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**Comparison of the Lifestyle Theory and the Routine Activities Theory**

Lifestyle Theory and Routine Activity Theory study exploitation by the perspective of intermingling of an inspired wrongdoer, that appeal specific or injured individual, and the no presence of good guardian (Travis, 2015). Those practices differs, unstandingly, on the way, they look over the theories and push people in trouble or in risk" for victimization and exploitation. Where the lifestyle theory discuss about the hazard in probabilistic terms (e.g., certain practices hoist one's chances of being misled and victimized), routine activity theory essentially depicts the exploitation and victimization occasion itself (e.g., if the three key components join, victimization occurs, yet on the off chance that one of the components is missing, victimization is kept away from) (Vakhitova, Reynald, & Townsley, 2016). It has been contended that this distinction is significant and that it is vanishing after some time has been consequential to the study of exploitation and/or victimization.

The most well-known v and hypothetical records for the victim-offender cover are lifestyle-exposure theory or hypothesis and routine activity hypothesis, as they "stress how the unique circumstance or context impacts weakness to crime or wrongdoing"

Throughout the previous four decades, these two theories have overwhelmed the investigation of criminal victimization and are regularly utilized reciprocally as “lifestyle or routine action system or framework" (Vakhitova, Reynald, & Townsley, 2016). The two theories share center recommendations practically speaking, for example, clarifying victimization in term of the intermingling in existence between the aroused offender, a defenseless victim, and the nonappearance of an able watchman or guardian' known as the "Crime Triangle". The way of lifestyle and routine activities structure has been utilized to depict a wide assortment and variety of types of victimization and offending exactly (Vakhitova, Reynald, & Townsley, 2016).

Besides, another significant augmentation of routine activities theory is its application to individual culpable, in which a solid relationship has appeared between individual culpable or offending and contribution in unstructured activities and exercises (Travis, 2015). Since the theory depicts the components required for a crime to happen or occur, it is principally a descriptive hypothesis than lifestyle theory.

**References**

Vakhitova, Z. I., Reynald, D. M., & Townsley, M. (2016). Toward the adaptation of routine activity and lifestyle exposure theories to account for cyber abuse victimization. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 32(2), 169-188.

Travis, C. P., (2015). Lifestyle and Routine Activity Theories Revisited: The Importance of “Risk” to the Study of Victimization: Victims & Offenders: Vol 11, No 3. (2019). Victims & Offenders. Retrieved from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/ref/10.1080/15564886.2015.1057351?scroll=top>