

VIOLENCE AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM¹

In recent years research on juvenile delinquency and aggression has turned into a veritable knowledge industry. We have been inundated by dozens of research reports, treatment plans, literature studies, trend analyses, television programmes, expert meetings, pilot projects, scholarly symposiums and policy memorandums. The deluge is comforting on the one hand, as it indicates that widespread popular concern about issues such as senseless violence quickly gives rise to research and policy plans. On the other hand, it is confusing, as the diagnosis is anything but straightforward, and proposals for intervention vary widely.

The prevailing view

Nonetheless, a measure of consensus is becoming apparent in these publications. Many researchers have come to believe that developmental psychology is the best way of dealing with the issue. Their view is justified. The empirical research refutes the general opinion that violent or criminal behaviour relates primarily to social circumstances. Factors such as low socio-economic status, divorced parents or living in underprivileged neighbourhoods come into play but are minor and often indirect influences. Factors related to personality, early education and the personal preferences of juveniles matter more.² Early onset of serious aggressive behaviour is therefore the best indicator for predicting violent offences later in life.³ Consequently, the intellectual debate has shifted gradually from the social circumstances that lead to aggression toward individual problems dominated by psychological and biological factors.⁴

This trend is very fortunate. In addition to putting an end to an overly general sociological approach, it has yielded new insights. We have learned that juvenile delinquency results from bad breaks rather than from inevitable causes. It boils down to an accumulation of risk factors.⁵ Such factors include impulsive behaviour and concentration disorders. At home, cold or inconsistent parenting is often detrimental. At school, repeated truancy and disinterest are warning signs. The leisure pursuits concerned are frequent use of drugs and alcohol. In the cities delinquent friends raise the risk as well.⁶ While these characteristics do not inevitably lead to a life of crime individually, their combination increases the likelihood considerably. Curtailing these risks and intervening immediately at the first signs of criminal development will be very beneficial. As Rolf Loeber has emphasized, therapeutic interventions are never too early or too late.⁷ The development is individual and will always respond to proper guidance.

In my book I deal extensively with this approach. The second part contains a summary of the chief findings in developmental psychology.⁸ This perspective has three shortcomings as well. First, it focuses on serious and violent juvenile delinquents, as indicated by the title of the broad and thorough study that Loeber *et al.* presented a few months ago.⁹ The problem lies in the inability to draw an absolute distinction between the small group of hard-core juveniles and normal ones who manifest fairly innocent but nevertheless frequent forms of aggressive behaviour. In fact, the spectrum ranges from juveniles who never engage in anti-social conduct through the ones who commit an offence to the small group responsible for the most serious problems. Although this group causes a disproportionate share of all offences, this does not mean that the more mundane forms of aggressive behaviour are insignificant.

My main interest concerns the large middle group comprising juveniles who have become increasingly aggressive and anti-social in recent decades without turning into full-fledged criminal or pathological cases. The second problem with a deeply psychological analysis is that it focuses heavily on the perpetrator rather than on the situation underlying the

aggression. That situation is paramount. Some juveniles may do very little wrong as long as they are in school or stocking shelves at the supermarket but can suddenly lose all self-control once they enter a disco with their friends. Such incidents are not attributable to psychological factors but to *sociological* ones. The third problem is that psychological theory fails to explain the strong rise in violence among juveniles in recent years.¹⁰ This would require a *historical* review of the way society has evolved and how this process has affected juveniles. In my view, the pattern of senseless violence calls for historical and sociological analysis in addition to the approach based on developmental psychology. In the following paragraphs I outline such an analysis.

Aggressive behaviour on the rise

The rise in violence among juveniles in the past three decades is indisputable. Every indicator reflects a disconcerting trend in all respects.¹¹ Table 1 reveals that the number of minors interrogated by the police for homicide increased tenfold between 1970 and 1995. During the same period the number of juveniles interrogated for abuse rose nearly fivefold. Vandalism grew more than threefold. Only sexual offences remained virtually the same. Incidents of such offences committed by adults increased as well, but the rise among minors was considerably greater. The figures of the Dutch central bureau of statistics (CBS) reveal an unquestionable rise in violence among juveniles in recent decades. The widespread concern is understandable.

Table 1

Incidence of violent crimes per 100,000 minors, 1952-1995

	HOM	ABU	VAN	SEX
1952	0.6	43	89	98
1955	0.4	38	69	80
1960	0.6	57	76	75
1965	1.6	49	105	60
1970	2.1	55	129	46
1975	3.6	59	195	33
1980	6.2	98	388	39
1985	6.7	114	417	40
1990	8.9	133	412	33
1995	26.3	256	456	58

Source: K. Wittebrood, *Cijfers*, pp. 126-127, 138. The data reflect the number of suspects interrogated by the police per 100,000 minors (ages 12-17). Our breakdown reflects homicides (= HOM), abuse (= ABU), vandalism (= VAN) and sexual offences (= SEX).

Still, we need to interpret these figures with caution. The police statistics – which are the foundation for the CBS data – are not necessarily representative of the actual trends. More active investigation, improved registration and automated record-keeping practices might just as easily have led to the increase in the number of suspects.¹² Criminologists have long been debating the reasons for the aforementioned increase in violence figures. In my book I conclude that two trends are in progress.¹³ On the one hand, the number of acts of aggression has risen gradually since 1970.¹⁴ On the other hand – possibly due to this increase but

probably for entirely different reasons as well – public concern has become widespread. The consequent impact on the policy of law and order forces in turn led to an increase in reports – especially since the early 1990s.¹⁵ This does not mean that the problems with juveniles are trivial. The increased tendency of juveniles to resort to aggression, combined with heightened public awareness, means that the problem is far greater than it was three decades ago.

In my view, this twofold trend is attributable to the expansion of an assertive lifestyle.¹⁶ The sweeping changes in the Netherlands – and in other countries in the West – since the 1960s are common knowledge. At all levels citizens demanded greater freedom of movement. They no longer submitted blindly to the authorities, discarded the role patterns and standards imposed on them, claimed the right to determine how they lived their lives, defended their personal interests vehemently, expressed their opinions clearly and emphasized respect and independence in their interactions. More than ever, they became autonomous citizens with little consideration for others. While this new lifestyle first emerged among the upper middle class, it has penetrated all layers of the population. Everybody manifests considerable self-esteem. In all cases we command respect as individuals and take offence if we do not get it.

This lifestyle has two seemingly contradictory consequences. First, a highly developed sense of self-esteem increases the likelihood of aggressive behaviour. Aggression and assertiveness are very closely related. The American psychologist Roy Baumeister has asserted that perpetrators of violence often feel superior. They place their own interests or desires first and do not tolerate opposition. The more imbued they are with self-esteem, the sooner they will lose their self-control. People with large but sensitive egos become aggressive at the slightest provocation.¹⁷ This is one of the main backgrounds to the pattern that we have identified as senseless violence for several years. The violence is both sudden and excessive and targets fellow citizens at random. Such conduct is often associated with nightlife in the media, although it occurs just as frequently among drivers, at stations and in public.¹⁸ At such sites the conduct, glance or mere presence of others is considered annoying. Individual freedom of movement is also greatest in these settings. Our assertive lifestyle coaxes us into more aggressive types of behaviour along these lines. The far lower level of aggression in societies that impose a much stronger social code on individuals is thus not merely coincidental.

Higher expectations

Moral or political condemnation of the pursuit of personal autonomy and assertiveness is pointless. It is intricately linked with the modernization that has affected social life in the Netherlands in recent decades and is irreversible. In fact, the highly developed sense of self-esteem among the public today is very justified, given the major individual and collective investments. Many parents devote more attention, time and love to the personal development of their offspring than their predecessors did a few decades ago. Collective investments in the education and personal enrichment of juveniles are immense. As a result, we deeply respect each person's intrinsic value and disapprove of countries or cultures where individuals do not matter.

This modernization of social life has had some unforeseen consequences as well. Our more assertive lifestyle has gradually raised our sensitivities and expectations. Certain remarks or types of conduct that used to be commonplace have become unacceptable. The current concept of unwelcome intimacies is an obvious example. We experience unwanted sexual advances as a violation of our physical integrity. Involuntary passive smoking is another example. In the 1960s a lot of men smoked, and people had to go outside for a breath of fresh air. Nowadays, the opposite applies, and smokers have to withdraw to a designated

corner to indulge in their bad habit. Over time, standards of social conduct have risen in many areas. The same holds true for what is expected of employees. Eligibility for paid employment is subject to rigid normative and social criteria.¹⁹

Perceptions of juveniles have changed as well. Conduct deemed characteristic of young people three decades ago is now considered annoying or aggressive and is more likely to inspire irritation or insecurity. Over the years, social and normative pressure on juveniles has increased and – once adopted by law and order forces through more active intervention – given rise to a higher number of registered suspects. In this respect the rise of violent crime among juveniles in the 1990s reflects both the actual increase and the reduced tolerance for anti-social behaviour. Juveniles have higher expectations to meet. Those unable or unwilling to do so raise considerable concern.

Family life has changed as well. Many believe that parenting has become more permissive, and that parental authority has lost ground, while negotiations with children have become more commonplace. Although the latter is certainly the case, it does not imply a reduction in normative pressure on children. Research on the changes in everyday life in Sassenheim show

Table 2

Frequency (in percentages) of parental punishments of their children in Sassenheim, 1950-1993

	nobody	father	mother	both
1950	25	23	20	32
1960	22	20	19	39
1964	20	13	19	48
1970	23	12	16	49
1976	23	11	16	50
1980	18	10	14	58
1986	12	4	11	73
1995	10	2	6	82

Source: K. Schuyt *et. al.*, *Sassenheim - de verandering van het normale*.

that children today are actually punished *more* frequently than they were a few decades ago (see Table 2). Whereas in 1950 a quarter of all children was never punished, this was true of only 10 percent by 1995. The share of children punished by *both* parents rose from 32 to 82 percent! The gradual rise in standards and expectations obviously carried over into family life as well. Remarkably, patterns for rewarding children underwent a similar transition. My conclusion is that parenting did not necessarily become more permissive but *intensified*. This correlates with the idea that self-esteem has risen among juveniles. The ambiguities that characterize modernization in general also apply with parenting. On the one hand juveniles have more freedom of movement and independence than they did a few decades ago, but on the other hand they need to live up to higher standards and expectations.

The importance of supervision

Above I have reviewed the historical trends that have instigated the considerable rise in aggressive behaviour among juveniles. I do not assume that an assertive lifestyle consistently and inevitably culminates in perpetration of violence. Fortunately, most citizens have

adequate self-control and pursue their desires in a civilized manner. Simultaneously, however, those lacking self-control encounter far fewer restraints. This is all the more true for juveniles subject to several risk factors by virtue of their predisposition or personal development.²⁰ Because of the highly assertive social climate, they have no incentive whatsoever to restrain themselves or to show consideration for others.²¹ As a consequence, their behaviour will easily get out of control. The same holds true for the substantial number of juveniles that – without developing truly pathological behaviour – has considerable trouble meeting the high demands of their social surroundings.²²

This observation leads me to the second element that I would like to add to the perspective of developmental psychology. Certain juveniles may indeed turn aggressive quickly, but whether they actually resort to violence also depends on the social situation. A systematic study of the different domains of juvenile life and the extent that these domains influence aggression would shed more light on this subject. Since no such study is available at this time, I have compared six situations in my book: corporate industry, school, family life, public space, nightlife and leisure pursuits.²³ According to the hierarchy in these domains, corporate industry and school impose considerable self-control on juveniles, while the opposite applies for public space and nightlife. I have used the term ‘impose’, because self-control does not depend exclusively on personal attributes but reflects concrete circumstances as well. Here, the measure of supervision or social control is relevant and entails the outside pressure on juveniles. In addition, actual standards come into play, such as the question as to which behaviour most juveniles expect in that setting. My view is as follows: in situations with extensive social control and high standards, juveniles will be less likely to resort to aggression than in ones with little social control or normative pressure.

I will provide two examples (nightlife and school) to illustrate my point. At school, teachers know their students and are in a position to supervise them. Moreover, the rules and expectations are common knowledge, with respect to both the intrinsic educational achievements and their social interaction with students and teachers. While occasional problems will occur, the social context is conducive to rapid identification and rectification. In this manner the school pressures the students and offers them a choice between adjusting to their surroundings or refusing to do so and seeking out another environment. Clearly, aggression is associated with the second

Table 3

Conduct in education and among friends (in percentages) among juveniles in the Zaanstreek-Waterland police district, 1999

	non	kick	violent	core
education				
attends school	99	94	92	87
occasional truancy	20	41	42	59
occasional tardiness	54	73	72	72
friends				
extensive contact	63	82	85	88
pressure exerted	13	23	34	43

Source: H. Ferwerda *et al.*, *Jeugdcriminaliteit*, pp. 39-57. The breakdown indicates non-delinquent juveniles (= non), juveniles whose delinquency is for kicks (= kick), violent juveniles (= violent) and hard-core juveniles (= core).

option, which comprises the notorious truants. Table 3 reveals that 20 percent of the non-delinquent juveniles has skipped school. The rate is twice as high among juveniles who perpetrate violence and three times as high for the group identified as hard-core juveniles. More serious delinquent behaviour correlates with lower educational involvement. Their rates of school attendance (line 1) and tardiness (line 3) convey this pattern as well. These juveniles clearly prefer other surroundings.²⁴ The average amount of time spent with friends is greater for those committing more serious offences (line 4). The corresponding pressure from friends increases as well. Among non-delinquent juveniles, 13 percent has been pressured to break the rules, compared with 34 percent of the violent perpetrators and 43 percent of the hard-core juveniles (line 5). The data illustrate how important the social surroundings are. The surroundings where juveniles spend most of their time and the way they influence their behaviour are decisive.²⁵

Insufficient self-control

Thanks to the combination of social control and clear rules or expectations, serious aggression is rare at school. The contrary applies for nightlife. Supervision there is much lower, and the expectations are entirely different. The whole idea is to get a kick out of the experience, and juveniles are more likely to relax their inhibitions.²⁶ Heavy drinking, possibly together with the use of illicit drugs, reinforces the feeling. As a result, people have far less self-control than during the day and are quick to enter confrontations. In this respect, aggressive behaviour thrives in surroundings like nightlife. Studies have shown repeatedly that the measure of drinking or the frequency of going out on the one hand is related to the likelihood of engaging in acts of violence on the other hand.²⁷

Table 4
Participation (in percentages) in nightlife by juveniles in the Zaanstreek-Waterland police district, 1999

	non	kick	violent	core

exuberant nightlife				
disco	70	83	84	85
house party	40	48	59	57
hash bar	18	34	48	57
average	43	55	64	66
sedate nightlife				
restaurant	69	65	67	55
cultural event	32	22	18	14
school activity	87	78	73	67
average	63	55	53	45
role of violence				
visits to nightlife sites	49	72	79	86
witness to a disagreement	51	77	(75)	89
witness to physical abuse	30	62	(77)	82

Source: H. Ferwerda *et al.*, *Jeugdcriminaliteit*, p. XVIII. The breakdown indicates non-delinquent juveniles (= non), juveniles whose delinquency is for kicks (= kick), violent juveniles (= violent) and hard-core juveniles (= core).

The above distinction between non-delinquent juveniles, violent juveniles and hard-core juveniles illustrates my point (see Table 4). Thirty percent of the first group witnessed abuse while going out, compared with 82 percent of the last group.²⁸ This obviously depends to some extent on the type of venue. Hard-core juveniles prefer more exciting spots, such as a disco or a house party. Non-delinquent juveniles are more likely to frequent sites requiring some measure of self-control, such as a restaurant or cultural event.²⁹

The differences between the domains are considerable. In my book I also review the impact of paid employment, family life, the media and urban settings on the conduct of juveniles. These influences cover a broad spectrum that exceeds the present scope. Basically, the effects of social surroundings have not been investigated systematically. The focus on the most serious types of behaviour and the perspective of developmental psychology is so great that more mundane types of aggression and the enabling social circumstances tend to be overlooked. Still, much remains to be done in this field, both for parents and teachers and for policymakers and professionals. In my book I advocate a new civilizing offensive similar to the one that emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century.³⁰ In the following paragraphs I will outline such an offensive.

A new civilizing offensive?

First, I believe that juveniles should be informed more explicitly of the rules for social intercourse. While standards and expectations regarding social conduct have risen as a consequence of the assertive lifestyle, they have remained implicit in most cases. People might easily get the idea that freedom is unlimited in the Netherlands. Dutch society leaves tourists and foreigners with this impression. More extended residence in the Netherlands shows that the idea of blissful freedom is an illusion. The wealth of codes regulating social interaction is not formulated explicitly and is thus difficult for outsiders and juveniles to adopt. Stating the point clearly would be more effective and fairer.

In addition to being stated more *explicitly*, the rules of the game need to be enforced more consistently. In that respect the findings of a survey I conducted for my book are rather disappointing.³¹ Over 500 professionals who work with juveniles daily participated in this survey. Their responses revealed that rules for social conduct exist, and that people are aware of them. Because of the inadequate sanctions on violations of these rules, however, compliance is poor. These professionals disapproved of the Dutch tradition of tolerance. The survey was conducted before the disastrous events in Enschede and Volendam. Still, the general sentiment was the same: rules exist for a reason, and ensuring compliance with them is in the interest of the public. That is the first element of a modern civilizing offensive.

The second element is that – as a group – we need to *invest more* in juveniles who have trouble acting civilized. Above I have opposed a purely psychological approach, although I am aware that certain juveniles really need more help. Children who have difficult temperaments, grow up in pedagogically underprivileged environments, perform poorly at school, spend their free time hanging about slums or have poor job prospects are at greater risk of getting into trouble.³² They tend to show signs of anti-social and aggressive behaviour early on and cause trouble at school or in the neighbourhood. As a result, they are rejected by age-mates and adults and are more likely to fall in with the wrong crowd. At that point things usually go from bad to worse.³³ The downward spiral starts with minor wrongdoings in early childhood and ends in prison.

Somewhere along the line, corrective intervention ceases to be possible, and repression is the only option that remains. Early identification of the problems and rapid remedial action would be much better. While parents bear chief responsibility in this respect, they can be part

of the problem – if only because of their inability to identify and correct misbehaviour. I therefore believe that teachers, police officers, therapists and other professionals need to become more involved in parenting. Especially with juveniles subject to many risk factors, parenting becomes a collective rather than a purely individual task.³⁴ It will require a lot of time, money, expertise and attention.

The third element of the civilizing offensive I have outlined is philosophical and concerns our self-image and our appreciation of modern citizenship. I question the pursuit of individual independence. Though intrinsically a noble mission, it merits *relativisation* in two respects. First, we are independent only by virtue of our associations with others. Consider a computer with virtually infinite options. You can use it for anything, from games to e-mail and from investing to surfing the Internet. Users have unlimited freedom, provided a few things are properly arranged. For example, the equipment needs enough power to run, and the software should be compatible. User vulnerability becomes apparent once malfunctions occur in any of these fields.

The same holds true for social interactions today. As long as everything is running smoothly, we think we are in charge of our lives. Believing that this is entirely true would be foolish. In this respect, the contemporary culture of individual independence is an illusion. Moreover, this desire has various drawbacks. Self-enrichment, self-esteem, assertiveness, independence and freedom of movement represent the culture of youth and the will to achieve. How do our surroundings feel about this? How do we perceive the disadvantages of our assertiveness for others? How do we balance rights with obligations?

Conclusion

Fortunately, the relevance of these types of questions is widely acknowledged. But they are rarely stated explicitly in public debate. In this respect, we are still caught up in the 1960s. We continue to fear of patronizing approaches or inappropriate interference. That is one of the reasons why I have written this book. I do not have all the answers and do not know how to solve the entire problem. Rather, I aim to identify a few elements that need to be addressed in the public debate about aggressive juveniles. Restricting the debate to individual and psychological factors would be a mistake. While they obviously matter, we should also consider the consequences for our own lifestyle and our approach to standards for social conduct.

Gabriël van den Brink
Leiden, September 2001

Akker, P. van den, I. Diepstraten, H. Vinken, *Jongeren en risicogedrag. Een inventarisatie van theorie en onderzoek over invloeden van gezin en directe omgeving, school en werk, jeugdcultuur, vrije tijd en persoonlijkheid*, Tilburg 1997.

Angenent, H., *Achtergronden van jeugdcriminaliteit*, Houten/Antwerp 1991.

Baumeister, R., *Evil. Inside human cruelty and violence*, New York 1997.

Bie, E. de, *Lokaal jeugdgeweld in kaart. Een onderzoek naar spreiding en concentratie van jeugdgeweld in de stad Groningen*, Groningen 1999.

Bieleman, B., H. Maarsingh, *Aangeschoten wild. Onderzoek naar jongeren, alcohol, drugs en agressie tijdens het uitgaan*, Groningen 1998.

- Bol, M., G. Terlouw, L. Blee, C. Verwers, *Jong en gewelddadig. Ontwikkeling en achtergronden van de geweldscriminaliteit onder jeugdigen*, The Hague 1998.
- Brink, G. van den, *De grote overgang. Een lokaal onderzoek naar de modernisering van het bestaan. Woensel 1670-1920*, Nijmegen 1996.
- Ferwerda, H., J. Jakobs, B. Beke, *Signalen voor toekomstig crimineel gedrag. Een onderzoek naar de signaalwaarde van kinderdelinquentie en probleemgedrag op basis van casestudies van ernstig criminele jongeren*, The Hague 1996.
- Ferwerda, H., M. Bottenberg, B. Beke, *Jeugdcriminaliteit in de politieregio Zaanstreek-Waterland. Een onderzoek naar omvang, aard, spreiding en achtergronden*, Arnhem 2000.
- Haan, W. de, G. Terlouw, B. Beke, *Geweld: gemeld en geteld. Een analyse van aard en omvang van geweld op straat tussen onbekenden*, The Hague 1999.
- Hakkert, A., et al., *Groepsriminaliteit. Een terreinverkenning op basis van literatuuronderzoek en een analyse van bestaand onderzoeksmateriaal, aangevuld met enkele interviews met sleutelinformanten en jongeren die tot groepen behoren*, The Hague 1998.
- Junger-Tas, J., *Jeugd en gezin I. Preventie vanuit een justitieel perspectief*, The Hague (Ministry of Justice) 1996.
- Junger, M., 'Een justitieel preventiemodel', in: W. Koops, W. Slot (Ed.), *Van lastig tot misdadig*, pp. 165-186.
- Komen, M., *Gevaarlijke kinderen. De justitiële kindbescherming en de veranderende sociale positie van jongeren 1960-1995*, Utrecht 1999.
- Koops, W., W. Slot (Ed.), *Van lastig tot misdadig. Een ontwikkelingsbenadering van lastige en misdadige kinderen en adolescenten: diagnostiek, behandeling en beleid*, Houten 1998.
- Laan, P. van der, A. Essers, G. Huijbregts, E. Spaans, *Ontwikkeling van de jeugdcriminaliteit: periode 1980-1996*, The Hague 1998.
- Loeber, R., D. Farrington (eds), *Serious and violent juvenile offenders. Risk factors and successful interventions*, London 1998.
- Loeber, R., 'Ontwikkelingspaden en risicopaden voor ernstige jeugddelinquentie en hun relevantie voor interventies: nooit te vroeg en nooit te laat', in: W. Koops, W. Slot (eds), *Van lastig tot misdadig*, pp. 15-32.
- Loeber, R., N. Slot, J. Sergeant (Ed.), *Ernstige en gewelddadige jeugddelinquentie. Omvang, oorzaken en interventies*, Houten 2001.
- Moelker, R., *Zou hij onze nieuwe werknemer kunnen zijn? Veranderingen in gevraagde kwalificaties als weerspiegeling van veranderingen in de betekenis van prestatie. Een inhoudsanalyse van personeelsadvertenties*, De Lier 1992.

- Moffit, T., 'Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behaviour: a developmental taxonomy', in: *Psychological review*, 100 (1993), no 4, pp. 674-701.
- Regt, A. de, *Arbeidersgezinnen en beschavingsarbeid. Ontwikkelingen in Nederland 1870-1940*, Meppel 1984.
- Sampson, R., J. Laub, *Crime in the making. Pathways and turning points through life*, London 1993.
- Schuyt, C. et al., *Sassenheim. De verandering van het normale*, Nijmegen 2002 (forthcoming).
- Schuyt, C., *Kwetsbare jongeren en hun toekomst. Een beleidsadvies gebaseerd op een literatuurverklaring*, Amsterdam 1995.
- Terlouw, G., W. de Haan, B. Beke, *Geweld: gemeld en geteld. Een analyse van aard en omvang van geweld op straat tussen onbekenden*, The Hague 1999.
- Tolan, P., 'Voorspellers van gewelddadig gedrag bij jongeren', in: W. Koops, W. Slot (eds), *Van lastig tot misdadig*, pp. 52-66.
- Tonkens, E., *Het zelfontplooiingsregime. De actualiteit van Dennendal en de jaren zestig*, Amsterdam 1999.
- Weerman, F., *Het belang van bindingen. De bindingstheorie als verklaring van verschillen en veranderingen in delinquent gedrag*, Groningen 1998.
- Winter, M. de, *Beter maatschappelijk opvoeden. Hoofdpijnen van een eigentijdse participatiepedagogiek*, Assen 2000.
- Wittebrood, K., *Cijfers omtrent geweld. Achtergrondstudie bij het advies verantwoordelijkheid en perspectief. Geweld in relatie tot waarden en normen*, The Hague (RMO) 1998.
- Wittebrood, K., 'Trends in geweldscriminaliteit. Een vergelijking tussen politiestatistieken en slachtofferenquêtes', in: *Tijdschrift voor criminologie*, (1999) No. 3, pp. 250-267.
- Wittebrood, K., 'Trends in jeugdgeweld', in: *Justitiële verkenningen*, Vol. 26 (2000) No. 1, pp. 21-34.
- Young, H., J. van Kan, P. Versteegh, *Zinloos geweld, overdreven of onderbelicht? Een eerste probleemverkenning*, The Hague (Politie Haaglanden) 1998.

Notes

¹ Revised version of a lecture for the Nederlands Studiecentrum voor Criminaliteit en Rechtshandhaving (NSCR) in Leiden in response to *Geweld als uitdaging. De betekenis van agressief gedrag bij jongeren*.

-
- ² J. Junger-Tas, *Jeugd en gezin*, p. 30; H. Ferwerda *et al.*, *Signalen*, pp. 33, 49-51; H. Angenent, *Achtergronden*, pp. 180-181, 201-202.
- ³ R. Loeber, D. Farrington (eds), *Serious and violent*, pp. 24, 113, 143; R. Sampson, J. Laub, *Crime*, pp. 12, 14; P. Tolan, *Voorspellers*, p. 63.
- ⁴ M. Bol *et al.*, *Jong en gewelddadig*, p. 46.
- ⁵ R. Loeber, D. Farrington (eds), *Serious and violent*, pp. 143-144; P. Tolan, *Voorspellers*, p. 61; J. Junger-Tas, *Jeugd en gezin*, p. 28; F. Weerman, *Het belang*, pp. 102, 184.
- ⁶ R. Loeber, D. Farrington (Ed.), *Serious and violent*, pp. 55, 59, 67, 113, 138, 140, 146, 151-152; R. Sampson, J. Laub, *Crime*, pp. 104, 110, 113, 118; M. Junger, *Een justitieel preventiemodel*, pp. 167-168, 171; H. Angenent, *Achtergronden*, pp. 64, 71, 77, 94, 103, 106, 108, 112, 142.
- ⁷ R. Loeber, *Ontwikkelingspaden*, pp. 15-32.
- ⁸ G. van den Brink, *Geweld als uitdaging*, pp. 125-212.
- ⁹ R. Loeber, N. Slot, J. Sergeant (Ed.), *Ernstige en gewelddadige jeugddelinquentie. Omvang, oorzaken en interventies*, Houten 2001.
- ¹⁰ The researcher R. Loeber admits this without reservation. Immediately after publishing his book about serious and violent juvenile delinquency, he granted an interview of which the title meant: 'We simply do not know why crime is rising' (*NRC-Handelsblad*, 13-6-2001, p. 3).
- ¹¹ K. Wittebrood, *Trends in jeugdgeweld*, pp. 23-25, 27-28.
- ¹² K. Wittebrood, *Cijfers*, pp. 84, 88-89, 90, 93; *Ibid.*, *Trends in geweldscriminaliteit*, pp. 252-264.
- ¹³ G. van den Brink, *Geweld als uitdaging*, pp. 38-54.
- ¹⁴ P. van der Laan *et al.*, *Ontwikkeling*, pp. 21, 28-29.
- ¹⁵ K. Wittebrood, *Trends in jeugdgeweld*, p. 31.
- ¹⁶ G. van den Brink, *Geweld als uitdaging*, pp. 71-87.
- ¹⁷ R. Baumeister, *Evil*, pp. 25, 132, 138, 139-141, 148-149.
- ¹⁸ H. Young *et al.*, *Zinloos geweld*, pp. 5-6, 11-12, 30; W. de Haan *et al.*, *Geweld, gemeld en geteld*, p. 5.
- ¹⁹ See e.g. the changes in job advertisements since the 1950s and 60s (R. Moelker, *Zou hij onze nieuwe werknemer kunnen zijn?*, pp. 78-79, 83-84).
- ²⁰ Cf. W. de Haan *et al.*, *Jeugd en geweld*, p. 75.
- ²¹ See the study about children who received court supervision orders in: M. Komen, *Gevaarlijke kinderen*, pp. 148, 157.

²² Collective and individual levels are not always parallel. Accordingly, certain individuals may have low self-esteem, even though an assertive disposition is generally accepted in collective settings. Reactions to such a discrepancy can vary. Some people will simply resign themselves to being dominated by those with a lot of self-confidence. Others respond by being more assertive, despite their social and cultural shortcomings. They resort to acts of violence precisely because their self-esteem is so vulnerable. This may explain why psychologists often diagnose low self-esteem among juvenile delinquents. Still, low self-esteem does not give rise to delinquent conduct. This sense becomes a problem only once people operate in a culture where assertiveness is the collective standard.

²³ G. van den Brink, *Geweld als uitdaging*, pp. 239-294.

²⁴ M. Bol *et al.*, *Jong en gewelddadig*, pp. 94, 96, 102-104.

²⁵ A. Hakkert *et al.*, *Groepsriminaliteit*, pp. 58-59, 60, 89; H. Angenent, *Achtergronden*, pp. 152, 165-166.

²⁶ P. van den Akker *et al.*, *Jongeren*, p. 1; H. Angenent, *Achtergronden*, p. 35.

²⁷ B. Bieleman, *Aangeschoten wild*, pp. 39, 62, 74, 77; H. Ferwerda *et al.*, *Jeugdcriminaliteit*, pp. 48, 55.

²⁸ B. Bieleman, *Aangeschoten wild*, pp. 64, 70. The high incidence of violence in nightlife often blurs the distinction between perpetrators and victims. The outcome of a brawl determines who is identified as the victim and who is identified as the perpetrator in the official report.

²⁹ H. Ferwerda *et al.*, *Jeugdcriminaliteit*, pp. 32-33, 42.

³⁰ With this analogy, we need to bear in mind that the bourgeois civilizing offensive at the end of the nineteenth century concerned the transition from an agrarian to an industrial society (cf. G. van den Brink, *De grote overgang*, pp. 490-500, 513-523; A. de Regt, *Arbeidersgezinnen*, pp. 240-248). The current transition reflects our abandonment of the industrial society for an existence dominated by services and knowledge acquisition. This obviously means a major change in the values and skills now propagated.

³¹ G. van den Brink, *Geweld als uitdaging*, pp. 295-310.

³² J. Junger-Tas, *Jeugd en gezin*, pp. 25, 27.

³³ H. Angenent, *Achtergronden*, pp. 5-6.

³⁴ Verg. M. de Winter, *Beter maatschappelijk opvoeden*, pp. 15-20.