# Crime prevention and young people: Models and future direction for youth night patrols:

By

**Trudi Cooper, Edith Cowan University**
**John Scott, Queensland University of Technology**
**Elaine Barclay, University of New England**
**Margaret Sims, University of New England**
**Terence Love, Love Services Pty Ltd**

# Crime prevention and young people: Models and future direction for youth night patrols

Trudi Cooper, Edith Cowan University
John Scott, Queensland University of Technology
Elaine Barclay, University of New England
Margaret Sims, University of New England
Terence Love, Love Services Pty Ltd

## Abstract

*This article presents a typology of different approaches to social crime prevention adopted by Australian Indigenous youth night patrols. Research that informed this typology occurred in a specific context, but generic observations about youth crime prevention policy are transferable to community youth crime prevention in other settings. The typology identifies several key points of difference between various service delivery models, in particular, different perceptions of relationships between crime prevention; community safety; community development; community self-determination; child protection; and youth development and welfare. Discussion teases out how political discourse frames concepts such as community governance, self-determination, paternalism, and funding accountability. The discussion illustrates how politicised decision-making has meant that policy makers responded selectively to programme evaluations, in ways that did not always maximise benefit. The typology is intended to be useful to youth crime prevention practitioners, evaluators and policy makers.*

## Introduction

Community night patrols have been used as a crime prevention strategy in Australia since the 1980s. These patrols operate in some Indigenous communities, usually staffed by local people, sometimes without payment. They have been used to achieve various policy purposes, including: to divert people away from situations where they may come into conflict with the law; to promote community safety; to reduce victimisation and provide victim support; to strengthen traditional cultural norms and authority that control violence; to mediate conflict between community members; and, to support community cohesion. Indigenous people are over-represented in the Australian justice system, as both perpetrators and victims of crime (Cunneen, 2007). Accordingly, night patrols have been used as part of a multi-faceted approach to reduce Indigenous people's engagement with the justice system (Taylor-Walker, 2010; Blagg, 2007, Blagg and Valuri, 2003, Blagg and Valuri, 2004).

Policy and practice in this area has been highly politicised, and we contend has made expedient use of theory to suit different political agendas. We combined the findings from a recent research project on youth night patrols (Cooper et al., 2014) with evaluations of previous Australian night patrol projects to develop this typology. We tease out different constellations of political influences and theoretical assumptions that have informed policy and practice. The typology presents the tensions, contradiction, strengths and limitations and lessons learnt (and not learnt) from past policy approaches. The typology has different uses. In Australia and in other countries with a similar post-colonial heritage, the typology will be useful to policy makers in Indigenous justice, youth justice and

crime prevention, as a means to improve policy. The typology will also be useful to practitioners interested in community-based crime prevention in diverse settings, because many of the issues discussed have resonance in other contexts.

## Background

A social crime prevention approach aims to intervene holistically early in an individual's life to address social factors that increase risk of youth offending or offending frequency (Ferrante, Loh, & Maller, 2004; NCP, 1999;). The strategy outlined in 'Pathways to Prevention' (Homel et al., 2006) has been widely used in Australia. This strategy promotes a harm reduction approach to crime prevention, which move beyond a focus on individual offenders and offences  (Blagg, 2003 ,p. 9, Richards et al., 2011). 'Pathways to Prevention' integrates elements from primary, secondary and tertiary crime prevention approaches, and Indigenous youth night patrols incorporate many of these strategies. Primary crime prevention strategies include both 'situational crime prevention' and 'social crime prevention' strategies. Situational crime prevention strategies seek to remove or reduce opportunities for crime, through modifications to the physical environment (including the design of public space and physical security measures). Social crime prevention strategies seek to ameliorate the social conditions associated with high levels of offending, for example, programmes that promote: school retention, youth employment, young people's contribution to the community, and address truancy and child neglect and abuse.

Secondary prevention seeks to change people, and includes initiatives that encourage young people away from peer groups and activities perceived as likely to normalise involvement in crime. For this reason, many youth night patrols operated in conjunction with initiatives, such as the police-operated Police and Citizen's Youth Clubs (PCYC) that provide supervised leisure opportunities and food. Tertiary crime prevention in youth justice diverts first offenders and young people who have committed minor offences away from the criminal justice system (Brantingham and Faust, 1976) and night patrols can play a pivotal role in this endeavour.

Night patrols have been supported by governments of all political persuasions, and we contend that policy and funding for Indigenous night patrols developed reactively in a politicised environment, which has meant that policy and practice changes only selectively addressed deficiencies identified in previous evaluations. The likely consequences of proposed policy changes were rarely analysed holistically. As a consequence, changes have often failed to preserve the benefits of previous arrangements, and have ignored relevant evidence where it did not align with political imperatives.

There have been many previous reviews of Indigenous night patrols in Australia ((Auditor-General, 2011) (Beacroft et al., 2011) (Blagg, 2003, Blagg, 2007, Blagg and Valuri, 2003, Blagg and Valuri, 2004) (Curtis, 1992 revised 2003) (IPSDB, 2008) (Lithopoulos, 2007) (Higgens, 1997); Mosey, 1994; Taylor-Walker, 2010; Walker & Forrester, 2002).  Previous research has mostly discussed projects that have occurred in one place, a single jurisdiction, or at a particular time. In consequence, there has been a tendency to homogenise night patrols and to fail to consider the broader social, cultural, historical and political context in which they occur. We contend that there is no one-size-fits-all approach and different approaches may be best suited to various situations.

# Typology of Indigenous youth night patrols: overview

The typology presented here was developed as part of a research project commissioned by the Gillard Australian Government Commonwealth Attorney General's Department in 2010. The purpose of the project was to evaluate different models of youth night patrols to inform policy decisions about good practice. Analysis of historical and contemporary frameworks for night patrols showed that policy development was informed by different discourses about the purposes of night patrols, competing assumptions about effective strategy and different ideological assumptions about key political values, such as Indigenous self-determination, welfare, paternalism, social justice and the balances between societal, individual and community responsibilities. To make sense of these differences, we developed a typology of youth night patrols based upon the political values, governance, and use of theory, combining both previous research and data gathered during our own research. We conducted fieldwork in eleven urban, regional and remote communities in New South Wales in 2011-2012, interviewing night patrol staff, management and stakeholders, and community leaders. A separate part of the study used similar methods to analyse an urban youth night patrol project operating in Perth, Western Australia. Originally we intended to interview young people in Western Australia, but the relevant agencies were unable to find any young people who have been apprehended in the project who might be willing to talk to us. In NSW, we did not have clearance from the university ethics committee to interview children or young people. Further details of the methodology can be found in the project report (Cooper et al., 2014). The typology differentiates six politically and theoretically different approaches to night patrols. The sixth approach represents a future approach that was foreshadowed in some projects, but only partially implemented. Whilst in practice there may be some overlap between the categories, here we have tried to distil key points of similarity and difference, and to explore the interplay between policy decisions and practice. Patrols differed in terms of how they were resourced, how they were managed, their aims, and method used. The 'types' we identified we have called:

- ➢ **Type 1: Community Activist:** Community initiated, owned and controlled patrols; Political commitment to self-determination and to strong Indigenous culture; minimally funded.
- ➢ **Type 2: Community Development:** Patrols prioritise community development and increased community cohesion. Community safety and crime prevention are seen as side effects of greater social inclusion.
- ➢ **Type 3: Community Safety:** Patrols prioritise community safety outcomes over community development, and potentially see safety as being achievable independently of community development.
- ➢ **Type 4: Crime Prevention:** Patrols prioritise crime prevention outcomes, rather than community development. This approach differs from the community safety model because the focus is upon longer-term crime prevention rather than immediate diversion from harm.
- ➢ **Type 5: Child protection:** Patrols prioritise child protection outcomes above other crime prevention measures.
- ➢ **Type 6: Integrated youth welfare and rights**: Patrols funded to provide integrated youth services that have a community-based youth work/ youth welfare focus.

The next section briefly describes how each approach emerged, provides examples, and summaries the strengths and limitations.

## Type 1: Community activism and youth night patrols

Indigenous night patrols commenced in the late 1980s in central Australia and were formed in response to social problems identified by Aboriginal elders and influential community members, (Curtis 1992, revised 2003; Blagg, 2003; Blagg and Valuri, 2004; Blagg, 2007; Attorney-General, 2008; Auditor-General, 2011). The patrols operated on a voluntary basis, often on foot, and without access to vehicles, (Taylor-Walker, 2010; Walker & Forrester, 2002). The communities they served, called town camps, lacked many basic facilities, such as street lighting and municipal rubbish disposal that are taken for granted in other Australian communities of similar size. Participation required a significant voluntary time commitment. Aboriginal elders who were recognised as having cultural authority in their communities, initiated patrols that mediated disputes and took actions to reduce community conflict. Many of the instigators of early patrols were women who had a high level of personal commitment to community self-determination, and believed that communities could and should resolve problems of anti-social conduct, minor disturbance and conflict between community members through active engagement and mediation by elders and community leaders (Walker, 2010). In the town camps outside Alice Springs, the Julalikari night patrol was regarded as one of the earliest successful examples of its type. The patrol was generic, and provided a service to young people as well as older people.

These patrols were informed by the values of practical self-determination. According to this analysis, colonisation had many adverse effects on Indigenous society, and paternalistic policies that imposed 'white solutions' upon Indigenous communities without their consent, continued a tradition of white cultural hegemony, reinforced the inferior status of Indigenous people and Indigenous culture, and undermined the informal cultural systems of social regulation (Cunneen, 2007). Self-determination and community activism was adopted by Indigenous activists as a practical method to counter hegemony and empower communities, in some instances inspired by the social mission of the US Black Panther movement (Stastny and Orr, 2014, Lothian, 2005).

According to this perspective, community activism is the practical enactment of self-determination. Community activism provides a practical means to address some of the underlying community issues that foster crime and are not addressed within the white justice system. Community night patrols provide a culturally affirming response to crime prevention, consistent with Indigenous social roles. Successful self-determination builds virtuous cycles and strengthens the Indigenous culture (Mosey, 1994), and community safety and crime prevention were assumed by-products of effective self-determination and community activism.  Mosey used this approach to facilitate fourteen night patrols during the late 1980s and early 1990s which operated under the auspices of Tangentyere Council and received small amounts of funding (Mosey, 1994, Mosey, 2009, Taylor-Walker, 2010, Walker and Forrester, 2002).These patrols were the precursors to the first funded night patrols in the Northern Territory (Walker and Forrester, 2002). The dominant political discourse within this perspective is Indigenous self-determination.

The benefits of this approach were that Aboriginal communities had ownership of patrols and patrols had cultural authority to respond rapidly, in a culturally appropriate manner (Taylor-Walker, 2010) and could be effective mediators in disputes. Frequent informal feedback ensured the patrols remained accountable to their communities (Higgens, 1997). The disadvantages were that the model of voluntary community activism was not readily transferable to demographically similar communities. Success depended upon high levels of personal commitment by a few community

leaders, and this only arose spontaneously in communities where leadership existed, and where there was sufficient cultural homogeneity and cohesion. In addition, case studies indicated that many patrols were under-resourced. Communities that were culturally heterogeneous, where violence and alcohol were most prevalent and where cultural law had broken down might benefit from night patrols, but were unable to implement this approach because of the difficulties in forming and sustaining effective patrols (Taylor-Walker, 2010). Politically this approach drew heavily on the importance of Indigenous self-determination as a means to resist colonisation and restore traditional cultural values.

## Type 2: Community development youth night patrols

Evaluations of community activist night patrols acknowledged their benefits but also stated they needed more formal support (Higgens, 1997). Attempts to replicate patrols in other communities met with mixed results (Taylor-Walker, 2010) . From the mid-1990s until 2004, funding for many night patrols was provided through the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) and later through Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services (ATSIS) (Auditor-General, 2011). These organisations had been established to facilitate Indigenous input into the implementation of government policy, and provided formal support for a degree of Indigenous self-determination. Night patrol staff were paid as part of community development strategy and received 'job creation' payments through the Community Development Employment Program (CDEP). No differentiation was made between population groups, and night patrols worked with both young people and adults. The original political discourse that framed this approach was adopted by the federal Keating (Labor) government and based upon a social democratic political commitment to welfare, social inclusion, and social capital, with some measure of self-determination and capacity to align programmes with local need. Parallel conservative and neo-liberal discourses were developed later by the conservative Howard government that emphasised mutual obligation, cost saving and the workfare (where people on welfare are required to work as part of mutual obligation).

 An advantage of this approach was that patrols were still accountable to local communities in varying degrees, and patrol members received some payment for their work. Disadvantages were that people paid through CDEP did not have the same rights as employees, and were not always selected or managed as employees. Sometimes the right people for the night patrol were excluded from employment by their personal circumstances or by the terms of the CDEP, which eliminated people who were employed, older people who were beyond working age, and people who could only work intermittently. This programme did not address the absence of outside support in communities that lacked cultural cohesion, an issue that was identified in earlier evaluations. This model of ATSIC/ATSIS- managed and CDEP-funded patrols continued until 2004.

For more than ten years this approach had bipartisan political support. This may be because the political values that underpinned the policy were mutable. The policy contained elements that could be presented as social democratic, the idea that community development and employment would build social capital and increase social inclusion. The policy could also be presented by conservatives as an example of 'mutual obligation' and the idea that Indigenous people in remote areas should work in exchange for government benefits. In addition, the CDEP policy aligned with neo-liberal ideology that focused on cost-reduction for service provision in remote communities. In this instance, successful night patrol programmes reduced the need for policing, youth services and social work, and lowered other social expenditure.

## Type 3: Community safety youth night patrol

A change in ideological position by the Australian federal Howard government in 2004 reversed the commitment to Indigenous self-determination and abolished ATSIC/ ATSIS. Responsibility for most Indigenous night patrols was transferred to the Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department (AGD), and their funding contract were usually tied to the Night Patrol Operational Framework (NPOF) (AGD, 2008). Funded patrols were generic and provided services to both adults and young people. Politically, this change represented a formal rejection of self-determination and of the social democratic commitment to social inclusion and community development. This was replaced by conservative policy guided by paternalism and law and order. The community safety discourses arose in response to concerns about domestic violence and public order. Patrols aimed to remove 'people at risk' from public places. Political commitment was to top-down models of intervention, implemented bureaucratically within a paternalistic model for service provision with little scope for self-determination or for adaptation to local needs.

Accountability moved away from the community and towards federal government. Schemes managed by the Commonwealth AGD focused on community safety rather than community development, and in many schemes the police took a lead role. Accountability and evaluation of effectiveness of community safety night patrols was based upon service utilisation rather than outcomes, (AGD, 2008 pp. 19-20; Attorney-General, 2010 pp. 45-46). Management processes were highly bureaucratic, with three levels of management above the patrols, (Auditor-General, 2011) and the scheme was highly prescriptive about how patrols should operate.

The only benefits of this change were that contracted service providers managed reporting requirements on behalf of the patrols, and the agreements provided some continuity of funding. There were several disadvantages. Patrols were no longer managed by elders or answerable to their communities (although community reference groups were established, many became inactive). No additional support was offered in heterogeneous communities lacking cohesive community leadership. In alignment with neo-liberal concepts of new public management, contracts were based upon a standard service specification. This was intended to aid comparison of service effectiveness between patrols in different communities. Standardisation meant that patrols had limited scope to customise how the patrol operated according to community resources and needs. Reporting focused on utilization rather than outcomes. This does not reward preventative work. A combination of rigid contractual arrangements and management separate from the community, inhibited partnership with other community support agencies (Attorney-General's Department, 2010). Evaluation found that whilst some services appeared to contribute to community safety others either did not provide services as contracted or had become inactive (Auditor-General, 2011).

## Type 4: Crime prevention and Indigenous youth night patrols

Many evaluations of community safety night patrols concluded they needed to be adapted better to individual communities (Auditor-General, 2011) as previous reviews had foreshadowed (Mosey, 1994; Taylor-Walker, 2010; Walker & Forrester, 2002; Blagg, 2003; Blagg, 2007; Richards, Rosevear & Gilbert, 2011). Evaluations were also critical of community safety approaches that were only reactive and focused upon short-term immediate problem-solving and situational strategies (persuading people to accept transport home to avoid conflict or victimisation). It was argued, by some participants that these approaches supported and normalised anti-social behaviour –that night patrols became booze buses offering free transport to drunks (Cooper et al., 2014) . Instead, it was

suggested night patrols should focus on crime prevention that linked people to other services to address personal issues connected with crime and victimisation. To do this, effective partnerships with local services, such as police, safe houses, sobering up shelters and health clinics, were required (Auditor-General, 2011) and patrols were expected to refer people to these other services. Examples of youth night patrols that follow a crime prevention rationale included the New South Wales (NSW) funded Safe Aboriginal Youth Program (SAY). We evaluated this model of service delivery as part of our research. These programmes usually included organised youth activities as a secondary crime prevention element. Diversionary activities were provided to keep young people off the streets. Leadership of such programs frequently rested with the police and allied organisations such as Police and Citizens Youth Clubs (PCYC), which are police-run youth centres. In a few instances local councils, or in one case an Indigenous organisation, assumed this role. The field work conducted for this project indicated that hunger was an important issue facing many Indigenous young people using night patrols in remote communities, and in many instances, food was offered by the associated organisations.

An advantage of this approach was that it provided some continuity of resources to Indigenous youth night patrols, and sometimes funded youth facilities in communities where otherwise none existed or where funding for facilities had been intermittent. Disadvantages included that police leadership further reduced community involvement with night patrols, especially where there was unresolved tension between police and communities. Also, because the police were often the dominant agency in the collaboration, we were told that the same standards were applied to employment of youth night patrol staff as to civilian police staff. Staff employed on youth night patrols and in associated youth services were required to have a full criminal record check, as if they were police employees. In New South Wales this meant that any conviction, however old and however minor, even convictions that for other purposes would be deemed as 'spent', debarred the person from employment. In many regional and remote communities, a very high proportion of adults were debarred because of minor historic convictions, explicable by racist approaches to policing (Cunneen and White, 2011), even though the same conviction would have been considered irrelevant in mainstream youth work. This meant that the pool of potential employees was unnecessarily limited, excluding many people who were well-respected in the community, who had no recent conviction, and who provided positive adult role models. A further problem was that accurate evaluation of crime prevention effectiveness is notoriously difficult, and the proxy evaluation methods applied in this scheme relied upon crime data figures, that were statistically too small, and inconsistently recorded.

Politically, crime prevention approaches of this type usually rely on a neo-conservative discourse of individual responsibility, and of collective community responsibility in Indigenous communities. This discourse was used extensively in Australia during the era of the Howard conservative government. According to this worldview, individuals are solely responsible for their criminal choices and Indigenous communities are collectively responsible for social conditions that foster crime. A link was sometimes imputed between Indigenous culture and criminogenic environments. When the Labor Rudd-Gillard government adopted this policy, the crime prevention approach was tied to a parallel minority social democratic discourse that links social conditions and crime, and which emphasises the need for a social justice response to social inequality and poverty. In public management, a neo-liberal discourse had continued bi-partisan support and emphasised evaluation and external accountability to demonstrate change and value for money. In consequence, night

patrols had to demonstrate outcomes rather than program implementation or outputs, and evidence needed to align with positivist assumptions about knowledge. In the context of the small total amount of funding for service delivery, this requirement for evidence was unrealistic. The costs for rigorous evaluation truly capable of demonstrating outcomes in a complex social situation would be incommensurate with service delivery budgets.

## Type 5: Child protection

Many links have been made between youth offending, early entry into the criminal justice system and exposure to violence, neglect or sexual abuse especially in middle childhood (Cashmore, 2011). For this reason some youth night patrols place a special focus on child protection. As part of the research project the team evaluated the Northbridge Policy Project (NPP) in Perth, sometimes referred to as the Northbridge curfew. The Northbridge Policy came into operation in 2003 and the NPP developed as a formal collaboration between the police, the Department for Child Protection, and Mission Australia, in partnership with several other agencies. Although the legislation included prevention of misconduct by young people under 18 years old, by 2008 the project focused only on child protection issues for children and young people under 16 years old and upon preventative work with their families.

Under this model, young people under the age of 16 who were found without a responsible adult after 10 o'clock at night (or nightfall if under 13 years) could be forcibly apprehended and held until they could be taken to a suitable adult and a safe place. The intention was to prevent unsupervised children from being on the streets late at night. By working with parents and young people, the project aimed to proactively protect children at-risk. The project also offered complementary support programmes to parents and to young people. Evaluation of the project found that numbers of young people apprehended had decreased over time, especially for Indigenous young people, but that this was mostly accounted for by displacement to other parts of the city where no patrols operated (Cooper et al., 2014).

Politically, this initiative developed in response to a moral panic about young people in public space (MacArthur, 2007), and was informed both by law and order concerns and by concerns about child protection. From its inception there were no mechanisms for community accountability or engagement except with other government departments and partners, only one of which was an Indigenous organisation. The politically dominant discourse variously emphasised either conservative paternalistic child-saver responses (Bessant, 2013) or social democratic interventionist-for-protection approaches aligned to children's rights and links between abuse in childhood and entry into the justice system at an early age (Cashmore, 2011). The initiative evaluated was introduced by a Labor state government in Western Australia which applied both discourses. In practice, both perspectives give priority to external intervention over self-determination. Evaluation found that the project fulfilled an immediate child protection role for children and young people who were in Northbridge. However, because compulsion was integral to the model, large groups of Indigenous young people actively avoided the patrolled areas and most families refused to engage voluntarily with 'prevention' programmes, for which there was no convincing evidence of efficacy. Displacement meant that the overall effectiveness of the patrol for child protection was limited. Strategies of compulsory apprehension were not welcomed by most Indigenous young people or their families, many of whom distrusted 'the welfare' because of the historic legacy of forcible removal of children, and on-going high levels of interaction with child protection agencies. As a

crime prevention measure, compulsory apprehension of young people by youth patrols was judged to be an expensive approach of unproved overall value (Cooper et al., 2014) .

## Type 6: Integrated youth work and youth welfare focused night patrols (emergent)

The interviews conducted with Indigenous youth night patrols in New South Wales indicated that many patrols wanted to move towards a way of working that focused upon holistic social crime prevention. A holistic social crime prevention approach seeks to reduce modifiable risk-factors for chronic involvement in crime. These risk factors include exposure to violence, neglect or sexual abuse especially in middle childhood (Cashmore, 2011), normalisation of crime and anti-social behaviour, substance abuse, disengagement from school, lack of prospects for employment and having no legitimate means to fulfil material needs (survival crime) (Cunneen and White, 2011).

Crime prevention policy influenced by *Pathways to Prevention* recommended a whole-of-government approach to service delivery that extended beyond the narrower interpretation of police-led collaboration typical of Type 4 programmes. The rationale for this approach was that when welfare issues are addressed through support programmes during middle childhood and youth, young people are much less likely to enter the justice system (Stewart et al., 2008) or will enter the justice system at an older age, and will be less likely to re-offend as adults (Chen et al., 2005). More recently this approach has been the target of justice reinvestment initiatives which redirects money spent on prisons to address the underlying causes of crime in disadvantaged communities (Schwartz, 2010).

In accordance with *Pathways to Prevention,* and Justice Reinvestment, integrated youth work/youth welfare night patrols build upon strategies adopted in type 4 patrols but their focus is a holistic modification of the social and intrapersonal conditions that foster crime, including issues of positive identity. The role of patrol staff in an integrated night patrol model extends beyond provision of transport, diversionary activities, and food. It may include provision of information, referral of young people to other services, support for pro-social interpersonal norms (anti-bullying, acceptance of diversity), provision of immediate emotional and practical support for young people in crisis, and support for positive Aboriginal identity. The role has strong similarities with detached youth work and night patrol workers would need more comprehensive training and support to undertake this more complex role.

Several SAY night patrols were attempting to implement a comprehensive social crime prevention model and had built strong relationships with young people. In the course of their work, they encountered young people who faced difficult circumstances and who would benefit from support from specialist youth mental health, homelessness or sexual health services. In urban areas, youth night patrol workers were able to refer young people to these specialist youth services, supporting the referral as required. However, in remote areas the night patrol was often the only youth service and no specialist youth services existed. The problem was particularly acute for homeless young people who had no safe place to stay. The lack of options undermined the social crime prevention model. In addition, mechanisms for genuine partnerships between the funding and communities were often fragile or non-existent.

The political discourse associated with the integrated youth welfare approach is broadly social democratic interventionist-for-enfranchisement. The approach emphasises the importance of intervention to promote self-determination, sometimes loosely allied to the critical pedagogy of

Freire (1972) and Giroux (2011). Assumptions are based upon a social justice perspective which combines a need for public funding to overcome material deprivation (poverty and lack of services) with informal education to overcome intrapersonal effects of oppression (internalisation of dominant negative cultural stereotypes of Aboriginality) and support for development of local leadership and local determination of priorities. This approach is philosophically consistent with the justice reinvestment approach discussed by Schwartz (2010).

## Discussion

For Indigenous youth patrols, a key issue that permeates policy is the tension between self-determination, resourcing, accountability and governance. Informal authority of night patrols depends upon community consent. Public accountability requirements mean funding bodies must demonstrate money has been spent for the purposes intended. Increasingly in the context of neo-liberal new public management, they also need to demonstrate quantitatively that projects represent value for money. This is problematic when prescribed measurement metrics are ill-matched to the project, and accurate evaluations costs would exceed the entire service delivery budget. In addition, there is always a power imbalance between funding bodies and community groups who seek funding. It is easy for funding bodies to impose paternalistic 'solutions' without an understanding of the realities of the situation on the ground. Equally, it is often tempting for community groups to tell funding bodies what they want to hear, to ensure funding is granted and retained. This may lead funding bodies to have unrealistic expectations about what can be achieved and the timescale for change. For Type 6 to succeed, these issues must be appropriately resolved.

On resourcing, our study showed that Indigenous youth night patrols were operating in some of the most marginalised communities New South Wales (NSW), which have suffered generations of racism, social exclusion, poverty, social dislocation and cultural disruption.  Compared with the Northbridge Project Program (NPP) (Type 5) the Indigenous youth night patrols in rural NSW were much less well resourced. The staff received less support and training, and they operated without recurrent, secure, long-term funding, in an environment with fewer alternative youth referral services and often no other youth provision, and few youth employment opportunities.

On self-determination, in culturally homogeneous and cohesive communities, with high levels of social capital and local leadership, properly resourced community-managed patrols (Type 1) would be the preferred option. In some circumstances, a youth patrol can be used to develop local leadership and social capital within the community, using a community development approach with external support and mentoring for emergent leaders (Type 2 or a variant on this). In communities where patrols have not been sustainable because there is entrenched conflict or limited social capital, full local governance and management may not be an option. Management may be better located elsewhere. However, even in these circumstances, if a purpose is to provide long-term social crime prevention, patrols should aim to strengthen local involvement and support, including developing leadership potential of the young people with whom they work. An integrated youth work/ welfare approach (Type 6) allows youth crime prevention programmes to be implemented in communities where community activist approaches have not been sustainable.  If workers assume an expanded role, they will need additional skills and knowledge, and this has training and support implications. In some of the SAY patrols this was beginning to occur, as young adults assumed leadership roles within the patrol.

On accountability, dual accountability was found in Type 3, and Type 4 patrols. When the expectations of funding bodies and community stakeholder(s) were not compatible, the patrol was placed in an impossible position. If the patrol failed to meet potentially diverse, community expectations, they were unable to function effectively; if they failed to meet funders' targets, they lost funding. In Type 5, there was no community governance. In type 6, problems with dual accountability are potentially avoidable if a genuine partnership is achieved between funding bodies and communities, and if active steps are taken to resolve, mediate, or nullify the adverse effects of conflict within communities.

## Implications for Australian and other contexts

The policy context we examined was night patrols for Australian Indigenous youth–this was the specification of our funding. We have provided an analysis we anticipate will be directly relevant to policy makers, practitioners and students in Australia who are concerned with Indigenous justice strategies, the relationship between youth work, youth justice and crime prevention, and especially audiences interested in policy options for youth night patrols in Australia or elsewhere. We believe the research also has relevance for other audiences who have a more general interest in social crime prevention, in Australia and internationally. Historically in Australia, Indigenous young people (and Indigenous communities) have been marginalised in all areas of life. In other societies, various groups and populations (recent migrants, particular ethnic or racial groups, working class populations living in poverty, homeless people) find themselves similarly positioned. Similar ideological framing and crime prevention discourses about marginalised groups are found in different places. In addition, policy makers and practitioners in crime prevention often have similar sets of options, including: what to do when communities are divided or if there is no effective leadership to counter crime; what kind of complementary crime prevention services might be most effective in the short-term and the long-term; whether and how to strengthen community leadership and support local determination; and how to make decisions about accountability and evaluation. We do not offer any easy solutions, because, as these studies illustrate, there is no easy solution or single formula. We do, however, conclude with some observations.

Firstly, paternalistic responses to youth crime are not uncommon.  Our research indicates that paternalistic policies lacking community support are unhelpful from a social crime prevention perspective because they undermine community leadership and the potential for collective efficacy (Sampson, 1997), which makes it difficult to sustain change. Dialogue with communities and young people can be used to develop strategy that has community support and prioritises crime issues about which they are concerned. This is sometimes possible even in divided communities.

Secondly, this research illustrates how politically-driven policy that selectively ignores research findings leads to poor policy and financial waste. Where community leadership exists, it is a powerful force for change. The political decision to reject self-determination was contrary to evaluation evidence. A consequence of this decision is that even now, genuine crime prevention partnerships with communities, built upon trust and respect, are not given priority. Crime prevention strategies cannot unlock the benefits of community leadership unless policy facilitates genuine local crime prevention partnerships. This must enable communities to exercise power, and must also acknowledge and support resolution of differences between factions within communities.

Thirdly in many communities, especially those with the greatest need for social youth crime prevention, there is no effective community leadership, or communities are irresolvable divided. In these circumstances, integrated youth work/ youth welfare services may provide a means to work with young people to modify known social risk-factors associated with chronic involvement in crime. Universal (non-targeted) youth work offers a cost effective stigma-free opportunity to provide support, mentoring, and referral to young people, in addition to diversionary recreational opportunities (McKee et al., 2010). This overcomes the counter-productive outcomes of targeted services identified in the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study (Sutton et al., 2014). Informal education methods can be used to overcome internalised negative stereotypes, to improve relationships and help young people achieve success in life by non-criminal means. Youth work can also help young people develop leadership roles with their peers and in their communities, and strengthen community self-determination. Detached youth work methods can be used to build trusting relationships with hard-to-reach young people. Current UK policy has cut funding to universal youth work and has thus reduced the capacity of youth work to operate as a crime prevention resource. Targeted youth support roles have become dispersed between multiple agencies (Ministry of Justice, 2015), and this risks stigma and fragmentation.

Fourthly, if the budget for a programme is relatively small, realistic decisions need to be made about how much should be allocated to servicing transparency and accountability requirements. It is important to avoid using unreliable data just because it is easy to obtain and necessary to be aware of how badly designed evaluation processes may unintentionally penalise successful programmes and reward failure.

Finally, there is a tendency for politicians and policy makers to develop 'one-size-fits-all' social youth crime prevention strategies. However, we found demographically similar communities that responded quite differently to crime prevention initiatives (Cooper et al., 2014). Our research indicates that policy makers should question the efficacy of singular solutions, and instead should develop strategy based upon the strengths, needs, circumstances, and resources of different communities.

## Acknowledgement

## References

AGD 2008. *Night Patrol Services in the Northern Territory Operational Framework 1 July 2008 – 30 June 2009,* Canberra, Attorney-General's Dept Indigenous Justice and Legal Assistance Division.

AUDITOR-GENERAL 2011. *Northern Territory Night Patrols. Audit Report No. 32 2010-2011,* Canberra, Australian National Audit Office.

BEACROFT, L., RICHARDS, K., ANDREVSKI, H. & ROSEVEAR, L. 2011. *Community night patrols in the Northern Territory: Toward an improved performance and reporting framework. Technical and Background Paper 47.,* Canberra, Australian Institute of Criminology.

BESSANT, J. C. 2013. History and Australian indigenous child welfare policies. *Policy Studies,* 34**,** 310.

BLAGG, H. 2003. *An Overview of Night Patrol Services in Australia,* Canberra, Attorney-General's Department.

BLAGG, H. 2007. *Models of Best Practice: Aboriginal Community Patrols in Western Australia,* Perth, Western Australia, Crime Research Centre and Department of Crime Prevention.

BLAGG, H. & VALURI, G. 2003. *An Overview of Night Patrol Services in Australia,* Canberra, Crime Prevention Branch, Commonwealth Attorney-General's Department.

BLAGG, H. & VALURI, G. 2004. Aboriginal Community Patrols in Australia: Self–policing, Self–determination and Security. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy* 14**,** 313-328.

BRANTINGHAM, P. J. & FAUST, F. L. 1976. A Conceptual Model of Crime Prevention. *Crime & Delinquency,* 22**,** 284-296.

CASHMORE, J. 2011. The link between child maltreatment and adolescent offending: Systems neglect of adolescents *Family Matters***,** 31-41.

CHEN, S., MATRUGLIO, T., WEATHERBURN, D. & HUA, J. 2005. The transition from juvenile to adult criminal careers, . *Crime and Justice Bulletin* 86.

COOPER, T., SIMS, M., SCOTT, J., BARCLAY, E., HENRY, P. & LOVE, T. 2014. Evaluation of Indigenous Justice programs Project D Safe Aboriginal Youth Patrol Programs in New South Wales and Northbridge Policy and Juvenile Aid Group in Western Australia. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, Attorney-General's Department, Indigenous Justice Branch.

CUNNEEN, C. 2007. Crime Justice and Indigenous People. *In:* BARCLAY, E., DONNERMEMYER, J., SCOTT, J. & HOGG, R. (eds.) *Crime in Rural Australia.* Sydney: Federation Press.

CUNNEEN, C. & WHITE, R. D. 2011. *Juvenile justice: youth and crime in Australia,* Melbourne, Oxford University Press.

CURTIS, D. 1992 revised 2003. *Jalulikari Council's Community Night Patrol,* Canberra, AIC.

FREIRE, P. 1972. *Pedagogy of the oppressed,* New York, Herder and Herder.

GIROUX, H. 2011. *Critical pedagogy,* New York, Continuum.

HIGGENS, D. 1997. Best practice for Aboriginal community night patrols and warden schemes : a report to the Office of Aboriginal Development. Available: http://indigenousjustice.gov.au/db/publications/285968.html [Accessed 7 Oct 2015].

HOMEL, R., FEIBERG, K., LAMB, C., LEECH, M., BATCHELOR, S., CARR, A., HAY, I., TEAGUE, R. & ELIAS, G. 2006. The Pathways to Prevention project: doing developmental prevention in a disadvantaged community. . *Trends and issues in crime and crimal justice,* 323

IPSDB. 2008. *Night patrol services in the Northern Territory* [Online]. Canberra: Attorney-General's Department. Available: http://www.ag.gov.au/www/agd/agd.nsf/Page/Indigenouslawandnativetitle_Indigenouslaw programs_NightpatrolservicesintheNorthernTerritory [Accessed 3 April 2011 2011].

LITHOPOULOS, S. 2007. *International Comparison of Indigenous Policing Models,* Ottowa, Public Safety Canada.

LOTHIAN, K. 2005. Seizing the Time: Australian Aborigines and the Influence of the Black Panther Party, 1969-1972. *Journal of Black Studies,* 35**,** 179-200.

MACARTHUR, C. 2007. The Emperor's New Clothes: The Role of the Western Australian Press and State Government in Selleing the Story of the Northbridge Curfew. Perth: Murdoch University.

MCKEE, V., OLDFIELD, C. & POULTNEY, J. 2010. Benefits of Youth Work. Community and youth Workers Union; Lifelong Learning UK; UNITE the Union; .

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE 2015. Youth Justice Statistics, 2013/14, England.

MOSEY, A. 1994. *Central Australian remote area Aboriginal night patrols / a review by Anne Mosey on behalf of D.A.S.A., funded by Living with Alcohol,* Alice Springs, NT, Living with Alcohol.

MOSEY, A. 2009. *Evaluation of the Volatile Substance Abuse (VSA) Supply Reduction Project on behalf of Tangentyere Council Incorporated*.

RICHARDS, K., ROSEVEAR, L. & GILBERT, R. 2011. *Promising interventions for reducing Indigenous offending. Brief 10, March 2011,* Canberra, Indigenous Justice Clearing House.

SAMPSON, R. J. 1997. Neighbourhoods and violent crime: a multi=level study of collective efficacy. *Science,* 277**,** 918-925.

SCHWARTZ, M. 2010. Building Communities, not Prisons: Justice reinvestment and Indigenous over-imprisonment. *Australian Indigenous Law Review,* 14**,** 2-17.

STASTNY, A. & ORR, R. 2014. The influence of the US Black Panthers on indigenous activism in Australia and New Zealand from 1969 onwards. *Australian Aboriginal Studies,* 2014**,** 60-74.

STEWART, A., LIVINGSTON, M. & DENNISON, S. 2008. Transitions and turning points: Examining the links between child maltreatment and juvenile offending. *Child Abuse & Neglect,* 32**,** 51-66.

SUTTON, A., CHERNEY, A. & WHITE, R. 2014. *Crime Prevention: Principles, Perspectives and Practices,* Port Melbourne, Australia, Cambridge University Press.

TAYLOR-WALKER, J. 2010. *Clash of the Paradigms: Night Patrols in Remote Central Australia.* Masters in Criminal Justice, University of Western Australia.

WALKER, J. & FORRESTER, S. 2002. Tangentyere Remote Area Night Patrol. *Crime Prevention Conference.* Sydney: AIC and Attorney-General's Dept.