Introduction

This paper addresses the topic of community crime prevention. As in many other areas of public policy, there are widely divergent approaches that might be taken to crime prevention focused on local neighbourhoods. In what follows four major forms of prevention relevant to the Australian context will be discussed, with particular emphasis being placed on an approach to crime prevention which enhances the ability of a community to bring together, in an integrative way, divergent groups which can easily become isolated from each other as a result of contemporary economic and urban forces.

What is “community crime prevention”? This analysis will follow the lead of Hope (1995: 21) in his comprehensive review of this topic and define community crime prevention as encompassing those policy actions that are “...intended to change the social conditions that are believed to sustain crime in residential communities.” It thus presumes a focus at a local, residential level, and programs undertaken to alter social institutions to reduce crime in that context. The social institutions can vary, and may include families, friendship groupings, clubs and associations, but it also may also refer to local settings where the change is directed at such diverse activities as education, housing, recreation and religion, to name but a few. As Hope (1995: 21-22) argues, these institutions combined make up the social structure of residential communities, and the “…distinctiveness of community crime prevention is seen to lie in its purposive concern to alter the social structure of particular communities.” In Australia, where most criminal justice agencies (police, courts and corrections) are organised at the state level, operationally “community prevention” as an exercise in government procedures commonly takes the form of negotiations with local councils to provide services or resources at the neighbourhood level (although some single agency approaches may consist of direct encouragement of activities at a local level, as in the case of Neighbourhood Watch as organised by state policing agencies).

There have been over the years an astounding array of different approaches to community crime prevention. For decades now, it has been clear that many forms of youth and adult crime appear to arise out of the particular conditions of neighbourhood life, and that a reasonable way of reducing crime would be to address these community conditions. Over sixty years ago, the conditions of various sub-communities in Chicago were subjected to close empirical study, and from these emerged one of the earliest specific community crime prevention initiatives, the “Chicago Area Project.” The perception of high levels of youth unrest and crime in the late 1960s led to a proliferation of crime prevention approaches which have spread in the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Holland and Australia in the ensuing years, so that by now there have been scores
of different ways of carrying out localised crime prevention tried out in residential communities.

There is no single way of grouping these approaches that would prove satisfying for all reviewers. What will be attempted here is to examine four different approaches which can be classified by virtue of the nature of the claims made regarding participation of local residents. The analysis begins with those which address the environmental sources of crime, which Hope (1995) terms “environmental modification” but which also are consistent with what Clarke (1995) has termed “situational crime prevention”, since it is the present position that the focus on environmental change is often distinctive because it specifically excludes local participation as a central issue. The remaining three approaches differ, in turn, in the level of claims made about participation, with “neighbourhood surveillance” (to again use a term suggested by Hope, 1995) being organised around a relatively limited concept of resident participation, with the involvement of local residents being considerably greater in the “community mobilisation” model where in some variations there was the phrase “maximum feasible participation” of residents employed in increasing the “competence” of the community to reduce crime (Hope, 1995; Marris and Rein, 1972). The final variant, the “community integration” or “community enhancement” (Brown and Polk, 1996) approach, goes somewhat farther in that in not only asks that local residents be mobilised in the effort to reduce crime, but that this mobilisation be carried out in such a way to maximise the bringing together of groups which are likely to have become isolated and segregated from each other as a result of the workings of deleterious economic and social trends in contemporary community life. It will be argued here that there is something of value in each of these approaches. Within each are ideas that community planners may find relevant as they go about the task of organising crime prevention at the residential level.

**Environmental Modification or Situational Crime Prevention Approaches**

Sociologists and social geographers have long been concerned with the idea that there are important effects of space itself on human behaviour, including crime. In the early (and somewhat crude by today’s standards) studies, there was an attempt to identify how different “social areas” of cities appeared to promote dysfunctional behaviour of various types. These evolved into more focused notions of decay in the modern city (Jacobs, 1962) and then the concern of Newman (1973) for what he termed “defensible space”. Newman was concerned with the issue of the way local residents identified with their community in terms of “territoriality,” arguing that improving social control was dependent upon facilitating that sense of territoriality which would encourage residents to claim “ownership” and thus a sense of responsibility for improved surveillance (Hope, 1995: 52). This view has led to a conclusion that some environments such as the mass public housing projects so common in contemporary cities are poorly designed and inhibit natural surveillance and defensiveness, and that “Appropriate design would remove these obstacles, and residential control would reassert itself naturally” (Hope, 1995: 52).

One of the clearest forms of environmental modification is to be found in the form of intervention known as “situational crime prevention” (Clarke, 1992, 1995). This
approach was premised in the idea that crime could be seen as a result of: (a) individuals with motivations which made them amenable to pursuing crime; (b) the opportunities available for engaging in such crime; and (c) the absence of guardians capable of preventing that crime (Cohen and Felson, 1978). The essence of the situational prevention approach is that it attempts to engage in tactics which:

(1) **increase the effort** necessary to commit crime (by such devices as “target hardening” through steering locks or bandit screens; “improving access control” with fenced yards or ID badges; “deflecting offenders” with street closures or by providing graffiti boards; or “controlling facilitators” with gun controls, credit card photos, etc.);

(2) **increasing the risks** of crime (by entry/exit screening and procedures to improve surveillance such as provision of security guards, burglary alarms, closed circuit television) or

(3) **reducing the rewards** of crime (by target removal, including removable car radios, phonecards’ or by such devices as property marking, vehicle licensing, etc., Clarke, 1995: 109).

A community considering its prevention alternatives may contemplate the matching of any specific problem with one or another of the above techniques (for example, closing taverns in known “hot spots” as a device to control violence, providing street lighting in an areas where residents feel unsafe), or they might use the general approach in a comprehensive effort to “design out” crime within the community context. This approach tends to have, however, a relatively limited focus, often at low cost, as Hope has noted:

Alternations to the physical environment for crime prevention purposes have thus tended toward relatively low-cost options: improving the security of individual dwellings, beautification and clean-up programs, improved street lighting, and installation of access-control and surveillance technologies. (Hope, 1995: 53)

Diagramatically, it can be seen that the effects of environmental modifications have theoretically direct effects, with the intervention (for example, the increase of street lighting) hypothesised to bring about a reduction of crime. and resulting from that a perception of increased safety and a reduced fear of crime (Model 1, Figure 1). The situational model in its simplest form, as outlined, makes no specific claims about participation of local residents either in the decisions about what is to be done, or in terms of their involvement in how it is to be done (although, to be sure, there is nothing which precludes local participation, as will be seen in what follows).

**Crime Prevention Through Organising of Community Surveillance: Neighbourhood Watch**
In his discussion of community crime prevention, Hope (1995) suggests that the movement toward the organizing of community surveillance came with the recognition that much of the earlier forms of urban planning were misguided because they obstructed natural means by which communities maintain order. Thus, a major task for planners was to organise ways whereby resident might regain informal social control over behaviour in public places through the encouragement of natural surveillance in order to strengthen a neighbourhoods informal defences against predation by strangers:

Intentional organizing embodied a two-fold expectation: first, that organizing communities into collective crime prevention projects would have a direct preventive effect on crime (by increasing natural surveillance) and on fear (through joint participation); and second, that participation would indirectly reduce crime and fear through increased social interaction; a stronger sense of community solidarity, and thus more effective informal social control in the neighborhood. (Hope: 1995: 43)

A common form this approach to crime prevention takes, especially in Australia, is Neighbourhood Watch, which represents an attempt by the police to organise local residential groups to engage in such procedures as block watch, security surveys and property marking. Overseas, despite reports of early success of such programs in reducing crime (Cirel, et al., 1977), later evaluations have tended to be less positive (see the review by Hope, 1995). Studies have suggested that participation tends to be low in low-income, deteriorated, high crime areas, and that the actual participation in many programs appears to be at a low level. It has been argued that in Britain only about one quarter of those who attended a launch ever attended another meeting, and that the most common activity of neighbourhood watch members appeared to be putting a sticker in the window (Hope, 1995: 49)

It may be that one of the central problems is the limited and voluntary role case for the community resident:

Through politically attractive, efforts to get individuals to give themselves voluntarily to communal activity, where the principal benefit is sees as a reduction in their own risk of crime, does not seem to be a viable crime-prevention strategy, particularly in high-crime communities. The volume of research suggests that at the heart of the problem lies the paradigm’s reliance on voluntarism as the guiding principal of communal activity. (Hope, 1995: 51, emphasis in the original)

Hope has commented on the complex set of expectations regarding how this model is presumed to have both direct and indirect effects on crime and fear of crime (Model 2, Figure 1):

Intentional organizing embodied a two-fold expectation: first, that organizing communities into collective crime prevention projects would have a direct preventive effect (by increasing natural surveillance) and on fear (through joint participation); and secondly, that participation would indirectly reduce crime and fear through increased social interaction, a stronger sense of community
solidarity, and thus more effective informal social control in the neighborhood. (Hope, 1995: 43)

It can be seen in this, then, that participation is presumed to be an important part of both the program and the outcome (increased surveillance and then reduced crime), with some of the more important indirect effects (increased interaction, stronger sense of community, and more effective informal control) being closely tied to the participatory features of the intervention.

**Crime Prevention Through Community Mobilisation**

The third approach to the organising of community crime prevention calls for more expanded role for residents than is provided in the surveillance programs. Recognising that it is the fabric of neighbourhoods themselves that seemed to be the crux of the crime problem, over the years a number of different ways have been taken to try to mobilise the resources of the community to reduce crime. In its earliest forms, as in Chicago Area Project, the focus was on the attempt to organise the leadership of local residents to achieve a better co-ordination of community institutions in a unified program of crime reduction. This community organising was intended to bring about better recreational programs for children, campaigns improve conditions in the neighbourhood, and outreach work with individuals and groups (Kobrin, 1962; Hope, 1995).

One of the better known forms of resource mobilisation consisted of the programs that were put in place in the early 1960s in response to an initiative of the Kennedy Administration in the United States, of which the best known was Mobilization for Youth (MFY) in the Lower East Side of New York City. These programs, which provided the base from which the much more extensive “War on Poverty” was launched (Knapp and Polk, 1972; Marris and Rein, 1972) were initially premised on the idea that a central task was that of improving community competence to deal with crime, especially youth crime. Initially, this was to be brought about by bringing community leaders together in a broad ranging leadership group, with this leadership, supplemented with additional government resources, leading to a broad ranging attempt to improve schools, employment training programs, recreational facilities, housing, legal services and other programs for youth in the community. Over time, these projects were additionally pushed in the direction of bringing about a more effective recruitment and participation of local community residents, the notion of “maximum feasible participation” which become the focus of considerable ideological debate.

While the evaluation reports on community action approaches is decidedly mixed, at best, the idea of mobilising the resources of local communities is one that continues to flourish. The notion that experiences of crime arise out of conditions of local communities, and therefore that one important strand of public policy may be to help communities to organise themselves to resist crime is appealing both to common sense and to policy makers.
In France in the 1980s the “Bonnemaison” approach to crime prevention emerged, with ideas much like earlier attempts in the United States. Like the MFY approach, the Bonnemaison model was an attempt to develop a co-ordinated national and local effort at crime prevention, except that the French program was much more systematic both in its conception of the national/regional/local linkages, and in reaching a broad range of communities. In that program, the national level government encouraged local (city level) governments to establish crime prevention committees which would analyse the local area’s unique problems, review local resources available to combat crime, develop a crime prevention plan, and then establish a contract with the national government to implement the plan (Sutton and Hazlehurst, 1996). An Australian review of that program pointed out that the types of activities implemented in Lille in 1985-86 provide an example of the local approaches taken within the Bonnemaison model:

- the provision of a site for gypsies;
- a community development programme on a housing estate;
- sponsorship of training, self-employment and a sales outlet scheme for ex-prisoners;
- the development of boxing clubs and other youth programmes;
- the installation of security door on the landings of blocks of flats in high crime areas; and
- the fitting of special alarms and other security devices in old people’s houses.

(Sutton and Hazlehurst, 1966: 428)

This was followed shortly afterwards by a similar attempt to stimulate local action in the Netherlands, although the Dutch program appeared to concentrate much more on “public order” problems in such locations as shopping centres, housing estates and public transport (Sutton and Hazlehurst, 1996: 429-432). At virtually the same time period, Britain created a nation-wide “Safer Cities” program which was similarly intended to “mobilise local resources and target crime at the ‘grass roots’ level” (Presdee and Walters, 1997).

Australia, too, has felt the influence of this attempt of governments to stimulate local action to address crime. In the late 1980s there was established in Victoria a relatively broad ranging program of local crime prevention that produced a number of local initiatives, such as the parents in one community providing a “safe train” so that teenagers coming home late at night could use public transport safely. In Queensland, Homel (1997) has described the action program known as the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project which was concerned with the problem of unacceptable levels of alcohol and violence in a way which makes clear the emphasis on local participation as a crucial character of the prevention initiative:

One way of summarising the project is to say that it provided a structure for focusing community militancy about safety and security by channelling energy into a steering committee, three major task groups, and a monitoring committee responsible for overseeing adherence to a code of practice developed by nightclub managers... all aspects of the project were designed in such a way that the local community --- business people, residents, community groups, representatives of council, taxi operators, police, security operatives, and
licensees themselves ---had “ownership” of the project and therefore responsibility for developing solutions appropriate to the local situation. (Homel, 1997: 226)

This approach, at least in the short run, was able to report a significant reduction in binge drinking, violence and incidences of drunk and disorderly behaviour (Homel, 1997: 229-230).

The options available in adopting a community centred approach to crime prevention are quite wide, and a typical set of alternatives laid out by a state agency for community action in Australia might include such diverse activities as:

- **Information Gathering** through such processes as safety audits, fear mapping, and community consultations;
- **Social Crime Prevention** which might include after school programs (to provide young people with activities to promote self esteem and skills development, for example) or providing a youth worker to work with youth identified as “at risk”;
- **Environmental Design** mechanisms addressing improved street lighting, better design of parklands, procedures to improve the environment of shopping centres and malls, or better control of access to alcohol in the vicinity of such community space as parks and reserves; or
- **Developmental Programs**, which might include parent education, family support programs, support for services for isolated parents with young children, and similar activities.

A well known state wide attempt at community mobilisation in Australia was the “Together Against Crime” program in South Australia, which was in its inception derived in large part of the Bonnemaison model (Sutton, 1997; Presdee and Walters, 1997). The unfortunate history of that approach (including a change of name), indicates how alterations to the political structure can result in a significant change in priorities which showed such early promise, and the program gradually withered away under a combination of organisational incompetence and political confusion:

Without any real managerial structures and with little or no thought given to the process of implementation, the Crime Prevention Unit (CPU) was left to work on the development of a theoretically flawed policy that had been politically presented then abandoned. This left the CPU the only option of clinging in some way to the notion of “community” whilst weaving this into the implementation of crime prevention programs. (Presdee and Walters, 1997: 209)

The writers of the major evaluation undertaken on the South Australian experience have some pungent observations to offer those who would engage in locally based crime prevention:

The Bonnemaison approach was about uniting and building existing local or community resources. These local structures provide the history and knowledge
necessary to develop local ideas for local problems. Once these existing structures are strengthened, crime prevention strategies have the potential to extend existing services and programs --- in other words, build on that which is already in place. But what so often happens, and South Australia is no exception, is that existing programs are permitted to fight for survival while money is thrown at a council or a local committee, which is simply told to “do crime prevention” without adequate planning, information or direction. To use a metaphor, a plantation of pine trees does not grow by dropping ten million seeds from an aircraft, rather it grows from a systematic and structured planning process. (Presdee and Walters, 1997: 212)

Inherent in this story, and in fact the tale of much of the community mobilisation literature, are two specific warnings. One, it is imperative for any program success that there be clear theoretical directives which guide the program. Failure to make clear what is intended by the phrase “mobilisation of local resources” can only lead to the useless scattering of money which becomes wasted on short term projects which leave little impression on the community when the money (inevitably) dries up. Two, by now it is clear that there is something simply “unstable” or “unnatural” in the attempt to link up wider governmental (either federal or national) with the local resources: whether it is Mobilization for Youth, the Bonnemaison program, or the South Australian and Victorian experiences of the 1980s. It is clear that after milking the initial political benefits from the program (assuming there are some), the wider government priorities shift, the money is withdrawn, and the initiative gradually deflates when local resources prove inadequate to maintain the large level of expenditure. A major issue here is the question of finances and resources. Local governments are provided with a brief “window of opportunity” to feed at the trough of money made available through the wide tax base accessed by the broader governmental unit, but then the funds are withdrawn, and local councils are unable to continue to support local crime prevention given the press of other local responsibilities. The experience of the last 40 years is stark and clear: local initiatives when funded from non-recurring, “soft” project moneys simply do not survive when cut off from their funding source.

In a recent discussion, Sutton makes the important contribution in commenting upon the idea of the “spontaneous rediscovery” of the “…community as a natural resource for minimising crime and healing its wounds” (Sutton, 1997: 23). There is something politically compelling about the idea of local community action directed at crime prevention. Currently, both South Australia and Victoria have in place crime prevention units which are designed to promote a strategic role of local government in community safety, and plans are under way for a similar development in New South Wales. Hopefully, planners can draw lessons from the past as they once again stir up local hopes and local action to engage in the task of community crime prevention.

In the community mobilisation model, considerably more in terms of resident involvement is expected to result from the intervention than in the previous two approaches (Model 3, Figure 1). The programs are presumed to bring about a form of “increased community competence” which is hypothesised to have an effect on crime reduction, with the resident participation having both direct and indirect
effects on fear of crime (again by means of increased social interaction, a stronger sense of community and more effective informal control).

The Community Integration Approach: Crime Prevention Through Community Enhancement

The fourth approach to community crime prevention is in many ways similar to community mobilisation. It presumes that an important resource for crime reduction resides within the structure of local communities. At this same time, however, there is a recognition that to some degree it may be aspects of these very structures that are an important part of the problem of alienation and crime. In particular, it is argued that there are mechanisms within communities which serve to isolate and “lock out” some individuals, especially some young people, from participation in mainstream activities which would give them a sense that they are part of the community with something to contribute to local activities.

In the early 1970s, there flourished for a brief time in the United States a “national strategy” which was promulgated by the Youth Development and Delinquency Prevention Administration (YDDPA) which was part of what was then known as the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. An explicit part of this strategy was the notion that the organisation of community institutions had to be seen not simply as part of the solution, but part of the problem of youth alienation and crime. A declaration developed by a group of youth crime prevention professionals who met to provide a conceptual base for the strategy provided that:

- We believe that our social institutions are programmed in such a way as to deny large numbers of young people socially acceptable, responsible and personally gratifying roles. These institutions should seek ways of becoming more responsive to youth needs. (quoted in Polk and Kobrin, 1972:2)

The statement went on to give emphasis to youth crime prevention programs which would:

- Assist institutions to change in ways that provide young people the socially acceptable, responsible, personally gratifying roles and assist youth people to assume such roles. (quoted in Polk and Kobrin, 1972:2)

The YDDPA strategy then moved to develop in partnership with communities which provided ways for neighbourhoods to promote youth crime prevention through youth development activities. At its theoretical core was the assumption that provision of educational and/or employment experiences were central to the building of stronger bonds between the young person and community. Local projects, it was argued, need to find ways within neighbourhood settings that young people might develop: (a) a sense of competence, so that they begin to feel that there are things which they can do well; (b) a sense of usefulness, such that they come to see themselves as contributing something of value to the community; (c) a sense of belongingness, whereby they come to see themselves as a meaningful part
of their community; and (d) a sense of efficacy or potency, whereby disadvantaged young people come to see that what they do can make a difference in their lives and the lives of others.

What this strategy attempts to provide ways of integrating marginalised young people into mainstream activities of the community. Youth development is not something done “on” young people, but “with” them participating as active partners. One writer, who spent much of his time during these years working with communities to work through positive youth development programs, described the assumptions of this approach in the following terms:

1. Youth problems and their prevention are community problems and responsibilities; and both the contributing factors and the solutions are to be found in the community.

2. As a community responsibility, the prevention of youth problems involves bringing about change in those conditions which contribute to youth problems.

3. A balanced community approach to youth development includes both the provision of legitimate remedial services and an emphasis upon creating conditions which contribute to the well being of young people.

4. Changing community conditions that contribute to youth problems usually requires changes in organisations and institutions in the community. This requires a co-operative effort on the part of decision makers, human service professionals and youth and adult citizens.

5. Community, organizational and institutional change requires a combination of useful concepts, purposive strategies and effective leadership skills. At best, these are shared by an expanding group of people who work together.

6. Resources at the state and national level can be supportive of the kind of community responsibility required for positive youth development. It is important that resources at those levels do not stand in the way and act as restraining forces, as they frequently do. (Lofquist, 1983: 24)

These guidelines are intended to provide a clear set of understandings about the responsibilities of communities to participate actively (the mobilisation assumption) into activities which are designed to bring about positive changes in institutional practices relating to young people (the integrative assumption). What communities actually do, however, is left unspecified since in each community there will be a different mix of youth problems, perceived crime problems and readiness of agencies to participate in a change process.

For a concrete example, a local council may be under pressure to provide for increased public safety because of perceived problems of unruly youth in a local bus station. Using a community integration strategy, the council might appoint a community development officer to initiate a solution to the problem by giving a
resident’s group the responsibility for carrying out a safety audit of the station, with
the additional task of coming up with an action plan for making the station safer.
The team of individuals might include adult residents (especially those most
fearful, such as the elderly) and young people from the community (including, but
not exclusively, those drawn from the group seen as “the problem”). Ideally the
group should be paid for their efforts. The action plan that the group develop
might be expected to address issues of environmental design (that is, some of their
recommendations might constitute “situational prevention”), but it would be
expected that they would give emphasis as well to a change in the human presence
of the facility (perhaps, for example, by having teams of young and elderly patrol
the area at times when threatening situations are likely to occur).

Action plans and safety audits carried out in this manner can provide a visible
focus for developmental prevention work which has as its immediate focus the
solving of a situational problem in the community, yet it is undertaken within the
positive, developmental approach. There are a number of other kinds of activities
which might be considered as part of developmental prevention, including creating:

1. community consultation teams, organised to bring youth and adult
competencies together to provide advice on community problems (mall friction,
alcohol and violence, or drug use issues, for examples);

2. community action planning teams, where young people and adults
work together to develop action plans for solving visible community problems;

3. community action teams, where young people and adults, often over a
very short time period, to take action to solve a particular community problem;

4. community service teams to provide some form of short or long term
service within the community (such as tutoring for young children, food services
for the elderly, expansion of recreation programs, etc.); and

5. specific programs of youth participation and involvement which are
designed to increase youth access to, and involvement in, existing community and
work organisations (see for examples Pearl, et al., 1978).

These activities are explicitly organised to help community agencies and
organisations address the myriad of processes that operate within them to exclude
and/or segregate youth, especially marginal youth. The focus is not on specific
issues of “how to control” youth but rather on how to expand and widen the
opportunities for all young people, but disenfranchised young people in particular,
to participate in mainstream neighbourhood and community activity. The cluster
of programs should be seen as providing devices for bringing youth people into
the centre of community life (centripetal activities) in sharp contrast to the activities of
much of the criminal justice system (which operate centrifugally to case young
people progressively farther and farther to the margins of the community).

Expressed in model terms (Model 4, Figure 1), the community integration
approach to crime prevention appears in many ways similar to that described for
community mobilisation, since the program is hypothesised to have both direct and indirect effects on crime and fear of crime, with the addition that the increased integration is presumed to have an impact on reduced stereotyping and thus a direct effect on fear of crime (although, again, some of the most important effects would result from the increased social interaction, a stronger sense of community, and more effective informal controls).

Discussion

Communities face a wide range of choices when it comes to the implementation of crime prevention programs. It needs to be underscored that many of the directions that can be chosen will have effects dramatically in opposition to the integrative approach described here. Some programs, especially those under the heading of situational prevention or surveillance, can clearly serve to increase the isolation and integration of marginalised young people. As Sutton has pointed out, crime prevention can pose the threat of:

\[\text{Extending social control and facilitation the ‘de facto’ privatising of safety and security, and of allowing governments to withdraw from commitment to social justice and social development.} \text{ (Sutton, 1994: 14)}\]

A central issue that has been identified in the present discussion is the particular stance taken with respect to the participation of community residents. A community integration approach is one which seeks to enhance community life by obtaining the widest possible participation of neighbourhood residents in undertaking change which will benefit their lives and their community.

There are two different kinds of suggestions that can be offered to aid in helping communities to engage in positive, in contrast to negative, forms of crime prevention. First, clear criteria can be developed which describe development programs. The kinds of activities which fit closest to the developmental model will (1) assure that young people are a part of crime prevention activities; (2) be integrative involving a mix of participants in change processes (such as youth and adults, marginal young people and more conventional appearing young people, different ethnic mixes, etc.); (3) ideally provide a wage, even if at a token level, to counteract the problems of voluntarism; (4) wherever possible have an educational skill development component (to help marginal young people in development of needed job skills); and (5) to have an strong evaluation component so it is possible to document the effects of the program.

A second suggestion is to provide a list of examples of programs which fit the desired model. In addition to participatory safety audits, programs have been tried both in Australia and overseas including youth-tutor-youth programs (where older students teach younger students), youth recreation programs (where older young people help provide recreation outlets for young children), direct service programs, youth consultancy programs, and the like. Running through such models is the guiding idea that young people can be given some ownership of solutions to community crime problems, and that young people, local agency representatives and adult neighbourhood residents can work together to bring about crime
prevention programs which encourage the positive development of local neighbourhoods.

It is to be expected that there will continue to be an attempt to provide resources directly to communities so that at the local, residential level efforts can be undertaken to reduce crime. The purpose of the foregoing discussion is to establish the range of options that are actually implied by this process. How a community chooses to proceed will be a function of what is identified as the problem or problems of particular salience, and which approaches seems best suited to address these. It is likely that if a given community had access to resources for a comprehensive prevention program, it might pursue elements of all four of the approaches to crime prevention that have been discussed. Thus, while it might be appropriate to have a broad effort at community mobilisation that focused institutional attention on improving schools, housing and recreation, and that within this there would be a strong component of community integration/enhancement activity, some of what might be done would include projects that are about environmental modification or increasing the effectiveness of surveillance.

While there will continue to be the “spontaneous rediscovery” of the community in the crime prevention equation, unfortunately many of the approaches to crime reduction that communities will generate will have either no long term effect, or perhaps make matters worse. Many of the cruder methods of “target hardening,” for example, which give emphasis to such interventions as installing locks and security doors, closed circuit television surveillance and the like, may make people feel safer inside their homes, but increasingly fearful of their own streets and neighbourhood. Other approaches, however, can both provide an enhanced, more integrative community while addressing crime prevention in a constructive way. Crime prevention can make things worse, that we know. Whether it can make things better requires us to consider ways of constructive participation, integration and enhancement of neighbourhood life..
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