

Online Supplemental Materials

Creation and Exploitation in Crime Opportunity: How 62 Ideas Help Tackle a 50-Year-Old Problem

Purpose

We compiled a list of crime opportunity ideas to identify those developed by researchers between 1976 and 2025. We did not intend to document every opportunity theory and concept over these 50 years. Instead, we wanted to document enough ideas to draw reasonable conclusions about the relative importance of opportunity creation versus opportunity exploitation.

The material in this supplement serves three purposes. First, it provides background to our findings in the main text of our paper and allows readers to check our work. Second, having uncovered 62 crime opportunity ideas, this list may have value beyond this paper. Students may find the list helpful in studying the opportunity perspective. And researchers (including students) might find the list helpful in developing new research projects. Third, if someone finds ideas we have overlooked, and when new ones are produced, these can be added to the list. We hope that this by-product of our paper proves helpful for others.

We call these *ideas* because we wanted to include both theories and concepts. For our purposes, concepts are names of theoretical entities, patterns, and processes (e.g., guardians are entities; near-repeat victimization is a pattern; and scripts are processes). Theories show relationships among concepts; how some concepts lead to others (e.g., routine activity theory is a theory because it shows how processes involving targets, offenders, guardians, and other concepts produce crime). For our paper, the distinction between concept and theory is unimportant, but the distinction did help us define the scope of the ideas we were collecting.

How We Selected Ideas

We began by recalling as many opportunity ideas as we could. Our draft list contained about 44 ideas. We asked twenty-five experts in opportunity theories, of whom twenty-two responded. We gave our draft list to each and asked them to strike ideas that should not belong and add ideas we had left off. We examined all of their suggestions, adding ideas we had overlooked and questioning some ideas we had put on the draft list. In the process, we also uncovered ideas our experts had not recalled.

Included Ideas

To be included on our list, an idea had to have two characteristics.

1. The idea was *communicated after 1975*. As Crime as Opportunity was published in early 1976, everything on our list comes after it. Our end date was September 2025, when we began drafting this paper. We list several obvious earlier ideas, which we called antecedents. These were ideas that influenced the opportunity perspective. We selected

these by drawing on citations in Mayhew et al. (1976) and other early opportunity writings, as well as discussions with early theorists. We did not attempt to ferret out all influences on opportunity ideas, as our interest was in what happened after Mayhew and colleagues (1976) wrote their foundational piece.

2. The idea was to develop *a new theory or concept* about crime opportunities. Following Mayhew et al. (1976) and later opportunity theorists, we imagined opportunities as constrained in space and time. So, an obvious opportunity idea involves a small geographic area—ideally, one within easy reach of the offender—and a short time period. We were uninterested in the breadth of an idea. Some are general theories (e.g., routine activity theory [Cohen & Felson, 1979]) and others are small concepts (e.g., convergence settings [Felson, 2003]). Many of the ideas are connected to other ideas, but as long as they contain something new, we include them.

Excluded Ideas

We also created criteria for excluding ideas. We did not include in our list ideas and findings with one or more of these characteristics:

1. *Ideas outside of the opportunity perspective.* No idea is entirely new, without a precursor. Many opportunity ideas draw on earlier ideas from another discipline—the idea of scripts, for example, comes from psychology, and foraging comes from animal ecology. Ideas that had not been applied to crime opportunities we excluded. When an outside idea was brought to bear on crime opportunities, we included it. So, we attribute the idea about scripts to Cornish (1994), though he drew on earlier psychological theories. Similarly, the concepts of flag and boost, which are used to explain repeat victimization, are an application of a general idea from other disciplines: the distinction between population heterogeneity and state dependence (Nagin and Paternoster, 2000).
2. *Offender disposition or propensity ideas.* Standard criminology dwells on why some people are interested in crime, while others are not. Dispositional ideas are not relevant to our interests because the opportunity perspective treats offender propensity as background (Clarke & Bowers, 2017).
3. *Potential victims' perceptions.* We excluded theories of how non-offenders perceive crime threats or fearful circumstances. This is an interesting and valuable area of research, but non-offenders' perceptions may have little to do with what offenders perceive as crime opportunities. For example, Fisher and Naser's concepts of prospect, refuge, and escape (1992) are not on the list for this reason.
4. *Neighborhood and regional theories.* Criminology has many publications about neighborhoods and larger areas (for example, Shaw & McKay, 1942; Wilson & Kelling, 1982; Sampson et al., 1997). From an opportunity perspective, these areas will contain a wide variety of crime opportunities of varying intensity. For example, the opportunity for shoplifting will be concentrated on the main street within the neighborhood, which contains shops, but will be absent from the residential streets behind the main street.

Although some neighborhood theories touch on opportunity theories, their scale is too large to be embraced by the opportunity perspective. In addition, other research suggests that the concept of neighborhood is too vague (e.g., Linning et al., 2025; Wilcox et al., 2018).

5. *Deterrence and incapacitation.* These two ideas are connected to the opportunity perspective. Without the possibility of sanctions, many aspects of opportunity structures would be irrelevant. Guardianship, for example, would be meaningless without the support of police, courts, and prisons. Like neighborhood and regional theories, most theories of deterrence and incapacitation operate over large time spans, spatial scales, and crime types — scales too large to fit within Mayhew et al.'s (1976) notion of crime opportunities. Therefore, we did not include deterrence-based or incapacitation theories (e.g., Paternoster, 1987) unless an author explicitly linked them to opportunity, as Sherman (1990) did with residual deterrence.
6. *Novel applications of existing opportunity ideas.* Some publications show how an opportunity idea developed for one type of crime has application to another, very different type of crime (for example, Rossmo's [1995] innovative use of crime pattern theory to investigating serial offenders; Wortley and Smallbone's [2006] application of situational crime prevention to child sexual abuse; Leclerc and Reynald's (2015) demonstration that crime scripts can be integrated with the concept of guardianship to enhance prevention). Applying an existing idea to a new unit of analysis also fell outside the literature we were collecting (for example, Weisburd and coauthors' [2012] application of informal social control to street segments).
7. *Advances in data collection, statistical analysis, or study design.* Since 1976, numerous ideas have been developed to help uncover crime patterns, offender movement, temporal distributions, and other related aspects. We did not include them because our interest is in theoretical concepts (for example, Pawson & Tilley [1997] on the realistic design of evaluation, and Bowers and Johnson's [2003] weighted displacement quotient).
8. *Ways to prevent crime.* There are many papers on how to prevent crimes under different circumstances. Ideas for preventing crime are of considerable value, but they are outside our scope for this paper. Problem-oriented policing (Goldstein, 1990), for example, draws on opportunity ideas, but Goldstein's theory is a theory of policing, not of crime opportunities.
9. *Empirical studies: evaluations and evidence.* Since our interest lies in ideas, we excluded the empirical literature on these ideas (for example, Dennis Roncek's [1981] pioneering work on facilities and crime). We also excluded evaluations of interventions based on opportunity theories and concepts (for example, Groff and Taniguchi's [2019] evaluation of near-repeat interventions). We did make one exception. When authors ventured beyond their data to develop a new way of looking at crime opportunities, we included the new idea (e.g., Morgan [2001] on near repeats).

Table A1

In Table A1, we list the ideas that fit the criteria. The first column contains the authors and publication years of the source documents. The entries in this table are ordered by year, from earliest to latest. The second column names the idea. We used the names provided by the authors, but in some cases, they did not name their ideas, so we created names for them.

The third column gives thumbnail descriptions of the ideas. We emphasized how the ideas relate to crime opportunities and why we classified the ideas as exploitation, creation, or mixed. If we classified an idea as exploitation or creation, the text in parentheses explains why we excluded the alternative classification. We need to issue a warning, particularly to student readers and researchers in a hurry. These thumbnails are incomplete descriptions and should not be trusted as definitive summaries of the ideas; read the cited document to understand any of these ideas.

The fourth column shows the type of opportunity idea: exploitation, creation, or mixed. And the last column provides our judgment on whether the idea is intended to be applied to reduce crime. We based our judgment on whether the source document shows that the authors intended their ideas to be applied to address crime (not just a theoretical exercise). Some authors may not have considered the application of their idea, but later it was applied (routine activity theory is an example). We marked these as applied. Consequently, there may be recent ideas that are not yet developed for application but could be in the future.

We tried to establish the first piece of printed communication to present the ideas. For most ideas, the first mention is obvious (routine activity theory is 1979), but a few are difficult to pin down. For example, the extension of place management to the internet appears in several papers under various names. We decided that the earliest mention of the core idea was in Eck and Clarke (2003).

Sometimes, the idea's most cited article points to an earlier publication. If the earlier paper met our inclusion criteria, we cited it. That is why we attribute the idea that street networks influence crime patterns to Beavis and Nutter (1977) rather than to several other well-known papers. The concept of near repeats was first published in a paper by Townsley et al (2000). However, they attribute the idea to Morgan, who had not yet published his paper. We cite Morgan (2001) even though it was published after Townsley and coauthors (the vagaries of the publishing industry should not cloud attribution).

We provide a thumbnail description to illustrate why we classified each idea as exploitation, creation, or mixed. The positive reason is stated first. Then, in parentheses, we describe what is missing (why we did not classify it otherwise). Again, we warn readers (particularly students and researchers working under pressure and at a rapid pace) that these thumbnails do not provide a comprehensive description of the theory or concept, and they are not a substitute for reading the original work.

We would like readers to be able to find papers we mention in this list. Most are readily available in libraries or online. However, some sources are difficult to find. Therefore, if the first source is a hard-to-retrieve report, we also cite a more accessible document. For example, the opportunity-

creating aspects of street networks were first described by Beavis and Nutter (1977) in a conference paper (which we have), but their ideas are more easily found in Beavon et al. (1994).

When classifying ideas as exploitation or creation, we examined the paper's emphasis. Many papers suggest both, but emphasize one and put the other in the background. For example, offender search focuses on exploitation and assumes heterogeneous opportunities, while routine activity theory describes the creation of opportunities but assumes offenders are roaming. We classified an idea as mixed when both exploitation and creation receive equal attention and when they interact. All three of us reviewed each included idea and discussed its classification. When we were uncertain, we reread the source paper and discussed the idea until we had resolved our differences. Usually, there was little disagreement. But to be included, we required all three of us to agree.

We also tried to classify ideas as applied or not applied. One of us drafted classifications, and the other two reviewed the draft and suggested revisions. We then discussed the ideas we disagreed on and reached a consensus. This was a subjective decision based on evidence in the publication or our knowledge of the authors (sometimes based on conversations or other writings). A few ideas (for example, routine activity theory) may have been developed primarily for academic purposes but later applied. If we knew an idea had applications the authors may not have intended, we classified the idea as applied. Ideas from later decades are less likely to be applied than those from earlier ones. Therefore, we may have underestimated the frequency of applied ideas in the last two decades.

Although we did not make serious efforts to identify opportunity ideas that predated *Crime as Opportunity*, we list a few notable ones that Mayhew et al. (1976) and others have mentioned.

Table A1: The first 50 years of the Opportunity Perspective: Concepts and Theories from 1976 to 2025				
Authors, year	Idea (concept or theory)	Thumbnail description of what the idea explains (and does not explain)	Type	Applied
Antecedents: 1956-1975				
Jacobs, 1956	Shopkeepers' eyes on the street suppress crime	Thriving small businesses block crime opportunities because their proprietors watch the street (does not examine how offenders behave). This article was the foundation for <i>The Death and Life of Great American Cities</i> (Jacobs, 1961).	Creation	Yes
Lynch, 1960	Navigation of urban environments	How people navigate cities using paths, edges, nodes, districts, and landmarks.	Exploitation	Yes
Boggs, 1965	Environmental opportunities	Risk of crime should be measured by the number of crime targets available (does not examine how offenders behave).	Creation	No
Barker, 1968	Behavioral settings	Places are designed to facilitate specific activities.	Creation	No
Jeffery, 1971	Crime prevention through environmental design	The design of physical space influences the chances of crime.	Creation	Yes
Newman, 1972	Defensible space	The physical space designs signal to offenders about the opportunities for crime. Offenders perceive their environment.	Creation	Yes
Decade 1: 1976-1985				
Mayhew, et al. 1976	Opportunity perspective	Opportunities for crime influence how offenders behave, and opportunities are unevenly spread across the environment (does not	Exploitation	Yes

		explain the creation of opportunities).		
Capone & Nichols, 1976	Journey to crime	Offenders tend to favor targets closer to their homes relative to those located further away (does not explain the creation of opportunities).	Exploitation	No
Bevis & Nutter, 1977	Street network accessibility	Highly accessible and understandable street networks hinder residents' abilities to surveil their areas, thereby creating more opportunities for crime. Alternatively, they make it easy for offenders to move through an area and exploit targets. See also Beavon et al. (1994).	Mixed	Yes
Hindelang et al., 1978	Lifestyle exposure theory	How people conduct their lives influences their chances of becoming a victim (does not examine how offenders behave).	Creation	No
Cohen & Felson, 1979	Routine activities of guardianship	Everyday routines of the public determine the level of guardianship for themselves and the things they own. This explains why crime changes over time (does not examine how offenders behave).	Creation	Yes
Clarke, 1980	Situational crime prevention	Changing small characteristics of micro-environments alters how offenders perceive their chances of success in crime, and can block them from offending (does not explain how opportunities are created or who makes the changes to block them).	Exploitation	Yes
Brantingham & Brantingham, 1981	Offender search / Crime pattern theory	The everyday routines of offenders determine how they discover crime opportunities and where crimes occur (does not explain how opportunities were created). See also Brantingham and Brantingham (1993).	Exploitation	Yes
Greenberg, et al.,	Informal social control	Social control is divided into two domains, formal and informal.	Creation	No

1982		Informal social control blocks crime opportunities. (does not examine how offenders behave)		
Clarke & Cornish, 1985	Rational choice perspective	Offenders are boundedly rational and make choices about when and where to commit crimes based on their perceptions of crime opportunities (does not explain how opportunities were created).	Exploitation	Yes
Decade 2: 1986-1995				
Felson, 1987	Handlers of offenders	People who are emotionally bonded to offenders can help prevent crimes. Their absence helps create opportunities (does not examine how offenders behave).	Creation	Yes
Cornish & Clarke, 1987	Displacement is not inevitable	Offenders will not consistently displace if their opportunities are blocked (does not examine how opportunities become blocked)	Exploitation	Yes
Sherman, 1990	Residual deterrence	A police crackdown on crime reduces crime during the crackdown, but even after the crackdown ends, offenders will refrain from offending until they are sure the police have left (does not explain the origins of the crackdown).	Exploitation	Yes
Atlas, 1990	Offensible space	Offenders use the physical environment to aid their actions, including defensible space features (does not explain the creation of the features). See Atlas (1991).	Exploitation	Yes
Farrell & Pease, 1993	Repeat victimisation time-course	A small proportion of victims experience most of the victimizations, and the risk of victimization increases for a short period following each victimization (does not explain why some victims are more likely to be vulnerable).	Exploitation	Yes

Cornish, 1994	Offender scripts	Crimes are predictable sequences of offenders' actions before, during, and after the crime (does not explain how crime opportunities are created).	Exploitation	Yes
Clarke & Weisburd, 1994	Diffusion of benefits	Following the blocking of crime opportunities, offenders may sometimes also refrain from offending at opportunities that were not blocked (does not explain why some opportunities were blocked).	Exploitation	Yes
Eck, 1994	Place management theory	The level of crime at a place is due to the decisions owners and operators of places make (does not explain how offenders exploit places).	Creation	Yes
van Dijk, 1994	Van Dijk crime chains	Crime breeds crime; sometimes one crime leads to another, which leads to another, and so on. A bike theft prompts the victim to steal a bike and so on. Felson & Clarke (1998) gave it the name. A van Dijk Chain is likely when the stolen item is widely owned, necessary, easily stolen, and relatively expensive.	Mixed	No
Brantingham & Brantingham, 1995	Crime attractors & generators	High-crime places are of two types. Places with many targets are crime generators. Places with many offenders are crime attractors (does not explain how targets came to the sites, or what about the place attracted the offenders).	Exploitation	Yes
Decade 3: 1996-2005				
Pease, 1997	Crime harvests	The introduction of a highly desirable product can lead to crime surges if the producer fails to design-in theft prevention and drives product demand and value through intense marketing (does not describe how offenders search for and steal these products). See,	Creation	Yes

		Blythe & Johnson (2021).		
Johnson et al., 1997	Offender forgetting	Offenders' memories of places they have exploited decay over time, thus explaining why victimization risk declines over time (does not explain the creation of opportunities).	Exploitation	No
Eckblom, 1997	Co-evolutionary perspective	Offenders adapt to new opportunities presented, and business and technology produce new opportunities.	Mixed	Yes
Pease, 1998	Virtual repeat victimization	Offenders generalize from their successes and attack targets similar to earlier targets (does not explain the creation of targets).	Exploitation	Yes
Clarke, 1999	Hot products / CRAVED	Some products are more desirable to offenders than others. The characteristics of products that are attractive to thieves include being concealable, removable, readily available, valuable, enjoyable, and disposable (does not explain how offenders find and exploit targets).	Creation	Yes
Eckblom & Tilley, 2000	Resourceful offender	Offenders need capabilities and resources in order to offend.	Exploitation	Yes
Morgan, 2001	Near repeat victimisation	Having successfully victimized a target at one location, offenders are more likely to victimize nearby targets soon after the first victimization (does not explain how the places were created). See also Townsley et al. (2000)	Exploitation	Yes
Wortley, 2001	Situational precipitators	Features of an immediate environment can provoke criminal behavior—even when the individual had no prior intent to offend (does not explain the creation of these environments).	Exploitation	Yes
Smith et al., 2002	Anticipatory benefits	Offenders may reduce offending before an anticipated crime prevention effort (does not explain the crime prevention effort).	Exploitation	Yes

Cullen et al., 2002	Environmental corrections	Correctional rehabilitation effectiveness can be enhanced by controlling the opportunities offenders encounter in their routines.	Mixed	Yes
Tseloni & Pease, 2003	Flag & boost accounts	Repeat victimization is the result of either the victim having characteristics that attract offenders (flag) or offenders gaining knowledge from the first offense (boost) (does not explain how victims get characteristics that flag them).	Exploitation	Yes
Felson, 2003	Convergence settings	Some public places serve offenders by being useful to meet new, potential confederates (does not explain how these places get created, or how offenders exploit crime opportunities).	Exploitation	Yes
Eck & Clarke, 2003	Network managers	Offenders can attack targets at a distance when they are connected to the target with a network, such as a postal service, telephones, or the internet. The network replaces the physical place (does not explain how offenders exploit the network).	Creation	Yes
Johnson & Bowers, 2004	Offender foraging	Offenders search for target patches and avoid threats, much like wild animals forage for food (does not explain the creation of opportunity patches).	Exploitation	Yes
Decade 4: 2006-2015				
Farrell & Roman, 2006	Crime as pollution	Crime is an externality of standard practices, including those of businesses, engineers, and product designers (does not explain how offenders exploit products).	Creation	Yes

Ratcliffe, 2006	Temporal constraint theory	Offenders are bound by their daily routines and obligations, so the times they have available for crime are constrained (does not address the creation of crime opportunities).	Exploitation	Yes
Clarke & Newman, 2006	EVIL DONE	The acronym lists the characteristics of targets most likely to be attacked by terrorists. It's a description of what attracts terrorists (does not explain how offenders find and exploit targets).	Creation	Yes
van Dijk, 2007	Security hypothesis	The improved and widespread use of security technologies reduced opportunities for crime, thereby contributing to the crime drop (does not address the offenders' exploitation of crime opportunities). See Farrell et al. (2011).	Creation	Yes
Eck, et al., 2007	Risky facilities	Within any homogeneous group of facilities, a small subset of facilities consistently produce the most crime, while most facilities have little to no crime (does not explain how offenders find and exploit facilities).	Creation	Yes
Madensen, 2007	The ORCA framework	The amount of crime at a place is driven by place management decisions (see above). Place managers have four functions—organizing space, regulating conduct, controlling access, and acquiring resources—and how they achieve these functions drives crime (does not explain how offenders find and exploit places).	Creation	Yes
Whitehead, et al., 2008	IN SAFE HANDS	Describes the characteristics of effective anti-theft designs for electronic goods (does not describe how offenders search for and take these goods).	Creation	Yes
Reynald, 2009	Guardianship in Action	Defines guardianship as having three components: presence, watching, and willingness to	Creation	No

		intervene (does not describe how offenders detect guardianship).		
Taniguchi, et al., 2009	Agglomeration economies of crime	Illicit markets cluster spatially, which has economic advantages over dispersed markets (does not describe how the agglomeration came to exist).	Exploitation	No
Felson & Clarke, 2010	Routine precautions	People and organizations take everyday actions to reduce their vulnerability to crime (does not describe how offenders react to routine precautions)	Creation	Yes
Sampson et al., 2010	Super controllers	Explains the influences that prompt guardians, handlers, and place managers to control crime. These controllers fail to prevent crime when super controllers are absent or weak (does not describe how offenders exploit opportunities).	Creation	Yes
Farrell et al., 2011	Debut crime hypothesis	By preventing crimes by youth, fewer young people begin a life of crime. Blocking easy-to-commit crime opportunities is the key (does not explain the production of opportunities).	Exploitation	No
Sidebottom et al., 2011	Price-theft hypothesis	Some types of theft are highly responsive to the market value of the items being stolen (does not explain how offenders detect these targets).	Creation	Yes
Hammer, 2011	Comfort spaces	Some crime-involved places have no reported crimes because offenders use them to hang out, stash their goods and tools, or watch their area. These places facilitate crime nearby (does not explain how these places become comfort places). See Herold & Eck, 2020.	Exploitation	Yes
Madensen & Eck, 2012	Corrupting spots	Some places promote crime elsewhere by providing markets for stolen goods. They may have no reported crime at their sites.	Mixed	Yes

		Place management decisions create these places, and these places influence offenders' exploitation of opportunities elsewhere.		
Madensen & Eck, 2012	Place-type classifications [CS4]	There are four types of crime-involved places: crime sites have a great deal of crime at the place; convergent settings allow offenders to meet each other; comfort spaces are private hangouts that make crime easier elsewhere; and corrupting spots make crime elsewhere more rewarding (does not explain how these places came to be crime-involved).	Exploitation	Yes
Bowers, 2014	Crime radiation	High-crime sites have a high incidence of crime and also tend to broadcast crime to nearby areas. See Linning et al. (2024) for the expanded theory.	Mixed	No
Eckblom & Hirschfield, 2014	11Ds	Proposes 11 mechanisms that influence offenders in proximal situations. These include practical methods (e.g., defeat, disable), psychological methods (e.g., demote, deceive), and personal methods (e.g., detect, detain).	Mixed	Yes
Nee & Ward, 2015	Dysfunctional expertise	Offenders gain expertise through practice (does not explain how crime opportunities are created).	Exploitation	No
Decade 5: 2016-2025				
Tilley & Sidebottom, 2017	Leaky systems	The designs of person-made systems can make them vulnerable to crime (does not explain exploitation).	Creation	Yes
Madensen et al., 2017	Crime place networks	Durable violence hotspots resist policing because they are composed of multiple networked places that most police interventions do not change. Offenders use the convergent settings, crime sites, corrupting	Mixed	Yes

		spots, and comfort spaces to facilitate their activities.		
Eck & Madensen-Herold, 2018	Place manager typology	There are four types of place managers depending on the crime-resilience of their location and their management approach: a) <i>Suppressors</i> are active managers in resilient locations; b) <i>Reactors</i> are passive managers in resilient locations; c) <i>Enablers</i> are passive managers in crime-susceptible places; d) <i>Promoters</i> actively manage to create crime in susceptible locations (does not describe how offenders take advantage of these managers).	Creation	Yes
Wilcox & Tillyer, 2018	Place in neighborhood [PIN] thesis	Crime at places is influenced by neighborhood characteristics and place characteristics. It is an attempt to reconcile place-based theories and neighborhood theories (does not describe offender exploitation). See Linning et al. (2022) for a contrary thesis.	Creation	No
Eck, 2018	Opportunity structures for bad place management	The theory explains why high-crime areas are often clustered within specific locations. The principal drivers are economic, social, and political influences on the value of places (does not describe offender exploitation).	Creation	Yes
Linning & Eck, 2018	Weak intervention backfire (criminal hormesis)	The theory explains that if a crime prevention strategy is too low a dosage, it may create greater opportunities for offenders to exploit (does not explain how the prevention strategy was developed, or who developed it).	Exploitation	Yes
Lemieux & Bruschi, 2019	Product-based crime scripts	Describes how illicit products move through stages of production and distribution, with each stage having its actors and scripts (does not describe the creation of the environment that facilitates the	Exploitation	Yes

		production).		
Linning et al., 2022	Neighborhoods out of places explanation [NOPE]	The amount of crime in a neighborhood is determined by the crime at places within that neighborhood. Crime at these places is determined by place management (does not describe exploitation). See Wilcox and Tillyer (2018) for a contrary thesis.	Creation	No
Linning & Eck, 2025	Revised control typology	Replaces the formal-informal social control typology with a set of six controls that influence crime opportunities: state, place management, organization, intimate, self, and stranger (does not explain how offenders address these controls).	Creation	No
Shen & Linning, 2025	Indirect & direct SCP	Situational prevention is on a set continuum ranging from direct to indirect: the more indirect, the less effective the prevention (does not explain exploitation).	Creation	Yes

Authors and Their Ideas

Table A2 lists authors of ideas from fewest to most contributions. Because most ideas had two or more authors, the names of ideas can appear several times in each column. This table was used to determine that authors seldom specialize in exploitation or creation ideas. Authors contributing to two or more ideas usually have exploitation and creation ideas in their portfolios.

Table A2: Crime Opportunity Authors and Their Ideas				
Author	Ideas			
	#	Exploitation	Creation	Mixed
Atlas	1	*Offensible space		
Belur	1		*Price theft hypothesis	
Bevis	1			*Street network accessibility
Bruschi	1	*Product-based scripts		
Capone	1	*Journey to crime		
Christenson	1			*Crime place networks
Cohen	1		*Routine activity theory	
Cullen	1			*Environmental corrections
Dunham	1		*Super controllers	
Garofalo	1		*Lifestyle exposure theory	
Gottfredson	1		*Lifestyle exposure theory	
Greenberg	1		*Informal social control	
Guerette	1		*Risky facilities	
Herold	1			*Crime place networks
Hindelang	1		*Lifestyle exposure theory	
Hough	1	*Opportunity perspective		
Lemieux	1	*Product-based scripts		
Lowenkamp	1			*Environmental corrections
Mayhew	1	*Opportunity perspective		

Table A2: Crime Opportunity Authors and Their Ideas				
McCardle	1		*IN SAFE HANDS	
McCord	1	*Agglomeration economies of crime		
Morgan	1	*Near repeat victimisation		
Nee	1	*Dysfunctional expertise		
Newman	1		*EVIL DONE	
Nicholes	1	*Journey to crime		
Nutter	1			*Street network accessibility
Olaghere	1		*Neighborhoods out of places explanation	
Ratcliffe	1	*Temporal constraint theory		
Rengert	1	*Agglomeration economies of crime		
Reynald	1		*Guardianship in action	
Rohe	1		*Informal social control	
Roman	1		*Crime as pollution	
Sampson	1		*Super controllers	
Shen	1		*Indirect & direct SCP	
Sherman	1	*Residual deterrence		
Smith	1	*Anticipatory benefits		
Storer	1		*IN SAFE HANDS	
Sturman	1	*Opportunity perspective		
Taniguchi	1	*Agglomeration economies of crime		
Tompson	1		*Price theft hypothesis	
Torrens	1		*IN SAFE HANDS	
Ward	1	*Dysfunctional expertise		
Weisburd	1	*Diffusion of benefits		
Whitehead	1		*IN SAFE HANDS	
Wilcox	1		*Place in neighborhood thesis	
Williams	1		*Informal social control	

Table A2: Crime Opportunity Authors and Their Ideas

Wortley	1	*Situational precipitators		
Brantingham, PJ	2	*Offender search theory *Crime attractors & generators		
Brantingham, PL	2	*Offender search theory *Crime attractors & generators		
Hammer	2	*Comfort spaces		*Crime place networks
Hirschfield	2	*Offender forgetting		*11D
Mailley	2	*Debut crime hypothesis	*IN SAFE HANDS	
Sidebottom	2		*Price theft hypothesis *Leaky systems	
Tseloni	2	*Flag & boost accounts *Debut crime hypothesis		
van Dijk	2		*Security hypothesis	*van Dijk chains
Cornish	3	*Rational choice perspective *Displacement is not inevitable *Offender scripts		
Eklom	3	*Resourceful offender		*Co-evolutionary perspective *11D
Johnson	3	*Offender forgetting *Offender foraging	*Price theft hypothesis	
Tilley	4	*Debut crime hypothesis *Resourceful offender	*Leaky systems *Place in neighborhood thesis	
Bowers	4	*Offender forgetting *Offender foraging	*Price theft hypothesis	*Crime radiation
Farrell	4	*Repeat victimisation time course *Debut crime hypothesis	*Crime as pollution *IN SAFE HANDS	
Felson	4	*Convergence settings	*Routine activity theory *Handlers of offenders *Routine precautions	
Linning	4	*Weak intervention backfire	*Neighborhoods out of places explanation *Revised control typology *Indirect & direct SCP	

Table A2: Crime Opportunity Authors and Their Ideas				
Madensen	5	*Place-type classification (CS4)	*ORCA framework *Place manager typology	*Corrupting spots *Crime place networks
Pease	5	*Repeat victimisation time course *Virtual repeat victimisation *Anticipatory benefits *Flag & boost accounts	*Crime harvests	
Clarke	11	*Opportunity perspective *Situational crime prevention *Rational choice perspective *Displacement is not inevitable *Diffusion of benefits *Anticipatory benefits	*Hot products/CRAVED *Network managers *EVIL DONE *Routine precautions *Risky facilities	
Eck	12	*Weak intervention backfire *Place-type classification (CS4)	*Place management *Network managers *Risky facilities *Super controllers *Opportunity structures for bad place management *Neighborhoods out of places explanation *Revised control typology *Place manager typology	*Environmental corrections *Corrupting spots

References

(Note: references for Table A1 can be found in the references list of the manuscript)

- Atlas, R. (1991). Offensible space: The other side of CPTED. *Security Management Magazine*, March, 63-66.
- Bevis, C. & Nutter, J. B. (1977). *Changing street layouts to reduce residential burglary*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology Conference. Atlanta, GA. Nov 16-20.
- Beavon, D. J. K., Brantingham, P. L., & Brantingham, P. J. (1994). The influence of street networks on the patterning of property offenses. In R. V. Clarke (Ed.), *Crime Prevention Studies* (Vol. 2. pp. 115–148). Criminal Justice Press.
- Blythe, J. M., & Johnson, S. D. (2021). A systematic review of crime facilitated by the consumer Internet of Things. *Security Journal*, 34(1), 97–125. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41284-019-00211-8>
- Bowers, K. J., & Johnson, S. D. (2003). Measuring the geographical displacement and diffusion of benefits effects of crime prevention activity. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 19(3), 275–301. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1024909009240>
- Brantingham, Patricia L. & Brantingham, P. J. (1993). Environment, routine, and situation: Toward a pattern theory of crime. In R. V. Clarke & M. Felson (Eds.), *Routine activity and rational choice* (pp. 259–294). Transaction.
- Clarke, R. V. & Bowers, K. (2017). Seven misconceptions of situational crime prevention. In N. Tilley & A. Sidebottom (Eds.), *Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety* (2nd ed.; pp. 109-142). Routledge.
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44(4), 588–608. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094589>
- Cornish, D. B. (1994). The procedural analysis of offending and its relevance for situational crime prevention. In R. V. Clarke (ed.), *Crime Prevention Studies* (Vol. 3, pp. 151–198). Criminal Justice Press.
- Eck, J. E., & Clarke, R. V. (2003). Classifying common police problems: A routine activity approach. In M. J. Smith & D. B. Cornish (Eds.), *Crime Prevention Studies* (Vol. 16, pp. 7–39). Criminal Justice Press.
- Ekblom, P., & Tilley, N. (2000). Going equipped: Criminology, situational crime prevention and the resourceful offender. *British Journal of Criminology*, 40(2), 376–398. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1093/bjc/40.3.376>

- Farrell, G., Tseloni, A., Mailley, J., & Tilley, N. (2011). The crime drop and the security hypothesis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 48(2), 147-175.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427810391539>
- Felson, M., & Clarke, R. V. (1998). Opportunity makes the thief. *Police research series, paper 98*. London, UK: Home Office.
- Fisher, B. S., & Nasar, J. L. (1992). Fear of crime in relation to three exterior site features: Prospect, refuge, and escape. *Environment and Behavior*, 24(1), 35–65.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916592241002>
- Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing*. McGraw-Hill.
- Groff, E., & Taniguchi, T. (2019). Using citizen notification to interrupt near-repeat residential burglary patterns: The micro-level near-repeat experiment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 15(2), 115–149. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-018-09350-1>
- Herold, T.D. & Eck, J.E. (2020). Gun violence in Cincinnati, Ohio. In M.S. Scott & R.V. Clarke (eds.) *Problem-Oriented Policing: Successful Case Studies* (pp. 28-39). New York: Routledge.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. NY: Vintage.
- Leclerc, B., & Reynald, D. M. (2015). When scripts and guardianship unite: A script model to facilitate intervention of capable guardians in public settings. *Security Journal*, 30, 1–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/sj.2015.8>
- Linning, S.J., Bowers, K., & Eck, J.E. (2024b). Crime radiation theory: The co-production of crime patterns through opportunity creation and exploitation. *Crime Science*, 13(32), 1-8.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40163-024-00234-6>
- Linning, S. J., Mierzwa, T., Cheung, J., & Eck, J. E. (2025). What is a neighborhood? A concept consensus review of recent criminological literature. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 97, 102370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2025.102370>
- Linning, S.J., Olaghere, A., & Eck, J.E. (2022). Say NOPE to social disorganization criminology: The importance of creators in neighborhood social control. *Crime Science*, 11(5), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.21428/cb6ab371.87801605>
- Mayhew, P., Clarke, R. V. G., Sturman, A., & Hough, J. M. (1976). *Crime as opportunity*. Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Morgan, F. (2001). Repeat burglary in a Perth suburb: Indicator of short-term or long-term risk? In G. Farrell & K. Pease (Eds.), *Crime Prevention Studies* (vol. 12, pp. 83–118). Criminal Justice Press.

- Nagin, D., & Paternoster, R. (2000). Population heterogeneity and state dependence: future research. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 16(2), 117–144. [https://doi-org.uc.idm.oclc.org/10.1023/A:1007502804941](https://doi.org.uc.idm.oclc.org/10.1023/A:1007502804941)
- Paternoster, R. (1987). The deterrent effect of the perceived certainty and severity of punishment: A review of the evidence and issues. *Justice Quarterly*, 4(2), 173–217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418828700089271>
- Pawson, R. & Tilley, N. (1997). *Realistic evaluation*. Sage.
- Roncek, D. W. (1981). Dangerous places: Crime and residential environment. *Social Forces*, 60(1), 74–96. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2577933>
- Rossmo, D. K. (1995). Place, space, and police investigations: Hunting serial violent criminals. In J. E. Eck & D. L. Weisburd (Eds.), *Crime and place (Crime prevention studies*, Vol. 4, pp. 217–235). Criminal Justice Press.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918–924. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5328.918>
- Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1972). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas* (revised edition). University of Chicago Press.
- Sherman, L. W. (1990). Police crackdowns: Initial and residual deterrence. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research* (pp. 1–48). University of Chicago Press.
- Townsley, M., Homel, R., & Chaseling, J. (2000). Repeat burglary victimisation: Spatial and temporal patterns. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 33(1), 37–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000486580003300104>
- Weisburd, D., Groff, E. R., & Yang, S. M. (2012). *The criminology of place: Street segments and our understanding of the crime problem*. Oxford University Press.
- Wilcox, P., Cullen, F. T., & Feldmeyer, B. (2018). *Communities and crime: An enduring American challenge*. Temple University Press.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 249(3), 29–38.
- Wortley, R., & Smallbone, S. (2006). Applying situational principles to sexual offenses against children. In R. Wortley & S. Smallbone (Eds.), *Crime Prevention Studies* (vol. 19, pp. 7–35). Criminal Justice Press.

