

## PREVENCIJA SITUACIJSKOG KRIMINALA: TEORIJSKA POZADINA I MOGUĆNOSTI ZA DALJI RAZVOJ

prof. dr Vesna Stefanovska, doc. dr Natasa Jovanova

Pregledni naučni rad

**Inspiracija za rad i problem(i) koji se radom oslovljava(ju):** Sprečavanje situacijskog kriminala je dio Politike prevencije kriminala, a proteklih godina, zagovornici teže da zamijene socijalnu prevenciju kao neuspješnu u smanjenju kriminala, a koja je suviše skupa i previše zahtjevnja za rješavanje socijalnih kriminalnih faktora. Na taj način, grupa kriminologa tvrdi da prevencija iz daljine ne funkcionise i preusmjerava njihov interes ka uklanjanju situacijskih faktora koji stvaraju mogućnosti za kriminal. U tom smislu, naš članak će elaborirati osnovu i glavne nalaze vezane za prednosti i moguće rizike od prevencije situacijskog kriminala.

**Ciljevi rada (naučni i/ili društveni):** Cilj rada je predstavljanje prednosti i slabosti primjene situacijskog sprečavanja kriminala. Naučni i društveni cilj za proučavanje ovog modela sprečavanja kriminala potiče od potrebe da šira politika kriminala obuhvati, ne samo represivne mjere, već i preventivne, i ne samo preduzimanje od strane sistema krivičnog pravosuđa, već izvan i od strane agencija unutar civilnog društva i privatnog sektora.

**Metodologija/dizajn:** Ovaj rad pruža pregled i analizu pojedinih naučnih radova i studija koji prikazuju rezultate istraživanja i rezultate koji se odnose na prevenciju situacijskog kriminala. Također, proći ćemo kroz nekoliko kriminoloških teorija i pogleda u okviru kriminologije životne sredine, kako bi smo predstavili teorijsku pozadinu prevencije situacijskog kriminala.

**Ograničenja rada/istraživanja:** Nedostatak javnog i naučnog diskursa, kao i nepriznavanje važnosti prevencije situacijskog kriminala između donosilaca politike krivične pravde u našoj zemlji.

**Rezultati:** Glavni nalazi se odnose na prepoznavanje koristi od sprečavanja situacijskog kriminala, ali i od određenih negativnih strana koje zahtijevaju pažljivu primjenu i odabir određenih preventivnih mjera od strane glavnih zainteresovanih strana.

**Generalni zaključak:** Prevencija situacijskog kriminala može u određenim okolnostima smanjiti kriminal, ali ne može i riješiti probleme kriminala, tj. ne može smanjiti ili ukloniti kriminalne faktore. Na taj način može biti dio opće nacionalne politike za sprečavanje kriminala, ali samo zajedno sa socijalnom prevencijom, jer su kao dvije strane jednog novčića.

**Opravdanost istraživanja/rada:** Istraživanje i sprečavanje situacijskog kriminala u Republici Makedoniji treba da bude predmet kontinuirane analize. Nauka, zasnovana na naučnim istraživanjima i rezultatima, treba da pomogne promovisanju pozitivnih efekata njegove primjene kako bi pronašla svoje odgovarajuće mjesto u okviru politike krivične pravde.

**Ključne riječi:** situacijska prevencija kriminala, dizajn okoline, prilika, politika kriminala

## **SITUATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND POSSIBILITIES FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT**

### **SUMMARY**

**Inspiration and issue(s) that are addressed:** Situational Crime Prevention is part of the Crime Prevention Policy and in recent years, it's proponents strive to replace the social prevention as unsuccessful in crime reduction, too expensive and too demanding to tackle the social criminal factors. That way, a group of criminologists claims that *prevention from distance* doesn't work and redirect their interest toward removing the situational factors that make opportunities for crime. In that regards, our article will elaborate the basis and main findings related to the benefits and possible risks of situational crime prevention.

**Purpose of the paper (scientific and and/ or social):** The aim of the paper is to present the pros and cons of the application of situational crime prevention. The scientific and social objective to study this model of crime prevention stems from the need that the wider crime policy should encompass, not just the repressive measures, but also preventive, and not just undertaken by the criminal justice system, but beyond and by the agencies within civil society and private sector.

**Methodology/ Design:** This paper provides an overview and analysis of certain scientific papers and studies that present research findings and results related to situational crime prevention. Also, we will go through several criminological theories and perspectives within the environmental criminology, in order to present theoretical background of situational crime prevention.

**Limitations of the study/ paper:** Lack of public and scientific discourse, as well as unrecognition of the importance of situational crime prevention among criminal justice policy makers in our country.

**Results/ Findings:** Main findings refer to the recognition of the benefits of situational crime prevention, but also of certain negative sides that demand careful application and selection of certain prevention measures by the main stakeholders.

**General conclusion:** Situational Crime Prevention may reduce crime in certain circumstances, but cannot solve the crime problems, i.e. cannot decrease or remove the criminal factors. That way, it can be part of the general national crime prevention policy, but only together with the social prevention, because those two are like two sides of one coin.

**Justification of study/ paper:** Research and situational crime prevention in the Republic of Macedonia should be subject to continuous analysis. Science, based on scientific research and results should help to promote the positive effects of its application in order to find its appropriate place within criminal justice policy.

**Keywords:** situational crime prevention, environmental design, opportunity, crime policy.

## INTRODUCTION

Situational crime prevention is part of the crime prevention policy and in recent years, its proponents strive to replace the social prevention as unsuccessful in crime reduction, too expensive and too demanding to tackle the social criminal factors. That way, a group of criminologists (Ekblom, 1994: 194) claim that *prevention from distance* doesn't work and redirect their interest toward removing the situational factors that create opportunities for crime. In that regards, we will make an overview of the basis and main findings related to the benefits of situational crime prevention. Also, we will go through several criminological theories and perspectives within the environmental criminology, in order to present theoretical background of situational crime prevention. Main findings refer to the recognition of the benefits of situational crime prevention, but also of certain negative sides that demand careful application and selection of certain prevention measures by the main stakeholders. But, due to the limitation of the space in this paper, we will not elaborate the cons of the application of the situational crime prevention here. Just, we will say that it may reduce crime in certain circumstances, but cannot solve the crime problems, i.e. cannot decrease or remove the wider social criminal factors. That way, situational crime prevention can be part of the general national crime prevention policy, but only together with the social prevention, because those two are like two sides of one coin.

## BEGINNINGS OF THE SITUATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION

The development of situational crime prevention is associated with an increase in crime in the 1970s in a number of countries in the world, primarily in the United Kingdom and the United States, and with the failure of traditional (positivist) criminology to explain its causes. However, the first ideas for the application of certain situational measures can be found in the works of Italian criminologist Enrico Ferry (1856-1929). He is recognized for his efforts to apply protective and preventive measures to prevent crime in order to deter the perpetrator from committing crimes (Arnaudovski, 2007: 175). On this basis, Ferry (1917) proposes a series of penal substitutes (economic, political and moral measures) that, instead to punish the offender, they are intended to prevent crime. For example, it proposes replacing coins with paper money to prevent their forging, using personal credit letters, rather than paying cash, the presence of snoopers or gatekeepers at the entrances to residential apartments, using door security guards, alarms, and even using an appropriate X-ray system to check luggage to prevent the smuggling of illicit goods (Ferry, 1917, cited in Garland, 2000: 5). Although Ferry, as part of the crime prevention, (which sees the crime as a social problem and the result of the individual pathology of the offender) is much more committed to

social reforms, however, certain situational measures had found appropriate place in his radical social policy (Garland, 2000: 5).

After the Second World War (1945), a new positivistic science in criminology develops which perceives the situational measures as artificial and insufficiently constructive to solve the real problems of crime. From a positivist perspective, crime is a social problem and therefore its roots and causes that are found within individual characteristics, within family, and the community should be covered (Garland, 2000: 6). It is not a problem produced by the physical environment where the crimes occur, but it is a result of the crime-genesis process (a process of influence and action of many factors on the perpetrator to commit the crime). So, at the beginning of the 20th century, situational crime prevention has no priority in criminological and criminal law sciences. The state is aimed at social reforms to reduce and mitigate criminal factors. Hence, the central themes after the Second World War are the subjective characteristics of the perpetrators and the limited educational, economic, social and other possibilities for meeting the needs of the citizens. Although in that period, security and private insurance companies are formed that offer protection and insurance measures, commercial companies are taking precautionary measures and the visibility of the police has increased, still the situation prevention is of secondary importance, both in criminological research and in policy of crime control (Garland, 2000: 8). It began to become a dominant topic in the 1980s and received an appropriate place in academic criminology and government policies. The appearance is related to the names of Ronald V. Clark, Derrick Cornish, Marcus Felson, Paul Ekblom, Kevin Heal, Mike Hough, Ken Pease, Barry Poyner, Nick Tilley (Garland, 2000: 8) who are mainly from the Anglo-Saxon countries. Their main thesis is that the immediate environment can better explain the crime.

From the aspect of the perpetrators, the situational prevention starts from the assumptions that: (1) the perpetrators are persons who want to increase the benefits and advantages from committing criminal acts, (2) their behavior is influenced by external incitement factors that encourage or deter them, (3) in the process of deciding whether to commit a crime they measure his benefits and costs, and the perpetrators rationally decide, although the pressure of time, their cognitive abilities and the access of important information have impact on the decision-making process. So, crimes are result of a rational choice, not a result of an individual pathology or other factors that are related to the perpetrator. Hence, the dominant perception within the criminology that crime is carried out by a small part of the population, should be abandon since everyone is a potential perpetrator. For Felson (2011), crime becomes a routine problem of urban life in large cities where more temptations are created for committing crimes, control decreases and all this leads to increased crime (Felson, 2011: 31). In addition, cities allow perpetrators to remain anonymous, who in a situation of crowds are tempted to commit a crime and again to fade away among the crowd. For example, certain parts of the city (shopping centers, student areas, night entertainment places) with increased density and frequency of pedestrians, with increased number of foreigners, more frequent contacts between citizens, etc. (Felson, 2011: 52) create convenient occasions for committing criminal offenses.

### **The development of situational crime prevention**

The beginnings and development of situational crime prevention are unambiguously associated with the name of Ronald Clark, who completed his PhD in psychology at Bristol (1962), and in London in 1968 he completed his doctoral studies in psychology. As a young researcher in Bristol Law School for Young Offenders (1964-68), he came to the conclusion that the escapees of young people from schools are more result of the environment and the circumstances in which the schools are located and built than of the dispositions and the personal characteristics of the youngsters. Later, first as a researcher and then as president of the Research and Planning Unit of the British Home Office, from 1968 to 1984, he was part of a team to develop a program to reduce crime, which has increased in that period. The program, which is predominantly based on situational approach and situational measures, was developed as a result of the failure of the rehabilitation model and due to the disappointment in penal and social prevention among certain scholars and main stakeholders in crime prevention policy (Clarke, 1997: 6). This approach, despite the resistance of academic criminology in that period, has developed as a practical and applied activity (Garland, 2000: 9). In that direction, experts have tried to find appropriate solutions to reduce crime, focusing on pragmatic, short-term and effective measures that give visible and quick results. In addition, rather than exploring the causes of crime related to the social structure and conditions in the society and the personal characteristics of the perpetrator, they focus on the appearance of crime, i.e. on investigation of the possibilities for committing crimes. On the basis of those surveys carried out in the UK, the publication *Crime as an Opportunity* (Mayhew, Clarke, Sturman and Hough, 1976) was edited. The basic findings are that in order to commit a crime, it is necessary to have appropriate opportunities which can be found in the environment. Hence, in order to reduce crime, opportunities should be reduced, which, apart from individual factors, have a crucial impact on its occurrence.

Starting from this assumption, advocates of the situational approach to crime prevention provide three main recommendations: (1) scientists and practitioners in that area should not be burdened with scientific theories, but should collect data from the field, that is, from the physical environment, (2) measures need to target specific crimes, and not the whole crime in a community, and (3) crime should be prevented in a practical, simple and natural way. Clark (and his associates) believe that it is necessary to go out on the field and to gather facts about crime which can reveal many evidences and details related to the crime scene (for example, through observation or conversation with perpetrators). This is important because the analysis of risky places, repeated victimization and immediate crime scenes make it possible to predict the time and place of committing the crime.

## SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CRIME

The phenomenological research on crime covers several aspects: the spatial and temporal distribution of crime, the characteristics of the victim (as object of attack) and the perpetrator, the extent and frequency of criminal events etc. In doing so, the findings show that criminal behavior is determined by the nature and the characteristics of the immediate environment in which it occurs, which means that the crimes are result of both the individual characteristics of the perpetrator and the situational circumstances in the particular environment. Crime is not accidentally distributed in space and crimes do not occur equally in all cities and settlements, but is concentrated on specific locations. Sherman (1995) found that the assessment of future crimes is six times more predictable according to their location, than by identifying the perpetrator. For example, the analysis of the calls for criminal offenses in Minnesota, the United States in the late 80s, found that 50% of calls came only from 9% of all locations in Minnesota. Therefore, those sites where there is a high concentration of crime have called them hotspots and defined them as small places where crime is frequent. Due to such frequency, the spatial execution of crimes can be easily predicted (Braga & Kennedy, 2008).

Also, crime is unevenly distributed and according to the time of the crime, because the commission of crimes varies during the day, week and year. For example, motor vehicles are stealing in the spring, violations of public order and peace on certain holiday days when there is more people on the street, violent acts are mostly perpetrated under the influence of alcohol and often occur in the night hours, shop thefts in the afternoon at lunch time, the burglary during warm days etc. (Tilley, 2008: 12).

In addition to the above, studies often show that for those who have been a victim of crime once, the risk of repeated victimization has increased. If they were twice a victim of a crime, they are still in a state of increased risk of being victimized for the third time. The risk increases with the number of experienced victimization, and it is greater, immediately after the execution of the crime. This feature is present in property and personal crimes, both in rural as well as in urban areas, in all countries. Therefore, if one predicts where and when a particular crime will occur, it is best to identify persons who have been once or more times victims of crime (Tilley, 2008: 13). In that sense, the first research on repeated victimization was conducted in 1973 by Johnson et al. (1973) in the United States. It was motivated by the concerns of the medical staff at a Texas hospital for the frequent reporting of the same persons who had serious gunshot wounds and wounds by knives. In 1976, another survey was conducted for repeated victimization, and criminal records were used as a source of information. On the basis of the obtained data, a small percentage of the citizens were identified as multiple victims of a disproportionate number of committed crimes. According to the British Crime Survey in 1995,  $\frac{1}{4}$  or  $\frac{1}{3}$  of all property crimes are committed against individuals who have been victimized five or more times over a period of one year. Other data show that about 40% of the crime is committed against individuals and households who have already been victims in the period of one year. Of all victims of violent or property crime, 20% have been revictimised from the same crime for several months.

The findings that have been obtained from the conducted surveys come to the following conclusions: (a) repeated victimization occurs rapidly after the previous victimization, (b) the same perpetrators, after perceiving that the goal is contributing to further victimization, are more likely to commit a new criminal offense (c) the risks of second (and third) victimization vary according to the type of crime, but the greatest risks for repeated victimization are in family violence, sexual violence, abuse of children and the elderly, as well as in racial attacks, harassment, threats and other violent behaviors; (d) high crime rates of repeated victimization are seen in shop robberies, burglary and robbery, and (e) repeated victimization is higher in violent than in property offences.

### **THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE SITUATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION**

The theoretical basis for situational crime prevention is based on: Oscar Newman's (2008) theory of defensible space, Jane Jacobs's analysis of natural crime prevention (Jane Jacobs, 1961), the crime prevention through environmental design (Ray Jeffry, 1977), on the theory of routine activities by Markus Felson (1986), the theory of rational choice of Ronald Clarke (Clarke, 1979), the theory of crime pattern of Brantingham & Brantingham (1993) and the life style theory. All of them are part of environmental criminology which presents umbrella of situational perspectives and theories of crime.

### **Environmental Criminology**

Environmental Criminology is a set of theories that share a common interest regarding the criminal event and the current circumstances in which it occurs, develops and persists. According to Brantingham (and others), environmental criminology primarily focuses its attention on criminal events that need to be understood as interrelation and interdependence of perpetrators, victims (or criminal purposes) and laws created in specific circumstances in a certain time and space. Basically, this theory explains crime through the influence that the environment has on it. By laying down certain rules in the natural and social environment, future criminal problems can be foreseen and strategies for crime prevention can be developed (Wortley & Mazerolle, 2011, indicated in Stefanovska and Gogov 2013: 59). The perpetrator is just one element of the criminal event, and the question: why did you commit the crime? is of secondary importance. The central interest is dedicated to the current dynamics of the crime: where it happened, when it happened, who was involved in it, what other participants did and how they deal with the crime. Research carried out within this theory covers three levels of analysis (according to Brantingham: macro, mezzo and micro). The macro analysis examines the distribution of crime between multiple countries, between parts of a state, regions within a particular state, or between individual cities within the state. Mezzo analysis of crime deals with smaller territories such as concrete streets or specific places. The analysis can be carried out from two aspects, sociological and architectural. The sociological aspect refers to human behavior within urban communities and to the effect that urbanization has on criminal activities and

other forms of deviance. On the other hand, using the knowledge of architecture and urbanism, some studies have shown that when a particular street or object is isolated, it is not traffic-related to the environment, it creates a sense of loneliness and isolation, and people living in such places lose the sense of community. Such environments become suitable places for crime. Otherwise, those streets or facilities that are open, with parks and greenery, with public and free children's amusement parks, create conditions for constant communication between the inhabitants of that place, thereby reducing the possibilities for committing crimes (Wortley & Mazerolle, 2011, stated in Stefanovska, Gogov, 2013: 60). The micro analysis focuses on the specific elements of the environment that have a direct impact on the behavior of individuals, that is, on the specific conditions in which the crime can occur. For example, thefts, robberies, violence, murders, etc., often occur in abandoned streets or parts of the city, near factory halls, warehouses, garages that do not have windows to the street, in public spaces that are not arranged and which are used for garbage etc. Micro analysis is done in order to determine the distribution of crime in places, areas and cities that are at higher risk, and in particular identifying the most problematic places in a risky areas or street. Therefore, in relation to which the prevention should be directed, four basic pillars were identified within the framework of the environmental criminology: (1) the architectural design of the space (Jacobs, Newman, Jeffrey), (2) the situation, that is, the specific context (specific crime occur at specific locations), which means that prevention should focus on specific crimes and to understand their situational dynamics, (3) the impact of wider social, demographic and natural factors related to both, environment and crime and (4) urban crime related to social disorganization and migration in certain parts of the city (Wortley & Mazerolle, 2011: 8). Taking into account the different aspects of the study, several theoretical frameworks (perspectives) have been established, which have their own particular aspect of study, but also certain common characteristics.

*Theory of environmental design.* Environmental design theory arises first in the United States and is inspired by the teachings of the Chicago School (1920), according to which there is a connection between individual urban zones in the city, that is, between the physical design of the environment and the crime. In that sense, preventive activities should be directed to changing the physical characteristics that will allow: (a) the perpetrator to be seen on the spot for committing the offense; (b) disable his escape; or (c) make hard the execution of the crime. The physical environment can improve the social character of the environment itself and will stimulate the interaction and association of citizens in a particular area. In this way, it will also enable more efficient crime control. Among the first advocates of this theory is Jane Jacobs (1961). Her theses presented in the book *Death and Life in Great American Cities* are an attack on the principles of the then-planned and built-up cities of the country. She observed the physical environment and how people behave in space. The focus is on the major urban cities in America such as Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Baltimore and New York in the 50s and 60s. The survey concluded that city streets must have three main characteristics: demarcation (clear distinction between public and private space), ownership



of the public space (to have natural space surveillance) and permanent users. Her thesis is that people, not the police, are the guardians of the space that is, they often maintain their informal social control, often *as eyes on the street*. According to her, the streets in the cities are unsafe because they are abandoned, and should therefore be built in a way that will allow the citizens themselves to observe the activities and events on the street.

Another notable representative of this theory is Oscar Newman (1972), who presented his theses in the book *Defensive Space*. He, unlike Jacobs, focuses on the architectural design of buildings. As director of the Institute of Planning and Housing at the New York University, he conducted a three-year research on the development of housing in major cities, especially in New York. In doing so, he discovered that there is a link between crime in certain parts of the city and lack of observation by the citizens themselves. He came to the conclusion that when tenants of buildings from their home have a view of the public space, crime in the streets decreases, and their irrational fear and concern over it is reduced. So, when people take ownership of the public space and observe it, that is, have control over it, a safe environment is created. Newman called that space a defensible space, based on the criticism of modern urban design. According to him, modern design is the main culprit for the high crime rate in some urban areas, as it disables any possibility of overseeing and controlling criminal activities. Spaces surrounding settlements that have been built up, with high-rise residential buildings with multiple entrances, represent an ideal place for committing criminal offenses, without perpetrators being seen and caught. Those spaces that do not belong to anyone, for whom nobody cares and who are not monitored, attract the crime. Therefore, according to the conception of defensible space, spatial design should have such an appearance that will enable easier monitoring of criminal activities. In this way, it will demystify the perpetrator of his intentions, which will have a direct consequence on the reduction of crime. The defensible space (which defends itself) should have four basic characteristics: (1) territorial definition of borders; (2) achieving as much natural control as possible; (3) the design of a residential neighborhood that should not be compacted; and (4) the construction of residential neighborhoods in secure urban areas. The weakness of this theory is the return of the term rational criminal. According to the theory, the general prevention consists in the fact that the defensible space will intimidate potential perpetrators and they will rationally conclude that there is little chance of successfully committing the crime. Another weakness is the one-sided view that the physical environment is the only reason for the appearance of crimes and the denial of its sociological characteristics. In this sense, certain statistics show that there are many settlements that do not have the character of a defensible space, and the crime rate is much lower compared to other metropolitan areas that have pronounced characteristics of space that is self-defending.

Another significant representative of the theory of environmental design is Ray Jeffery, who published *the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design* (CPTED) book in 1971. He points out that the design and security features of households and housing residences can affect crime and its characteristics in the area. Therefore, CPTED is

trying to remove, reduce or change the possibilities for committing criminal acts by changing the design and planning of buildings and other private and public spaces in the city.

The design of the environment should prevent the offender from escaping from the crime scene, to allow legitimate users to freely use the space by the citizens themselves and the opportunity to escape situations when they are potential victims. In addition, spatial design should increase informal social control in the neighborhood by establishing surveillance groups, enable natural monitoring of space, and send a message to outsiders and potential perpetrators that crime in those places is risky and unprofitable. So, in order to have preventative effects, the environment itself should control the behavior of people. In Europe, environmental design approach is known as “reducing crime and fear of crime through urban planning and architectural design”, or short *Designing Out Crime* (DOC) (Soomeren, 2000: 6). Advocates of this approach in Europe in 1999 formed the European Association for Designing Space without Crime (Designing Out Crime Association). In 2000, the Council of Europe organized a conference in Poland “The Relationship between the Physical Urban Environment and Crime Prevention” on which the Final Declaration was adopted. According to her, in reducing and preventing crime, states, and especially local authorities, should adopt appropriate policies for designing cities, in the areas of housing, physical environment, urban transport and sports facilities (CG / CONF / POLAND (2000) 2, Final Declaration).

*Theories of Opportunity.* The basic idea of situational prevention is based on the assumption that the reduction of crime depends on the reduction of the possibilities for committing crimes. So, the possibilities are equally important, as are the criminal motives and dispositions of the perpetrators. These factors act together and are related to each other. Opportunities motivate the perpetrator to commit a crime and vice versa. The motivated perpetrator requires suitable circumstances and a suitable situation in order to achieve his criminal goals (Clarke, 2000: 97). Hence, the possibility has a tempting effect and can create offenders even among those who do not have specific criminal predispositions (Tilley, 2008: 114). In Felson and Clarke’s book, *Opportunities make the thefts, 1998* it is stated that opportunities are necessary conditions for the crime to happen and therefore, they are the causes in the true sense of the word. The argument is that no single reason is sufficient to guarantee the appearance of crime, and they are equally important, as individual factors, and even more important in everyday life (Felson & Clarke, 1998).

Considering the importance and role of the possibilities for the emergence and increase of crime, there are several theoretical approaches commonly named as theories of opportunity: routine activities theory, rational choice theory, crime pattern theory and life style theory. The main difference between them is in the analysis and explanation of the actions of criminal possibilities. The theory of routine activities explains the crime as a result of three main factors in the environment (perpetrator, victim and formal or informal crime control), the theory of crime pattern as a result of the perpetrator movement in the space and the theory of rational choice explains

the process of decision making to commit a crime as a result of the assessment of the profits and losses from its execution. Common to all theories is that the change in criminal opportunities at any level (macro, mezzo and micro level) will reduce crime (Felson & Clarke, 1998: 8).

*Theory of routine activities (Felson, 1986).* Because of the criticism of Oscar Newman's defensible space concept (1972), a group of researchers in the United States, in an attempt to find appropriate solutions for suppressing and preventing crime, are directed to the three elements of the crime: perpetrator, victim and situation. In particular, Cohen and Felson (1979) advocate the thesis that the three elements (a motivated offender, a suitable target (victim) and the absence of a capable guardian, that is, the absence of formal or informal social control) must be present to make the criminal event happen. The theory of routine activities actually wants to explain that the routine way of life of citizens in the modern city characterized by more freedom in movement, behavior and goals, on the one hand, and the lack of social control over their behavior (because of the disagreement with traditional forms of life), on the other hand, leads to criminal activities. Victims become suitable targets for attack and, in conditions of lack of a capable guardian in a certain space and time, potential perpetrators are motivated to commit crimes. If any of these three elements are not met, a crime cannot be committed. For example, if there is a motivated perpetrator and an appropriate victim, if there is satisfactory control of a certain area and at a certain time, there will be no criminal act. Hence, the motivation of the perpetrator and the suitability of the victim depend on their routine activities. For example, the increase in the number of female employees created opportunities for more burglary of apartments and individual houses because in the morning hours they are mostly empty. At the same time, the increased absence of women outside the home creates greater exposure to assault (such as robbery, theft, rape), especially during the period of walking and returning from work. In this context, the increase in crime rates in the United States after the 1960s is explained by the increased percentage of vacant homes throughout the day, the greater participation of women in the labor market, and the increased availability of valuable, light and transferable moving things (items). In addition, potential victims undertake activities that instead of deterring them, encourage the perpetrators (for example, people carry different items of value with them, which due to the traffic density, become easier target for the perpetrators). Also, at different times in the day, routine activities bring people in contact with a large number of people and, because of frequent contacts, they can be found in a situation to be attacked or robbed.

Hence, perpetrators and victims are persons who conduct routine activities, and the crime occurs when, in the absence of a capable guard, the victims and perpetrators come into contact. Therefore, certain crimes can be prevented if they, as two sides of the crime, are separated. Using this approach, Clark and Felson (1988) envisaged several situational strategies for prevention, such as separating elderly people from young people and children into public homes, strengthening social control by establishing departments in schools with fewer students to reduce violent acts, restrict access to certain places (for example, prohibit the sale of alcohol during football matches) etc.

So, changes in society create more opportunities and convenient occasions, and at the same time reduce the number of capable guards. In this sense, not only does the motivated perpetrator seek a good opportunity, but also the opportunity incites the crime (Tilley, 2008: 114). Therefore, the theory of routine activities is a macro theory that, at a wider social level, explains how changes in society in terms of the number of suitable targets, or in the number of capable guards, extend the possibilities for committing crimes. Taking into account the above, the measures offered by this theory should be aimed at: reducing the motivation of the offenders, carrying out activities with which the goal becomes less attractive and increasing the capabilities of the guards to monitor the potential target.

*Theory of Rational Choice (Clarke, 1979).* The theory of rational choice, unlike the theory of routine activities, explains the process of deciding and selecting the perpetrator to commit a specific crime (Clarke, 2005: 41), that is, explains the crime from the perpetrator's perspective. Its roots are in the classical school, according to which the perpetrator chooses to commit a crime depending on his perceptions of risk and reward. In this decision-making process, he chooses what gives him the greatest pleasure, that is, chooses the one that requires less effort to master, and at the same time gives more profit. This means that the decision is based on the effort and the award received, instead of the consequences of the offense and the risk of imposing a sentence. On the basis of these assumptions, representatives of the theory of rational choice consider criminal activity to be viewed from the perspective of "attractive opportunities". If the possibility is tempting, comes to the realization of the crime. Accordingly, the perpetrator is rational and every individual in society is a potential offender. Whether such an individual will indeed become a criminal, depends on the possibilities. Also, crime constitutes a deliberate, not a random form of behavior that aims to satisfy some need (for example, for money, status, excitement, sex, etc.). However, although Clark and Cornish use the term *rational perpetrator*, it is still noted that the decision to commit crime does not necessarily have to be always rational, and appropriately considered, since a number of factors influence the decision-making process. This means that the execution of the crime is not only mechanically triggered by external factors, but also depends on other circumstances that influence the decision-making process, such as limiting the time, the cognitive abilities of the perpetrator and the available information about the victim, i.e. the target (Tilley, 2008: 105). Therefore, rationality is limited. In that sense, Cornish (1993) points out that it is not always necessary to apply the concept of rational choice as the standard around which decisions are measured, especially when it comes to violent crime (Guilling, 1997: 46).

Also, the advocates of this theory make differences between *criminality* and *crime* as two different concepts. For example, crime is an event, while criminality is a personal characteristic. Offenders with criminal inclinations do not always commit crimes, while those who are not prone to crime can, in certain situations, commit a certain crime. Hence, the decision-making process is influenced by various factors that need to be considered separately. Some high-risk offenders do not have the opportunity to commit a crime, while, on the other hand, low-risk ones can often encounter attractive

opportunities. Therefore, the selection process is not always rational, but rather limited. In addition, the motives can be different: from property gain, to sexual satisfaction, escape from weariness or pursuit of excitement. In this context, the perpetrator's ability to analyze the situation may be different because it is influenced by multiple situational circumstances. Bearing in mind that the preconditions for selection are the perpetrator to achieve the smallest amount of effort, the least risk and the greatest profit, the preventive measures are aimed at those elements: increasing the efforts of the perpetrator not to commit the crime, increasing the risk of being caught and reducing the profit.

*Crime Pattern Theory (Paul and Patricia Brantingham, 1993).* Crime pattern theory focuses on crime as a complex event that requires the fulfillment and interaction of multiple elements to happen (space, time, target and other situational circumstances). It places particular emphasis on geographical distribution and on the pattern of criminal behaviors to understand how the physical and social environment structures the criminal event (Fisher S. Bonnie & Lab P. Steven, 2010: 190). This theory explains the relationship between the movement and the daily rhythm of the activities of the perpetrators in the near environment and the geographical distribution of crime. So, it wants to answer the question: how do the perpetrators, within their daily movements in the space around them, seek or encounter the possibilities for committing crimes? In this sense, Paul and Patricia Brantingham (1993) found that crime occurs depending on the availability of appropriate targets (victims) in the area in which the perpetrator moves. This space is called a comfort zone or a awareness space and has a special familiarity because of the frequency of visits to those places. The structure of that space creates a mental visualization (map) among the perpetrators of all known places and paths, even for those who might be a subject of attack. So, the space of movement and daily routine activities is a central notion within the crime pattern theory. Namely, the theory describes how the perpetrators find the goals, that is, the targets during their routine activities, going from home to work and recreation sites. Behind those places, and along these paths, perpetrators seek opportunities for committing crimes. Thus, criminal opportunities are shaped by the network of paths around which perpetrators undertake their daily routine activities (Tilley, 2008: 144). For example, the founders of the theory explored the influence of the street network on the property crimes in several cities in Canada (1994) and found that property crimes mostly occur in parts of the streets that are easily accessible, in places where they have a high frequency of people and places that involve attractive goals / targets (Linden, 2007: 145). Also, research shows that the path to crime is typically very short. The perpetrators commit crimes in the range of one to three kilometers from their homes. For example, the analysis of 260,000 crimes over a period of two years (Brumwell Andy) shows that about half of the crimes are performed within a range of 1.5 kilometers from their homes (Clarke & Eck, 2005).

## POSSIBILITIES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITUATION CRIME PREVENTION

Opportunity theories are an important theoretical basis for the development of situational prevention and its incorporation as the main government policy in the control of crime. It, in contrast to developmental and social prevention, offers faster and cheaper ways to reduce crime: to design safe conditions and to apply effective procedures. In essence, the reform and development of situational crime prevention is largely influenced by the development of technology that differentiates information-based technologies (called soft technology) and hard-based technology. Hard technology includes: close-circuit television video (CCTV), street lighting, school metal detectors, luggage scanning, bullet-resistant glasses, private security systems, alcohol-measuring devices etc. Soft technology includes the strategic application of crime prevention information, such as the application of new computer programs for the analysis, classification and exchange of information, the introduction of registries of convicted persons for sexual acts and the like (Byrne & Marx, 2011 : 19). Representatives of the situational approach advocate practical, natural and simple measures to prevent crime. This approach is based on the assumption that situations are more predictable than people's behavior. Therefore, preventive measures should apply to those criminal situations that facilitate crime in certain areas. In addition, different forms of crime depend on various situational circumstances, i.e. factors. The situational prevention literature is rich in research and evaluations, which generally provide positive results for the effectiveness of situational measures and programs. Among the first research, the case of the suicide rate in England and Wales, which was reduced as a result of the change of toxic gas with natural gas, was the biggest cause of suicides in the period from 1958 to 1977. With the replacement of natural gas at that time, the results show that in England and Wales suicides did not count for ¼ (Clarke, 1997: 45). Another example is the reduction of unwanted calls from public payphones by setting up a system to identify the telephone number of public payphones (Clarke, 1997: 29). In Germany, an example is the legal introduction of a protective helmet while driving motor vehicle in 1980, which reduced thefts because the perpetrators were unable to drive the stolen vehicle without a protective helmet (Clarke, 1997: 30). Greater efficiency of situational measures, compared to other measures of social prevention, show the results obtained by the Barry Poyner research in 1987/88. His analysis confirms that the best effects have the following programs: providing housing blocks, marked parking spaces, using a steering wheel locking device in vehicles rewarding children for their positive behavior. According to the research results, the social measures applied within the social and social services: counseling and social work, educational projects, recreational activities for the young, etc. do not show significant effect in the prevention of crime (Poyner, 1993).

The above findings develop the situational approach (or situational prevention), which shows that in order to reduce the number of crimes, the possibilities for their execution should be reduced. On the other hand, in order to reduce opportunities, situational measures should be taken that will make the victim and the purpose of the attack less attractive and tempting for the perpetrators. This stems from the fact that

individual behavior is a product of the interaction between the person himself and the situation, that is, the situational circumstances in which he is located (Felson & Clarke, 1998). They are: a certain space, time, presence of victims, related targets and absence of obstacles to the commission of criminal acts. These factors are significant triggers of crime that create opportunities, and therefore, in order to reduce and prevent crime on a particular site, the possibilities of the same space should be changed and reduced.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Арнаудовски, Љ. (2007). *Криминологија*, 2-ри Август, Штип.
- Braga, A. & Kennedy, J. (2008). Police Enforcement Strategies to prevent crime in Hot Spot Areas, *Crime Prevention Research Review* (2), the Campbell Collaboration, US Department of Justice.
- Byrne, J. & Marx, G. (2011). "Technological Innovations in Crime Prevention and Policing. A Review of the Research on Implementation and Impact", *Cahiers Politiques Jaargang*, 3 (20), Maklu-Uitgevers, pp. 14–40.
- Clark, R. (1989). Theoretical background to crime prevention through environmental design and Cational prevention vo Designing Out Crime: The Conference Papers. Canberra, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Clarke, R. & Eck, J. (2005). *Crime Analysis and problem solvers in 60 Steps*, Center for problem oriented policing, US Department of justice.
- Clarke, R. (1997). *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*, Harrow and Heston Publishers.
- Clarke, V. Ronald (2000). "Situational Prevention, Criminology and social values", *Ethical and social perspectives on situational crime prevention*, Oxford: Hard Publishing, pp. 97 – 112.
- Cornish, D. (1994). "The procedural analysis of offending and its relevance for situational prevention", *Crime Prevention Studies*, pp. 151–196.
- Ekblom, P. (1994). Proximal Circumstances: A Mechanism-Based Classification of Crime Prevention, *Crime Prevention Studies*, (2), pp. 185 – 232.
- Felson, M. & Clark V. Ronald (1998). *Opportunity Makes the Thief, Practical theory for crime prevention*, Home Office, Policing and Reducing Crime Unit, London.
- Felson, M. (2008). "Situational Crime Prevention", *International Handbook of Penology and criminal justice*, CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 295–320.
- Felson, M. (2011). *Zlocin i svakodnevni zivot*, Pravni fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, Biblioteka Crimen.
- Fisher S. Bonnie & Lab P. Steven (2010) *Encyclopedia of Victim logy and Crime Prevention*, SAGE Publication.



- Garland, D. (2000). "Ideas, Institutions and Situational Crime Prevention", *Ethical and social Perspectives on Situational Crime Prevention*, Oxford-Portland, Oregon, 2000, pp. 1–16.
- Gilling, D. (1997). *Crime Prevention, Theory, policy and politics*, Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. London and New York.
- Lab P. Steven (2014) *Crime Prevention Approaches, Practices and Evaluations*, Elsevier
- Linden, R. (2007). "Situational Crime Prevention: Its Role in Comprehensive Prevention Initiatives", *IPC Review (1)*, pp. 139–159.
- Poyner, B. (1993). "What works in crime prevention: An overview of evaluations", *Crime Prevention Studies (1)*, pp. 7–34.
- Soomeren, P. (2000). Crime prevention solutions for Europe: Designing Out Crime, Conference on the relationship between the physical environment and crime reduction and prevention, Szczecin – Poland: 19 – 21 October 2000.
- Стефановска, В. и Гогов, Б. (2014). *Улогата на заедницата и на полицијата во превенција на криминалитетот, состојби во градот Скопје*, Факултет за безбедност – Скопје.
- Tilley, N. (2008). *Crime Prevention*, Willam Publishing.
- Wortley, R. & Mazerolle, L. (2011). "Environmental Criminology and Crime Analysis: situating the theory, analytic approach and application", *Environmental Criminology and Crime Analysis*, Routledge, 1–18.
- Wortley, R. (1996). "Guilt, Shame and Situational Crime Prevention", *Crime Prevention Studies (5)*, 115–132.

#### Podaci o autorima

prof. dr Vesna Stefanovska

Univerzitet "St. Kliment Ohridski" – Bitola, Fakultet za bezbednost - Skoplje, Odsjek za kriminologije i krivično pravosuđe  
vstefanovska77@gmail.com

doc. dr Natasa Jovanova

Univerzitet "St. Kliment Ohridski" – Bitola, Fakultet za bezbednost - Skoplje, Odsjek za kriminologije i krivično pravosuđe  
natasa.akademija@yahoo.com