Save the Children

GENERAL GUIDELINES

A Child Rights Approach to Combat Bullying in Detention and Residential Care Settings

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

"CRAC - A child rights approach to combat bullying in detention and residential care settings" (JUST/2014/AG/) is cofounded by the European Union as part of the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme.

The project intends to address the lack of perception and understanding of bullying both on the part of operators in the field of juvenile justice as well as among children within the structures, by providing them with practical and sustainable instruments to recognize and deal effectively with individual cases.

The General aim of the project is to reduce the incidence and impact of bullying in detention and residential care settings.
The specific aim is to improve the ability of juvenile justice services (particularly detention and residential care settings) to prevent, detect and deal with cases of bullying.

This has been achieved through the development and implementation of a child rights-oriented methodology and approach, which take into account existing standards and best practices at international level.
A set of actions have been carried out in three different national contexts - Italy, Portugal and Bulgaria - ensuring mutually beneficial learning experiences and understanding:

1 **to assess the perception of bullying by structures' (juvenile justice services')** staff - educators, social workers, penitential police officers, psychologists, authorities, etc. – and young people, within detention and residential care settings involved in the project;

2 **to develop tools to be used by juvenile justice services to assess** their capacity to prevent and/or deal with bullying, as well as to support them in creating anti-bullying policies and procedures or strengthening existing measures;

3 **to implement a self-assessment process**, on the part of the structures involved, to determine how effective they are in relation to bullying; identifying their strengths and weaknesses and measures needed to develop a comprehensive Anti-bullying Policy and a set of procedures;

4 to carry out, on the part of the structures involved, an **experimental phase** in which the measures that have been prioritized are implemented;

5 **to produce a set of guidelines** for all the players involved in detention and residential care settings on how to prevent and deal with bullying, which will be disseminated and shared across all the juvenile justice services in each of the countries involved in the project.

Within the frame of the project, **the General Guidelines represent the final product of the work done in each country in collaboration with juvenile justice services**.
Said document sums up the overall experiences, analyzes the reports and recommendations produced within each phase of the process carried out in structures, and produces a useful instrument for detention and residential care settings in implementing anti-bullying policies.

This document is divided into three main sections:
1) the general overview;
2) the methodological framework;
3) the recommendations.

ITALY

BULGARIA

PORTUGAL

1 THE GENERAL OVERVIEW

The first part of the general guidelines includes some definitions of the main issues that the project dealt with.
In the first paragraph, the definition of bullying given by international literature is compared with the definition as reported by the self-assessment process. In the second paragraph, country-specific background information is reported, including a brief description of the Juvenile Justice Systems in the three national contexts.

1.1 DEFINITION OF MAIN ISSUES

Academic background

Bullying has been studied since the '70s-'80s (Olweus1978; Smith and Sharp 1994) and definitions of the problem have stressed its main characteristics, i.e.: intentionality, repetition, the power imbalance and the different forms of bullying.

*"Those offensive and/or **aggressive** behaviours, perpetrated by one or more people within a group**, repeatedly over time**, damaging one or more individuals with the **purpose** of **exercising power** or control over the victim"* (Fonzi, 1998).

Nevertheless, some theoretical problems arise when defining bullying in a different context to that which the first definition comes from (i.e. school environments). Connell and Farrington (1996) report that victimization had to be severe before inmates would construe it as bullying, and argue that what incarcerated youths consider to be bullying may not be the same as the definitions applied in relation to school children.

In general, detention institutes have been described as essentially violent environments and bullying in these contexts can be just one of many forms of violence. Ireland's research suggests the idea that these settings can be particularly susceptible to bullying behaviours (Ireland, 2000, 2011; Monks et al., 2009), embedded in relationships of power and hierarchy. For this reason, Beck and Ireland (1995) suggested a broader definition of bullying applied to a prison setting, whereby a behaviour does not necessarily have to be repetitive for it to be described as bullying. Moreover, given the peculiarity of the detention context, the behaviours that may fall within the category of bullying may take different forms and overlap with violence and predatory behaviours. For this reason, in literature there is a lack of consistency about which activities can be classified as bullying. Olweus (1996) suggests that even a serious (single) instance of victimization can be regarded as bullying under special circumstances.

The concept of seriousness would seem especially relevant to those abusive behaviours specific to a prison environment:

Nevertheless, Ireland's criteria (2007) concerning how to codify victim and bully roles (i.e., the presence of one bullying experience, perpetrated or endured, would be sufficient to categorize an individual as a victim or a bully) can overestimate the rate of bullying and thus have a low discriminatory power within detention settings. For this reason, acknowledging the suggestions of Connell and Farrington (1996), in our study we have decided to adopt more stringent criteria, taking into consideration at least some element of repetition of the behaviours to compute the roles in bullying among participants. Our criteria are described below:

Severe pure victims: those subjects reporting four or more incidents of being bullied and one or less incident of bullying another youth.

Occasional pure victims: those subjects reporting two or three incidents of being bullied and one or less incident of bullying another youth.
Severe pure bullies: reporting one or less incident of being bullied and four or more incidents of bullying another youth.

Occasional pure bullies: reporting one or less incident of being bullied and two or three incidents of bullying another youth.

Bully/Victims: reporting two or more incidents of being bullied and two or more incidents of bullying another youth.

Not involved: reporting one or less experience of either being bullied or bullying another youth.

Definition of bullying by participants

Bullying as reported by participants (children/young adults in detention and staff of juvenile justice services) in CRAC self-assessment process:

Bullying develops within relational or social contexts and it involves **forms of violence or abuse** that a person (the so called "bully") perpetrates repeatedly or with single or non-continuous actions, against one or more persons, causing them suffering, humiliation and isolation, with the aim of attaining as much **consent** as possible within the group.

- **Forms of violence or abuse**
- **Repeated, or single actions,** against one or more persons
- **Suffering, humiliation and isolation** of the victim
- **Social consensus** of the bully

Episodes of bullying include harassment, denigration, defamation and explicitly intimidating behaviours, as well as violence, focused on **establishing dynamics of power already existing outside the detention setting.** In this sense, bullying in prison is strictly connected to the existence of organized crime groups ("camorra", "cosa nostra") which make the abuse of power (by the clans and their gregarious) a widespread social matter.

"…as a minor, I cannot be judged as affiliated to the Camorra. This changes your life forever, even when I get out of here"

A very subtle kind of bullying is known as **hidden bullying.** It consists in repeated and not immediately evident behaviours (e.g. exchanging glances and use of non-verbal language), often disguised as a **"joke",** causing the complete alienation and marginalization of the victim from the group. Victims who speak out and report this kind of behaviour are considered by their peers to be informers or "grasses" (and obviously this aggravates their isolation).

"Bullying often starts out as an offensive joke. Joking and heavy joking represent the first signs of bullying and must be stopped immediately" (Rome, educator)

Mockery, humiliation, conflicts, challenging behaviour, incitement and encouragement to break the rules are other forms of bullying in child detention settings. These behavioural patterns represent the specific cultural attitudes that exist in society as a whole.

Definition of preventing bullying by participants

To prevent and limit bullying in the structures and to offer a collective and comprehensive response to each single episode, the following should be identified:

- **timely detection**: all risky circumstances and so-called indicators of vulnerability must be detected as soon as possible;
- **multidisciplinary team work** to support prompt detection of the problem;
- **a shared and comprehensive response** by the team to each episode of bullying;
- **networking and partnership** with other relevant institutions, communities and stakeholders.
- **brief interventions and individual consultations** with the parties involved in the incident.

1.2 CONTEXT SPECIFIC BACKGROUND

Italian Juvenile Justice context

The **Juvenile and Community Justice Department** (**JCJD**) is the competent branch of the Italian **Ministry of Justice for juvenile justice** aims at ensuring the implementation of penal measures decided by the Juvenile Justice authority**.** It was established in 2001 to cover matters relating to minors and the management of staff and equipment related to the sector of Juvenile Justice. Law 176/1991, art. 40 paragraph 3, *"Ratification and execution of the Convention on children's rights, which took place in New York on 20th November 1989"*, established an Institution intended for minors who are accused of, or have been condemned for, a crime.

It works to defend the rights of **minors and young adults, aged 14-18**, who are subject to penal measures, providing educational and reintegration programmes (including professional training and leisure activities), aimed at ensuring real integration of minors and young adults into the outside community. Law no. 117, dated 11 August 2014, extended the provision of support to youths *"who have **reached the age of twenty-five**, on condition that those who are older than twenty-one are not subject to particular security measures, following assessment by the competent court, and in the light of the educational goals"*.

At regional and interregional level, the **Juvenile Justice Centre** (**JJC**), established by art.7 of legislative decree 28 July 1989, n.272 *"Regulations for the implementation and coordination of D.P.R. 448/88"*, performs the following functions:
I) technical and financial planning; II) follow-up and supervision of juvenile justice services such as the Youth Social Service Offices (U.S.S.M.), Juvenile Detention Centre (I.P.M.), Juvenile Classification Homes (C.P.A.) and Communities. In Italy, there are 11 Juvenile Justice Centres (JJC) in Turin, Milan, Venice, Bologna, Florence, Rome, Cagliari, Naples, Catanzaro, Bari and Palermo.

Juvenile Justice Structures in Italy

Penal institutions for minors - IPM (**16**) aim to ensure the enforcement of sentences and custody of juvenile offenders. Although IPM are detention facilities, they focus on re-education and reintroduction into society of young offenders.

Youth Social Service Offices - USSM (**29**) provide young offenders with assistance during every stage of the criminal proceedings, supporting them from their arrest to the subsequent provisions taken (e.g., probation, suspended sentence, etc.), gathering information on behalf of the public prosecutor, formulating a plan for their rehabilitation in accordance with the Juvenile Justice Authority.

Juvenile Classification Homes/Reception Centres - (**C.P.A.**) (**24**) are structures which temporarily house minors under arrest or who are detained. Minors can be held at the Centre for a maximum of 96 hours, after which the arrest must be validated or annulled. The Centres aim to avoid the traumatic impact that the prison could have on a minor (in accordance with the Rights of the Child).

Communities (**3**) are based on certain fundamental principles: a) the limitation of the time spent by minors in the structures; b) the promotion of active participation in educational, recreational and cultural activities. Moreover, according to D.lgs. 275/1989: they have a "family" type organization (with a maximum number of ten to guarantee individual attention); they guarantee the on –site presence of educators and cultural mediators; they collaborate with other institutions and local authorities in their area.

Day Centres (**4**) are non-residential and welcome all those minors who are going through a criminal procedure or are at risk of committing offences. Managed by Juvenile Justice Centres and staffed by a team of experts, they can also accommodate youths who are not in the Juvenile Justice System and they are housed alongside Communities so as to share personnel and management.[1]

CRAC interventions were carried out in **three IPM and one Community**:
- The Penal institution for minors of Nisida, Naples (Southern Italy);
- The Penal institution for minors of Bicocca, Catania (Sothern Italy)
- The Penal institution for minors of Quartucciu, Cagliari (Central Italy)
- The ITCA Community Borgo Amigò, Rome (Central Italy)

Portuguese Juvenile Justice System[2]

The **Direção Geral de Reinserção e Serviços Prisionais** (Directorate-General of Social Reintegration) is the department responsible for defining and implementing public policies for crime prevention management and social reintegration of young people and adults. It is also responsible for the promotion and implementation of educational measures and alternatives to imprisonment, under the supervision of the Portuguese Ministry of Justice.

The Educational Guardianship Law (Lei Tutelar Educativa - Law No.166/99, dated 14 September) applies to **all youths aged 12 to 16**, who commit an act qualified by law as a crime.

Currently, the Portuguese justice system combines three different kinds of intervention regarding child and youth offenders, considering three age ranges: 1) children below the age of 12, 2) juveniles aged 12 to 16, and 3) young adults aged 16 to 21. The first two categories fall within the scope of juvenile justice, whereas young adults are subjected to the adult criminal justice system.

The set of educational measures applied by the courts to youths aims to reintroduce offenders into society, educating them in the values protected by penal law, as part of a process called "education in the law". The Educational Guardianship Law allows for fulfilment of a measure in the community or in a Youth Detention Center.

The process of ratifying the *Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) by Portugal in 1990* supported the need for its implementation, which has led to a broader assessment of and deep critical reflection on the efficacy and constraints of the Portuguese welfare system. Culminating a long process of debate and work begun in 1996, the system was assessed as inadequate and ineffective, inoperable in relation to the problems it was supposed to address. Since 1999, the Portuguese juvenile justice system has made significant changes, and international standards have been integrated into the legal framework. There have been extensive modifications to the juvenile justice system, carried out with the approval, in 1999, of two new laws: the Promotion and Protection Law for Children and Youths in Danger (*Lei de Promoção e Protecção de Crianças e Jovens em Perigo,* LPCJ, Law n.° 149/99, dated 1 September), and the Educational Guardianship Law (*Lei Tutelar Educativa,* LTE, Law n.° 166/99, dated 14 September). Both laws came into force on 1 January 2001. The idea was to distinguish the situation of children in danger, which that legitimizes a State's intervention of protection (LPCJP), from the needs and situation of children aged 12 to 16 years old, who commit an offence qualified by the penal law as a crime and, as a result, justify another kind of intervention.

Juvenile Justice structure in Portugal

At the moment, Portugal has a total of six Youth Detention Centres (two of these centers have female units)[3]. The Santa Clara YDC was closed last year. Measures can be accomplished at a YDC in an *open*, *semi-open* or *closed system.*

The open system is applicable in the case of minor crimes and varies from a minimum of three months to a maximum of two years. Under this system, the young people live in the YDC but attend school or work in the community. They can leave the YDC without supervision and can spend weekends and holidays with their family.

The semi-open system is applicable in the case of more serious crimes and has the same duration as the open system. Under this system, young people live in the YDC and attend school or training activities inside the Centre. They can spend holidays with their family.

The closed system is applicable in the case of very serious crimes committed by young people over the age of 14. It has a minimum duration of six months and maximum of three years. In this system, the young people live and attend training activities in the centre. Temporary leave is strictly subject to legal obligations, health requirements or other exceptional reasons.

CRAC interventions are carried out in **two YDC in the Lisbon district**. All the YDC have a similar structure. Two main figures are required to manage a YDC; a director and a pedagogical coordinator. The pedagogical coordinator is responsible for the management of all the academic and extra academic activities offered, and for preparing offenders to return to their home life. Usually, the pedagogical coordinator is the focal contact for external projects. The daily routines of the young people are constantly monitored by other staff, called TPRs, and by a security team. A YDC offers several activities. All the youngsters are integrated into professional training schemes, suited to their academic level. Besides that, the centre offers other activities, like developmental programmes, sports, leisure activities and other opportunities, mainly promoted by external organizations.

Bulgarian Juvenile Justice System (JJS)

The Juvenile Justice System (**JJS**) in Bulgaria is governed by several laws – those executed within the common criminal justice system (*Penal Code, Code for Penal Procedure, Execution of Sentences and Detention in Custody Act*) and those designed to cover specifically child-related issues (*Juvenile Delinquency Act, Child Protection Act*).

The Penal Code (PC) comprises a separate chapter (*Specific Rules for Juveniles*) setting forth rules imposing punishments on underage persons mainly with the aim of re-educating and preparing them for socially useful work. Punishments that may be applied to juveniles are deprivation of liberty, probation and public censure, as well as deprivation of the right to practice a certain profession or activity.

The Penal Procedure Code (PPC) comprises a separate chapter setting forth special rules on the examination of cases of crimes committed by underage persons. In addition to the provisions, within the criminal justice system, there is another set of legislative acts which completes the framework of measures available for children who have come into conflict with the law.

The Juvenile Delinquency Act (JDA) was adopted in 1958 and establishes:
• separate administrative system for combating anti-social acts by minors and underage children;
• provisions for punitive correctional measures for children who have committed crimes under the Penal Code but are not criminally responsible;
• certain responsibilities towards prevention of juvenile delinquency.

The respective institutional framework and administrative structures created by the provisions of the JDA include the Central Commission for Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, whose functions are related to prevention of anti-social acts and crimes committed by children, coordination of the national policy in the area and supervision of the activities of the Local Commissions on Juvenile Delinquency in each municipality. The legislative framework regulating child-related issues was completed in 2000 when the Bulgarian government adopted the Child Protection Act (CPA), which establishes:

• a separate administrative system for child protection;
• a mechanism for the placement of children in public care;
• basic principles of child protection; and
• rights of children in the public domain.

Child protection under this law is carried out with the application of protective measures with respect to children or of special protection with respect to children at risk.

The Penal Code establishes separate juvenile detention facilities, i.e. one for boys (Boychinovtsi, North-western region) and one for girls (Sliven, South-eastern region). Punishments, which do not involve deprivation of liberty, are probation, public censure and deprivation of the right to exercise certain activities. The most severe custodial measure under the JDA involves accommodation in specialised institutions, which are classed as boarding schools in terms of organisation and function. Therefore, these facilities are governed and financed by the Ministry of Education and Science (MES).

Juvenile Justice structure in Bulgaria

Socio-Pedagogical Boarding School (**SPBS**) is an institution for corrective or preventive placement of children over the age of eight. The grounds for placement are either delinquent behaviour or living in an environment conducive to delinquency by the child.

Correctional Boarding School (**CBS**) accommodates children over the age of eight who have committed anti-social acts, and adolescent offenders for whom non-custodial disciplinary measures have proven insufficient and inadequate. Placement in CBS is a measure available to the court or prosecutor to divert the child from the formal criminal justice process.

According to the JDA, children placed in SPBS and CBS shall be provided conditions to complete their basic and/or secondary education. Therefore, the decision which particular institution will best correspond to the profile and needs of the child is mandated to the Ministry of Education and Science.

CRAC interventions were carried out in three CBS:
• CBS in Zavet,
• CBS in Podem,
• CBS in RAkitovo

2 METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

The methodology of intervention used by different juvenile justice services throughout the whole project is reported here.
It includes the general approach used, main feedback, principles and techniques linked to the different instruments applied in work with the juvenile justice services.

2.1 GENERAL APPROACH

This study adopted a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches (see paragraph 2.3 techniques) according to the specific project goals.
The research design consisted in a descriptive and exploratory model which involved a general and pervasive flexibility of research. It had three main steps: a) a desk review of existing theory (from several different viewpoints for each country); b) field research; c) formulation of a conclusion (recommendations).

The main aim of this combined approach is to obtain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon: starting from a preliminary quantitative approach and following with qualitative aspects, using as many viewpoints as possible. In our specific context we decided to start from a scientific preliminary understanding (bullying in an interdisciplinary scientific approach) and achieve a deeper knowledge through the specific socio-cultural conditions in each partner-country project (viewpoints). This combined a general and shared preliminary understanding with specific field researches.

A survey was carried out to assess the perception of bullying in juvenile justice services, including staff (e.g.: educators, social workers, police officers, psychologists etc.) and children/young people in detention.
A second approach included focus groups to carry out a self-assessment process with the juvenile justice services and to develop a comprehensive policy and a set of procedures to prevent and combat bullying.
This method was used to encourage debate and the exchange of information among small groups of participants.

During each *focus group*, the facilitators used a topic guide to ensure that the key subject areas were covered. The topic guide was designed to reflect the needs of the study, remaining sensitive to the requirements of participants as well as the confidentiality and contractual obligations of service providers. An expert in Child Self-guarding Protection reviewed the entire research protocol, including the content of the topic guide.
The topic guide was designed to be a flexible instrument and amendments were made in the light of the researcher's experience with each focus group and the feedback from participants, which was actively sought at the end of each session.

Thanks to the different approaches, a vast set of quantitative and qualitative data related to bullying were collected. With the first phase of the survey, fundamental information on a sample of population in detention centres was achieved, especially in terms of bullying perpetrated and endured, bully/victim roles, detention environment perceptions and coping strategies. In particular, the survey results provided the team with a set of basic knowledge to help approach young people in detention and, therefore, to efficiently implement the activities within the juvenile justice services.

2.2 PARTICIPANTS AND RESEARCH RESULTS

In Italy and Portugal, a comparative analysis of young people in detention centres was carried out because the same survey tool was used in the juvenile justice services of both countries. In Bulgaria, a qualitative research technique was preferred because of the young age of the children placed in the Correctional Schools (for detailed descriptions refer to each National Country Report).

The **sample of youngsters consisted of 122 participants** from seven different Juvenile Detention Institutes located in Italy (four Institutes- three penal institutes and one Community); N=62; 50.8%) and Portugal (three Institutes; N=60; 49.2%). Young offenders' age ranged from 13 to 24 (M=18.12 years, SD = 2.55), with Italian participants (M=20.09) being significantly older than the Portuguese (M=16.12). Only nine participants (7.4%) were female and 112 (91.8%) were male (one missing).
Overall, 54 participants (44.3%) had Italian nationality, 49 (40.2%) were of Portuguese origin and 17 (13.9%) had non-Italian and non-Portuguese nationality.
In addition, 93 participants (78.8%) spoke only or mostly the native language in the family and 25 (21.2%), mainly from the Italian sample, had also a second family language.
The frequencies and percentages of last school certificate were: 44 (36.4%) had a primary school certificate, 69 (57.0%) a middle school certificate and seven (5.8%) had a high school certificate. Only one participant (0.8%) declared possession of no school certificate. As the Italian and the Portuguese educational systems are organized differently, we also calculated the average sum in years of participants' education (M=7.47; SD=2.00). In this respect, a significant difference emerged in favour of the Italian participants (M=7.85) compared to Portuguese (M=7.07).
Overall, participants served during the current sentence an average of 13.78 months in a detention centre (Min = .23; Max = 60.0, SD = 13.39).

For 70 participants (57.4%), mainly from the Portuguese sample, this is the first time they have been in a youth detention institute. As regards the others (N=52), in the Italian sample, seven participants (5.7%) stated that they had already been in a detention centre once, 31 (25.4%) two or three times, and six (4.9%), four or more times. As regards the Portuguese sample, seven individuals (5.7%) affirmed that they have been in a detention institute twice and two participants (1.6%) three or more times.

Crime and sentences (data only for Italian young detainees).
Participants were in detention institutes especially for crimes against people (16; 28.6%), crimes against property (six; 10.7%) and violent crimes against property (32; 57.1%).

Suffered and active bullying.
The number of young detainees classified as "severe" (i.e. involvement in episodes of bullying more than twice a week in the last two months) were particularly involved on Indirect, Verbal and Physical *active and endured* bullying. However, some qualitative differences were found among **endured** behaviours. We used an adapted form of the Direct and Indirect Inmate Behaviour Checklist-Scaled version (DIPC-SCALED-r; Ireland, 2007) to measure direct (43 items) and indirect (42 items) forms of bullying.
In detail, the highest mean scores were found in the endurance of "indirect" bullying (M=0.36, SD=0.55, mean range 0-2.58) and "verbal" bullying (M=0.24, SD=0.39, mean range 0-2.00. As regards **active bullying,** "indirect" (M=0.33, SD=0.49, mean range 0-2.91), "psychological" (M=0.31, SD=0.57, mean range 0-2.50) and "verbal" bullying (M=0.29, SD=0.45, mean range 0-2.37) had higher values in comparison to other behaviours.

As regards the frequency of bullying, 50.8% of participants obtained a value ≥3 in the victimisation subscales sum, and 54.9% of participants obtained a score ≥3 in the bullying subscales sum. The number of participants classified

N: number, M: mean, SD: standard deviation

as "severe" for victimisation and bullying experiences were particularly high in Indirect, Verbal and Physical endured and active bullying.

Overall, our data are congruent with literature, which indicates that indirect forms of bullying and victimisation occur more often than direct forms of bullying, which are nevertheless not so rare in correctional settings (Ireland, 2005; Ireland & Power, 2004; Kury & Smartt, 2002; Maitland & Sluder, 1998; South & Wood, 2006).

As far as the staff sample is concerned, 62.5% of participants declared awareness of regular (more than twice a week in the last two months) forms of bullying (especially Indirect and Verbal). These data confirmed that bullying in detention settings is present, and is an issue of concern for safety.

Victim and bully roles[4].
The data collected reported a situation where only 24.6% of young detainees were not involved in bullying while the 46.7% of them was classified as bullies/victims. These data are worrisome considering the possible implications for mental health of inmates who are involved in bullying, especially for those who are involved in the double role of bully/victim. Both pure victims and bully/victims, in fact, tend to report more psychological symptoms (e.g., somatic concerns, depression, anxiety and insomnia) than pure bullies and those not involved (Ireland, 2005).

Time spent in prison and bullying / victimization.
The time spent in prison (in terms of months served for the current sentence) was associated with the general frequency of victimization and bullying. Data on bully / victim roles were congruent with this finding: participants who have never had detention experiences before were under-represented in the pure bully group, while those who had been detained once or more before the current sentence were over-represented in the pure bully group. Furthermore, young detainees undergoing their first prison experience and those more frequently bullied were more afraid of being bullied. Parallel to this, staff members pointed out that prisoners with less experience in prison correspond to the category most at risk of victimization, and prisoners with higher incarceration experience to those more at risk of bullying others. These data showed that bullying, both perpetrated and endured, increases with the time spent in prison, and individuals with more detention experience are those who tend to bully others more.

Prison environment.
On the assessment of prison environment, both young detainees and staff participants obtained the highest values for "Rules, Regulations and Security" (which generally refers to the importance of prison rules) and "Supervision and Rules" (which comprises items reflecting a social dimension ranging from, for example, prisoners talking to staff on a regular basis to the availability of social contact and meaningful activities). These results are important because, as Allison and Ireland (2010) point out, "… the environmental factor rules, regulations and security were predictive of bullying perpetration" (p. 49). Again, for both young detainees and staff participants, the lowest value reached in the assessment of prison environment referred to "Prisoners' Supportive Attitudes to Aggression" (which refers to the existence of an informal regulatory system among prisoners, with unwritten rules and behavioral standards, which are generally supportive of bullying and aggression).

This finding is encouraging if we consider that a subculture which legitimizes violence may promote the likelihood of aggression (Ireland, 2002) and may link with feelings of fear of bullying.

Prison environment and bullying.
As far as the staff sample is concerned, positive associations were found between a prison environment characterized by power and dominance (with the existence of a pecking order between prisoners defining who becomes exploited, with those at the top demanding and receiving material goods from those below) and Indirect, Verbal and Psychological bullying and Theft. Negative associations, on the other hand, were found between a prison environment characterized by rules, security and supervision, and bullying. These data confirm the importance of combatting bullying with a prison environment (and culture) that is able to combine an explicit condemnation of bullying and a strong structure of rules and supervision.

Coping strategies and bullying / victimization.
To counter bullying, the coping strategies valued as more useful by young detainees were Seeking Help and Reasoning, but also Aggression. Our data also reveals that coping strategies change according to the victim / bully roles of the young detainees. More in particular:
(a) on Aggression, Pure victims obtained significantly lower scores than Pure bullies and bullies/victims;
(b) on Avoidance, Bullies/victims obtained significantly higher scores than the other roles;
(c) on the strategy "Show themselves stronger", Bullies/victims obtained significantly higher scores than Pure victims and bullies;
(d) on Seeking Help, Pure bullies obtained significantly lower scores than bullies/victims.
Furthermore, participants in detention settings for the first time declared that they found seeking help to be more useful than experienced inmates, while the latter declared more frequent use of avoidant coping strategies. In addition, participants who were more afraid of being bullied considered Avoidant coping strategies as more useful.

In Bulgaria, focus groups were carried out with children placed in CBS. Generally, six focus groups were carried out with 12 to 20 children, for a total of **88**. Two groups consisted of boys only and one of just girls. Almost 88% of the respondents had committed a criminal offence and had had previous experience with law enforcement officers[5]. Some of the children are in these facilities because they have run away from their homes due to domestic violence and abuse.
The majority of children in a CBS came from another childcare institution or community centre. A high number of children are placed in a CBS because of inadequate parental care and poor socio-economic conditions. This indicates that the main reason for child placement in these facilities is to protect them from a harmful environment. Yet children experience and perceive this as a punishment. In addition, there is evidence that, in Bulgaria, there are no alternative services available for children with deviant and delinquent behaviour. The juvenile justice system is not comprehensively developed yet and this causes the gaps in support services for children.

2.3 TOOLS

By using the above-mentioned approach, the following tools and instruments related to the specific project phase were developed and shared with the juvenile justice services:

WS 1 - State-of-the-art.
In order to perform the survey to assess the perception of bullying in juvenile justice services, **two types of questionnaires**, one for adults and one for children, were developed by the University of Bologna in collaboration with project partners. The questionnaires were presented in hardcopy.

WS 3 – Implementation of a self-assessment process in structures (the anti-bullying package).
Two focus groups, one consisting of staff and the other of young people, were created within each of the structures involved in the project. These groups worked with the following tools:

• **Self-assessment tool,** consisting in eight points of discussion dealing with specific aspects of bullying. It drove participants to produce a policy and action plans;

• **Anti-bullying Policy,** written jointly by children and staff in order to contrast bullying in prison. The policy includes: (1) the group's consideration of bullying; 2) rules and instruments to prevent forms of bullying; 3) rules and instruments to tackle the phenomenon when cases of bullying occur.

• **Action Plan,** suggesting measures, strategies and actions for improvement.

WS 4 – Implementation and follow-up of the anti-bullying action plan.
As defined in the anti-bullying action plan, specially created **training seminars and workshops** were created for adults and children. In Italy, training seminars for children and young adults focused on (a) cyber-bullying and new media, (b) mapping internal areas of the detention structure, analysis of an internal set of rules, while seminars for staff focused on (a) cyber-bullying and new media and (b) working methods and tools (e.g., drafting personalized plans for young people in detention centres)

3 CONCLUSION

In the context outlined above, the CRAC project tested a methodology and practical tools that can be adapted in other EU countries in order to combat bullying against children by developing and implementing anti-bullying policies and practices.
Based on the project experience, partners recommend considering the following challenges, principles and procedures.

3.1 CHALLENGES

During the project implementation, several critical issues appeared worthy of mention. These elements represent a good basis for possible interventions in the future to set child friendly standards for juvenile justice service providers. Because these issues are crosscutting or are related to different fields, they can be subdivided into three main macro-groups:
(a) socio-cultural issues;
(b) systemic or structural issues;
(c) project related issues (alerts).

(A) Socio-Cultural Issues

Underestimation of episodes of bullying
Children / young adults in detention centres see violence as part of the system/environment they live in. They do not, or hardly ever, want to recognize bullying and tend to minimize it as a "joke".

Bias against those who report bullying
The person who reports an episode of violence is seen as a spy by peers and risks being re-victimized, with forms of retaliation, or isolated by the whole group. This makes it very hard to report to staff and creates several concerns for staff members with regard to how to react to bullying in order to avoid exposing the victim.

" *"You mustn't talk behind anyone's back and grass to the staff"; "If you have a problem, you sort it out yourself"; "Being a responsible person means that you solve your problems without grassing".*

Code of silence
Children / young adults apply a culture of silence which is deeply rooted in the social background that they come from (mafia culture). In this case, change is hard to achieve because violence is connected with a deeper social problem.

Marginalization of the victim
The child, unable to defend himself/herself, is considered by peers as a weak person who deserves to be victimized: "a retard".

(B) Systemic or Structural Issues

Children and young adults cohabiting in the same structure
Young adults (In Italy, max. age of 25) and minors live in the same detention centres. This coexistence determines the need to better understand differences in the state of psychological and physical growth of these two groups.

Isolation of the female section
The female section is prevented to attend the centre's activities available to the rest of the group, as the use of shared spaces increases promiscuity and violence. This creates a condition of discrimination of girls as a minority group within the centre.

Children / young adults with different vulnerabilities allocated to inadequate centres
Because of a lack of available places in dedicated institutes, sometimes children with serious or multiple vulnerabilities (e.g. mental disturbances or

drug abuse) are allocated to residential communities that do not have adequate skills or staff. Furthermore, the presence of these persons destabilizes the fragile social context of the residential community.

(C) Project Related Issues /Alerts

Changes in the population in detention during the different stages of the project or even in the same stage (e.g., children are moved from one place to another or leave the centres).

Lack of participatory process: during the self-assessment process, the staff selected children and young adults and peer-to-peer interventions were not realized.

Marked heterogeneity among the different detention centres, when considering the organization (e.g. Correctional boarding schools are targeted in Bulgaria, while penal institutions with stricter regulations are included in Italy).

Tension in the structures
Specific issues of tension in the structures (that might be reported in other contexts, using other formulas) were reported in Bulgaria. The ongoing reform in the Bulgarian Juvenile Justice System has caused considerable tension in Correctional Boarding School (CBSs) administrations and staff members. The uncertain future of the schools leads to low motivation and decreases the working capacity of the staff members. The implementation of the project activities related not only to the project itself but also to development of motivational and empowerment strategies for the staff of the CBSs.

3.2 PRINCIPLES

Thanks to the approach used, the juvenile justice services identified a set of **fundamental principles** that juvenile justice services are encouraged to use:

Child Safeguarding Policy
Save the Children (STC) and its partners are committed to conducting its programmes and operations in a manner that is safe for the children they serve and helping protect the children with whom they are in contact. For this reason, STC and the project's partners, deployed a **child-safeguarding risk assessment analysis** (based on the *child safeguarding policy*).

Child Participation
The participation of boys/girls was encouraged in all the different stages of the project in order to guarantee a shift in their perspective toward a more constructive way of relating to others and themselves. With this aim, a participatory process was promoted in work with the structures.

Child Friendly Approach
The attention and participation of children was encouraged and supported using clear and simple language, asking questions in an understandable way. In this sense, each project's tools/instruments were adapted as closely as possible to the group of beneficiaries.

Participatory Process
The youngsters who participated in the project were selected, when possible, through a participatory process. When they were identified by a structure's staff (besides the fact that participation has to be voluntary), this was done according to set criteria. This lowers the risk of suffering negative consequences for their involvement and, at the same time, gives credibility/validity to the outcomes of their work (see the **Child Safeguarding Policy Form**).

Equal Opportunity
An equal opportunity perspective was taken into consideration when approaching different groups of participants, including the gender perspective, due to the presence of a female section in one detention structure (Naples).

Sharing and Clarity of Goals and Methods
All participants, both children and staff, were informed of every single goal and step within the general framework of the project, with explanations of the tools expected to be used and the end products. The methodology was agreed with each structure according to its context and specific needs. The support of project staff members was always guaranteed, both through direct intervention as facilitators or as external formative support. In some cases, beneficiary structures preferred to underpin a more autonomous process with the external support of project staff members (see **the guidelines of the self-assessment tool and child safeguarding format**)

Sharing and Clarity of Working Rules
All participants, both children and staff, were informed about the working rules in each project stage. In the self-assessment phase, all participants were made aware of the rules that govern the working group (see the **Child Safeguarding Policy Form**). This meant, for instance, that secrecy was mandatory in the working group, i.e., what was revealed and discussed within the group remained within the group and was not shared with anyone outside. However, the facilitator had to clarify that, according to his/her function/role in the structure, he/she was obliged to report any fact that he/she became aware of that could be related to a crime committed within the structure.

Free and Voluntary Participation
Both children and staff were asked to participate voluntarily in the project activities and to freely present their point of view (see **Informed Consent in the questionnaire phase**).

Confidentiality
In all activities with children and young people, as well as with staff, it was crucial to ensure that the participants understood that the information they shared would be confidential.

Mutual Trust
An atmosphere of mutual trust was encouraged in each project stage in order to guarantee an open and free debate among participants and the high quality of outcomes.

3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

A general approach based on the following key criteria was encouraged:

to take into account context-specific characteristics in order to investigate for a context-specific definition of bullying and to adapt tools and instruments according to specific needs. The Juvenile Justice context displays particular paths. Considering the definition of bullying, this is aimed at developing a deeper knowledge on how such a phenomenon is perceived and known in the different juvenile justice services. According to the participants in focus group discussions, bullying develops within relational and social contexts: episodes of bullying often originate from the differences existing among the young people in detention. These differences make some people, or a group of people, stronger than others and cause a condition of inequality. For instance, in Italy it takes the form of higher economic and social status linked to affiliation to a criminal group. Bullying in correctional and detention settings is fed by a misrepresented culture of "respect" according which a person who is unable to defend himself/herself deserves to be victimized;

to standardize tools and procedures establishing a common system to tackle bullying. First, in all countries, the project intends to adapt tools and instruments to the emerging needs in the Juvenile Justice context. Secondly, by addressing the specific need to combat bullying against children, the project revealed the importance of developing and implementing anti-bullying policies and practices to tackle the problem. In this way, the project reacted to the need to make up for a lack of knowledge and instruments to deal with bullying within these structures.

to encourage a participatory process of children and young adults in juvenile justice services and in social communities where structures are located. Participation of young people in detention is fundamental in order to encourage them to achieve and build a personal project for life. Youngsters in detention become active parties in the rehabilitative path, taking part in its definition together with the juvenile justice service. This encourages a non-punitive approach aimed at pushing children to be responsible for themselves, for their actions and life goals.

to focus on the specific needs of teens and young adults going through a particular stage of personal growth and, therefore, acknowledge the need for targeted treatments that take into account any psychological vulnerabilities. Particularly, a positive rehabilitative project to be underpinned within a juvenile justice context includes the following principles:
a) a people-oriented approach, where each individual has specific attitudes and life goals to be recognized,
b) a need-oriented approach, where individuals show different needs to be taken into account,
c) a relationship of trust among staff and youngsters based on the idea of mutual respect,
d) participation by boys and girls, as their peculiar attitudes and skills should be enhanced during the rehabilitative path.

to guarantee and promote the wellbeing of the staff, who often require psychological support and tools to deal with a huge range of cases of violence and bullying. The project emphasized the need for a *multidisciplinary approach* including different professional figures (educators,

guards, psychologist, etc.) and stakeholders, and for professional training to be encouraged. In Italy, the approach also includes relations with both internal operators and external professionals supporting the work of juvenile justice services; in Bulgaria, the need relates to promoting an education process involving the family and parents of children and young adults in detention center.

to encourage the establishment of "spaces", considered both in terms of physical spaces and relational spaces, promoting a relationship of mutual trust among the staff and young people in detention. Preventive actions against bullying emerged as a specific tool to target the more vulnerable young people (i.e. youngsters in custody who are experiencing detention for the first time, those who are at risk from stigma inside a specific prison culture).

to perform an individualized and customized approach, addressing the children's projects for life and encouraging their active participation in the rehabilitative process. According to this approach, multidisciplinary teamwork including all the different professional figures should be carried out within the juvenile justice services. This teamwork should share knowledge about the story of each boy/girl in detention, his/her educational path and life goals.

to install an action plan focused on bullying and targeting the needs of each detention centre. The proposed plan includes:
a) roles and responsibilities of the juvenile justice service staff and children,
b) principles and procedures to prevent, detect and manage bullying,
c) monitoring and policy infringement procedures. In Italy, a specific process relates to policy integration within the existing regulations of each penal institution; in Portugal, a single policy format and application methodology were considered.

1 SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL
WORK TEMPLATE

2 ANTI-BULLYING POLICY OF
WORK TEMPLATE

A Bullying constitutes a widespread problem in our society and can also involve juvenile prisons and community centres.

B Our institute is equipped with clear rules aimed at tackling violent forms of behavior.

C Our institute's rules have been shared by all and we are all in agreement with these rules.

D Within our institute diversity is accepted and appreciated.

E Our institute is open to new ideas aimed at hindering violent forms of behavior.

F Our institute offsets violent forms of behavior (and/or bullying) by making people aware of the problem known and improving persons' self-esteem.

G In our institute there is transparency and collaboration between the adults, young people and their parents.

H The youth at the institute feel that they are being listened to and feel they can trust the adults.

A Bullying constitutes a widespread problem in our society and can also involve juvenile prisons and community centres.

- How can we define bullying?
- What is bullying?
- What does not represent bullying?
- Does bullying take place inside our institute (community)? elements

ACTION FUNDAMENTALS

We are good at:

We need to improve on:

We agree that we should carry out the following actions:

a.

b.

c.

d.

B Our institute (our community centre) is equipped with clear rules aimed at tackling violent forms of behavior.

- Do we have a list of behaviours that can be defined as violent at our institute (community centre)?
- Do we have a shared set of rules to tackle violent behaviours with?
- What have been the steps leading to the development of these rules?

ACTION FUNDAMENTALS

We are good at:

We need to improve on:

We agree that we should carry out the following actions:

a.

b.

c.

d.

C Our institute's (community centre's) rules have been shared by all and we're all in agreement with these rules.

- Have the internal rules of the institute (community centre) been shared with all concerned (adults, young people and their parents)?
- Are there specific times in which these rules are to be updated?
- Do we feel that we play an important role in tackling violent behaviours?

ACTION FUNDAMENTALS

We are good at:

We need to improve on:

We agree that we should carry out the following actions:

a.

b.

c.

d.

D Within our institute (within our community centre) diversity is accepted and appreciated.

- Are there differences between the boys and girls in our institute (community centre)? What types of differences?
- Is the fact that there are differences between us a positive or a negative one?
- Is respect shown between adults and young people and between young people themselves in the institute (community centre)?

ACTION FUNDAMENTALS

We are good at:

We need to improve on:

We agree that we should carry out the following actions:

a.

b.

c.

d.

E Our institute (our community centre) is open to new ideas aimed at hindering violent forms of behaviour.

- Are we open to new ideas aimed at tackling violent behaviours?
- Have there been occasions when groups of adults and young people have talked about violent behaviours and how they have been managed?
- Are there regularly set moments for relection in which certain behaviours that arise in our institute (in our community centre) are discussed?

ACTION FUNDAMENTALS

We are good at:

We need to improve on:

We agree that we should carry out the following actions:

a.

b.

c.

d.

F The youth at our institute (community centre) feel that they are being listened to and feel they can trust the adults at the institute (community centre).

- Is there a way to point out incidences of violent behaviour?
- Can someone who points out violent behaviours be sure that the gesture will led to positive results?

ACTION FUNDAMENTALS

We are good at:

We need to improve on:

We agree that we should carry out the following actions:

a.

b.

c.

d.

G Our institute (our community centre) offsets violent forms of behaviour (and/or bullying) improving persons' self-esteem.

- Do we have group activities that work on increasing young people's capabilities?
- Are there activities we could carry out to improve young people's self-esteem?

ACTION FUNDAMENTALS

We are good at:

We need to improve on:

We agree that we should carry out the following actions:

a.

b.

c.

d.

H In our institute (our community centre) there is transparency and collaboration between the adults, young people and their parents.

- Is there a person to refer to in our institute (in our community centre) to talk about violent behaviours?
- Are there occasions devoted to the understanding and sharing among all (adults and minors) that they have a resposibility to help tackle violent behaviours?
- What should be done to improve the system?

ACTION FUNDAMENTALS

We are good at:

We need to improve on:

We agree that we should carry out the following actions:

a.

b.

c.

d.

ANTI-BULLYING POLICY OF (INSERT NAME OF THE DETENTION STRUCTURE)[6] – WORK TEMPLATE

Introduction

- Aim of the Policy.
- Role and Responsibility (*what is expected from each actor in the detention structure?*).
- Sharing the Policy within the structure *(how, where and in what contexts the policy became known).*
- Management of the Policy's infringements *(what happens when an adult, or a minor, breaks the policy's rules).*
- Monitoring and updating of the Policy implementation (*who verifies the policy enforcement within the structure, and how such a procedure is done; when and how the policy is modified in order to improve it).*
- Policy integration with the existing Rules (*the policy is included into some other structure's regulations).*

Prevention, detection and management of the cases

Prevention
- What are the risks
- Actions to put in place in order to avoid possible dangerous circumstances to become bullying cases

Collection of data
- What to report
- How to report: where to go and who to contact in bullying cases / what tools to report them
- How to manage bullying cases' reporting *(what happens when dangerous circumstances emerged and what actions are put in place to face with)*

Management of the cases
- List of actions that should be implemented according to specific cases (*what actions are put in place and who is responsible in solving the cases when they are reported)*

Annexes (to be produced within the structure) - Optional

1 Operating Procedures for managing Policy infringements.
2 Operating procedures for detection, monitoring and management of case reporting.
3 Operating Procedures for handling bullying cases.

Note

[1] Ministero Della Giustizia Dipartimento per la Giustizia Minorile, Ufficio IV Del Capo Del Dipartimento Studi, Ricerche e Attività Internazionali. Ufficio II DG PRAM - Promozione di interventi di prevenzione della devianza; rapporti, consulenze e convenzioni con gli enti locali; Promozione della giustizia riparativa e della mediazione, in coordinamento, per gli adulti, con l'Ufficio I dell'Uepe.

[2] This document was produced based on the Annual Report of DGRSP (2015)

[3] Centro Educativo Da Bela Vista, Lisbon distric; Centro Educativo Navarro Paiva, Lisbon district; Centro Educativo Padre Antonio Oliveira, Lisbon district; Centro EducativoDo Mondego, Guarda district (Center); Centro Educativo Olivais, Coimbra district (Center); Centro Educativo Santo Antonio, Porto district (North)

[4] For the classification of the young detainees in victim and bully roles, we considered the following criteria: (a) Pure victims: those subjects reporting ≥ 2 incidents of being bullied and ≤1 incident of bullying another youth; (c) Pure bullies: reporting ≤1 incident of being bullied and ≥ 2 incidents of bullying another youth; (e) Bully/Victims: reporting ≥2 incidents of being bullied and ≥2 incidents of bullying another youth; (f) Not involved: reporting ≤1 experience of either being bullied or bullying another youth

[5] Annual report of Bulgarian Ombudsman on the National Prevention Mechanism, published 2015, available at: www.ombudsman.bg/reports/3458

[6] What is a Policy: it is a shared document explaining a set of rules of conduct, procedures and actions on a defined topic.
What is an anti-bullying policy: it is a policy drafted by the structure's staff and children about the bullying phenomena.

The Policy should include:
1) The idea / concept of bullying within the work-group;
2) The rules and ways to prevent bullying cases or even dangerous contexts ending in bullying;
3) The behaviors and ways to address those problems linked to the phenomenon.

The goal of such a process (often characterised by several meetings) is that the structure adopts an internal policy to be used in a preventive perspective and when a bullying episode occurs.

Notes

The 'CRAC' project sought to improve the ability of juvenile justice services to prevent, intercept and deal with cases of bullying in three national contexts.

These General Guidelines process the overall project experience to produce a set of recommendations useful for detention and residential care settings to implement their anti-bullying policies and practices.

Save the Children believes every child deserves a future.
In Italy and around the world, we work every day to give children a healthy start in life, the opportunity to learn and protection from harm.
When crisis strikes, and children are most vulnerable, we are always among the first to respond and the last to leave.
We ensure children's unique needs are met and their voices are heard.
We deliver lasting results for millions of children, including those hardest to reach.
We do whatever it takes for children – every day and in times of crisis – transforming their lives and the future we share.

Save the Children