

THE ROLE OF OPPORTUNITY IN CRIME PREVENTION AND POSSIBLE THREATS OF CRIME CONTROL BENEFITS

Suçun Önlenmesinde Fırsatın Rolü ve Suç Kontrolü Uygulamalarına Karşı Olası Tehditler

Özkan GÖK*

Özet

Suçun meydana gelmesinde “fırsat” kavramı önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Geleneksel suç teorilerinin birçoğu, suç davranışını incelemek yerine, sadece suçluluk ya da suç işleme üzerine odaklanmaktadır. Diğer taraftan, “fırsat teorileri” olarak adlandırılan yeni suç teorileri, genellikle sadece suç eğilimlerini değil, aynı zamanda suç davranışını da açıklamaya çalışmaktadır. Bu çalışmada fırsat teorilerinin (rutin aktiviteler, rasyonel seçim, suç deseni savunulabilir alan/ çevre düzenlemesi aracılığıyla suç önlenmesi, durumsal suç önleme) temel noktaları açıklanmıştır. Ayrıca, bu makalede, suç önleme uygulamalarına yönelik ciddi tehditler olarak algılanan “suçun yer değiştirmesi” ve “faydaların bir bölgeden bir başka bölgeye yayılması” kavramları detaylı olarak izah edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Fırsat, Suç önleme, Suçun yer değiştirmesi, Faydaların yayılması.

Abstract

Opportunity plays an important role on crime occurrence. Most of the traditional criminological theories are generally focused on only criminality or delinquency rather than criminal behavior. On the other hand, some newer crime theories which are called as “opportunity theories of crime” broaden the attention from the offender to the crime event. In the current study, major points of opportunity theories of crime (routine activities, rational choice, crime pattern, defensible space/ crime prevention through environmental design, and situational crime prevention) are

* Dr., Polis Akademisi Başkanlığı, ozkangokkos@yahoo.com
PBD, 13 (1) 2011, ss.97-114

explained clearly. Additionally, the most serious threats to crime prevention efforts, “displacement” and “diffusion of benefits” are clarified in detail in present article.

Key Words: Opportunity, Crime prevention, Crime displacement, Diffusion of benefits.

Introduction

There are two options to prevent crime: the first is try to remove the criminal dispositions that offenders have, and the second is to remove the crime opportunities that offenders have. This essay will review the literature for the part of the second option: situational crime prevention.

The first stage of any situational crime prevention intervention is to identify the crime. Individual events generally do not deserve intervention, because it is not cost-efficient to do so. Then, how can we find out clustering in crime? Routine activities theory explains crime clustering in time and targets. The second stage is to diagnose the opportunities that make offending possible. Why some places, times, or targets have better crime opportunities, or why offenders think that they have better opportunities? Routine activities theory explores “lifestyle routines” that produce crime opportunities and rational choice theory explains criminal decision making. The third stage is to remove crime opportunities. This can be done by design or redesign of space and routines of people. Defensible space theory/crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles shows us how to do it.

Situational crime prevention does not change criminal disposition of offenders. It only removes or reduces crime opportunities. If criminal disposition remains untouched, then will offenders seek new opportunities to commit crime? If this is the case, then situational crime prevention does not do any good in the long run. Empirical studies (Eck, 1993; Hesseling, 1994) found that situational crime prevention almost never displaces crime totally; even it diffuses benefits of intervention to other opportunities.

This essay will try to answer all above questions. It may be a step-by-step checklist for crime prevention interventions.

1. Routine Activities Theory

Routine activities theory is developed by Cohen and Felson (1979). According to the theory, predatory crime is a product of a likely offender's, a suitable target's convergence in time and space with the absence of a capable guardianship. That is, crime can occur only if a likely offender (a thief) meets a suitable target (something valuable) when a capable guardian is absent. In the theory, capable guardianship is somebody or something close to the target, and this guardianship capacity of the person or animal deters the offender. Capable guardianship is not provided by only police officer or a security guard, it is rather provided by somebody or something close to the target (Felson and Clarke, 1998).

Criminologists first applied the routine activities theory to predatory crime. Predatory (or exploitative) crime is defined as illegal acts in which "someone definitely and intentionally takes or damages of the person or property of another" (Cohen and Felson, 1979:589).

Routine activities theory improved over time and included a fourth element: intimate handler. Intimate handler is somebody who can impose social control (such as family members, close friends) to offenders who have some social bond (Felson, 1987:913). Crime occurrence depends on absence of a capable guardianship and an intimate handler.

There are four main attributes that influence a target's risk of attack: value, inertia, visibility, and access. These attributes are considered from the offender's viewpoint. Offenders are interested in the targets that they value. Inertia is the size or weight of the item; the smaller or lighter the item, the more it has the risk of theft. Visibility is the exposure of the target to the offender; it becomes a target once seen by the offender. Access is street patterns, doors, or placement of the target which makes target accessible (Felson and Clarke, 1998:8).

How do likely offenders and suitable targets meet in absence of capable guardianship? How do they appear in same place at same time? According to the theory, lifestyle routine activity patterns influence them converge in time and space. Firstly, all routine activities have rhythm and tempo. Rhythm is the period of a type of activity and tempo is its frequency. Timing (rhythm and tempo) of people's activities is more or less interdependent to other people's activities (Hawley, 1950: 289 as cited in Felson and Cohen, 1979). This interdependence explains convergence in time. Secondly, according to Zipf's (1950) 'Principle of Least Effort', people tend to find the shortest route, spend the least time, and seek the easiest means to accomplish something. Offenders and non

offenders both behave in accordance with this principle, and convergence in space is explained with it.

2. Rational Choice Theory

Rational choice theory is developed by Clarke and Cornish (1985). The theory basically argues that crime is a result of rational choices based on analyses of anticipated costs and benefits. Individuals choose to commit crime to somehow maximize their benefits and minimize their costs. Both benefits and costs have subjective and objective dimensions. There are two stages of criminal decision making and criminologists explain these two stages with two different models: initial involvement model and criminal event model. They also developed a third continuing involvement model to explain continuance in crime.

Clarke and Cornish's (1985) initial involvement model looks at the individual's willingness or readiness to become involved in crime to satisfy his/her individual needs. Individuals can have different options to satisfy their needs; while some of these may be legal, others may not. Preference of criminal options depends on several variables; individual factors, especially background, including individual temperament, upbringing, and social and demographic characteristics such as gender, social class, and neighborhood. All these variables contribute to initial criminal involvement decision (Clarke and Cornish, 1985:154).

According to Clarke and Cornish (1985), once the individual feels ready to commit a type of crime, the second stage is to decide committing a particular crime. Clarke and Cornish's (1985:155) event model of the theory explains this stage of criminal decision making. Immediate situation of the offender, characteristics of the selected target, and characteristics of other available targets influence whether or not committing a particular type of crime.

A third model of rational choice theory explains continuance decision of crime (Clarke and Cornish, 1985). Increased professionalism, changes in lifestyle and values, and changes in peer groups influence the decision whether to continue crime or not. Individual offender becomes proud of skills and knowledge about crime; becomes financially more dependent on crime, enjoys "life in the fast lane" (Gibbs and Shelly, 1982:301), devaluates legal work; his/her close friends change, his/her self conception changes (he/she sees himself/herself as criminal), and loses contacts with his/her friends (Clarke and Cornish, 1985:156).

How routine activities theory and rational choice theory help us to plan a situational crime prevention intervention? Routine activities theory explains how the amount of crime opportunities can increase or decrease. Routine activities are patterned depending on the design of place; people can go where they can. They are also patterned depending on timing. Designers of space can influence possible targets' and offenders' convergence in space, just like engineers do to decrease traffic accidents (Felson, 1987:929). Felson (1986) added the absence of a handler as a fourth component in the routine activity theory.

Rational choice theory suggests that, event decision of crime is, regardless of background factors, highly influenced by characteristics of selected and rejected options of crime. Then, the theory suggests us to focus on characteristics of potential targets. Thus, in situational crime prevention, principles of routine activities and rational choice theories shall be our toolbox. We suggested that the first stage is to study distribution of crime, in space and time. How can we diagnose crime clustering? Crime mapping is a way to do it. Crime pattern theory, which is developed by Brantingham and Brantingham (1995), explores spatial distribution of crime.

3. Crime Pattern Theory

Crime pattern theory is developed to explain spatial distribution of crime and fear of crime. The theory has six main concepts; nodes, paths, and edges; and crime generators, crime attractors, crime neutral areas and fear generators. The former three concepts are about spatial distribution of lifestyle routines. The latter four concepts are about distribution of crime. While the former can be used to explore the backcloth, the latter can be used to explore the hot spots of a crime map. Let us observe each concept in more detail.

Nodes are central places in people's lives: homes, works, recreation sites, and shopping malls. They are places where people travel from and to. Paths are the networks, such as streets or footpaths, along which people travel to get to their routine destinations. People travel from and to their nodes through the paths. According to the crime pattern theory, people become victims and commit crime close to their nodes (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1995:7), because they spend most of their time there. Paths are important, because they determine the awareness areas of people. Where crime is clustered is closely related to victims' and offenders' life nodes and paths (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1995:8).

Edges are places where there is enough distinctiveness that refers to noticeable change between one part and the other. Edges can be physical or perceptual. A river or a highway is an example for a physical edge. Somewhere that the commercial district ends and residential district starts is an example of perceptual edge. According to Brantingham and Brantingham (1995), some crimes such as shoplifting, racial attacks, or robberies are more likely to occur at these edges because in those places, people from different neighborhoods who do not know each other come together.

Crime generators are places where large numbers of people visit without any criminal intention (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1995:7). Shopping malls, schools, recreation centers are typical examples for crime generators. These places have more numbers of crime, because they create particular times and places to provide appropriate concentrations of peoples (offender and non-offender) and other targets (Angel, 1968:28).

Crime attractors are particular areas where well-known opportunities for offending exist that attract offenders to them for the purpose of offending first and foremost (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1995:8). Examples of crime attractor areas are red-light districts or big insecure car parks.

Crime- neutral areas neither generate crime nor attract crime by producing opportunities. They occasionally experience crime by local insiders. Fear generators are places which cause a perception of fear. Fear generators experience less crime too, because they are generally abandoned (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1995:8-9). No offender, no target, and then no crime.

Crime is not clustered only in space and time, but it is also clustered at victim level. British crime survey in 1992 showed that 40% of the population formed the victims of all crimes and 4.3% of the population was victimized in 43.5% of all incidents (Farrel, 1993). In another study, Sherman, Gartin and Buerger (1989) found that 50% of all calls for services came from 3% of places. Then we must consider focusing on characteristics of both places and targets.

Brantingham and Brantingham (1999:10-11) suggested a theoretical model for crime hot spot generation. They defined hot spots as concentrations or cluster of crime in space. According to their theory, crime environment has several layers. Actual crime event points are at the top layer. Below the top layer, there are socio-economic, general movement, and activity generators layers. Socio-economic layer is a map

of socio-economic classes, such as low socio-economic status (SES), middle-SES, or upper-SES. General movement layer is a map of major and minor roads. Activity generators layer is a map of activity generators, such as business districts, industrial areas, shopping and entertainment centers. Crime is more likely to happen where these three layers converge, that is, if same place is in low-SES area in socio-economic layer, on a major road in general movement layer, and on activity generator in activity generators layer, there is more likely to experience crime.

At this point, social disorganization theory may help us to map the crime. Social disorganization theory is developed by Shaw and McKay (1942). In Chicago, in the 1930s, the surrounding area of industrial zone near Michigan Lake always had relatively higher rates of criminality. Social disorganization theory explained higher rates of delinquency in this area by higher mobility, heterogeneity, poverty, and density. According to the theory, in such places residents have differential value systems, thus they are unable to establish common values and maintain effective social control. In such areas, delinquent subcultures develop and transmitted from one generation to other.

Combining crime pattern theory, theoretical model for hot spot generation, and social disorganization theory, it can be argued that crime clusters around general movement paths and activity generators. Crime is also radiated from low-SES areas and socially disorganized, or heterogeneous, mobile, and dense areas.

4. Defensible Space Theory/ Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED)

Defensible space theory was originally proposed by Jacobs (1961) and then refined and empirically examined by Oscar Newman (1972), who was an architect. A defensible space is an environment under control of its residents. Defensible space principles are a set of strategies to create such an environment. There are four aspects of a defensible space: natural surveillance, territoriality, image/milieu, and juxtaposition. Natural surveillance is the ability to see into or out from the space. Walls made of windows are good examples for natural surveillance aspect. Territoriality is a sense of ownership or proper usage of space. Territoriality is provided by demarcation of space, such as walls, fences, signs, etc. Image/milieu is related to the appearance, maintenance, and civility of the space. Juxtaposition is positioning of the space within the broader environment, such as proximity to downtown, business district, or

industry zone. These four aspects of space are influenced by access to the space (i.e., roads), boundary markers, and posting of instructions regarding legitimate use, site design, disorder, and urban locale (Newman, 1972:44).

In the experiments that he carried out; St Louis, Clason Point, and Yonkers; Newman emphasized the importance of territoriality. Regarding the territoriality aspect of defensible space, Newman classified space as private, semi private, semi public, and public. Sense of ownership and control of residents is the most in private space and the least in public space. In a single family house (or detached houses with separate entrances), all the area inside the building is private. Backyard is semiprivate or private if it is fenced. Front yard is either semi private, or at least semi public. Even some part of the road can be considered semi public. Such a design is the best defensible. In walk-up apartments, inside the dwelling unit ('the interior of an apartment unit or home') is private; some area inside the building and all other areas are relatively less private than single family houses. Such design is not the worst, but still worse than single family houses. In high rise apartments, all the area but inside the dwelling unit is public. This type of design is the worst defensible (Newman, 1972:56). The more private is the space, the better defended it is.

In his Five Oaks, Dayton experience, Newman emphasized the privacy of the neighborhood. Land use and circulation patterns are known to affect defensible space. Cross sectional studies found that internal layouts of low crime neighborhoods are less permeable than high crime neighborhoods (Greenberg and Rohe, 1986:92). In Five Oaks, Newman closed thirty five streets and twenty six alleys which opened the neighborhood to outsiders. The neighborhood had a grid-like designed street structure and these streets could be used as alternate ways for commuters. They assessed that thirty some percent of the traffic load of the neighborhood comprised outsider commuters. Closing the streets decreased the traffic load (i.e., removed outsiders from inside traffic) (Newman, 1972:27).

There are two ideas that explain how defensible space principles reduce crime. According to one idea, applying these principles, the amount of crime opportunities is reduced. According to the second idea, applying these principles influences the residents' behavior (i.e., helps to establish collective efficacy), and then the residents defend their space, because they have a greater sense of ownership. The former model is called situational model, and the latter is called the community model.

It is debatable whether situational model or community model works. Donnelly and Kimble (1997:497-498), using the data from Five Oaks neighborhood, made research to assess which one of the ideas was correct. After the intervention, the neighborhood experienced substantial decrease in crime rates. They implemented 191 surveys before and 183 surveys after the intervention. They suggested that, after the intervention, if there was any change in the residents' perception about the neighborhood, this would prove that it was the community model that worked. Else, the situational model was the reason for crime reduction. They found that residents' perceptions did not change that could establish community cohesion. If we assume that establishing community cohesion takes more than one year, then we can argue that this research lacks enough number of follow-up measurements.

It is possible that defensible space principles may not have desired effects depending on social and cultural context. In her research, Merry (1981) found that, although conformable with defensible space principles, places can remain undefended because of their social and cultural contexts.

5. Situational Crime Prevention

It is not always possible to change people's routines, or changing people's routines may not be sufficient to prevent crime. Using the assumptions of the theories summarized above, Cornish and Clarke (2003) developed situational crime prevention techniques. These are twenty five techniques grouped into five categories: increasing the efforts, increasing the risk, reducing the rewards, reducing the provocations, and removing the excuses.

Increasing the efforts techniques are: hardening the targets (such as immobilizer in cars), controlling the access points, screening the exits, deflecting the offenders (such as separate toilets for women), and controlling the tools and weapons that can be used to commit crime. Increasing the risk techniques are: extending the guardianship (i.e., neighborhood watch), assisting natural surveillance, reducing anonymity (i.e., IDs), utilizing place managers, and strengthening formal surveillance. Reducing the rewards techniques are: concealing the targets, removing the targets, identifying the property, disrupting markets, and denying benefits. Reducing the provocations techniques are: reducing frustration and stress, avoiding disputes, reducing emotional arousal, neutralizing peer pressure, and discouraging imitation. Removing the

excuses techniques are: setting rules, posting instructions, alerting consciences, assisting compliance, and controlling drugs/alcohol.

Defining these principles, Felson and Clarke (1998:9) relied on ten principles of situational crime prevention. Opportunities play role in all crime. These opportunities are highly specific to crime type and they are concentrated in time and space. They depend on everyday movements. Some crimes produce opportunities for other crimes. Some products provide more opportunities. Social and technological changes produce new opportunities. These opportunities can be reduces and reducing opportunities do not always displace crime, rather focused opportunity reduction can produce wider crime declines.

Let us assume that we spotted crime problem using principles of the crime pattern theory. Then using principles of routine activities theory we found what routines of people created the opportunities for the crime. Using the principles of rational choice theory, we also found how rationally criminals decided to commit those crimes. Then using principles of defensible space theory and situational crime prevention, we planned an intervention and applied it. Our implementation succeeded. Did the criminals quit committing crime, or did they go somewhere else to find new opportunities? One of the common criticisms against crime prevention is that it displaces crime rather than really preventing it.

6. Crime Displacement and Diffusion of Benefits

Displacement of crime is defined as the response of offenders – as a change in the crime they commit - to the blocking of crime opportunities (Barr and Pease, 1990). It is often used to refer the changes in location of crime, but six types of displacement are commonly recognized: temporal, spatial, target, method, crime type, and perpetrator (Repetto, 1976:57; Gabor, 1990:24; Barr and Pease, 1990:30).

Eck (1993:530) described these types in more detail. Temporal displacement is the change in time of the crime (for example, burglars' switching from night time to day time burglary). Spatial displacement is the change in location of crime; for example, auto thieves stop business in one neighborhood and start it in another. Target displacement is the change in the target that the offender attacks, for example, offenders stop stealing one type of car and start stealing another type which is less secure. Method displacement is the change in the way of attack that the offender uses; for example, offenders stop using knives and start using guns when committing robbery. Crime type displacement is the change in the type of the crime that is committed; for example, the drug dealers stop

selling drugs and start medical fraud which is more lucrative. Finally, perpetrator displacement is the change of old offenders with new ones; for example, the gang employs new drug dealers when old ones get caught (Eck, 1993:532).

Displacement can also be classified as malign and benign displacement. In malign displacement, crime increases outside of the primary targets. For example, when the opportunity for burglary in a neighborhood is blocked, burglary moves totally (or more) to another neighborhood, or to a more vulnerable neighborhood. In benign displacement, crime increases outside the primary targets too, but with less serious types or less frequent. For example, when the opportunity for burglary is blocked, burglary moves to another neighborhood, but either the frequency of burglary is less than before or the new neighborhood is less vulnerable than before (Clarke and Weisburd, 2009:12).

To sum up to this point, crime prevention may have six types of displacement effects, and these effects may worsen the problem, if it is 'malign' displacement; or lessen the problem, if it is 'benign' displacement. Crime prevention efforts are supported by the argument that - even the displacement is benign; it spreads the burden of crime more equitable across the community or replaces more serious with less (Barr and Pease, 1990).

Completely opposite of displacement (Poyner, 1988) is 'the spread of the beneficial influence of an intervention beyond the places which are directly targeted' (Clarke and Weisburd, 2009:16) diffusion of benefits. Poyner (1988) also argued that diffusion of benefits is a phenomenon which is not less occurred than displacement of crime. A variety of terms are used to describe this phenomenon, Chaiken et al. (1974) called "multiplier effect"; Scherdin (1986) called "halo effect"; Clarke and Mayhew (1988) called "spill over benefits"; and Miethe (1991) called "free rider effect". Sherman (1990) also referred to the same phenomenon as "free bonus".

According to the rational choice theory; rationality of offenders is somewhere between none and all. This means, contrary to deterministic theories which suggest that offenders are driven to crime, at least to some extent, they choose to commit or not (Eck, 1993:537). Moreover, the theory suggests that besides calculating the costs and benefits of the crime, they also calculate costs and benefits of non-criminal opportunities to suffice their needs. Thus, since crime prevention efforts affect the cost/benefit balance of crime, this theory requires that opportunity

reduction may not displace crime or may displace crime but not more than hundred percent.

In the theory, “wide and narrow models” describe the range of rationality. In the narrow model, while offenders make this calculation perfectly precise; in the wide model, they are limited in their precision. As much their calculation is flawed, that much opportunity reduction may have diffusion of benefits. Parallel to this idea, Sherman (1990:11) suggests that the police can prevent crime not only ‘showing its hand’ but also “by barking or bluffing”. He continues arguing that crime prevention benefits may be improved by making the offenders believe that the probabilities of being caught are greater than they really are.

Crime prevention efforts regarding both routine activities theory and crime pattern theory will influence perception of offenders. Since their knowledge of crime opportunities and rationality are limited, they may have two different perceptions about the amount of change in crime opportunities. They may think that the reduction in opportunities (or reduction in rewards, or increase in efforts or risk) is less than the real reduction, or they may think that it is more than the real reduction. If they think that opportunities are reduced more than actually they did, then for the same reasons that we suggested in rational choice theory, diffusion of benefits will occur.

Three of the opportunity theories suggest that crime prevention may displace crime, but it will not be more than one hundred percent, and may always have diffusion of its benefits. Then, do the empirical studies really support the theories? Empirical research about displacement can be grouped into two categories. The first group is, studies based on interviews of offenders, such as studies which Repetto (1974) and Bennett and Wright (1984) did. The second group is, studies looking at changes in crime patterns following an intervention, such as studies which Press (1971), Allatt (1984), and Mayhew et al. (1976) did (Eck, 1993:531). The most considerable challenge against these studies is that most of them did not directly focus on displacement. Miethe (1991), Clarke and Mayhew (1988), and Mayhew, Clarke and Elliott (1989) studies were the most prominent studies which directly focus on displacement. Lurigio and Rosenbaum (1986), in their comprehensive community crime prevention research, also found that researchers directly looked for displacement in only 3% of the studies.

Eck (1993:530) summarized thirty three crime prevention interventions and displacement in those studies. In three of these studies evidence of much displacement was found; in twelve of them there were some displacement; and in eighteen of them there was no displacement

(Eck, 1993:530). Eck also examined 99 crime prevention interventions in Sherman et al. report (1997:19), and found that in 91 of them there was evidence of crime change. In 89 interventions, there was 90% decrease in crime and in 2 interventions there was 2% of increase. In this report, they graded the studies according to Maryland Scale of Scientific Points (Sherman et al., 1997:8), and the average for the studies was 3 points over 5. Though, the average scientific scale point for the studies is not perfect, and the studies did not directly focus on displacement, it seems that it is more likely that a crime prevention intervention will not displace crime but rather diffuse its benefits.

7. Ethic Considerations of Crime Prevention

Though displacement seems to be the exception (Eck, 1993; Hesseling, 1994) and diffusion of benefits the norm, displacement (even partial displacement) is a possibility. Is it fair to displace our own problem to the neighbors' backyard? These anxieties form the ethical considerations of situational crime prevention.

Anxieties about situational crime prevention fall into two main groups; "ideological" concerns which focus on objectives of situational crime prevention and "ethical" concerns, which focus on means of achieving its objectives. Main ideological arguments are that situational crime prevention neglects moral culpability and punishment of the offender; punishes the law abiding by infringing upon freedom and privacy; and diverts the attention from the root causes by concentrating on situations. Ethical criticisms are about social justice, civil liberties and privacy (Felson and Clarke, 1997:198).

Ethical standards of a liberal democracy require three principles regarding government crime prevention; provide equal prevention to all social strata, show respect for individual rights, and share responsibility with all sections of society. Equal protection principle has three aspects; situational prevention may not displace crime from one segment of the community to another, prevention may not serve just one class, and costs of prevention may not be borne by another social class of the society than the class that benefits, prevention may be attentive to victimization risks of minorities and disempowered segments (Felson and Clarke, 1997:200).

One probable obvious criticism against situational prevention is that it serves wealthy at the expense of the poor (for example, O'Malley, 1994),

but some public housing preventions showed that it declined substantial crime rates and served the poorest of the poor (Cisneros, 1995). Another misunderstanding is that crime prevention may be used as a policy against poor to discourage them wandering anywhere (Felson and Clarke, 1997:202), assuming this requires that street crime is limited to poor.

Conclusion

In this essay, in order to give general information about to the role of opportunity for crime prevention, I summarized some important points of crime prevention literature. First, routine activities theory, rational choice theory, crime pattern theory, and defensible space theory are explained in detail. These theories are theoretical basis for situational crime prevention. They make clear causal template of crime or how to prevent crime regarding immediate situations of opportunities, and assumptions of these theories are our gadgets to develop different crime prevention interventions.

Displacement and diffusion of benefits are potential threats for crime prevention interventions (Eck, 1993). Approaching to a crime prevention project with an understanding of displacement and diffusion of benefit effects will allow performers to more carefully assess the impact of their crime prevention efforts.

To sum up, any crime intervention project must include crime diagnosing crime problem using opportunity theories; deciding the intervention to apply; consider displacement and diffusion of benefit probability. Sherman et al.'s (1997) scientific techniques can be used to evaluate the study that is implemented.

References

- Allatt, Patricia, (1984), "Residential Security: Containment and Displacement of Burglary", *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, V. 23, pp.99-116.
- Barr, Robert ve Ken Pease, (1990), "Crime Placement, Displacement and Deflection," in *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, Vol. 12, Michael Tonry and N. Morris eds., Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brantingham, Patricia L. ve Brantingham, Paul J., (1999), "A Theoretical Model of Crime Hot Spot Generation", *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention*, V. 8, No.1, pp.7-26.

- Brantingham, Patricia L. ve Brantingham, Paul J., (1995), "Crime Generators and Crime Attractors", *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, V. 3, pp.5-26.
- Chaiken, Jan M., Michael Lawless and Keith A. Stevenson, (1974), *The Impact of Police Activity on Crime: Robberies on the New York City Subway System*. New York: New York City Rand Institute.
- Clarke, Ronald V., (1998), *The Theory and Practice of Situational Crime Prevention*, www.e-docs.net/Resources/Articles/Clarke_the_theory_and_practice_of_situational_crime_prevention.pdf (erişim tarihi: 10 Haziran 2010).
- Clarke, Ronald V. ve Mayhew, Paul, (1988), "The British Gas Suicide Story and Its Criminological Implications", in *Crime and Justice*, eds M. Tonry & N. Morris, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Clarke, Ronald V. ve Cornish, Derek B., (1985), "Modeling Offender's Decisions: A Framework for Research and Polic", pp.147-85 in M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.), *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, Volume 6. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clarke, Ronald V. ve Weisburd, Daniel, (2009), *Diffusion of Crime Control Benefits: Observations of the Reverse of Displacement*, <http://www.popcenter.org/Library/CrimePrevention/Volume%2002/08clarke.pdf> (erişim tarihi: 06.06.2010).
- Cohen, Lawrence E. ve Felson, Marcus, (1979), "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach", *American Sociological Review*, V. 44, pp.588-608.
- Crowe, T., (1990), "Designing Safer Schools", *School Safety*, V. 5 (2), pp.9-13.
- Donnelly, P.G. ve Kimble C.E., (1997), "Community Organizing, Environmental Change and Neighborhood Crime", *Crime and Delinquency*, V.43, pp.493-511.
- Eck, John, (1993), "The Threat of Crime Displacement", *Criminal Justice Abstracts*, V.25, pp.527-555.
- Eck, John, Chainey, S., Cameron, J., Leitner, M. ve Wilson, R. E., (2005), *Mapping Crime: Understanding Hot Spots*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, NCJ 209393.
- Eck, John ve Spelman, W., (1987), "Who ya Gonna Call? The Police as Problem Busters", *Crime and Delinquency*, V.33, pp.31-52.

- Farrell, G. ve Pease, K., (1993), *Once Bitten, Twice Bitten: Repeat Victimization and its Implications for Crime Prevention*, Crime Prevention Unit Paper 46. London England: Home Office.
- Felson, Marcus, (1987), "Routine Activities and Crime Prevention in the Developing Metropolis", *Criminology*, V. 25, pp.911-931.
- Felson, Marcus ve Clarke, Ronald, (1998), *Opportunity Makes the Thief*, Police Research Series, Paper 98.
- Felson, Marcus ve Clarke, Ronald, (1997), The ethics of situational crime prevention. In Newman, G., Clarke., and Shoham, S. G., *Rational Choice and Situational Crime Prevention*, Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- Felson, M., Belanger, M.E., Bichler, G.M., Bruzinski, C.D., Campbell, G.S., Fried, C.L., Grofik, K.C., Mazur, I.S., O'Regan, A.B., Sweeney, P.J., Ullman, A.L., Williams, L.M., (1996), Redesigning Hell: Preventing Crime and Disorder at the Port Authority Bus Terminal, in R. Clarke (ed.), *Preventing Mass Transit Crime, Crime Prevention Studies, Vol. 6*, Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Fisher, Bonnie, Sloan, John, Cullen, Francis T. ve Lu, Chunmeng, (1998), "Crime in the Ivory Tower: The Level and Sources of Student Victimization", *Criminology*, V. 36, pp.671-692.
- Fisher, Bonnie ve Nasar, J.L., (1995), "Micro-level Fear Spots in Relation to Physical Cues: Exploring the Overlooked", *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, V. 34, pp.214-239.
- Gabor T. (1990), "Crime Displacement and Situational Crime Prevention: Toward the Development of Some Principles", *Canadian Journal of Criminology*", V. 32, pp.41-73.
- Gibbs, John ve Shelly, Peggy, (1982), "Life in the Fast Lane: A Retrospective View by Commercial Thieves", *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, V.19, pp.299-330.
- Greenberg, S.W. ve Rohe, W.M., (1986), Informal Social Control and Crime Prevention in Modern Urban Neighborhoods. In R.B. Taylor (Ed.), *Urban Neighborhoods: Research and Policy*, (pp. 79-122), New York: Praeger.
- Greene, Lorraine, (1995), "Cleaning up Drug Hot Spots in Oakland, California: The Displacement and Diffusion Effects", *Justice Quarterly*, V.12, pp.737-754.

- Hesseling, Rene, (1994), "Displacement: A Review of the Empirical Literature," in *Crime Prevention Studies*, Vol. 3, ed. R.V. Clarke, Monsey (New York): Criminal Justice Press.
- LaVigne, Nancy, (1997), "Safe Transport. Security by Design on the Washington Metro", in R. Clarke (ed.), *Preventing Mass Transit Crime, Crime Prevention Studies, Vol. 3*, Monsey, NY:Criminal Justice Press.
- Lurigio, A. J. ve Rosenbaum, D. P., (1986), The Evaluation Research in Community Crime Prevention. A Critical Look in the Field. In D. P. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work* (pp.19-44). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mayhew, P.M., Clarke, R.V., Sturman, A. ve Hough, M., (1976), "*Crime as Opportunity*", Home Office Research Study, no. 34, HMSO, London.
- Merry, S. E., (1981), "Defensible Space undefended", *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, V.16, pp.397-422.
- Miethe, Terance D., (1991), "Citizen-Based Crime Control Activity and Victimization Risks: An Examination of Displacement and Free Rider Effects," *Criminology*, V.29, pp.419-39.
- Newman, Oscar, (1996), *Creating Defensible Space*, US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.
- Poyner. Barry, (1988), "Video Cameras and Bus Vandalism" *Security Administration*, V.11, pp.44-51.
- Reissner, D ve Heinzelmann, F., (1996), *CPTED and Community Policing*, NCJ 157308.
- Repetto, Thomas A., (1976), "Crime Prevention and the Displacement Phenomenon," *Crime and Delinquency*, V. 22, pp.166-177.
- Rosenbaum, D., (1988), "Community Crime Prevention: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature", *Justice Quarterly*, V.5, pp.323-395.
- Rosenbaum, D., (1987), "The Theory and Research Behind Neighborhood Watch: Is it a Sound Fear and Crime Reduction Strategy?", *Crime and Delinquency*, V.33, pp.103-134.
- Scherdin, Mary Jane, (1986), "The Halo Effect: Psychological Deterrence of Electronic Security Systems", *Information Technology and Libraries*, V. 5 (3), pp.233-235.

- Sherman, Lawrence, (1990), "Police Crackdowns: Initial and Residual Deterrence", in *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, Vol. 12, eds. Michael Tonry and Norval Morris, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sherman, L.W., Gottfredson, D.C., MacKenzie, D.L., Eck, J., Reuter, P., Bushway, S.D., (1997), *Preventing Crime: What works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*, NCJ 171676.
- Smith, Mary S., (1996), *CPTED in Parking Facilities*, NCJ 157310.
- Smith, M. ve Clarke, Ronald, (2000), "Crime and Public Transport", *Crime and Justice*, V.27, pp.169- 233.
- Taylor, R.B. ve Harrell, A.V., (1996), *The Physical Environment and Crime*, NCJ 157311.
- Welsh, B.C. ve Farrington, D.P., (2000), "Monetary Costs and Benefits of Crime Prevention Programs", *Crime and Justice*, V.27, pp.305-361.