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Abstract

‘An Exploration of the Potential for Situational Crime Prevention to Reduce Child Sexual Abuse’

Situational Crime Prevention (SCP) theories are based upon the premise that crime can be prevented through manipulation of the environment. Situational theories have traditionally been applied to theft but are now expanding in their application to various other forms of crime. One of which is Child Sexual Abuse (CSA), the SCP perspective aims to prevent CSA from occurring through subtle environmental changes, rather than a focus on the individual, which previous CSA prevention has focused on. This dissertation aimed to investigate how situational theories can be applied to CSA, specifically Clarke’s twenty-five situational crime prevention techniques and the ‘CRAVED’ model of crime. In order to achieve this, this dissertation undertook a systematic literature review of existing research on the area to provide a consolidation of evidence to apply to the SCP theories. Through an examination of research, findings suggested that both Clarke’s SCP techniques table and the ‘CRAVED’ model can both be broadly applied to CSA. The application provided an increased understanding of the situational aspects of CSA and how they can be used to prevent it from occurring. However, due to the complexity of CSA, particular elements of the SCP theories were limited in their application due to a lack of existing literature on specific areas. For example, making CSA less ‘enjoyable’ for the offender and also a lack of research surrounding the ‘rewards’ associated with CSA to provide environmental suggestions to ‘reduce the rewards’. Overall it concludes that CSA has the potential to be reduced through the application of
situational crime prevention efforts, yet further research is warranted to provide a more comprehensive application.
Introduction

Child Sexual Abuse (CSA) is generally acknowledged as one of the most heinous crimes with far-reaching consequences for the victim and society at large. It not only leads to psychological and physical harm experienced by the victim, but it also has a profound effect on their families and wider communities (Dedel, 2010, p.7). CSA statistics have revealed that there is a high prevalence of CSA within society, with figures from the NSPCC (2019b) reporting a peak of 76,204 recorded offences in the United Kingdom in 2018/19. This statistic demonstrates a dynamic increase of reported CSA offences, with a rise of 60% since the year 2014/15 (NSPCC, 2019b). However, as this is based upon only reported crimes, the reality is that this is a significant underestimate of the truth (Erooga and Kaufman, 2019, p.4195). Notwithstanding the severe consequences and the increasing prevalence of CSA (Erooga and Kaufmen, 2019, p.4196), the prevention of this crime has traditionally focused upon “understanding and changing those that offend” (Wortley et al., 2019, p.4304), with the aim manipulating offenders’ intrinsic qualities that may predetermine them to commit CSA. Yet, traditional offender-based prevention may be problematic in the area of CSA as it relies upon applying preventative efforts after the offence has occurred; therefore, this means that the consequences to the victim remain (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010b, p.2).

Consequently, to improve the understanding and prevention of CSA, research must progress beyond traditional efforts that focus on the individual, and instead explore other avenues of prevention (Cockbaine and Reynald, 2016, p.1). One specific area addressed by academics is Situational Crime Prevention (SCP), by applying principles of SCP it focuses on explaining the ‘who’, ‘what’, ‘where’, ‘how’
and ‘when’ of CSA through analysis of the environment (Cockbaine and Reynald, 2016, p.1). This approach allows for the recognition and manipulation of situational precipitators to propose an offence-focused approach (Erooga and Kaufman, 2019, p.4197). In light of this, the situational perspective will be the focal point of this dissertation.

It is essential to contribute to the growing body of knowledge surrounding this research area as the application of SCP onto CSA is a relatively new field of criminological thought. As a result, there is limited published literature to combine the two fields of research. Due to the severity of this crime, it is vital to provide additional research to help increase awareness on the role the situation can play in CSA and how this has the potential to inform techniques which attempt to prevent it (Cockbaine and Reynald, 2016, p.1). This dissertation seeks to explore how theories of situational crime prevention can be applied to child sexual abuse. The aims of this dissertation are twofold. The first aim is to adopt Clarke’s twenty-five situational crime prevention techniques table used to manipulate environments to reduce crime and apply it to CSA. It seeks to uphold this aim through mapping out suggestions based upon offender-informed studies to create an institutional and domestic situational technique framework. The second aim is to map the ‘CRAVED’ acronym, used to understand why certain targets of crime are ‘likely targets’, onto CSA. In doing this, it aims to explain why some children are more at risk of CSA than others through consolidation of offender-informed target selection studies. These concepts will be further explained in chapter one. The overall goal in fulfilling these two aims is to contribute to existing research, which can build upon the growing body of literature around applying SCP to CSA.
The overall structure of the dissertation takes the form of three main chapters, which are organised as follows. The first section of this dissertation provides a brief overview of situational crime prevention theories and models, specifically, Rational Choice Theory (RCT), Situational Crime Prevention (SCP) techniques and the ‘CRAVED’ acronym. It explains how the theories in question have been applied to crime in general, moving onto an examination of their significance for the research. The remaining chapters focus upon mapping the SCP models discussed in chapter one onto CSA to highlight the potential for prevention. Chapter two begins by briefly explaining the definitions and prevalence of CSA before moving onto applying the rational choice theory to CSA. It finishes with an application of Clarke’s SCP techniques table onto two different contexts in which CSA can occur, institutional and domestic. Chapter three consolidates research based upon offender-informed studies on target selection in order to apply the ‘CRAVED’ acronym onto CSA. This dissertation then concludes with an explanation of how different SCP theories can be applied to CSA, along with an examination of how the research builds upon existing knowledge and provides scope for further research into the field.

In order to achieve the aims of the dissertation, a systematic literature review was undertaken to analyse and consolidate relevant secondary data. The appropriate literature for this research drew on empirical studies which were conducted with child sex offenders, specifically those which provide prevention suggestions. This allowed for prevention to be viewed through the lens of the offender. The research data was drawn from specific databases, such as the NSPCC online library, the Office for National Statistics publications on child sexual abuse, the University of Leeds library
and the use of Research Gate. These databases were used to search for key terms such as “child sexual abuse”, “CSA”, “situational crime prevention of child sexual abuse” and “environmental criminology”, to find a range of sources such as journal articles, books, media articles and policy documents. During the process of identifying sources, international studies were included, for example, from Canada, the United States and Australia. They were included as CSA is not a problem just in the UK but also across the world; similarly, SCP is increasingly being used as a theoretical model globally to ascertain prevention techniques. However, one limitation encountered when collecting data was the lack of available literature surrounding the ‘enjoyment’ and ‘rewards’ of CSA from the offender’s perspective. Without a widespread availability of research, particular elements of SCP theories were unable to be applied to CSA.
Chapter One – Theoretical Background surrounding Situational Crime Prevention (SCP).

This chapter is concerned with examining the main theories surrounding the Situational Crime Prevention (SCP) approach. In order to correlate the subsequent research effectively, it is necessary to describe the main concepts that will follow. This chapter will firstly explain the Rational Choice theory of crime, moving on to look at the theory of Situational Crime Prevention, notably Clarke’s SCP techniques table and ending with the ‘CRAVED’ theory of crime. The majority of this chapter will be descriptive in order to examine the theoretical applications to crime in general, which will be of use for the later chapters.

The following theories come under the umbrella of ‘Environmental Criminology’ and specifically Situational Crime Prevention, which has risen in popularity as an explanation of criminal behaviour. The approaches it encompasses differ from ‘traditional’ criminological theories of crime. The traditional theories are fundamentally focused upon the criminality within the individual (Wortley and Townsley, 2017, p.1/2). The basis of these theories is built around explaining criminality through various factors which may affect individuals and dispose them to commit crime, namely biological influences and personal experiences (Wortley and Townsley, 2017, p.2). Therefore, for traditional theories of crime, prevention is concerned with altering the individual’s criminality by fundamental changes in society once the offences occur (Wortley and Townsley, 2017, p.2). By contrast, the situational approach does not try to eradicate characteristics within criminals through societal changes (Clarke, 2018,
It is essential to look at crime in this way, as an understanding of the role that the environment plays in criminality may lead to it being used as a “powerful weapon in the investigation, control and prevention of crime” (Wortley and Townsley, 2017, p.3). Using this framework is significant for crime prevention as it can help to prevent an extensive range of crime, from burglary and theft to terrorism and child sexual abuse, but with little cost for society (Clarke, 2018). This is of crucial significance in a time of cuts and austerity which has led to criminal justice agencies being stretched in their abilities. Yet it must be emphasised that this research will not argue that traditional theories of crime focusing on the individual should not be used. Instead, it will argue that looking at crime, and in particular, child sexual abuse (CSA), through the lens of situational crime prevention may provide a different direction for prevention.

Despite the situational approach being a vast area inclusive of various theories, the focus for this research will be on Rational Choice Theory, Situational Crime Prevention and the ‘CRAVED’ model of crime. This research will now discuss each of these in turn.

**Rational Choice Theory**

The Rational Choice Theory (RCT) loosely refers to a theoretical perspective which contends that offenders’ decisions to commit crimes have a *rational* basis, which is informed by the situational data from the environment (Wortley and Townsend, 2017, p.11). It is now a widely used theory within criminological thought and over time has
been successfully applied to an expansive range of differing crimes that will be discussed later within this chapter (Wright, 2009).

Wortley and Tilley (2017, p.11) argued that the origins of RCT originate from utilitarian deterrence models adopted by Beccaria and Bentham from the 18\textsuperscript{th} century. Yet, arguably it was something that was primarily introduced by economists into the area of criminology (Becker, 1968, cited in Simpson et al., 2002, p.25). This is because the underlying groundwork of the theory is built upon the economic ‘Expected Utility Model’, which claims that individuals make rational decisions dependent upon whether their choice will “maximise their profits or benefits and minimise their cost or losses” (Akers, 2000, cited in Simpson et al., 2002, p.25). Previous to this, criminological theories had generally ignored offender decision making, yet RCT attempts to understand crime from an offender’s viewpoint (Leclerc and Reynald, 2018, p.1).

Individuals all make decisions; some are mundane everyday decisions and others are important life-changing ones. Yet, the process of making decisions is based around weighing up perceived costs and benefits and making an informed decision based upon immediate information. The method of criminal decision making reflects the same process. A quote by Willie Sutton highlights this; when asked why he robbed banks, he responded with “Because that’s where the money is” (Cocheo, 1997, cited in Cornish and Clarke, 2016, p.29). This quote gives an insight into the rationality of offenders, highlighting that their criminal decisions derive from perceived costs and benefits. RCT further anticipates that criminal behaviour occurs when the perceived benefits outweigh the costs (Simpson et al., 2002).
Another central point of the RCT is the notion that offenders, like all individuals, are goal orientated (Brezina, 2002, p.241), and therefore, will seek to follow the best choices that obtain the most benefits. Every crime will have specific costs and benefits that inform decisions; this is because the information criminals receive from their environment that informs their choices will differ significantly across offences (Cornish and Clarke, 2014, p.2). Perceived benefits may include physical benefits such as monetary gain, but also psychological benefits such as sexual gratification. Similarly, there are monetary and non-monetary costs to weigh up. These may include the cost of travel, a high risk of being caught, guilt and condemnation from others (Farrell, 2018). An examination of different offences illustrates the difference in perceived benefits across crimes types. For example, rape may not necessarily have a perceived monetary gain but instead may benefit the individual by satisfying their sexual urges and desire for domination and control (Katz, 1988, cited in Cornish and Clarke, 2016, p.34). Yet, burglary may satisfy monetary needs and possible psychological benefits (Ibid, p.34).

The perspective assumes that all offending is rational (Simon, 1978, cited in Cornish and Clarke, 2014, p.1), yet it must be noted it is not assuming perfect rationality (Cornish and Clarke, 2016, p.33). Situations that criminals find themselves in are dynamic in nature with the risks continually changing. Therefore, costs and benefits cannot always be accurately estimated in advance, so rationality is not always perfect (Cornish and Clarke, 2016, p.33).

A common criticism of the RCT is that it does not apply to crimes with an expressive nature, yet recent research, such as that from Beauregard and Leclerc (2007) has
shown it can be applicable to expressive crimes such as CSA. This is an issue which will be discussed in a later chapter. The notion that the most serious crimes can have a rational basis is difficult to comprehend. Yet, evidence has found that in the most pathologically motivated crimes, rational elements were present. For example, Bennett’s (2014, p.83) study highlighted that there are rational elements to opioid use, and additionally Clarke and Newman’s (2006) work recognised that there are rational elements to terrorism.

Why is the Rational Choice Theory significant to this research?

The Rational Choice Theory fundamentally challenges existing beliefs about the nature of offending. The theory provides an understanding that offenders are somewhat rational, and their environment informs their decisions, therefore interventions that change the “criminogenic features” within CSA environments can be put into place (Brezina,2002, p.242). This theory is critical in relation to the following chapters as it helps to explain the rationality behind child sex offenders, which is not often considered when discussing this area. Moreover, if the rationality of CSA offenders can be better understood, then more effective interventions can be implemented to reduce the perceived costs and benefits.
The next core concept to explore is Situational Crime Prevention (SCP), which loosely refers to a discipline within environmental criminology that is described as “the art and science of reducing crime opportunities” (Clarke, 2005, p.39). Arguably crime is reduced by amending the situation in which crime is likely to happen (Clarke, 2016, p.286). This was accomplished by leading criminologist Clarke’s twenty-five situational crime prevention techniques that he devised. It must be noted that the definition of SCP is purposely general because it makes no specific mention to certain types of crime but instead can be applied to vast amounts of crime types (Clarke, 1997, p.4).

SCP arose over fifty years ago following the work by leading criminologist Ronald Clarke and has developed and expanded since. His work on SCP rests upon other criminological theories such as Rational Choice Theory and Routine Activity Theory, all of which emphasise the role of opportunity within offending, these are principles which act as a basis for SCP (Clarke, 2016, p.286). In his work, Clarke argued that for crime to be prevented effectively, exact situational precipitators need to be understood to explicitly target them (Wortley and Townsley, 2017, p.10). To target situational precipitators, Clarke developed a table of situational prevention techniques, made up of five main headings with specific techniques within. The components of the table have been altered over time to devise a set of methods that can be used by practitioners to manipulate the criminal opportunities within an environment (Lee, 2010, p.264). The table originated in 1992 when Clarke devised the first draft to include three headings, namely: Increase the effort, Increase the risk, Reduce the reward, with
twelve subsequent techniques (Clarke, 1992, cited in Lee, 2010, p.264). Further to this, Clarke and Homel (1997) added a column to include ‘Removing excuses’. Lastly, Cornish and Clarke (2003) added the last column, which focuses on ‘Reducing provocation’ (Freilich and Newman, 2014, p.33). It must be noted the table is likely to continue to change as understanding of situational aspects of criminal behaviour widens (Lee, 2010, p.264). For the purposes of clarity, Clarke’s twenty-five situational prevention techniques table is below.

### TWENTY FIVE TECHNIQUES OF SITUATIONAL PREVENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase the Effort</th>
<th>Increase the Risk</th>
<th>Reduce the Rewards</th>
<th>Reduce Provocations</th>
<th>Remove Excuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Target harden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21. Set rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Steering column</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locks immobilisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Set rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Anti-robbery screens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rent an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tamper-proof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>packaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Harassment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities</td>
<td>- Take routine precautions:</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Off-street parking</td>
<td>frustrations and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Entry phones</td>
<td>- go out in a group at night,</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Gender-neutral phone</td>
<td>stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Electronic card</td>
<td>- leave signs of occupancy, carry phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>- directories</td>
<td>• Efficient queues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access</td>
<td>- “Cocoon” neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and polite service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Baggage screening</td>
<td>watch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expanded seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Screen exits</td>
<td>7. Assist natural surveillance</td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Remove targets</td>
<td>• Soothing music/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ticket needed for exit</td>
<td>- Improved street lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Removable car radio</td>
<td>muted lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Export documents</td>
<td>- Defensible space design</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Women’s refuge</td>
<td>• Reduce crowding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Electronic</td>
<td>- Support whistleblowers</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Pre-paid cards for pay phones</td>
<td>in pubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merchandise tags</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fixed cab fares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Street closures</td>
<td>- Taxi drive IDs</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Property marking</td>
<td>emotional arousal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Separate bathrooms</td>
<td>- “How’s my driving?”</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Vehicle licensing and parts marking</td>
<td>• Controls on violent pornography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for women</td>
<td>- decals</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cattle branding</td>
<td>• Enforce good behaviour on soccer fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disperse pubs</td>
<td>- School uniforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Prohibit racial slurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weapons</td>
<td>- CCTV for double-deck buses</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Monitor pawn shops</td>
<td>pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Smart” guns</td>
<td>- Two clerks for</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Controls on classified ads</td>
<td>• “Idiots drink and drive”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disabling stolen cell phones</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>- License street vendors</td>
<td>• “It’s OK to say No”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Restrict spray paint</td>
<td>- Reward vigilance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Disperse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sales to juveniles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>troublemakers at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increase the Risk</td>
<td>10. Strengthen formal surveillance</td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Deny benefits</td>
<td>school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase the effort</td>
<td>- Red light cameras</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ink merchandise tags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase the risk</td>
<td>- Burglar alarms</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Graffiti cleaning</td>
<td>intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reduce the rewards</td>
<td>- Security guards</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Speeds humps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reduce Provocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCP differs from the majority of criminological thought as its focus is on the settings in which crime takes place, as opposed to those committing the criminal act (Clarke, 1997, p.2). The twenty-five techniques constructed by Clarke starts with the first column, which focuses upon *Increasing the effort* for the offender when committing a crime. From knowledge of the Rational Choice Theory, evidence suggests that offenders will commit crimes that are easy for them, yet if made harder for them, it may, in turn deter them. Clarke proposed one way of doing this would be via ‘target hardening’, which involves increasing the physical security of targets using security mechanisms (Wortley and Townsley, 2017, p.11). A successful case study to demonstrate this comes from the United Kingdom, whereby the post office mostly eliminated theft from public telephones in the late 1960s by replacing the aluminium coin receptacles with steel ones to increase the effort for the offender (Clarke, 1983, p.241). This technique has also been applied to the vastly different crime of terrorism. Wilkinson (cited in Clarke, 1997, p.5) found that there was a significant reduction in aircraft hijackings after baggage screening became a necessity, as this meant that potential terrorists would have to increase their effort significantly to carry through explosive devices.

The second column focuses upon *Increasing the risk* for the offender through techniques such as ‘*extending guardianship*’. One way this may be achieved is through the use of schemes such as ‘Cocoon Neighbourhood Watch’, which increases the risk to the offender as multiple neighbours watch out for properties (Bennett et al., 2008). Thirdly, manipulating the environment to reduce crime can be achieved by
Reducing the rewards available to the offender. One specific technique of doing this could be by ‘removing the target’ from the environment. For example, pay-in electricity and gas meters used commonly in the 1970s and 80s were replaced by quarterly billing to remove the target of theft from the environment (Clarke, 1983, p.243). Moreover, the last two headings of Reducing provocations and Remove excuses were added, both of which, recognise the psychological and emotional elements within the offender’s motivations (Lee, 2010, p.264).

Why is Situational Crime Prevention significant to this research?

SCP and Clarke’s twenty-five techniques are significant for the understanding and prevention of CSA. It provides a differing approach, adopting the offender’s perspective to inform situational techniques that may be put into place to manipulate the environments in which CSA may occur (Clarke, 2018). Furthermore, the SCP theory is ubiquitous, so can be applied globally, which is key to CSA prevention as it is a crime that is committed in a wide range of contexts across the world.

The ‘CRAVED’ model

The last key concept to examine is the ‘CRAVED’ model of crime. The ‘CRAVED’ model refers to a widely used criminological acronym referring to concealable, removable, available, valuable, enjoyable and disposable targets. It attempts to capture the qualities of ‘hot products’, which are those items and people most commonly targeted by offenders (Bowers and Johnson, 2013, p.9).
The idea of capturing ‘attractive’ qualities of frequently victimised targets arose in 1979 when Cohen and Felson (1979) attempted to encapsulate the characteristics of ‘suitable targets’ through their ‘VIVA’ acronym. ‘VIVA’ referred to ‘hot products’ being valuable, inertia, visible and accessible. However, after it was criticised for not considering any motivations for crime, it was subsequently replaced by the ‘CRAVED’ model (Clarke, 1999, p.23).

This section will now go on to discuss the components of ‘CRAVED’ in more detail. Academics contend that crime is not distributed evenly across time, place or person, and evidence has shown that some targets termed ‘hot products’ are considerably more likely to be targeted than others (Clarke, 1999, v). It must be noted that targets do not necessarily only refer to inanimate objects but also animals and more recently people (Clarke, 1999, v). What makes these targets more attractive to criminals is captured by the six components of the ‘CRAVED’ acronym. The first element is ‘Concealable’, which refers to targets that are small enough to be taken without attracting attention from guardians (Bowers and Johnson, 2013, p.9). The next element is ‘Removable’ which refers to targets that are physically easy to move (Clarke, 1999, p.24). ‘Available’ refers to those targets that can be easily accessible to the criminal (Bowers and Johnson, 2013). The target must also be ‘Valuable’ which may be seen as a subjective term, as what is termed ‘valuable’ is dependent on the person’s opinion, but it commonly refers to items of a high monetary value. Targets must also be ‘Enjoyable’ to be worthy of being targeted, otherwise, there is little reason why offenders would choose them. Lastly, the target must be ‘Disposable’, in that the offender can easily sell it on or control afterwards. Evidence suggests that more ‘CRAVED’ characteristics a target has, the more likely it is to be targeted; therefore,
the characteristics should be manipulated in order to make them less ‘attractive’ to criminals (Lester, 2001).

Despite traditional examples being focused on primarily inanimate objects, the acronym has more recently been applied to wildlife crime to analyse why some species may be targeted more often than others (Kurkland et al., 2017). To illustrate this, Sidebottom’s (2013) research, using data from surveys of 11,280 households in Malawi, found livestock with greater CRAVED characteristics were those significantly more likely to be stolen. Research by Pires and Clarke (2011) found similar results in relation to parrot poaching. This demonstrates how the acronym is not just restricted to the application of inanimate objects and therefore, has far-reaching potential that will be explored in subsequent chapters.

**Why is the ‘CRAVED’ model significant to this research?**

Evidence has demonstrated that despite ‘CRAVED’ being heavily applied to the theft of inanimate objects, its application has started to be expanded to wildlife. Further to this, this research will attempt to apply it to CSA. It is significant to this research to apply the ‘CRAVED’ model, as to understand target selection from the offender’s perspective may help to explain what increases the likelihood of a child being targeted. This may enhance the potential to prevent CSA by making targets and the environment in which they occur less ‘attractive’ (Felson, 2002, p.30).

This chapter has sought to demonstrate an outline of the main theories that help to underpin the theoretical framework surrounding SCP, which will now go on to be applied to child sexual abuse.
Chapter Two – The application of Rational Choice Theory and Clarke’s Situational Techniques Table onto Child Sexual Abuse.

The following chapter will apply the theories previously discussed to CSA. There is much to unveil regarding the application of these theories to CSA, as it is a relatively new area of research. Wortley and Smallbone (2010a) are leading academics in this area, and they highlight the importance of applying situational theories to inform CSA prevention. This is evidenced by their research which suggests that CSA happens when the situational circumstances are favourable to the offender (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010a). This, therefore, informs the rationale for this chapter.

This chapter will first briefly discuss the offence of CSA, moving on to how it may be applied to the RCT with reference to key studies. Finishing with the application of Clarke’s SCP techniques table to CSA in an institutional and domestic context. All of which will attempt to analyse the potential for situational elements to prevent CSA (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010b, p.3)

Overview of Child Sexual Abuse

It seems relevant to briefly discuss CSA before applying it to theories. There are varying definitions that have attempted to encapsulate CSA, yet no comprehensive definition is used by all agencies and academics (Dedel, 2010, p.2). A useful definition for the purposes of this research comes from The World Health Organisation which describes CSA as “The involvement of a child in sexual activity that he or she does not fully comprehend, is unable to give informed consent to, or for which the child is
not developmentally prepared, or else that violate the laws and social taboos of society. Children can be sexually abused by adults or other children who are – by virtue of their age or stage of development – in a position of responsibility, trust or power over the victim” (World Health Organisation, 2006, p.10). The broadness of this definition highlights that a wide range of behaviours may constitute CSA, Kaufman et al. (2010, p.102) suggests these can range from ‘non-contact abuse’ (i.e. Grooming online) to ‘contact abuse’, which includes the offender perpetrating acts of “physical intrusiveness” (Ibid, p.102). Throughout this research, due to word restrictions, CSA refers to ‘contact abuse’ only. Moreover, for clarity, a ‘child’ is referring to “any individual who has not yet reached their eighteenth birthday”, as defined by the Office for National Statistics (2020a, p.8).

Examining the prevalence of CSA highlights the importance of research into this area. It is vital to recognise that quantifying the prevalence of CSA is a challenging task as it is a crime generally hidden from sight (NSPCC, 2019a, p.3). However, multiple sources provide evidence of the scale of the offence, such as the Office for National Statistics (2020b). It highlights that from Police Recorded Data from the year ending March 2019, the police recorded 73,260 sexual offences against children (Office for National Statistics, 2020b, p.2). Yet, there are limitations with this data as it relies upon the reporting of the crime. This is problematic as often there are limited witnesses to report it and the child may not know they are a victim, this leads to police recorded data being a significant underestimate of the reality (Office for National Statistics, 2020b, p.5). Furthermore, the Crime Survey for England and Wales from the year ending March 2019, estimated that 7.5% of adults aged between 18-74 had experienced CSA before they were sixteen (Office for National Statistics, 2020b, p.4).
However, this is an estimate based on adults’ past experiences of CSA, so it will not portray the current prevalence of the crime (Office for National Statistics, 2020b, p.5). Due to the limitations with the sources, they provide only a partial picture of CSA, and therefore the prevalence of it may be much higher than the statistics show.

**Application of Rational Choice Theory (RCT) to CSA**

Although hard to imagine that offenders of CSA are in any way rational, this chapter will attempt, through the use of studies, to demonstrate that offenders of CSA use a rational basis for their crimes. This is only a brief overview as it does not form a main contribution, but it is necessary to inform understanding of following applications.

Recent research into the connection between CSA and the RCT has highlighted that CSA offenders calculate decisions like all individuals based upon costs and benefits (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010a; Beauregard and Leclerc, 2007). For example, Beauregard and Leclerc’s study (2007), analysed the decision-making processes of sixty-nine sex offenders, 25% of which offended against children. The results highlighted that before the crime, 71% of offenders calculated the potential risks associated with the crime. The results further indicated that the risks of sexual offending are perceived as low when there is a favourable environment (27%) with a cooperative victim (50%). On the other hand, the offenders associated high risk with the presence of a capable guardian (24%) and a risky environment (45%) (Beauregard and Leclerc, 2007, pp.121-122). This study contributes to the understanding and prevention of CSA because it highlights that offenders’ decisions are based upon a degree of rationally and are impacted upon by situational factors.
Understanding the decision-making processes of CSA offenders is furthered by the idea of ‘crime scripts’, which are a “step-by-step account of how offenders commit a crime” (Leclerc et al., 2011, p.210). Leclerc et al.’s (2011) study based upon analysis of scripts of 221 adult CSA offenders’ highlights that ‘crime scripts’ help to understand offender’s decisions when committing a crime. Analysis found that decisions were based around where to encounter a victim, how to gain trust, choosing a location which isolates the victim, and how to undertake the abuse and avoid disclosure (Leclerc et al., 2011, 218-219). This is important for prevention because as Cornish (1994) highlighted understanding crime scripts allows researchers to recognise the rationale behind the crime-commission process, which allows for the implementation of potential situational measures to manipulate the offender’s decisions.

The application of CSA to RCT and Crime Scripts highlight that multiple situational factors have an impact on the decisions made by CSA offenders, therefore, through the implementation of SCP techniques this may prevent the onset of CSA. The specific techniques that could be applied to the environment will be reviewed in the next half of the chapter.
Application of Situational Crime Prevention to CSA.

As previously discussed, the environment is much more than a passive background in the facilitation of CSA (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010a, p.8). From an examination of the rational choice-making of offenders, it is clear that situational factors represent “precipitators within the crime setting itself that may prompt, provoke, pressure or permit an individual to offend” (Kaufman et al., 2010, pp.106). Therefore, the next half of this chapter will focus on adopting Clarke’s twenty-five SCP techniques table to understand CSA and the potential to prevent it. When applying the techniques to the environment, it is vital to look at the range of contexts in which CSA occurs (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010a). The reason is that different situational techniques that are appropriate to each environment need to be identified to avoid imposing a ‘one size fits all’ approach to a crime which is highly heterogeneous (Kaufman et al., 2010; Terry and Ackerman, 2008, p.644).

This research will focus on two different settings: institutional and domestic and will attempt to map out situational techniques to prevent CSA in each of these contexts. It must be noted that this is not an exhaustive list of settings where CSA takes place, and there is still a wide range of variation within each (Smallbone et al., 2008, p.162). Furthermore, despite focusing on the appropriate techniques for each setting, some strategies will apply to both environments so may be repeated, likewise, not all of the techniques will be able to be mapped onto CSA. For example, Clarke’s ‘reduce the reward’ column has not been applied as available research did not include any mention of this concept. It must be noted that to the best of my knowledge there are no empirical studies that test the effectiveness of the techniques in relation to the
prevention of CSA; therefore, this section is based upon purely speculative suggestions (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010a, p.23).

**Application of Clarke’s SCP techniques to an Institutional setting**

Institutional settings include establishments such as schools, sports clubs, hospitals, care homes and church organisations (Smallbone et al., 2008, p.167). These places are usually ‘hotspots’ for CSA as they provide a setting for offenders to exploit their duties while working with children (Smallbone et al., 2008, p.162). To illustrate this, research by Leclerc and Cale (2015, pp.4-5) found from self-report studies with offenders, that the youth organisations they worked in enabled them to abuse children undetected for an average of 16.2 years with an average of twenty-one victims. It is possible that these numbers could be considerably higher as the data was collected from self-report studies; therefore, offenders may have underestimated in their accounts. For this setting techniques will centre around Clarke’s headings: *Increase the effort, Increase the risk, Reduce provocation and Remove excuses.*

1. **Increase the Effort**

Evidence has highlighted that offenders commonly choose victims who require minimal effort to access (Simon and Zgoba, 2010; Stop it now; 2003). Therefore, by increasing the effort through the following techniques, it may make it more difficult for offenders to access children in this setting.
Target Harden

This refers to hindering offender’s acts by better protecting targets (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010, p.24). Regarding CSA, this could involve providing education to children to ensure they are aware of the appropriate behaviours from staff. If children are aware that particular behaviours from staff are not acceptable, they can then impose protective strategies, such as saying ‘no’ (Terry and Ackerman, 2008, p.653). However, this may not be easy for children in some circumstances such as towards a priest as they are perceived as trustworthy, therefore education should also include how to say no (Terry and Ackerman, 2008, p.653). Yet, approaches of this kind carry limitations as they undoubtedly shift the burden of responsibility onto the child (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010, p.23). Nevertheless, the significant effect of education should not be ignored. Evidence from Smallbone and Wortley (2000, xvii) based upon self-report data of 182 CSA offenders, found the most effective strategies employed by children to deter offenders involved saying they didn’t want to do it (40.2%) and saying ‘no’ (31.2%).

Control access to facilities

In some youth-orientated establishments, multiple adults may enter the organisation frequently, giving them access to children with minimum effort. Wortley and Smallbone (2010, cited in Terry and Ackerman, 2008, p.652) suggested that to make it harder for offenders to access children, increasingly stringent screening procedures need to be implemented for visitors, staff and volunteers prior to entering the environments. However, limitations to this technique are highlighted by Sullivan et al.’s. (2011) study based upon convicted CSA offenders, they found that those who offended in organisations were unlikely to have prior sexual convictions with only 16% of their
sample having previous sexual convictions (Ibid, p.66). Similar findings were mirrored by Sullivan and Beech (2004, p.44) who found that in their sample of 41 religious-institutional CSA offenders, 36.6% had no previous sexual convictions.

**Control tools/weapons**

Research has highlighted that CSA offenders in institutional settings may use ‘tools’ to facilitate their crime (Terry and Ackerman, 2008, p.653); therefore, techniques should restrict the use of these ‘tools’ to make it harder for the offender. Research by Colton and Vanstone (1996, Cited in Leclerc et al., 2005, p.188) found that offenders used gift giving as a tool to gain the trust of children. Therefore, a technique to control this would be to prohibit gift-giving in these institutions (Leclerc et al., 2015, p.8) and encouraging children to report gift-giving by staff.

2. **Increase the risk**

For an offender, the risk of detection is perceived as an essential factor when making a decision, and therefore increasing the risk of the offender being observed is fundamental in the possible prevention of CSA (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010a, p.25).

**Extend guardianship**

Research has found that in organisations, offenders will target those children who are alone. For example, Gallagher (2000, p.806) found in 92% of cases of CSA in establishments involved lone perpetrators. Therefore, techniques to extend the guardianship of children may reduce the times that a child can be alone with a single
adult. For example, in a church, guardianship could be extended by educating parents, priests and church staff about the realities around CSA in this institution (Terry and Ackerman, 2008, p.654). This could be implemented into the environment through ‘safe environment programmes’ whereby parishes create handouts which are informative about CSA and the need to look out for children (Ibid, p.654). Guardianship could be extended in institutions such as sports clubs by ensuring there are always two coaches with children at any time (Smallbone et al., 2008, p.168).

Assist natural surveillance

Increasing the natural surveillance in institutions will increase the risk to the offender of being caught. One technique to do this is through designing corridors and hidden spaces indoors so that they are overlooked by others through the use of windows (Leclerc et al., 2015, p.8). Likewise, the implementation of glass doors on staff offices may prevent CSA or the development of inappropriate relationships through increasing the risk of detection. Furthermore, institutions should where possible, eliminate hidden areas such as outhouses (Leclerc et al., 2015, p.6).

Reduce anonymity

Including staff name tags in all child-centred institutions will ensure that all adults within organisations can be correctly identified. Firstly, this prevents anyone who isn’t staff from entering these organisations to gain access to children. Implementing name tags also ensures that staff who do offend against the children can be easily identified, which may help a child when they are reporting any inappropriate behaviour by adults.
Utilise place managers

Policy for management to been under the obligation to disclose abuse immediately could be implemented to ensure that offenders do not carry on offending (Leclerc et al., 2015). However, a challenge to this is that various institutional settings are surrounded by secrecy, and frequently those in charge are the perpetrators of the crime (Wortley and Smallbone, 2008, p.167).

Strengthen formal surveillance

Increasing formal surveillance within an institution may increase the risk to the offender through ensuring that hidden areas are covered by CCTV (Leclerc et al., 2015), this could be directed to areas such as remote outhouses. In the context of a church, Terry and Ackerman (2008, p.654) suggested the use of CCTV cameras around the church to record the behaviour of priests with children; they emphasised the use of CCTV outside the house of the priest as their research highlights this is a ‘hotspot’ for CSA. Additionally, every child-centred establishment should strengthen formal surveillance by being open to external scrutiny. Kendrick and Taylor (2000, p.568) further suggested that external “inspection, monitoring and standards” was the most effective way to prevent CSA within hospitals.

3. Reduce provocations

The environment in which an offender finds themselves in may provoke their criminal behaviour through situational cues that ‘trigger’ their offending (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010a, p.27). Therefore, the following techniques aim to reduce the potential ‘trigger’.
**Reduce emotional arousal**

This can be implemented through strict rules which prohibit staff members from entering the bathroom in an institution such as a care home when the child is bathing or showering (Terry and Ackerman, 2008, p.655). Furthermore, Terry and Ackerman (2008, p.653) suggested that enforcing a strict dress code for minors in a church setting would reduce priests ‘sexualising’ children. Moreover, evidence has indicated that the use of pornography acts as a trigger for CSA (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010a; Elliot et al., 1995; Langevin and Curnoe, 2004). Therefore, institutions should have strict controls on pornography, enforced through monitoring the computers of staff or through blocking pornographic websites on institutional computers.

**Discourage imitation**

Although CSA has not been commonly perceived as a ‘copycat’ crime, it is still vital to discourage imitation between staff members. Therefore, stringent and consistent dismissals and punishment of known offenders in institutions are necessary to discourage the imitation from other members (Leclerc et al., 2015). This could be done in the catholic church via “zero tolerance” policy towards CSA, ensuring that they are removed from the church immediately (Terry and Friehlich, 2012, p.451).

**4. Remove excuses**

Citing Sykes and Matza (1957), child sexual offenders may use ‘techniques of neutralisation’, which act as a tool allowing their criminal activities to continue or relieve their feelings of guilt or shame (Spraitz and Bowen, 2016, p.2521). Therefore, techniques to remove the excuses used by offenders within institutions are necessary
to challenge the cognitions that may enable an offender to permit their behaviour (Smallbone et al., 2008, p.170).

Set rules

Setting clear rules in institutional environments may reiterate expected behaviours from staff (Smallbone et al., 2008, p.171). Research has found that most CSA in institutions occurs away from the institution itself and is usually when the offender takes the child away (Sullivan and Beech, 2004; Leclerc and Cale, 2015). Therefore, rules should forbid staff and volunteers from taking children away from the institution alone (Leclerc et al., 2015, p.8).

Post instructions

Signs around institutions should restrict the movement of staff. For example, this may be through implementing signs into the environment indicating ‘adult only’ or ‘child only’ areas above toilets or bedrooms (Leclerc et al., 2015, p.8). In doing this, it may remove the potential for excuses from offenders when entering a restricted part of a premise.

Alert conscience

Ensuring all staff members undergo regular ethics training when working with children to remind them of the rules and codes of conduct (Leclerc et al., 2015, p.9). A further way to alert the conscience of offenders may be through public education campaigns that may be shown as an advert on TV (Smallbone and Wortley, 2000). Research by Smallbone and Wortley (2000, p.43) highlighted that 41.7% of their
sample watched TV with a child as a strategy to spend time alone with them. Therefore, this would be the most beneficial time to alert the offender’s conscience as it would target them while they are contemplating the act (Ibid, p.72).

*Control Drugs and Alcohol*

Research has found that alcohol facilitates CSA in different ways, as a way of gifting the child to gain trust and as a tool used by the offender before carrying out the abuse (Leclerc et al., 2009, p.10). Therefore, institutions could implement a strict no alcohol or drugs policy on the sight of the institutions, which is reinforced by signs (Leclerc et al., 2015, p.8).

*Application of Clarke’s SCP techniques to a Domestic setting*

The last section of the chapter will focus upon applying SCP techniques to the domestic environment. This usually refers to the home of the offender or of the child. Evidence has highlighted the domestic setting is overwhelmingly where CSA occurs most often. For example, research by Mckillop et al. (2015, p.4) on 100 male CSA offenders found that 80% of incidents occurred within a domestic setting, highlighting the importance of prevention within this context. However, as the home is by definition a place of privacy, it is the most challenging setting in which to implement SCP techniques as it relies upon the implementation from the homeowner (Wortley et al., 2019, p.4308). For this setting, techniques will centre around *Increase the effort, Increase the risk, Reduce provocation and Remove excuses*. The reduction in techniques for this area reflects the difficulty in implementing CSA situational prevention techniques into the home.
1. Increase the effort

Target Harden

CSA in the home can be perpetrated by primary caregivers, however, evidence has suggested it is overwhelmingly perpetrated by others, for example, Simon and Zgoba (2010, p.83) highlighted that parents are the perpetrators of CSA in 14.8% of cases within the home. Consequently, there is scope for prevention to be implemented by the parents in order to make it harder for other individuals to access their children. In relation to ‘target hardening’, caregivers could be educated through public education programmes in ways to protect their child within the household (Higgins and Morley, 2018, p.3). Furthermore, as demonstrated by the examples in the institutional context, making children a ‘harder’ target involves making them aware of protective behaviours if CSA should occur (Higgins and Morley, 2018, p.3). However, a note of caution is due here since this may lead to early exposure to adult concepts and a general fear of adults which is especially problematic in the home (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010, p.25).

Controlling access to facilities

Effort should be made to control access to the home and specifically areas within the households where the child is most vulnerable, such as their bedroom or the bathroom. This may be implemented by physically making it harder to get into these areas, for example, by better locks on bathrooms, particularly in overcrowded households (Leclerc et al., 2011, p.225).
Control tools/weapons

Langevin and Curneo’s (2004) research into the use of pornography during the commission of sexual offences found that for offences against children, the use of pornography is a common ‘tool’ to increase the ease in commissioning CSA. Leclerc et al. (2009) and Dedel (2010, p.10) furthered this by suggesting that many adolescent CSA offenders against siblings in the home, used pornography as a ‘tool’. Therefore, primary caregivers should restrict the access of pornography within the home (Leclerc et al., 2009, p.10) this could be through parental controls on the internet.

2. Increase the risk

Extend Guardianship

Evidence from Wortley et al. (2019, p.4315) from self-reports of 82 child sex offenders, found that 59% reported someone was nearby at the time of the offence; therefore, this highlights the need to extend guardianship. This technique is hard to implement within the home as there may not be many individuals to extend the guardianship onto. However, some techniques can still be applied to the household, such as parents restricting a child’s interaction with external adults in the home (Mendelson and Letourneau, 2015).

Assist natural surveillance

The positioning of bedrooms within a household may assist natural surveillance from guardians. This may be through ensuring the child’s bedroom is opposite the guardian’s bedroom, rather than the child being out of sight. The importance of this is reflected by research by Lang and Frenzel (1988) which recognised that from their
sample, 41% of offenders within the household would sneak into the child’s rooms to abuse them, however through small situational changes this may prevent that from occurring.

**Strengthen formal surveillance**

Notably, this technique is hard to implement within a private setting as formal surveillance would significantly impact upon the privacy of those in the home. However, subtle formal surveillance could be implemented; for example, despite CSA being less likely perpetrated against babies and toddlers, they are still victimised. Therefore, technologies such as baby monitors in young children’s bedrooms may strengthen formal surveillance as it could ensure the guardian can watch them at all times; this may also deter offenders.

3. **Reduce Provocation**

**Reducing emotional arousal**

Evidence from Leclerc et al. (2011) highlights that a situational trigger based on offenders’ reports was when a child was being bathed or put to bed. Primary caregivers may implement techniques to reduce this by restricting external adults to engage in these acts with the child. Furthermore, small changes to the environment may reduce triggers, such as implementing a shower curtain to uphold the privacy of the child. Moreover, accommodation pressures can create temptations and opportunities to offend, for example, Finkelhor (1984) recognised CSA is more common in the home amongst siblings when they share beds or bedrooms. Therefore, to reduce emotional arousal, where possible children should have their own room.
4. **Remove excuses**

*Set Rules*

One suggestion based around setting rules within the domestic sphere comes from Wortley et al.’s. (2019, p.4309) self-report study with adult male CSA offenders, they suggested that “house rules” should be implemented which focus on children’s clothing, sleeping arrangements and behaviour while in the bathroom. Secondly, rules may be implemented within communities that domestically live together. For example, a report on CSA by Stanley et al. (2002, p.4) highlighted that it is estimated children from aboriginal communities are seven times more likely to be subject to CSA than non-aboriginal children. Extending this, Smallbone et al. (2000) reported there is a high prevalence of CSA in Australian aboriginal communities, which exacerbates the likelihood for CSA through intimate living spaces. Therefore, setting rules in residential communities may remove the excuses for adults to engage in activities that are initially prohibited; these may include restricting adults sleeping with children and showering with them.

*Control drugs and alcohol*

Research has found that the use of alcohol and drugs within the home exacerbates the likelihood of CSA. For example, a report from the National Indigenous Intelligence Task Force found that alcohol within indigenous communities “exacerbate the severity and frequency of child sexual abuse” (cited in Davidson, 2015, [No page]). Therefore, communities that domestically live together could implement a limited/no alcohol policy.
This chapter has attempted to encapsulate the main areas in which CSA occurs and identify risk factors within them. Overall, through analysis and consolidation of existing studies, evidence suggests that SCP has the potential to prevent CSA. For example, analysis of research allowed for the application of Clarke’s table on to CSA, producing SCP technique tables for an institutional and domestic context. However, as recognised throughout the chapter, a lack of available literature meant specific techniques could not be successfully applied to CSA. Despite this, this chapter provides important insights into the potential for SCP to prevent CSA through building upon existing research, allowing for preventative suggestions to be created.
Chapter Three - Mapping the ‘CRAVED’ acronym onto Child Sexual Abuse.

This final chapter will focus upon applying the ‘CRAVED’ model discussed in chapter one to CSA, to explain why particular children are more likely than others to be targets of CSA and which situations may increase the likelihood of being targeted. The ‘CRAVED’ acronym has been successfully applied to various forms of theft such as that of mobile phones (Whitehead et al., 2007), bags (Smith et al., 2006) and animals (Sidebottom, 2013; Pires and Clarke, 2012), but there is little literature around applying it to ‘expressive crimes’ (Beauregard and Martineau, 2015, p.3). Beauregard and Martineau’s (2015) research provides one of the first attempts to apply this model to an ‘expressive crime’ through the application of ‘CRAVED’ to the sexual homicide of children and adults. Therefore, this study will help to inform the application of ‘CRAVED’ to CSA.

As previously mentioned, to my knowledge there is no existing literature explaining why some children are more likely to be targets of CSA than others based on the indicators of ‘CRAVED’; therefore, this will be the first contribution that has attempted this. It is important to apply the ‘CRAVED’ model, as a better understanding of why some children are more likely to be targeted by offenders than others may enable better-informed prevention techniques, which focus on manipulating the ‘CRAVED’ values to reduce the likelihood of certain children being targeted (Clarke, 1999, v). It must be noted that this chapter is not suggesting that only those children who display ‘CRAVED’ characteristics will be those targeted, as stated by the Darkness to Light’s (No date, p.3) policy report “no child is immune”, but instead that certain characteristics within the child and the environment make them more likely to be
targeted (Ibid, p.3). This chapter will now go on to discuss each part of the ‘CRAVED’ acronym – *Concealable, Removable, Available, Valuable, Enjoyable and Disposable* in relation to the application to CSA.

The most valuable research that helps to inform the application of ‘CRAVED’ to CSA comes from studies which are informed by the offender’s perspective, such as that from Conte et al. (1989) and Elliot et al. (1995) which both focus on target selection. Using offender-informed studies increases the likelihood that the following suggestions are based upon which characteristics offenders target, which may increase the validity of the suggestions.

**Concealable –**

This element of ‘CRAVED’ is challenging to apply to CSA, as it is not focusing on characteristics within the child; however, it can still be applied but with focus on which environment may be more likely to be targeted as a place for CSA to take place. Felson (2002, p.32) argued that to apply ‘concealable’ to acts such as CSA it is necessary to change it to a verb, he argues that offenders will seek to *conceal* their act and the actions before and after. Evidence from self-report studies with offenders have highlighted that generally offenders reported choosing a location that would allow them to conceal the target and the act. For example, Leclerc and Cale (2015, p.5) reported that 52% of offenders used their own home for the abuse as it was the place that was most concealable to the outside world. Similar findings were mirrored by Smallbone and Wortley’s (2000, p.56.) study with convicted CSA offenders, which found that locations used by offenders were mostly their own home.
(68.9%), a car (27.4%) and isolated places (25.6%) to ensure secrecy. As a result, SCP techniques such as CCTV should target isolated areas to reduce the likelihood of CSA being ‘concealed’.

**Removable –**

In order for CSA to occur, the offender may have to move the target from one setting to another (Felson, 2002, p.32), children are therefore more ‘attractive’ to the offender if they are easily ‘removable’. Evidence from Beauregard and Martineau’s (2015, p.4) study based upon victim-selection in 350 cases of sexual homicide, suggested that those targets who can be moved around easily are those most likely to be targeted by an offender. Applying this to CSA, research has indicated that CSA especially in the context of institutional abuse, requires the offender to take their target away from the institution to another location to abuse them. To illustrate this, Terry and Ackerman (2008, p.651) found that priests would take the child from the church institution to the parish residence in order to abuse them. Additionally, Sullivan and Beech’s (2004, p.47) study on interviews with forty-one CSA offenders found 77% of their sample took a child away from the institution to abuse them.

From an analysis of offender-based studies looking into target selection, multiple things may impact whether a child is easily ‘removable’. These could be factors within the environment such as the level of guardianship protecting the child, the level of cooperation from the child to accompany the abuser to another location, and the physical attributes that may make them more ‘removable’ if force was necessary (Elliot et al., 1995). For example, research by Elliot et al. (1995, p.584) on semi-
structured interviews with 91 child sex offenders, analysing why certain child were selected, found that offenders reported being more likely to target children who were without a guardian as this enabled them to be easily removed.

Additionally, research has highlighted that a child’s physical attributes may make them more ‘removable’, one of which would be a child’s age. For example, research by Felson (1998, cited in Mogavero and Hsu, 2018, p.911) stated that children who are younger and smaller will be physically less able to resist being moved from one location to another. Similar findings were found by Elliot et al. (1995, p.584) which reported offenders were more likely to target those children who were small so they could be easily transportable. Therefore, those children who are younger and physically smaller than others and who have a lack of guardianship are those that are more likely to be perceived by offenders as ‘removable’ and in turn more likely to be targeted. Consequently, factors within the environment should be manipulated to make it harder for children to be removed. In relation to a lack of guardianship, techniques from Clarke’s table, focusing on ‘extending guardianship’ could be implemented in some circumstances to increase the risk to the offender. Although it is more difficult to apply techniques aimed at manipulating the physical attributes that make children easier to ‘remove’, ‘target hardening’ measures could be put into place to better protect the child from being removed.
Available –

Smith’s (2018, p.435) research into which products are likely to be shoplifted stated that those which are easily ‘available’ are more likely to be taken. This can be applied to CSA as research highlights that an offender is more likely to target a child who they can gain easy access to (Wortley and Smallbone, 2010a). Despite not being able to remove the availability of children to offenders completely, reducing the offender’s accessibility to them may reduce CSA. As with inanimate objects, a target is more likely to be targeted by an offender if it is visible and easily accessible to them. This is mirrored in the previous chapter, as offenders being ‘rational actors’ to an extent means that they will target children who are easily available to them as this will require the least effort. As Cockbaine and Wortley (2015, p.2) suggested, offenders tend to abuse children to whom they have easy access to and where there is a lack of guardianship. Moreover, research from Leclerc et al.’s (2011, p.216) study on 221 sex offenders stated that when accessing a child, the offenders exploited situations whereby children were without a guardian in 82% of cases, as they were viewed to be more accessible than those with a guardian. Furthermore, research by Leclerc and Cale (2015, p.5) found that when offenders were asked what impacted upon them choosing one child over another, they replied that they were unlikely to target children who were well supervised (62.5%). Therefore, those children who are less guarded may be more likely to be targeted as it reduces the risk to the offender. Moreover, Deslauriers-Varin and Beauregard’s (2010, p.320) research suggested that it is possible for the offender to find a suitable target that is too well guarded to attempt to access.
Knowing a child is less likely to be targeted if they are guarded allows for the implementation of situational prevention techniques into the environment, through techniques such as such as ‘extending the guardianship’. However, a problem with this suggestion is that it may not be applicable when the guardians of children are the ones that offend -though, as has been mentioned earlier, this is only a small percent of offenders.

**Valuable —**

Across all crimes, targets that are the most ‘valuable’ are those more likely to be targeted by criminals as they will reap the most rewards. In relation to inanimate objects, domestic burglars, are more likely to target laptops and jewellery rather than a kettle, for example, as they typically are more ‘valuable’ items (Clarke, 1999). This idea also applies to children targeted by sex offenders (Beauregard and Martineau, 2015, p.5) as offenders are more likely to target those children who are perceived as more ‘valuable’. It can be hard to define ‘value’ in terms of human targets as it is a subjective concept, and what makes a particular child perceived as ‘valuable’ varies from offender to offender (Beauregard and Martineau, 2015, p.5). However, a consolidation of research has shown that ‘value’ typically, is based upon a child’s physical attributes such as age and gender.

Regarding gender, Rudin et al.’s (1995) examination of CSA victims with 87 lone female and lone male perpetrators, found that both of these groups abused more girls than boys (62% and 76%) which indicates that girls are of more value to the offenders (Rudin et al.,1995, p.963). This study is useful as it includes analysis of female perpetrators, which is regularly ignored in most literature on this area, and it
therefore shows who is seen as a ‘valuable target’ to both genders. Similar findings were mirrored from multiple studies which found that girls were more ‘valuable’ targets than boys reflected through the significantly larger number of female victims (Conte et al., 1989, p.296; McKillop et al., 2015, p.4). Furthermore, age seemed to determine whether a victim was perceived as ‘valuable’. Evidence from Rudin et al. (1995, p.967) found that different age groups were seen as more ‘valuable’ than others and this was consistent across male and female perpetrators, this was reflected in the mean age of children they targeted – f = 6.0 m=9.3. The Darkness to Light (No year) child sexual abuse statistics highlight that age is a significant factor in sexual abuse, and the most targeted children are those between 7-13. Therefore, although no specific interventions can be put into place to change the physical characteristics of children, preventative interventions could be better targeted to those children who are more at-risk dependent upon the characteristics discussed. This is not to say that other groups should not be targeted with intervention because all children may be subject to abuse but directing resources mostly to those perceived as high risk is necessary (Rayment-McHugh et al., 2015, p.2).

The idea that older children (i.e. thirteen +) are viewed as less ‘valuable’ than their younger counterparts correlates with Bowers and Johnson’s (2013, p.10) argument that ‘CRAVED’ targets have ‘life cycles’. They argue that the newer a target is, the more likely it is to be targeted and the older it gets, the less likely it is to be targeted. This can be applied to CSA, in that evidence above suggests younger children are more likely targeted, and their risk decreases with age.
Generally speaking, perpetrators of crime will select targets that can provide them with the most pleasure, for example, thieves overwhelmingly target mobile phones and televisions as these are products which can be enjoyed (Beauregard and Martineau, 2015, p.5). Although it is more complicated, this concept can also be applied in the context of CSA, as evidence has highlighted that offenders are more likely to target children who let them acquire sexual gratification (Beauregard and Martineau, 2015, p.5). Arguably, this is a child who can be easily controlled, manipulated and who is compliant (Beauregard and Martineau, 2015, p.5). This is reflected by Conte et al.’s. (1989) study on child sexual offenders, who were asked what was it about the child’s behaviour that attracted them. Answers generally indicated that those less likely to put up a fight were more likely to be targeted as they would go “along with things” and therefore allow sexual gratification to be obtained without resistance (Conte et al., 1989, p.296).

More interestingly, research has led to the idea that offenders targeted children who seemingly had knowledge of sex as it made it more enjoyable. A study by Leclerc and Cale (2015, pp.3-4) when asked about what characteristics increased the risk of children being targeted, all sixteen offenders reported that they were more likely to target those children who they saw as knowing a lot about sex and those who had experienced it before. Furthermore, Conte et al. (1989, p.296) found that when asked what about the child’s behaviour attracted them, offenders generally all said they were more likely to target a child who they knew had been a victim before as they would be easier to control.
Offender-based studies have highlighted that offenders are more likely to target children who they perceive would enable them to fulfil their goal of sexual gratification, which can be through compliant and easy to control children and also those who know about sex. Therefore, knowing this, techniques could be implemented to reduce the likelihood of CSA being ‘enjoyable’ for the offender. These techniques may be centred around the ‘target hardening’ of children, as discussed in the previous chapter. It must be noted that this ‘CRAVED’ element is significantly harder to manipulate primarily through situational techniques as it focuses on adapting children’s behaviour.

**Disposable –**

Felson (2002) argued in his book ‘Crime and Everyday Life’ that the CRAVED model can equally be applied to violent/sexual acts, stating that the offender of these crimes will seek to *dispose* of evidence that may incriminate them (Felson, 2002, p.32). Beauregard and Martineau (2015, p.5) furthered this by suggesting that similar to thieves, who are likely to target items that can be sold after, offenders of CSA are likely to target victims who can be easily controlled afterwards to uphold secrecy. In regard to controlling children, this refers to the offender being sure that the victim will not tell anyone what has happened, therefore offenders may target children who they perceive are less likely to reveal details about the abuse to anyone. Although there is no causal link, offender-based studies have suggested that offenders may target children with certain characteristics such as vulnerability (Parkinson and Cashmore, 2017, p.11) as they are perceived as those less likely to reveal what has happened. In the context of CSA, this is paramount for offenders as it is viewed as
one of the highest risks. To highlight this, research by Conte et al. (1989, p.296), found that from semi-structured interviews with offenders, when asked why they selected one child over another, the majority indicated they would choose those children who they thought would not talk about it and who also seemed vulnerable. This was also broadly mirrored by Leclerc and Cale (2015, p.5) who reported that 75% of their sample said they wouldn’t pick a child who was “likely to tell their peers” or “talk to parents about their problems” because they couldn’t control them after the offence. Instead, they were likely to choose a vulnerable child who is unlikely to tell.

Research from a victim-perspective similarly reflected the results. For example, a study from Berliner and Conte (1990, p.36) found that from interviews with 23 CSA victims, they all reported personal and family vulnerabilities, which meant they were less likely to report the abuse afterwards as the disclosure would impact negatively upon their life. Conte et al. (1989) further looked into the idea of vulnerability within a child and why they were seen to be less likely to tell anyone. Offenders reported that vulnerability was seen as children who may have poor relationships with their family and also who are “needy…depressed or unhappy” as they may feel they have nobody to tell (Conte et al., 1989, p.299). It is notably difficult to alter this, as being perceived as ‘vulnerable’ and therefore controllable could be due to a child’s physical inability or not having the language to repeat the issue (Conte et al., 1989, p.299). However, situational techniques could be implemented into child-centred environments; for example, boxes in institutions into which children can put written complaints in may provide a better opportunity for vulnerable children.
Consistent with the ‘CRAVED’ model, those children most likely to be targeted for CSA are those who are *concealable, removable, available, valuable, enjoyable* and *disposable*. In line with Clarke’s (1999) work, the more of these characteristics surrounding a child, the more likely they are to be a target of CSA. Although these concepts were slightly adapted, they can still be mapped onto CSA to help understand why some children are more ‘attractive’ targets than others. However, it must be noted that some of the ‘CRAVED’ characteristics such as ‘concealable’ and ‘enjoyable’ are considerably harder to manipulate than other characteristics. This may be because there is a lack of substantive research looking into these areas, but with further research on this area, it may lead to more conclusive answers. Yet, this chapter has provided the first contribution mapping the ‘CRAVED’ acronym onto CSA, therefore it has usefully enhanced knowledge on this area (Petrossian and Clarke, 2014, p.13). This may increase understanding of why CSA offenders select certain children, which is vital for future prevention efforts (Elliot et al., 1995, p.593).
Conclusion

Through an examination of existing literature, this dissertation aimed to explore the potential for Situational Crime Prevention theories to be applied to Child Sexual Abuse and in particular its prevention. Specifically, it aimed to apply Clarke’s situational crime prevention techniques table and the ‘CRAVED’ acronym to CSA, to contribute to this under-researched area. Through analysis and consolidation of relevant literature, this dissertation found that in relation to Clarke’s twenty-five situational crime prevention table, CSA can be applied to four of Clarke’s headings, that being Increase the effort, Increase the Risk, Reduce Provocation and Remove Excuses. The mapping of Clarke’s headings onto CSA produced a variety of techniques that could be implemented into an institutional and domestic environment with the aim of preventing CSA from occurring. However, it must be noted that Clarke’s fifth heading ‘Reduce the Reward’ could not be applied to CSA. This is due to a lack of existing literature exploring the ‘reward’ for CSA offenders and how this may be reduced. Therefore, the potential for CSA to be reduced through ‘reducing the reward’ was not included in the discussion.

Furthermore, findings also suggested that the ‘CRAVED’ acronym, typically applied to theft can be applied to child sexual abuse. An examination of target-selection studies suggested that each element of the ‘CRAVED’ acronym could be applied to CSA. Evidence highlighted that those children who are ‘concealable, removable, available, valuable, enjoyable and disposable’ are those more likely to be targets of CSA. However, findings suggested that some ‘CRAVED’ elements were more challenging to apply to CSA than others. For example, the ‘Concealable’ and ‘Enjoyable’ elements as they focused on both the child and intrinsic factors within
offenders. Overall the results lead to the conclusion that theories underpinned by situational crime prevention can be broadly applied not only to crimes such as theft but also to the highly expressive crime: child sexual abuse. This application poses a new approach for CSA prevention through a manipulation of environmental factors to reduce the likelihood of CSA occurring. The complexity of CSA highlights that suggestions for prevention put forward in the findings require further research into other types of CSA and in other contexts.

Before moving onto future recommendations for the prevention of CSA, it is necessary to reflect on the limitations of this research. Firstly, CSA is a vastly complex and broad offence encompassing various different behaviours, however due to time and word restrictions, this research could not map out situational prevention theories onto the vast behaviours that CSA encapsulates and could not apply it to all contexts in which it occurs. For example, it could not be applied in a public setting or on the online sphere. Secondly, the suggestions put forward that inform possible prevention techniques are based upon speculation as no research to date has tested the SCP techniques to reduce CSA. Therefore, it is unknown whether the techniques discussed can prevent CSA from occurring without putting them into practice.

Based on the limitations of this research and conclusions drawn from it, future recommendations for possible research could involve the exploration of under-researched areas. Firstly, future studies could explore potential techniques to be created which ‘Reduce the reward’ that offenders gain from CSA. This may be through offender-based studies which examine the reward offenders gain and how situational techniques could manipulate this. Secondly, as findings have indicated,
children with the more ‘CRAVED’ characteristics are those most at risk of being targeted for CSA. Consequently, future research should explore possible preventative measures to be implemented into the environment in order to manipulate the ‘CRAVED’ characteristics which increase a child’s likelihood of victimisation. Furthermore, as evidence has suggested, the environment plays a role in the facilitation of CSA. As a result, child-centred institutions, guardians and policymakers should learn from this and manipulate the settings in which children are in to prevent the onset of CSA through small environmental changes. Moreover, interesting research questions could derive from the effectiveness of SCP techniques in preventing CSA. Although this would be a contentious topic, it would build upon existing knowledge of this area and provide information on whether the suggested techniques are effective in the prevention of CSA when they are implemented into the environment.

Finally, this dissertation provides a contribution to the area of situational crime prevention and child sexual abuse. It builds upon existing research as it consolidates studies in the area to create a concise set of SCP techniques to potentially prevent CSA across two different contexts. Furthermore, it provides an insight into which children are most likely to be targets of CSA based on the CRAVED acronym, which is the first contribution in the area to do so.
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Appendix

Appendix 1: Clarke’s Situational Crime Prevention Techniques Table

Figure 1, Clarke’s twenty-five situational crime prevention techniques table (ASU Center for Problem-Oriented Policing, [No date]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase the Effort</th>
<th>Increase the Risk</th>
<th>Reduce the Rewards</th>
<th>Reduce Provocations</th>
<th>Remove Excuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Steering column locks immobilisers</td>
<td>• Take routine precautions: go out in a group at night, leave signs of occupancy, carry phone</td>
<td>• Off-street parking</td>
<td>• Efficient queues and polite service</td>
<td>• Rental agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anti-robbery screens</td>
<td>• “Cocoon” neighbourhood watch</td>
<td>• Gender-neutral phone directories</td>
<td>• Expanded seating</td>
<td>• Harassment codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tamper-proof packaging</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Unmarked bullion trucks</td>
<td>• Soothing music/muted lights</td>
<td>• Hotel registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| • Entry phones | • Improved street lighting | • Removable car radio | • Separate enclosures for rival soccer fans | • “No parking” |
| • Electronic card access | • Defensible space design | • Women’s refuge | • Reduce crowding in pubs | • “Private property” |
| • Baggage screening | • Support whistleblowers | • Pre-paid cards for pay phones | • Fixed cab fares | • “Extinguish camp fires” |

| • Ticket needed for exit | • Taxi drive IDs | • Property marking | • Controls on violent pornography | • Roadside speed display boards |
| • Export documents | • “How’s my driving?” decals | • Vehicle licensing and parts marking | • Enforce good behaviour on soccer fields | • Signatures for customs declarations |
| • Electronic merchandise tags | • School uniforms | • Cattle branding | • Prohibit racial slurs | • “Shoplifting is stealing” |

| • Street closures | • CCTV for double-deck buses | • Monitor pawn shops | • “Idiots drink and drive” | • Easy library checkout |
| • Separate bathrooms for women | • Two clerks for convivence stores | • Controls on classified ads | • “It’s OK to say No” | • Public lavatories |
| • Disperse pubs | • Reward vigilance | • License street vendors | • Disperse troublemakers at school | • Litter bins |

| • “Smart” guns | • Red light cameras | • Ink merchandise tags | • Rapid-repair of vandalism | • Breathalysers in pubs |
| • Disabling stolen cell phones | • Burglar alarms | • Graffiti cleaning | • V-chips in TV’s | • Severe intervention |
| • Restrict spray paint sales to juveniles | • Security guards | • Speeds humps | • Censor details of modus operandi | • Alcohol free events |

Appendix 2: Ethics Application

Internal research ethics application form for taught student modules (where University ethical approval is in place for the module)
For modules LAW3035 covered by University of Leeds ethical approval reference [AREA 11-019]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ID</th>
<th>[REDACTED]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your name</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional title/topic area</td>
<td>'An Exploration of the Potential for Situational Crime Prevention to Reduce Child Sexual Abuse'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of dissertation supervisor</td>
<td>[REDACTED]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you planning to conduct fieldwork with (data on) human participants for your dissertation? Enter a tick in the box next to either yes or no below.

- Yes (This includes online research methods and secondary data analysis).
- No, I am conducting library-based research or content/media analysis only. ✓

If you ticked ‘no’ you do not need to take further action in respect of ethical approval. Please proceed to the declarations on page 8 and 9.

If you ticked ‘yes’ you need to complete the rest of this form.

You MUST submit your signed ethics form to your supervisor upon their request.