

# CLAIMED: Mobilisation for crime prevention and community safety

January 2008

Prof. Paul Ekblom

5Is, CCO, CLAIMED and definitions in depth of partnership, crime prevention and community safety are all covered in *Crime Prevention, Security and Community Safety Using the 5Is Framework*, by Paul Ekblom (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2011). See [www.palgrave.com/products/title.aspx?pid=296569](http://www.palgrave.com/products/title.aspx?pid=296569) and author's blog at <http://5isframework.wordpress.com/>.

# CLAIMED: Mobilisation for crime prevention and community safety

Prof. Paul Ekblom

Crime prevention interventions – seeking to manipulate the causes or risk factors of criminal events – are rarely implemented by professional crime preventers. Instead, the role of the professional is often one of specifying one or more crime prevention interventions and then somehow getting people or institutions in the ‘civil’ world to implement or otherwise support them. For example, a crime prevention sticker on a bike parking stand may have been designed by a professional preventer; put in place by a council worker; and hopefully noticed by bike owners to alert and inform them of the risk of theft, and empower them to take appropriate preventive action in the form of parking their bike in a secure way (the intervention). Likewise the developers and promoters of a teaching pack on ethics may seek to approach the local education authority to allow them to approach head teachers in individual schools to ask their staff to use the pack on their pupils (the intervention).

The CLAIMED framework sets out a generic procedure for getting particular people or institutions to act as crime preventers, ie to take responsibility for effectively and acceptably reducing the risk of crime and/or improving community safety; and conversely, to cease acting as crime promoters (inadvertently, recklessly or deliberately increasing the risk of crime). Acting as preventers can involve undertaking very specific tasks, as with the council worker above; or taking on a wider role with greater scope for initiative (for example, getting architects to ‘think thief’ in all their work). The preventer/promoter dimension has been incorporated implicitly in the Crime Triangle (see [www.popcenter.org](http://www.popcenter.org)) in that preventers take the form of managers of places, guardians of targets and handlers of offenders. Again with the above examples, notice how the CLAIMED algorithm is **recursive** – that is, the procedure can be repeated on its own outputs, an indefinite number of times, in generating a hierarchical implementation track.

In the process of tackling a specific crime problem, whenever a particular risk or cause of crime is identified and an intervention suggested, the logical next step is to ask **who might be mobilised** to cease contributing to that risk or cause and/or to implement that intervention; and **what tasks or roles should they undertake**. Applying CLAIMED therefore links end-to-end with the generic crime risks and functional solutions identified through the Misdeeds and Security framework, or any of the causal interventions mapped in CCO classic or dynamic. In a developmental crime prevention context its application can also follow from identifying particular **risk and protective factors** for offending (see for example those listed by the UK Youth Justice Board: <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/Publications/Resources/Downloads/Risk%20Factors%20Summary%20fv.pdf> ).

In knowledge management terms CLAIMED can document the Mobilisation aspect of the ‘implementation track’ of complex preventive programmes. CLAIMED is therefore incorporated within the 5Is framework, where Mobilisation comes under the Involvement process, accompanied by Partnership and Climate-Setting. CLAIMED also fits within the definition-in-depth of Partnership elsewhere on this site.

## Background

The CLAIMED framework emerged from Paul Ekblom’s reading of the Design Council’s report on the state of designing against crime amongst designers, design education establishments and industry, funded as part of the UK Government’s Crime Reduction Programme (1998-2003) – see for example Design Council (2000), Learmont (2005) and Pease (2003:29). Basically, while implementation arrangements for crime prevention through design were complex and diverse, a common

algorithm appeared to underlie them all. It was soon realised that this framework (which started with AME, then extended to include CL, then D, then most recently, I!) was applicable across the board in crime prevention and community safety and incorporated in the extension of the CCO framework that eventually became 5Is (Eklom 2001).

## References

Design Council (2000). *Design Against Crime*. A Report to the Design Council, The Home Office and the Department of Trade and Industry. Cambridge, Salford and Sheffield Hallam Universities. <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/dac/respub.html>

Eklom, P. (2001). 'The Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity: a Framework for Crime Reduction Toolkits' - Crime Reduction website. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100413151441/crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/learningzone/cco.htm>.

Learmont, S. (2005). 'Design Against Crime', in Clarke, R. and Newman, G. (Eds.) *Designing out Crime from Products and Systems*. *Crime Prevention Studies*, Vol. 18. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press and Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Pease, K. (2003). *Cracking Crime through Design*. London: Design Council. [http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/Documents/Documents/Publications/Cracking\\_Crime\\_Through\\_Design\\_Design\\_Council.pdf](http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/Documents/Documents/Publications/Cracking_Crime_Through_Design_Design_Council.pdf)

## Mobilisation Framework

The generic procedure for mobilising crime preventers

to implement particular interventions comprises several steps:

- **Clarify** the crime prevention tasks or roles that need doing, eg the intervention itself; alleviating constraints; and supplying enablers.
- **Locate** the individuals or organisations best-placed to undertake them, including designers, manufacturers, marketers and consumers. Then
- **Alert** them that their product could be causing crime, or that they could help stop unrelated crimes
- **Inform** them of the nature of the problem/risk/causation.
- **Motivate** them – by hard or soft incentives including an image of corporate social responsibility, naming and shaming, 'polluter-pays' taxes, awakening consumer expectations and pressures and imposing insurance costs, and legislation.
- **Empower** them – by supplying preventers with education, guidance on intervention, tools (eg property-marking kit) and other resources; and by alleviating a range of constraints
- and perhaps **Direct** them, in terms of standards (such as BSI or CEN), and targets. Regulations relating to privacy or anti-vigilantism may also be applied to stop people taking crime prevention beyond acceptable limits or clashing with other values.

These actions must be undertaken in step with public and commercial understandings and expectations – hence the importance of **climate-setting activities** such as setting the public tone for those who are considered to be responsible for the diverse causes of crime, and for those who should take action.

Nor can specific actions always be undertaken in isolation. All the above enablers and their counterpart

constraints interlock and may form a self-reinforcing system which is hard to shift from one state to another without a **concerted approach**. In some cases this may require basic actions to develop **social capital/ social cohesion** in order to make things work.

To the extent that the relationships between the various institutions and individual people initiating this process is one-sided, **mobilisation** is the appropriate concept; to the extent that there is a more symmetrical relationship of mutual decision-making, task/role specification and taking of responsibility, then **partnership** is the preferred term. Many crime prevention/ community safety actions combine elements of each, though there is a growing trend towards participation, engagement or co-design to use some of the many terms that apply.

## Constraining Crime Promoters

Crime promoters are people or institutions who make criminal events more likely to happen or who otherwise jeopardise community safety. This could be inadvertent, careless, reckless or deliberate. In some cases promoters will be knowingly committing criminal offences themselves (eg electronically unlocking stolen mobile phones for the thief or the buyer). CLAIMED can be applied in reverse to constrain or demotivate particular promoters... and in some cases to get these people/institutions to go beyond mere desistance of promotion to become active crime preventers. The simplest example of this is influencing people who customarily leave their doors unlocked (promoters) to become preventers (locking up).