Crime Prevention – Criminal Justice

1. Criminal justice crime prevention can be defined in the following way:
    a. "It deals with offending after it has happened, and involves intervention in the lives of known offenders in such a fashion that they will not commit further offences. In so far as it is preventative, it operates through incapacitation and individual deterrence, and perhaps offers the opportunity of treatment in prisons or through other sentencing options" (Cameron, M. and Laycock, G. (2002) 'Crime Prevention in Australia', in Graycar, A. and Grabosky, P. (eds) **The Cambridge Handbook of Australian Criminology**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, page 314).

2. Police are central to criminal justice crime prevention. Some relevant models of policing include the following:
    a. **Community-based policing**
        i. Sarre suggests that "central to the notion of community based policing is its emphasis upon the community (in whatever form that may take) being consulted by police about their policing and security priorities and needs, in order to make policing (and the use of police resources) more effective, cost-efficient and democratically accountable" (Sarre, R. 'The State of Community Based Policing in Australia: Some Emerging Themes', in Duncan Chappell and Paul Wilson (eds), **Australian Policing: Contemporary Issues,** 2nd Edition, Butterworths, Sydney).
        ii. Terms like community, responsiveness, consultation, and accountability all provide insight into the nature and style of policing. Increased legitimacy is a goal of this approach. Engaging with community members through community consultative committees, police open days, community liaison officers, Volunteers in Policing, Police in Schools, etc., it is expected that community members will be more willing to report crimes, assist police and contribute to the prevention of crime.

    b. **Zero-tolerance policing (ZTP)** rests heavily on the 'broken windows thesis', which is based on the following observations/claims –
        i. Disorder and fear of crime are strongly linked
        ii. Police negotiate rules of the street
        iii. Different neighbourhoods have different rules
        iv. Untended disorder leads to breakdown of community controls
        v. The essence of the police role in maintaining order is to reinforce the informal social control mechanisms of the community itself
        vi. Problems arise not so much from individual disorderly persons as from the congregation of large numbers of disorderly persons
        vii. Different neighbourhoods have different capacities to manage disorder (Sousa, W.H. and Kelling, G. L. (2006) 'Broken Windows, criminology, criminal justice' in Weisburd, D. and Braga, A.A. (eds) **Police Innovation – Contrasting Perspectives**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, page 79).

c. **Problem-oriented policing (POP)**
   i. "It requires police forces to analyse the problems that they are routinely called upon to deal with and to devise more effective ways to respond to them" (McLaughlin and Muncie, 2001, **The Sage Dictionary of Criminology**, Sage Publications, London, page 225)
   ii. First developed by Herman Goldstein in the late 1970s.
   iii. Goldstein was critical of traditional incident-driven policing strategies (reactive). Repeatedly dealing with problems in the same location can be demoralizing and a waste of limited resources.
   iv. Goldstein was also critical of the overt attention to law enforcement and crime control – much of police work is non-criminal in nature. An over-reliance on law enforcement and crime control can result in the belief that more powers will be the only way to solve particular problems.
   v. Goldstein suggests that the "reactive, law enforcement based model of police work should be replaced by proactive 'bottom-up' approaches which emphasise getting to grips with the underlying conditions that create the problems police officers have to deal with. They can do this because many of the incidents that take up police time are recurring rather than random in nature. Police forces should analyse patterns of crime incidents clusters to identify underlying causes and problems and formulate appropriate responses … There should be as detailed a breakdown of problems as possible from the outset and the identification of key characteristics (location, time, participants' behaviour and so on)" (McLaughlin and Muncie, 2001: 225). Data should be gathered from a range of police and non-police sources and strategies developed to respond, often involving non-police agencies.
   vi. POP employs the SARA model – scanning / analysis / response / assessment

d. **Third-party policing**
   i. "Third party policing is defined as police efforts to persuade or coerce organisations or non-offending persons, such as public housing agencies, property owners, parents, health and building inspectors, and business owners to take some responsibility for preventing crime or reducing problems … Central, however, to third party policing is the use of a range of civil, criminal and regulatory rules and laws, to engage (or force) third parties into taking some control responsibility" (Mazerolle, L. and Ransley, J. (2005) **Third Party Policing**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, page 2)
   ii. "Third party policing initiatives are typically ad hoc, episodic and many have been implemented in response to 'external pressures' operating on the police. We argue that these external pressures are increasing not by accident, but rather as a result of societal transformations that have shifted the responsibility and interest in crime control across a range of regulatory 'nodes' … the pace, context and prominence of third party policing initiatives has escalated in recent years for two reasons: first, in response to the 'blurring' of civil and criminal laws and second, as one of the many consequences in the move from centralised state control to a system of de-centred networks of governance and crime control agents … part of the transformation of

government and governance taking place in contemporary society" (Mazerolle and Ransley, 2005: 2).

3. Concurrent with these developments in policing, have been significant developments in offender treatment and rehabilitation. Movement from the 'nothing works' pessimism of the 1970s to 'what works' in the 1990s has resulted in a new found optimism in work with offenders. Principles of effective intervention emerging from the 'what works' literature include the following and reveal the focus on targeted interventions:

Assess risk levels and allocate individuals to different levels of service accordingly.	'Dosage' matters. A person who is offending frequently and has been assessed as reflecting many risk factors, will require more intensive support / intervention.
Assess dynamic risks / criminogenic needs and target intervention towards their remediation.	Dynamic risk factors are those which can be changed. Alcohol and other drug use is an example. Static risk factors cannot be changed. Being a young male increases your chances of being involved in offending, but it cannot be changed.
Multi-modal approaches: focus on a range of criminogenic needs in recognition of the multiple factors associated with offending.	Use diverse strategies to tackle offending behaviour. Putting a young person in a basketball program to reduce boredom, will not be sufficient if that young person also has problems with their education and witnesses violence in the home. In such a case, basketball would need to be complemented with individual tutoring and family support.
General responsivity: attempt to match services to the learning styles, motivations and aptitudes of participants within high quality interpersonal relationships.	Programs and individual work should seek to generally touch on the various learning styles (listening, watching, saying and doing) and acknowledge motivational factors (internal and external).
Specific responsivity: adapt intervention strategies to accommodate difference and diversity (age / gender / ethnicity / race / language) among participants and recognition of their strengths.	Individual needs should be understood and used in developing programs. Mixing young men and women, having ages spread from 10 to 18 and having one young Aboriginal person in a Anglo-Australian group might be barriers to participation.
Develop coordinated strategies of monitoring continuity of services and care, including relapse prevention.	Regular review and program debriefing are just two ways that this can be achieved.
The most effective agencies will locate programmatic interventions within broader social arrangements, giving attention to variations in local contexts and client groups and adapting services accordingly.	Linking with other agencies and ensuring that programs reflect local considerations will be important.

Adapted from Maguire, J. (2002) **Offender Rehabilitation and Treatment: Effective Programmes and Policies to Reduce Re-offending**, John Wiley and Sons, West Sussex, page 24.