

## Activity of Preventive Subdivisions of Public Police in Implementation of Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency

Kęstutis Vitkauskas

*Mykolas Romeris University,  
Ateities str. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius*

**crossref** <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.ppaa.12.1.4010>

**Abstract.** *The article is striving for evaluation of activity of Public police officer in implementation of prevention of juvenile delinquency. With reference to analysis of legislation, activity of Kaunas county Public police and results of sociological research, there are examined legislation regulating activity of juvenile police officers and the means of common and individual prevention implemented by officers, revealed attitude of officers towards efficiency of preventive work.*

*The conclusion was made in the article that while implementing common prevention of juvenile delinquency the police officially is striving to develop this activity and implement the means assigned to it. However efficiency of this activity is decreased by few factors: immoderate workload, lacking time for qualitative work, lack of personnel and financing, insufficient cooperation with social partners, weak local community, imperfection of qualification refreshing system, inadequacy of wage and workloads, decrease of officers' work motivation.*

**Keywords:** *crime prevention, juvenile delinquency prevention, means of prevention*

**Raktažodžiai:** *nusikaltimų prevencija; nepilnamečių nusikalstamumo prevencija;*

### Introduction

Crime prevention is understood as purposeful activity of state institutions, different public movements or other public organizations as well as single citizens in striving to eliminate reasons and conditions for crime or at least to clamp down their influence. Prevention of juvenile delinquency is essential part of crime prevention in society. By involving them into legal, socially useful activity and implementing humanistic attitude towards society and life, young people can acquire non criminal attitude towards social environment [4, p.2].

Crime prevention, in accordance to what goals are striving for, can be divided into different strains. Therefore it can be described with reference to different criteria – strategic goal, place, object and so on. In accordance to the direction, prevention could

be divided to common and individual. Common prevention is the means using which there is striving to identify and eliminate common reasons and conditions of criminal activity [13, p. 23]. Individual prevention is the means of influence using which it is possible to influence the persons minded to crime of possible crime victims. There is a close (direct and feedback) relationship between the means of common and individual prevention. The means of common influence are creating a foundation based on which it is possible to stop particular crime, and the means of individual influence increase the efficiency of the means of common influence.

It is agreed universally that prevention of juvenile delinquency is relevant in Lithuania today. This preventive activity is being performed and supported by different institutions, such as: 1) law institutions, courts, penal institutions; 2) institutions of education; 3) institutions of social care, employment, protection of children rights; 4) public organizations and other subjects.

Police is supplier of social services to society, and its mission is protection of society together with other state and non state institutions from negative criminal impact. Qualitative preventive activity performed by police can strongly influence behavior of under - ages. Alongside, the facts that juvenile are performing about one fifth of all crimes and youth aged 14 to 29 years makes about 60 % all delinquent persons as well as decreasing financing of police work, lack of officers and increase of dissatisfaction of officers in working conditions stimulate more careful evaluation of activity efficiency of police, the main institution performing juvenile delinquency prevention, the police.

*Goal of the study* – to evaluate activity of police officers in implementing prevention of juvenile delinquency and to determine factors decreasing efficiency of this activity. To that end, with reference to analysis of activity of preventive subdivisions of Kaunas county public police, there are examined legislation regulating activity of officers, preventive means implemented by police and factors influencing quality of officers preventive work revealed.

The method of analysis of scientific literature and regulation documentation was applied in the article. For evaluation of efficiency of police work, the article refers to the results of interview of juvenile police officers working in the Kaunas county territorial institutions. Total were questioned 78% of all Kaunas county juvenile police.

Aspects of juvenile delinquency prevention were studied by: A. Čepas, A. Drakšienė, R. Drakšas, G. Babachinaitė, A. Dapšys, A. Jatkevičius, V. Paviolis [2; 3; 1; 13]. Revealing different aspects of juvenile delinquency and describing delinquency as phenomenon differently, different authors agree that delinquency is a negative phenomenon inflicting huge damage for society, and the earlier it is impeded the less level of criminal will be in the future. Activity of police officers in the area of prevention of juvenile delinquency was not studied more widely.

### Legal regulation of activity of juvenile police officers

Factors important to quality of preventive work are efficient regulation of officers' activity and quality of work organization. Work tasks and functions stated in legislation should be formulated clearly and correspond abilities of the officers to implement them qualitatively, and work of officers should be organized in accordance to requirements of law regulations.

Tasks of the institution are firmed up in *the Law of police activity* which is regulating police activity directly and one of these tasks is prevention of criminal activities and other law violations. The document describes the rights of the officers while performing prevention of crime and other law violations as well: right to visit living premises, convene persons recorded into preventive registration for conversation, enter living premises of sentenced person any time while performing adjudication, deliver drunken offenders of law or asocial persons for physical examination and other [6, Artcl. 19]. It should be noticed that the law talks only about the rights of the officers while performing individual and post criminal (successive) prevention, but the rights in common and early prevention are not described. Also, there is no particular law institute regulating police work with juvenile in the law, therefore it is regulated by the post-law legislation – *Description of juvenile police officer official activity* (further – *Activity description*), which is supposed the main document describing officer activity [11]. The functions of juvenile police officers, stated by the article 8 of *the Activity description* conditionally can be divided to the work in the area of common and individual prevention (*see Table 1*).

Evaluating of these functions in aspects of their official explicitness (this feature reveals how clear and specifically the rule of behavior is described in the rule of law) and officers' abilities to perform them qualitatively, the attention should be paid to unclear formulations of some rules. For example, the formulation of the function „to organize and perform prevention of criminal activities and administrative violations, violence against children, children prostitution, use of drugs and other psychotropic materials“ [11, Artc. 8.1] practically covers all the preventive work of officers therefore it should be more appropriate to describe a mission of officers activity but not single function. It is purposeful to describe the function mentioned by enumerating particular aspects, task or means implemented of officers' preventive activity. Employee's duty firmed up in the legislation to help “employees of institutions interested” to organize different preventive events, without listing of these institutions, does not allow identification what particular organizations the officers should help. Abstract listing of possible partners may impede planning of officers' activity, performance of planned tasks and impinge expectations of other institutions for full-rate support from police officers. Formulation of the function, attached to officers, „to render immediate social assistance to vagrant, begging of drug addicted children when required“, without description of conception of that help and boundaries of officers activity does not allow understanding what real help could be expected from the officer [11, Artcl. 8.5]. Duty of juvenile police officers to prepare files of administrative law violations for adult persons who involved juvenile into criminal

activity, use of alcohol or drugs [11, Artcl. 8.7] expands a circle of subjects attached to their supervision – the officer is obliged to work not only with children but with adults as well. This may require new work methods, skills and professional experience. It would be more purposeful to forward that function to inspectors of neighborhood, who are better acquainted with adult citizens living in their territory and having appropriate work experience. It is supposed that functions of officers would be more clear having indicating the main preventive means implemented by officers, the number of implemented continuing programs and so on in *the Activity description*.

**Table 1. Functions of juvenile police officer**

<b>Activity direction</b>	<b>Functions</b>
<b>Common prevention</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Performs prevention of children criminal activity and administrative violation, violence against children, children prostitution, use of drugs and other psychotropic materials;</li> <li>2) Performs preventive work at schools: performs legal education, participates meetings with pedagogues, pupils and their parents; helps organizing activity of young police supporters, cooperates closely with school administration, social pedagogue, institutions of school self-governance in solving the questions of prevention of law violations, valance, other negative phenomena at school;</li> <li>3) Cooperates with other subdivisions of police institution, institutions of protection of children rights, municipal, educational, medical, other interested institutions, non-governmental organizations, local community.</li> </ol>
<b>Individual prevention</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Performs individual work with juvenile to whom liabilities or remands determined in <i>the Law of organized crime prevention</i> are applied;</li> <li>2) Determines: a) under-ages who performed legal violations, used drugs or other psychotropic materials, vagrant, begging children, prepares files of their law violations; b) adult persons who involved children to criminal activity, alcoholism, use of drugs, prostitution; c) informal youth groups, their constitution, activity character;</li> <li>3) Helps correctional institutions to control performance of liabilities and (or) prohibitions imposed on juvenile by court;</li> <li>4) Informs institution of children rights protection about identified violations of child's rights;</li> <li>5) Prepares files of administrative law violation for child's representatives or foster-parents who are not performing fostering duties;</li> <li>6) Accepts and examines reports and complaints of citizens regarding the law violations performed by children, violations of child rights</li> <li>7) Prepares a material and performs administrative procedures in accordance with requirements of <i>the Law of child's minimal and middle care</i>.</li> <li>8) Renders immediate social assistance to children if required.</li> </ol>

Source: created by the author in accordance to Activity description [11].

Work of police officers in the area of juvenile delinquency prevention is being affected by other legislation as well, implementation of rules of which is delegated to police. After acceptance of *the Law on child's minimal and medium care* [7] in 2007 that was supposed to help creation of system of preventive means directed towards child's education, but not infliction, *Activity description* was supplemented by new function – to prepare a material and perform administrative procedures regarding asserting of means of minimal or medium care to child [11, Artcl. 8. 10]. However it is needed to admit that minimal care implementation requires infrastructure that is not created yet (because of lack of specialists in many municipalities children are nor given the mean of behavior correction; refresher course of parents contact with children are being organized, at best, only in the big cities); the institute of persons performing child's minimal care means is not created (the law only determines rights and duties and so no of such persons), therefore many tasks related to this care are assigned usually to social pedagogues of schools and police officers workload of which is increasing due to this). *The Law on protection against violation in close environment* [8] implementation of which started in 2011 also increased workloads of police officers and escalated problems of work organization: expansion of officers' functions was not supported by increase of financing and human resources, therefore leaders of police stations were forced to relocate available funds and workloads. Analyzing proportion of workload and work quality there was a question during social questioning if expansion of work volume disturbs productive work? 71,4 % of officers recognized that huge workloads negatively affect quality of preventive work (this was agreed in full by 28 %, partially by 43 % of respondents, 23 % of officers disagreed the workload affects quality of their work).

Quality of legal regulation is partially revealed by legal relationship that shows efficiency of functioning of the rule of law. In other words, optimality of rules of law can be evaluated according to the possibilities of their realization. In this aspect application of some rules of *Activity description* in practice raises some doubts. For example, qualitative implementation of the requirement to perform semiannual analysis of tendencies and reasons of state of criminal activity, violations against children in the supervised territory and to foresee ways of elimination of these phenomena [11, Artcl. 8.8], practically is very difficult for officer, therefore usually this rule is being performed officially by presenting only statistical data without deeper analysis of the situation. It is indicated in *Activity description*, that juvenile police officer working in accordance to personal plan has to devote the main part of the work day to common and individual prevention [11, Artcl. 8.15]. However such organization of the work is quite difficult because lot of time is required for performance of other functions as well: writing of reports, conduction of neighborhood file, preparation of files of administrative law violations and other. Evaluating time input of preventive work, police offices have no one opinion: 31,4% of officers think preventive work takes less than half their working time, 37,1% think it takes more than half and 8,6 % of interviewed indicated this work takes practically all working time. The conclusion should be made that prevention is dominating part of police officers working time. On the other hand, if that time is enough for qualitative

performance of all preventive means? This question was answered positively only by 25,7 % of officers, and 74,3 % indicated they are lacking time for qualitative performance of all functions and means described in the *Activity description*. Even 80 % of respondents recognized they have to work after working hours or during holidays (23 % of officers are doing it often, and 57 % – sometimes). The research results suppose a presumption that officers' workloads are not calculated reasonably and are too big.

Efficiency of preventive work is influenced by managers' ability to organize officers' work in accordance to the requirement of legislation. Unfortunately there are cases when this is not done. It is described in *Activity description* that newly employed officer is allowed working individually only after one month of common work together with a specialist of the area having experience of 3 years at least [11, Artcl. 4]. However, 35 % of respondents stated that this requirement was not applied to them; another 47 % indicated the support of the specialist attached to them was only declarative (on paper). Legislation indicates that territory supervised by juvenile police officers in accordance to its peculiarities (number of educational institutions, places of children bunch, pleasure centers, market-places and similar) is determined by manager of county HQ or police station, and there should be not more than 3 thousand of juvenile living in that territory [11, Artic. 6]. However, part of territories in Kaunas county are determined without keeping this requirement: 2,9 % of respondents indicated that there are up to 500 juvenile living in their territory, 20 % – from 1000 to 1500 juvenile, 57,1 % – from 1500 to 3000, and 20 % – more than 3000 juvenile. So it has to be acknowledged that work of officers in some police station is organized by violating requirements of rules of law, and that may increase the risk of work quality problems.

In summarizing, it could be stated that in determining functions of juvenile police officers the possibilities of the officers to implement the functions attached to them were not evaluated properly. Activity regulation by post-law rules, non-particularity of some functions and possibility to expand boundaries of activity by using rules of other legislation impede clear evaluation of officers' work volume, stimulate formal attitude towards performance of duties. Without particular preventive means firmed up in legislation (continuing projects or programs) and mechanism of their financing, it is difficult to create common national, clearly structured system of common prevention that ensures equal activity in all regions of the country.

### **Means used by police while implementing common and individual prevention**

Officers of Public police preventive subdivisions are performing their activity in accordance with the activity plans prepared by Board of public order (VTV) of counties' HQ. In consideration of these plans the semiannual plans of main means of structural subdivisions are being prepared. Directions of preventive work are being set in accordance with *the programs of Government activity* [10], *the plans of means of Lithuanian police system's development program's implementation* [11], *the plan of*

implementation of means of National crime prevention and control program 2010 - 2012 [12] and other programs related to crime prevention.

### Implementation of common prevention

One of the functions of police officers is together with other institutions and non-governmental organizations to prepare and implement preventive programs, objective means related to prevention of violation of children rights, drug addiction, prostitution, violence. Implementing these functions, police officers of Kaunas county HQ are preparing preventive programs part of which are financed by districts municipalities and other (without financing) are being implemented by using funds of Police department for preventive activity.

The level of police cooperation with municipalities and other institutions and financing from these institutions are significant to efficiency of implementation of preventive programs. By developing relationship with social partners, Kaunas county HQ and municipal institutions signed 21 cooperation agreements regarding financing and implementing of preventive projects (programs) and 8 agreements regarding preventive work in 2011. During the year 2011, Kaunas county police together with municipalities and their financing prepared 10 programs and projects. For example, the continuing program of Raseiniai district HQ „*Want to be secured*“ got 1800 Lt from municipality, the project of Kėdainiai district HQ „*On childhood path*“, the aim of which is to organize purposeful occupation during vacation period for risk group children, was budgeted 1500 Lt (in 2012 - 2000 Lt), the preventive program of Jonava district HQ „*Masculinity training school*“ was budgeted 300 Lt by municipality, Birštonas HQ implements the continuing program financed by municipality (2300 Lt) „*Childhood in Birštonas to everyone*“. However the concern is raised by the fact that financial support of municipalities to police preventive means has decreasing tendency: in 2012 the number of programs budgeted by municipalities decreased twice (see Table 2).

**Table 2. Number of preventive programs in Kaunas county in 2009 – 2011.**

Year	Preventive programs prepared and implemented by police initiative	Programs financed by municipalities	Unfinanced programs	Participation in implementation of preventive programs prepared by other institutions
2009	18	13	5	49
2010	20	12	8	44
2011	20	10	10	36
2012	15	5	9	34

Source: created by the author in accordance to the data of Kaunas county HQ Board of public order [6].

Decrease of suspension of financing impedes possibility of police institutions to implement properly continuing programs. For example, Kaunas district police headquarters in accordance with contract with municipality took obligations for implementation of the projects “*Secure neighbor – secure me*” and “*Photo patrol*” in 2009 - 2012, however in 2012 municipality canceled financing of these projects and police had to continue the work on own resources. In 2011 there were 8 continuing programs regarding violation against children, children socialization, against addiction and others in Kaunas city and 2 in Kaunas district without financing. In 2012 the officers of Kaunas county HQ Prevention subdivision prepared and implemented (without presentation for financing contest) 3 preventive programs: 2 programs of children socialization „*Be safe*“ and „*Be friendly*“ and one program of violation against children „*Live safely*“. Planning of preventive program is impeded by the circumstance that the purpose of finances received from municipalities is not indicated clearly: Kaunas district municipality is financing the preventive program „*Secure Kaunas district*“ (in 2012 – 100 thousand Litass) from the funds which are intended for keeping both police station and implemented preventive means. In such case preventive work gets only funds remaining after administration of the office. Preventive activity is impeded by the fact that since 2009 in Kaunas city there are no contests of Ministry of Education and science announced for financing of preventive programs [5].

Evaluating the programs organized by initiative of Kaunas county police in formal (quantitative) aspect, the presumption should be made that municipalities decreasing financing of preventive means decreases total amount of programs implemented and weakens cooperation with social partners especially while participating the projects of other institutions. This raises concern, because a success of preventive work consist in common activity of all institutions, that is more efficient than single means implemented by single organizations [4, p. 1]. Changes of intensity of police cooperation with social partners partially are shown by decrease of the number of informational – methodical publications on juvenile delinquency prepared by police for other institutions. For example, in 2009 there were 168 publications prepared, in 2010 – 135, and 2011 – 128 publications [14, p. 327].

As one of the common prevention means intended for control of places of increased risk or juvenile bunch, adits of education institutions, police uses the organization of raidspurpose of these raids is rather control allowing prevent law violations or protect under-ages from possible violence or constraints. While performing control of smoking prohibition in the places where this is prohibited by the *Law of tobacco control*, in 2012 there were 778 preventive inspections organized in Kaunas county (in 2011 - 1018), during which the officers wrote 226 protocols according to the article 185 of LR ATPK to juvenile (in 2010 - 285). While implementing the plan “*Regarding the means warranting children safety and public order in summer time*“, in June – August 2011 officers organized purposive raids, meetings with administration of children stationary resting camps. In 2001 total amount of raids organized in Kaunas county was 1013 (in 2010 – 893, in 2009 – 615), which shows increase in intensivity of work in this area. On the other hand, the



circumstance that in 2011 there were organized 64,0 % of raids in Kaunas city (in 2009 – 83,0 %) of total raids in the county implies that in other districts this mean is not applied properly yet [14, p. 325].

One of the tasks of preventive activity of public police is to organize and coordinate the activity of police supporters. Youth involvement to prevention of juvenile delinquency is assumed to be an efficiency index of work with under-ages as well. After regulations of “*Young police supporters*” were approved in 1998, the circles of police supporters began to be established. In 2012, Kaunas district police headquarters prepared and started implementing of the project, financed by the “LEADER” program of EU, „*Academy of young police supporters*“, where the means predicted will be implemented till the year 2015. On the other hand, the number of young supporters in the county is decreasing: in 2010 police was helped by 298 young people, and in 2012 – only 220. Also, different number of young people is involved to police supporters in districts, for example, in 2011 Raseiniai district accepted 20 new members, Kėdainiai district – 6, Jonava district – none [14, p.328]. The presumption should be made that work of inspectors in these districts is being performed more formally and they have no trust of the youth.

### **Implementation of individual prevention.**

Individual prevention is being implemented by performing the following functions: 1) taking an interest in juvenile behavior; 2) recording of children to preventive registration; 3) writing protocols of violation of administrative law to juvenile or their parents. Individual prevention is often coordinated with common prevention: while working with children from risk group officers are involving them to all means of common prevention if possible.

According to the regulations of *Activity description* [11, Artcl. 24.1], officers are taking an interest in behavior of children returned from detention facilities, socialization centers, sentenced to arrest or public works and other risk groups. It is necessary the officers to be acquainted with these children personally, making visits to their houses in term appointed, to control their activity. In 2012 there were 365 children in Kaunas county behavior of which was taken in interested by police (495 children in 2011, 485 children in 2010).

Only those under-age who have appointed particular court liabilities or interdicts (stayed judgment, suspended sentence, arrested to the room or the means of education applied in accordance to the article 82 of the Penal Code) are being recorded into preventive police registration. Preventive work with the person recorded into registration is being planned individually in consideration of person’s behavior. In 2012 there were 85 children in the preventive registration of Kaunas county (30 children in 2011). On the other hand, knowing that in 2012 there were 1343 under-ages pulled in subdivisions of police stations for different violations of the Code of Violations of Administrative Law (ATPK), 105 vagabond children and 9 beggars, the conclusion should be made that only very small part of juvenile inclinable to crime is

recorder into preventive registrations. This shows big latency of children delinquency and bad enough efficiency of common and individual prevention.

The rules of *Civil Code* (CK 3.155) regulating inter-rights and inter-duties of children and parents determine that children are being supervised by parents till adulthood of emancipation. The articles 181 and 181<sup>(1)</sup> of ATPK provide the responsibility for neglecting parents, foster-parents (guardians). These articles also are significant for prevention of juvenile delinquency because they oblige parents (foster-parents) to take care and look after their children, educate them properly. It should be noted that the number of protocols written by Lithuanian police officers according to the articles 181 and 181<sup>(1)</sup> is increasing every year. For example, in 2008 total amount of the protocols according these articles in the country was 6183, and in 2010 – 7352 protocols, in Kaunas county in 2009 there were 1075 protocols of ATPK, in 2010 – 1494, and in 2011 – 1601 protocols [5]. Increase of the number of ATPK protocols could indicate both, increasing work activity of the officers, and weakening supervision of parents or foster-parents to children as well as growth of social pressure (unemployment, increase of the number of risky families, alcoholism, disappointment in law and other) in the country that creates assumptions for rise of juvenile delinquency.

Juvenile police officers do not name directly what kind of prevention they spare more time: in opinion of third (31,4 %) of respondents both the common and individual prevention are being spared equal time, 42,9 % of officers indicated that the work is performed in accordance to the situation, in opinion of 8,6 % of questioned persons more time is devoted to common prevention, 2,8 % – to individual. However, analyzing activity reports of Kaunas county police headquarters it was noted that the results of common prevention are more distinguishing. Quality of individual preventions depends more on personal characteristics of the officers – professional qualification, motivation, incentive and creativity. The circumstance that the third of officers are indisposed to distinguish individual prevention from the common one implies that most officers do not have those characteristics.

Summarizing activity of police officers in the area of juvenile prevention the conclusion should be made that officially police headquarters are striving for development of this activity, however the decrease of financing impedes implementation of preventive programs, decreases the number of means, weakens relationship of police with social partners.

### **Attitude of police officers towards efficiency of juvenile delinquency prevention**

Investigation of means of juvenile delinquency prevention reveals more quantitative side of police activity, i.e. types and number of implemented programs and means, which not always allow objective evaluation of qualitative side of the activity – efficiency. Quality of this work often depends not on quantity of the means but on professionalism of officers implementing these means, motivation, management of organization and other factors.

One of the factors motivating activity of officers is evaluation of workload and received reward for it. About half (45,7%) of Kaunas county juvenile police officers think their workload partially corresponds their wage, and a little more respondents (51,4%) are confident that wage is too small in comparison to the workload. The latter opinion was expressed more by officers having experience of more than 10 years [14, p.328]. It is supposed that the need of person with longer experience for higher wage is formed by increase of expenses for living (family, children, household and other) as well as growth of own value as specialist. From this point of view it is purposeful to develop a system of officers' horizontal (when wage is increased in consideration of employee's qualification and work experience) stimulation, which allows evaluating of needs of those with longer experience.

Professional qualification of officers and possibility to refresh it during time of service is important for quality of activity. More than half (54,3 %) of officers have been in different refreshment courses or seminars during the last 5 years. 34,3 % of respondents attended courses once and only 5,7 % haven't refreshed their qualification during that period. Confession of part of respondents (5,8 %) they don't remember participating such course is difficult to explain [14, p. 327]. It is supposed that could be some result of formally organized courses, expressed by indifference of employees to such training. It should be noticed that almost half of the police officers (42,9 %) were not lectured on subject *Prevention of juvenile delinquency* during professional studies, only 17,1% of respondents stated they had this course. Prevention of juvenile delinquency was not much referred to during lectures of other subjects as well. The conclusion should be made that the correction of study programs intended to police officers is required, for example, study subjects related to prevention of juvenile delinquency should be lectured as obligatory subjects, not as free chosen ones.

While evaluating relationship with social partners most of police officers (62,8%) acknowledge their usefulness, but 34,3% of respondents think these relationships are more formal. It is interesting that police officers consider scholastic institutions (evaluation of 8,8 points of 10) the best partner, and the worst ones are municipalities (3,8 points). Even 72,4% of officers state never received any real support from municipalities, and 12,8% felt such support only episodically. Relations of police with local community and public organizations are not strong as well (5,1 and 5,5 points accordingly). Weak relationship between police and local community are evidenced by the fact that 43% of officers state that while implementing prevention of juvenile delinquency they practically are not receiving any help from citizens. Community support was really felt only by 14% of Kaunas county juvenile police officers. It is difficult to evaluate these phenomena unambiguously, however it is likely that this is a consequence of decrease of personnel number and financing. Since 2009 to 2012, after decrease of assignments to police institution by 25% , less resources are budgeted to preventive programs as well. For example, in 2008 *National crime and control program* was budgeted by 6,6 million Litass, in 2009 – 1,3 million Litass, and 2010 – only 105 thousand Litass. [14, p. 324]. Budgets of *National drug control and drug addiction prevention programs, Juvenile justice programs of 2009–2013, Children and youth*

*socialization programs* were decreased similarly as well. On the other hand, the research results show that there is no formed strong local community in Lithuania, people are lacking civil activity, and police is lacking skills of communicating to community.

It is important that officers themselves are evaluating efficiency of preventive means implemented by police differently. Given the question „If implemented preventive programs in your opinion are forming skills of under-ages that help resisting delinquent activity?“, only 7, 2% of officers were certainly confident in efficiency of these programs, and 62,0% do not trust much in these programs. Answering the question „If activity of police in the area of juvenile delinquency prevention in your opinion really helps solving that problem?“, 17, 2% of officers stated that they are confident in it, 51,4% agree partially and 31,4% of respondents have doubts in it. These answers should make plunge into reverie on modernity of work done in the country in the area of juvenile delinquency prevention, expedience of selected activity methods and means as well as quality of activity organizations and administration.

## Conclusions

1. Legal basis of activity of juvenile police officers was created without proper evaluation of officers' possibilities of implementing functions accredited to them in complete. Activity regulation by substatutory rules of law, inaccuracy of some functions and possibility to expand activity bounds by rules of other legislation impedes to clear evaluation of officers' work extent, stimulates formal attitude towards performance of duties. Without particular preventive means consolidated in legislation (continuing projects or programs) and mechanism of their financing it is difficult to create nationwide clearly structural system of common prevention that ensures equal activity in all the regions of the.

2. Having analyzed the means of juvenile delinquency prevention implemented by officers of Kaunas county police headquarters, the conclusion has to be made that officially police headquarters are striving for development of this activity, however decrease of financing impedes implementation of prevention programs, weakens relations of police with social partners, therefore implementation of these means becomes less efficient.

3. Efficiency of juvenile delinquency prevention implemented by police is decreased by the following factors: immoderate workload, lack of time for qualitative work, lack of personnel and financing, insufficient cooperation with social partners, weak local community, imperfection of qualification refreshing system, inadequacy of wage with workloads, decrease of officers' motivation to work.

## References

1. Babachinaitė G., Čepas A. ir kt. *Nepilnamečio asmenybė ir nusikalstamumas*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1984;
2. Čepas A. *Ankstyvoji nepilnamečių nusikalstamumo prevencija*. Vilnius: Mintis, 1973.

3. Drakšienė A., Drakšas R. *Nepilnamečių baudžiamoji atsakomybė*. Vilnius: Eugrimas, 2008.
4. Jungtinių Tautų nepilnamečių nusikalstamumo prevencijos gairės (Rijado gairės). [http://www.nplc.lt/sena/nj/Dokumentai/Uzs\\_teis\\_aktai/Rijado%20gaires.htm](http://www.nplc.lt/sena/nj/Dokumentai/Uzs_teis_aktai/Rijado%20gaires.htm) [2012-03-14].
5. Kauno apskrities vyriausiojo policijos komisariato Viešosios tvarkos valdybos 2012 m. veiklos ataskaita (apibendrinta už Kauno apskritį, vykdamas Kauno apskr. VPK veiklos planą). Kaunas, 2013.
6. Lietuvos Respublikos policijos veiklos įstatymas. *Valstybės žinios*, 2000, Nr. 90-2777.
7. Lietuvos Respublikos vaiko minimalios ir vidutinės priežiūros įstatymas. *Valstybės žinios*, 2010, Nr. 157-7969.
8. Lietuvos Respublikos apsaugos nuo smurto artimoje aplinkoje įstatymas. *Valstybės žinios*, 2011, Nr. 72-3475.
9. Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo 2008 m. gruodžio 9 d. nutarimas Nr. XI-52 *Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės veiklos programa*. [http://www.smm.lt/veikla/docs/lrv/15\\_vyr\\_programa.pdf](http://www.smm.lt/veikla/docs/lrv/15_vyr_programa.pdf) [2013-02-01].
10. Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės 2007 m. birželio 19 d. nutarimas Nr. 606 *Dėl Lietuvos policijos sistemos plėtros programos įgyvendinimo priemonių plano patvirtinimo*. *Valstybės žinios*, 2007, Nr. 72-845.
11. Lietuvos policijos generalinio komisaro 2009 m. gruodžio 1 d. įsakymas Nr. 5-V-893 *Dėl viešosios policijos prevencijos padalinio specialisto (nepilnamečių reikalų policijos pareigūno) tarnybinės veiklos aprašo patvirtinimo*. Prieiga internete: [http://www.policija.lt/index.php?id=2796&extension=.doc&type=kdok\\_blob&did=7369326&page=23](http://www.policija.lt/index.php?id=2796&extension=.doc&type=kdok_blob&did=7369326&page=23) [2013-02-05].
12. Nacionalinė nusikaltimų prevencijos ir kontrolės programa. *Valstybės žinios*, 2003, Nr. 32-1318.
13. Šatkus A., Bukauskas A., Ragauskas R. ir kt. *Problemos. Aktualijos. Patarimai. Informacija*. Vilnius: Judėjimas „Stabdyk nusikalstamumą“, 1998.
14. Vitkauskas K. Lithuanian Police Activity in Common Juvenile Delinquency Prevention. *Visuomenės saugumas ir viešoji tvarka: mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys* [elektroninis išteklius]. Kaunas: Mykolo Romerio universitetas, 2012, t. 8, p. 321–332.

Kęstutis Vitkauskas

### **Viešosios policijos prevencinių padalinių veikla įgyvendinant nepilnamečių nusikalstamumo prevenciją**

Anotacija

Straipsnyje siekiama įvertinti Viešosios policijos pareigūnų veiklą, vykdamas nepilnamečių nusikalstamumo prevenciją. Remiantis teisės aktų, Kauno apskrities Viešosios policijos veiklos bei sociologinio tyrimo rezultatų analize, nagrinėjami nepilnamečių reikalų policijos pareigūnų veiklą reglamentuojantys teisės aktai, pareigūnų vykdomos priemonės bendrosios ir individualiosios prevencijos srityje, atskleidžiamas pareigūnų požiūris į prevencinio darbo efektyvumą. Straipsnyje daroma išvada, kad, vykdamas nepilnamečių nusikalstamumo bendrąją prevenciją, policija formaliai stengiasi plėtoti šią veiklą ir vykdyti jai pavestas priemones. Tačiau šis veiklos efektyvumas mažėja dėl daugybės veiksnių: per didelio darbo krūvio, laiko kokybiškam darbui stokos, personalo ir finansavimo trūkumo, nepakankamo bendradarbiavimo su socialiniais partneriais, silpnos vietos bendruomenės, kvalifikacijos kėlimo sistemos

netobulumo, darbo užmokesčio ir darbo krūvių neatitikimo, pareigūnų motyvacijos dirbti mažėjimo.

*Kęstutis Vitkauskas* – Mykolo Romerio universiteto Viešojo saugumo fakulteto Policijos veiklos katedros docentas, humanitarinių mokslų daktaras.

E. paštas: k.vitkauskas@mruni.lt

*Kęstutis Vitkauskas*, Doctor of Humanitarian Sciences is an Associate Professor at the Department of Police Activities, Public Security Faculty of Mykolas Romeris University.

E-mail: k.vitkauskas@mruni.lt

Straipsnis įteiktas redakcijai 2012 m. gruodžio mėn; recenzuotas; parengtas spaudai 2013 m. kovo mėn.