mit Migrationshintergrund. In: Bertelsmann-Stiftung (Hrsg.) 2008, S. 47-65.
- Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft der Kinderschutz-Zentren e.V. (Hrsg.) (2009): Frühe Hilfen. Köln.
- Bundesjugendkuratorium (Hrsg.)(2009): Kinderarmut in Deutschland. Eine drängende Herausforderung an die Politik. München.
- Bundesjugendkuratorium (Hrsg.)(2008): Zukunftsfähigkeit von Kindertagesstätten. München.
- Bundesjugendkuratorium (Hrsg.)(2004a): Bildung fängt vor der Schule an. Bonn.
- Bundesjugendkuratorium (Hrsg.)(2004b): Neue Bildungsorte für Kinder und Jugendliche. Bonn.
- Bundesjugendkuratorium (Hrsg.)(2003): Auf dem Weg zu einer neuen Schule. Jugendhilfe und Schule in gemeinsamer Verantwortung. Bonn/Berlin.
- Bundesjugendkuratorium (Hrsg.)(2002): Bildung ist mehr als Schule – Leipziger Thesen zur aktuellen bildungspolitischen Debatte. Bonn/ Berlin/Leipzig, 10. Juli 2002.
- Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (Hrsg.)(2009a): Aufstieg durch Bildung. Die Qualifizierungsinitiative für Deutschland. Berlin.
- Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (Hrsg.)(2009b): Lernen vor Ort. Eine gemeinsame Initiative des Bundesministeriums für Bildung und Forschung mit deutschen Stiftungen. Bonn, Berlin.
- Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (Hrsg.) (2009a): 13. Kinder- und Jugendbericht. Bericht über die Lebenssituation junger Menschen und die Leistungen der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe in Deutschland. Berlin.
- Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (Hrsg.) (2009b): FamilienReport 2009. Berlin.
- Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (Hrsg.) (2005a): Zwölfter Kinder- und Jugendbericht. Bericht über die Lebenssituation junger Menschen und die Leistungen der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe in Deutschland. Berlin.
- Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (Hrsg.) (2005b): Stärkung familialer Beziehungs- und Erziehungskompetenzen. Berlin.
- Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (Hrsg.) (2005c): Nationaler Aktionsplan. Für ein kindergerechtes Deutschland 2005 – 2010. Berlin.
- Bundesministerium der Justiz (Hrsg.)(2009): Das Jugendkriminalrecht vor neuen Herausforderungen? Jenaer Symposium 9.-11. September 2008. Mönchengladbach.
- Bundesverband der Unfallkassen (Hrsg.)(2005): Gewalt an Schulen. Ein empiri-

- scher Beitrag zum gewaltverursachten Verletzungsgeschehen an Schulen in Deutschland 1993-2003. München.
- Buskotte, Andrea (2007): Am Rande der Wahrnehmung. Kinder als Zeugen und Opfer häuslicher Gewalt (www.praeventionstag.de).
- Bussmann, Kai (2005): Verbot elterlicher Gewalt gegen Kinder – Auswirkungen des Rechts auf gewaltfreie Erziehung. In: Deegener, G./ Körner, W. (Hrsg.): Kindesmisshandlung und Vernachlässigung. Ein Handbuch. Göttingen e.a., S. 243-258.
- Deutsche Telekom Stiftung (2010): Frühe Bildung auf dem Prüfstand. Welchen Stellenwert nimmt frühkindliche Bildung in den Köpfen der Gesellschaft wirklich ein? Bonn.
- Deutsches Jugendinstitut (2010): DJI-Thema 2008/09 „Fürs Leben lernen: Nachhaltige Kompetenzen durch informelle Bildung“.
- Deutsches Jugendinstitut (2009a): Quantität braucht Qualität. Agenda für den qualitativ orientierten Ausbau der Kindertagesbetreuung für unter Dreijährige. München.
- Deutsches Jugendinstitut (2009b): DJI-Thema 2009/2 „Kinderbetreuung zwischen Familie, Kindertagespflege und Kita: neue Zahlen und Entwicklungen“.
- Deutsches Jugendinstitut (2009c): DJI Bulletin 85 „Das Wissen über Kinder – eine Bilanz empirischer Studien“. 1/2009.
- Deutsches Jugendinstitut (2009d): Stellungnahme des Deutschen Jugendinstitutes zur öffentlichen Anhörung der Kinderkommission zum Thema „Neue Konzepte Früher Hilfen“ am 2. März 2009.
- Deutsches Jugendinstitut (2009e): DJI Bulletin 88 „Experiment Familie“. 4/2009.
- Deutsches Jugendinstitut (2008a): DJI Bulletin 81 „Gerechtes Aufwachsen ermöglichen. Bildung – Integration – Teilhabe“. 1/2008.
- Deutsches Jugendinstitut (2008b): DJI-Thema 2008/12 „Gut integriert? Fakten und Emotionen“.
- Deutsches Jugendinstitut (2007): DJI Bulletin 80 „Kindertagesbetreuung in Deutschland. 3/4/2007.
- DJI siehe Deutsches Jugendinstitut
- Erthal, Claudia/Bussmann, Kai (2009): Alltägliche Gewalt in der Erziehung. In: Schwind/Steffen/Hermann (Hrsg.) 2009, S. 37-56.
- Feltes, Thomas/Goldberg, Brigitta (2009): Gewalt und Gewaltprävention in der Schule. Holzkirchen/Obb.
- Galm, Beate u.a. (2007): Kindeswohl und Kindeswohlgefährdung. In: Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (Hrsg.): Strategien der Gewaltprävention im Kindes- und Jugendalter. München. S. 31-59.
- Geißler, Rainer/Weber-Menges, Sonja (2008): Migrantenkinder im Bildungssystem: doppelt benachteiligt. APuZ 49/2008, S. 14-22.
- Gragert, Nicola u.a. (2008): Angebote der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe als Beitrag zur Teilhabe. In: DJI Bulletin 81, 1/2008, S. 30-31.
- Groebel, Jo (2009): Medien als (Mit-)Erzieher im Digitalzeitalter. In: Schwind/Steffen/Hermann (Hrsg.) 2009, S. 58-85.

- Hanke, Ottmar (2007): Strategien der Gewaltprävention an Schulen. In: Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (Hrsg.): Strategien der Gewaltprävention im Kindes- und Jugendalter. München. S. 104-130.
- Heitkötter, Martina (2009): Öffentliche Betreuung und Familie – Spannungsfeld oder Ergänzung? In: DJI Bulletin 85. 1/2009, S. 18-21.
- Heitkötter, Martina u.a. (2007): Unterstützende Rahmenbedingungen gewaltpräventiver Strategien. In: Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (Hrsg.): Strategien der Gewaltprävention im Kindes- und Jugendalter. München. S. 248-278.
- Heitmeyer, Wilhelm (Hrsg.)(2010): Deutsche Zustände. Folge 8. Frankfurt am Main.
- Heynen, Susanne (2007): Strategien zur Prävention von Kindeswohlgefährdung bei Partnergewalt. In: Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (Hrsg.): Strategien der Gewaltprävention im Kindes- und Jugendalter. München. S. 60-73.
- Holthusen, Bernd/Schäfer, Heiner (2007): Strategien der Gewaltprävention in der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe im Jugendalter. In: Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (Hrsg.): Strategien der Gewaltprävention im Kindes- und Jugendalter. München. S. 131-168.
- Hübenthal, Maksim (2009): Kinderarmut in Deutschland. Empirische Befunde, kinderpolitische Akteure und gesellschaftspolitische Handlungsstrategien. Expertise im Auftrag des Deutschen Jugendinstitutes. München.
- Hüther, Gerald (2009): Männer. Das schwache Geschlecht und sein Gehirn. Göttingen.
- Hüther, Gerald u.a. (1999): Die neurobiologische Verankerung psychosozialer Erfahrungen. Zeitschrift für Psychosomatische Medizin und Psychotherapie. H. 45, S. 2-17.
- Jurczyk, Karin/Heitkötter, Martina (2007): Kindertagespflege in Bewegung. In: DJI Bulletin 80, 3/4/2007, S. 20-22.
- Keupp, Heiner (2009): Urvertrauen zum Leben. Wie man die Gesundheit von Kindern und Jugendlichen fördern kann. Blätter der Wohlfahrtspflege 6/2009, S. 214-220.
- Kindler, Heinz (2007): Beeinträchtigung des Kindeswohls durch häusliche Gewalt (www.praeventionstag.de).
- Klemm, Klaus (2009): Klassenwiederholungen – teuer und unwirksam. Studie im Auftrag der Bertelsmann Stiftung. Gütersloh.
- Klemm, Klaus/Klemm, Annemarie (2010): Ausgaben für Nachhilfe – teuer und unfairer Ausgleich für fehlende individuelle Förderung. Studie im Auftrag der Bertelsmann Stiftung. Gütersloh.
- Koalitionsvertrag zwischen CDU, CSU und FDP (2009): Wachstum. Bildung. Zusammenhalt. (17. Legislaturperiode). Berlin.
- Kraus, Josef (2008): Bildungsgerechtigkeit. APuZ 49/2008, S. 8-13.
- Krumm, Volker/Weiß, Susanne (2006): Ungerechte Lehrer. Zu einem Defizit in der Forschung über Gewalt an Schulen. In: Melzer, W. (Hrsg.) 2006, S. 123-146.
- Krumm, Volker u.a. (1997): Gewalt in der Schule – auch von Lehrern. Empirische

- Pädagogik (1997) 2, S. 257-275 und: www.paedpsych.jk.uni-linz.ac.at:4711/LEHRTEXTE/Krumm.html.
- Lange, Andreas/Jurczyk, Karin (2009): Die globalisierte Familie. DJI Bulletin 88. 4/2009, S. 4-6.
- Lengning, Anke/Zimmermann, Peter (2009): Expertise Intervention und Präventionsmaßnahmen im Bereich früher Hilfen. Internationaler Forschungsstand, Evaluationsstandards und Empfehlungen für die Umsetzung in Deutschland. Hrsg. Nationales Zentrum Frühe Hilfen. Köln.
- Lösel, Friedrich (2006): Bestandsaufnahme und Evaluation von Angeboten im Elternbildungsbereich (publikationen@bundesregierung.de).
- Lösel, Friedrich (2004): Multimodale Gewaltprävention bei Kindern und Jugendlichen: Familie, Kindergarten, Schule. In: Melzer/Schwind (Hrsg.) 2004, S. 326-348.
- Lösel, Friedrich u.a. (2010): Das Präventionsprogramm EFFEKT (1. Teil). In: forum kriminalprävention 1/2010, S. 39-48.
- Lösel, Friedrich u.a. (2008): Das Präventionsprogramm EFFEKT: Entwicklungsförderung in Familien: Eltern- und Kinder-Training. In: Bundesministerium des Innern (Hrsg.): Theorie und Praxis gesellschaftlichen Zusammenhalts. Berlin 2008, S. 199-219.
- Lucas, Torsten (2009): „Wenn der Blitz einschlägt...“ Trauma, Entwicklung und Resilienz. In: Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft 2009, S. 114- 128.
- Lenzen, Dieter (2009): Eine neue Chance für die Bildung? APuZ 45/2009, S. 6-9.
- Meier-Gräwe, Uta (2009): Der tiefgreifende Strukturwandel von Familie und Kindheit – Neue Herausforderungen für Kindertageseinrichtungen. In: DJI-Thema 2009/2.
- Melzer, Wolfgang (Hrsg.)(2006): Gewalt an Schulen. Analyse und Prävention. Gießen.
- Melzer, Wolfgang (2004): Von der Analyse zur Prävention – Gewaltprävention in der Praxis. In: Melzer/Schwind (Hrsg.) 2004, S. 35-49.
- Melzer, Wolfgang/Schubarth, Wilfried/Ehninger, Frank (2004): Gewaltprävention und Schulentwicklung. Analysen und Handlungskonzepte. Bad Heilbrunn/Obb.
- Melzer, Wolfgang/Schwind, Hans-Dieter (Hrsg.)(2004): Gewaltprävention in der Schule. Grundlagen – Praxismodelle – Perspektiven. Dokumentation des 15. Mainzer Opferforums 2003. Baden-Baden.
- Menne, Klaus (2009): Familie und Erziehungsberatung – ein nicht artikulierter Skandal. Theorie und Praxis der Sozialen Arbeit. Nr. 5/2009 (60. Jg.), S. 365-373.
- Meyer-Timpe, Ulrike (2008): Unsere armen Kinder. Wie Deutschland seine Zukunft verspielt. München.
- Mückenberger, Ulrich (2009): Die Familie darf nicht länger Privatproblem der Eltern sein. DJI Bulletin 88. 2009e, S. 10-11.
- NRW-Landesverbände AWO, DGB, GEW, Deutscher Kinderschutzbund, Paritätischer Wohlfahrtsverband (2010): Memorandum zur Bekämpfung der Kinderarmut – eine Bündnisstrategie. Theorie und Praxis der Sozialen Arbeit Nr. 1/2010 (61.Jg.), S. 65-69.
- Peuckert, Rüdiger (2007): Zur aktuellen Lage der Familie. In: Ecarius, Jutta (Hrsg.):

- Handbuch Familie. Wiesbaden 2007, S. 36-56.
- Programm Innere Sicherheit. Fortschreibung 2008/2009. Hrsg. Von der Ständigen Konferenz der Innenminister und –senatoren der Länder (www.bundestag.de).
- Rauschenbach, Thomas (2009a): Zukunftschance Bildung. Familie, Jugendhilfe und Schule in neuer Allianz. Weilheim und München.
- Rauschenbach, Thomas (2009b): Neue Realitäten, alte Ideale. DJI Bulletin 88. 2009e, S. 3.
- Rauschenbach, Thomas (2009c): Bildung – eine ambivalente Herausforderung für die Soziale Arbeit? SP Soziale Passagen. 2009/1, S. 209-255.
- Rauschenbach, Thomas (2007): Kindertagesbetreuung in Deutschland – eine empirische Standortbestimmung. DJI Bulletin 80. 3/4/2007, S. 5-10.
- Roth, Gerhard (2008): Homo neuro-biologicus – ein neues Menschenbild? APuZ 44-45/2008, S. 6-12.
- Sann, Alexandra/Schäfer, Reinhild (2008): Frühe Hilfen zwischen Helfen und Kontrollieren. DJI Bulletin 81. 1/2008, S. 25-27.
- Sann, Alexandra/Thrum, Kathrin (2008): Stärkung der Erziehung in der Familie – Chancen und Grenzen der Arbeit mit Laien. DJI Bulletin 81. 1/2008, S. 18-19.
- Scheithauer, Herbert/Mayer, Heidrun (2009): Außerfamiliäre Erziehung in Krippe und Kindergarten: Papilio - ein Programm im Kindergarten zur Primärprävention von Verhaltensproblemen und zur Förderung sozial-emotionaler Kompetenz. In: Schwind/Steffen/Hermann (Hrsg.) 2009, S. 69-85.
- Scheithauer, Herbert/Mayer, Heidrun (2008): Papilio: Ein Programm zur entwicklungsorientierten Primärprävention von Verhaltensproblemen und Förderung sozial-emotionaler Kompetenzen im Kindergarten. In: Bundesministerium des Innern (Hrsg.): Theorie und Praxis gesellschaftlichen Zusammenhalts. Berlin 2008, S. 221-239.
- Schneider, Ilona K. (2009): Lernfenster Kindergarten. APuZ 45/2009, S. 32-38.
- Schubarth, Wilfried (2010): Gewalt und Mobbing an Schulen. Möglichkeiten der Prävention und Intervention. Stuttgart.
- Schubarth, Wilfried (2006): Gewaltprävention durch Öffnung von Schule. Schule und Jugendhilfe – gemeinsam zum Wohle des Kindes. In: Melzer, W. (Hrsg.) 2006, S. 181-192.
- Schubarth, Wilfried (2004): Schulsozialarbeit und Unterstützungsnetzwerke für Schulen –Perspektiven einer „systemischen Gewaltprävention/-intervention“. In: Melzer/Schwind (Hrsg.) 2004, S. 243-253.
- Schwind, Hans-Dieter (2009): Familiäre Erziehung aus kriminologischer Sicht. In: Schwind/Steffen/Hermann (Hrsg.) 2009, S. 19-29.
- Schwind, Hans-Dieter/Baumann, Jürgen (Hrsg.)(1990): Ursachen, Prävention und Kontrolle von Gewalt. Analysen und Vorschläge der unabhängigen Regierungskommission zur Verhinderung und Bekämpfung von Gewalt. 4 Bde. Berlin.
- Schwind, H-D./Steffen, W./Hermann, D. (Hrsg.)(2009): Kriminalprävention durch familiäre Erziehung? Dokumentation des 19. Mainzer Operforums 2008.

Baden-Baden.

- Sommerfeld, Verena (2007): Strategien der Gewaltprävention im Bereich der Kindertageseinrichtungen. In: Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention (Hrsg.): Strategien der Gewaltprävention im Kindes- und Jugendalter. München. 2007. S. 74-103.
- Stecher, Ludwig u.a. (Hrsg.)(2009): Ganztägige Bildung und Betreuung. Zeitschrift für Pädagogik. 54. Beiheft 2009.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2009a): Ergebnisse des 19. Opferforums des Weißen Ringes 2008 „Kriminalprävention durch familiäre Erziehung?“ – Zusammenfassung der Referate und Diskussionen. In: Schwind/Steffen/
- Hermann (Hrsg.) 2009, S. 161-166.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2009b): Bürgerschaftliches Engagement in der Kriminalprävention. Gutachten zum 13. Deutschen Präventionstag „Engagierte Bürger – sichere Gesellschaft“. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Hrsg.): Engagierte Bürger – sichere Gesellschaft. Ausgewählte Beiträge des 13. Deutschen Präventionstages 2008. Mönchengladbach 2009, S. 25-72.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2009c): Moderne Gesellschaften und Kriminalität. Der Beitrag der Kriminalprävention zu Integration und Solidarität. Gutachten für den 14. Deutschen Präventionstag am 8. und 9. Juni 2009 in Hannover (www.bundestag.de).
- Steffen, Wiebke (2008): Jugendkriminalität und ihre Verhinderung zwischen Wahrnehmung und empirischen Befunden. Gutachten zum 12. Deutschen Präventionstag am 18. und 19. Juni 2007 in Wiesbaden. In: E. Marks/W. Steffen (Hrsg.): Starke Jugend – starke Zukunft. Ausgewählte Beiträge des 12. Deutschen Präventionstages 2007. Mönchengladbach 2008, S. 233-272.
- Steffen, Wiebke (2002): Zukünftige Aufgaben der Polizei: Kriminalprävention als Gefahr und Chance. In: Polizei Dein Partner. Gewerkschaft der Polizei – Junge Gruppe. 11. Bundesjugendkonferenz 2002, S. 7-9.
- Stöbe-Blossey, Sybille (Hrsg.)(2010): Kindertagesbetreuung im Wandel. Perspektiven für die Organisationsentwicklung. Wiesbaden.
- Textor, Martin R. (2009): Elternarbeit im Kindergarten. Ziele, Formen, Methoden. Norderstedt.
- Thiessen, Barbara (2009): Fremde Familien. DJI Bulletin 88. 4/2009, S. 7-9.
- Uslucan, Haci-Halil (2009): Riskante Bedingungen des Aufwachsens: Erhöhte Gewaltanfälligkeit junger Migranten? In: BMJ 2009, S. 187-202.
- von der Leyen, Ursula (2009): Grundsatzreferat zur Familienpolitik. In: Schwind/Steffen/Hermann (Hrsg.) 2009, S. 150-159.
- Wetzels, Peter (2009): Erziehungsstile und Wertorientierungen in Familien mit und ohne Migrationshintergrund. In: Schwind/Steffen/Hermann (Hrsg.) 2009, S. 102-119.
- Wößmann, Ludger (2008): Die Bildungsfinanzierung in Deutschland im Licht der Lebenszyklusperspektive: Gerechtigkeit im Widerstreit mit Effizienz? Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaften 11. Jg. (2008) H. 2, S. 214-233.

Content

Introduction	5
Lectures and Documents from the 4th Annual International Forum	
IRVIN WALLER	
Convincing governments to invest in prevention: Reducing crime, Protecting victim rights.....	9
PAUL EKBLOM	
Citizen participation in crime prevention – capturing practice knowledge through the 5Is framework	15
HARALD WEILNBÖCK	
‘Violence Prevention Network’ & ‘Cultures Interactive’: EU good-practice research on de-radicalisation work in prison and community – and the factor of culture.	33
EUROPEAN FORUM FOR URBAN SECURITY (EFUS)	
General Assembly – Berlin, 10-11 May 2010 “How cities reconcile security and fundamental rights”	53
WIEBKE STEFFEN	
Expert Report for the 15 th German Congress on Crime Prevention 10 th & 11 th of May 2010 Berlin	59
GERMAN CONGRESS ON CRIME PREVENTION AND CONFERENCE PARTNERS	
Berlin Declaration of the 15 th German Congress on Crime Prevention	123
Lectures and Documents from the 5th Annual International Forum	
JÜRGEN STOCK	
International Cybercrime: Results from the Annual International Forum	129
GERMAN CONGRESS ON CRIME PREVENTION AND CONFERENCE PARTNERS	
Oldenburg Declaration of the 16th German Congress on Crime Prevention.....	137
Programs of the 4th and 5th Annual International Forum	143
Authors	155