CONTRASTS AND SIMILARITIES

This section considers the main contrasts and similarities of routine activity theory and the rational choice perspective, and where the two theories intersect. Clarke and Felson (1993) have tackled this issue themselves. This thesis is predominantly concerned with the point of intersection between the two theories, which is when the three elements of routine activity converge an offender must decide (the rational choice perspective) if the guardian and place are too formidable. Clarke and Felson (1993) also state that perspectives can converge despite differences, "in criminology, as in other fields, different points of departure and different perspectives can converge at nearly the same place, despite difference of detail and nomenclature" (p. 11).

There are many differences and similarities between the rational choice perspective and routine activity theory. The main similarities are that both have an environmental focus, they are crime specific and they concentrate on the criminal event. The main difference is that routine activity theory operates at a wider level of focus while the rational choice perspective operates at a finer level. Routine activity theory has its origins in the disciplines of geography, demography, and human ecology, whereas the rational choice perspective has its origins in the disciplines of psychology, economics and environmental criminology (Clarke and Felson, 1993).

There are tensions between the two theories. For example, the rational choice perspective suggests that an active street life hinders the opportunities for crime (Angel, 1968; Clarke, 1992; 1997; Jacobs, 1961; Newman, 1972; Woods, 1961) because informal surveillance reduces the chances that an offender could get away unnoticed. However, routine activity theory suggests that increased street usage would increase the flow and convergence of motivated offenders with suitable targets. What may minimise crime best are prevention initiatives that combine both theories (Tilley, Pease, Hough and Brown, 1999). One example, is neighbourhood watch, which contains elements of situational crime prevention based on the rational choice perspective and routine activity theory. This is because it contains elements
such as property marking (Bennett and Wright, 1984; Laycock, 1985; 1997) and capable guardian surveillance (Skogan, 1989).

When the three elements of routine activity theory converge in time and space, a crime is most likely to occur. It is when these three elements converge that the rational choice perspective has an influence. The offender makes a decision whether the target is suitable for attack. Once together, the rational choice perspective can determine whether an offence takes place. It could be argued that the rational choice perspective is situated between the suitable target and the capable guardian and the place and manager. The rational choice perspective explains the test of the capable guardian and place elements, when offenders weigh up risk versus gain. Pease (1997) succinctly stated that what rational choice adds to routine activity theory is twofold in that it provides a more “precise definition of what counts in people’s heads as capable guardianship, victim suitability and the rest; and offender-specific departures from presumptive rationality” (p. 238). If gain outweighs risk, the capable guardian is absent and the place manager is having little or no effect; if risk outweighs gain, the capable guardian is present and the place manager is having significant impact. It is the offender, through their own perceptions and decision making who decides whether a house is a possible B&E target (Feins, Epstein and Widom, 1997). It is possible that two different burglars could rate the exact same house as a likely or unlikely target, when they were presented with the same cues. Routine activity theory explains how an offender finds himself or herself in a particular street, but the rational choice perspective explains why a particular house in the street is broken into and why another is not.

This thesis also considers the ability of place to discourage crime. The place being a house or street. Therefore, if a house and street are administered well by a place manager, in this case a home owner, a crime will be less likely to take place. An example could be neighbourhood watch. One could argue that a street in a neighbourhood watch area could be subject to better place management compared to a street that is not in a neighbourhood watch area. The fact remains, that it is an offender who decides if the control being exerted by a place manager and guardian is
formidable enough, and to some extent it is the offender who also decides whether
the handler’s attempt at control is compelling enough. The offender exercises his
decision making abilities to decide the strength of all three controllers. One cannot
escape the fact that the rational choice perspective has the central role in the chemical
reaction. Ekblom and Tilley (2000) and Ekblom (2000) support this view as they
argue that too much emphasis on place can neglect what an offender brings to a
criminal event. This thesis concentrates on targets and place but does not neglect the
offender’s active contribution.

Routine activity theory and the rational choice perspective are intertwined and they
interact continually at a criminal event. Routine activity theory better explains how a
motivated offender and a suitable location, such as a street come into contact.
However, once location and motivated offender meet the rational choice perspective
better explains why one unoccupied house in a street is broken into and another is left
untouched. Where the two approaches interact most is the capable guardian and
place elements. It could be argued that it is up to the offender if various cues, signals
or physical attributes constitute a capable guardian. Whether a capable guardian is
present or not present is determined by the decision making of the offender and the
rational choice perspective best explains this. The offender can also decide if the
attempts by the place manager to minimise victimisation are formidable or
inconsequential. The fact remains that households are most subject to B&E when
they are vacant and this is irreversibly due to modern lifestyles and accessibility to
transport. Persons in modern society can not drastically alter their lifestyles so that
someone is always home. However, research that informs persons how to reduce the
chances of victimisation of their home when they are not present is best achieved
through the capable guardian and place manager aspects of routine activity theory.

THE MERITS OF SITUATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION

A discussion of any theory would be deficient if the main criticisms of it were not
canvased and examined. There is a debate concerning the validity of situational
crime prevention based on the rational choice perspective and routine activity theory.
The arguments against situational crime prevention are predominantly based on philosophical and practical grounds. Supporters believe that situational crime prevention based on the rational choice perspective and routine activity theory is acceptable because it prevents crime, involves citizens and may result in diffusion of benefit. Detraectors argue that situational crime prevention based on the rational choice perspective and routine activity theory is invalid on philosophical grounds and that the millstone of displacement renders the whole concept redundant.

The first section presents two of the assets of situational crime prevention over and above crime reduction. These are increased community involvement and diffusion of benefit. The next section examines and debates the philosophical, moral and practical criticisms of situational crime prevention based on the rational choice perspective and routine activity theory. The third section discusses displacement, which is one of the main criticisms levelled at situational crime prevention.

Supporters (Barber, 1984; Bennett, 1990) argue that citizen involvement in situational crime prevention is a benefit to society. Citizen involvement is a positive as it engenders an active and engaged and cohesive feeling in society and a sense of belonging. Involvement at the grass roots level is true democracy. It will ensure support and stability and higher moral and ethical standards will be facilitated (Grabosky, 1992).

Many researchers have documented the existence of an added benefit of situational crime prevention. Scherdin (1986; 1992) noticed that when electronic detection was introduced in libraries the theft of all materials (books, video and audio tapes) declined although only the books were protected with the electronic detection device. Scherdin called this unexpected benefit the halo effect. Other researchers have noticed a similar benefit to Scherdin and have given it various names, such as the multiplier effect (Chaiken, Lawless and Stevenson, 1974), spill over of benefit (Clarke, 1989), free bonus (Sherman, 1990), drip feed (Pease, 1991a), and the free rider effect (Meithe, 1991). Clarke, (1992) and Clarke and Weisburd (1994) suggest that this phenomenon be formally called diffusion of benefit. Many studies have

Critics are often only familiar with early works such as that of Newman (1972) and they often discredit this and all similar studies as being examples of architectural determinism. Clarke (1994) states that the left (eg. Young, 1988) criticise situational crime prevention because it is “too accepting of establishment definitions of crime” (p. 43). White (2001) makes the same criticism. The right (eg. Bright, 1992) criticise situational crime prevention arguing that it neglects concepts such as moral culpability, responsibility and punishment. O’Malley (1994b) argues that situational crime prevention has been widely accepted by western governments over recent years as it is based on the rational choice perspective, which emphasises the decision making of the offender. This emphasis on decision making has allowed governments to promote the rational choice perspective to justify a dismantling of a Keynesian approach and replace it with a neo-liberal approach predominantly made up of tougher and harsher sentencing legislation. Liberals criticise situational crime prevention because it ignores many of the well established “root causes of crime, such as poverty, deprivation, and unemployment” (Clarke, 1994, p. 43). These criticisms really reflect the degree to which critical criminology has become detached from its true purpose, the study of crime.

King (1990) argued that behind the benevolent facade of the crime prevention initiatives set up by the British Government’s Home Office (Safer Cities and Crime Concern) are all the elements of Thatcherism. King argues that rather than addressing the causes of crime (“relative poverty, poor housing, long-term youth unemployment, failures in the education system and financial insecurity” [p. 7]) the crime prevention initiatives of the British Home Office are a law and order response that emphasise individual responsibility.

While ignoring individual pathology, situational crime prevention is usually highly location and target specific. This leads some critics to conclude (Grimshaw, Harvey
and Pease, 1989; Martin, 2000; White and Sutton, 1995) that those with economic power can commandeer any situational crime prevention initiative for their own ends. An alleged emphasis on property protection is what leads some writers such as Wilson (1986), Davis (1990) and Marx (1986; 1991) to claim that situational crime prevention will lead to the development of an *urban fortress* mentality in regards to crime.

One criticism of situational crime prevention is that it concentrates predominantly on street crime (Pavlich, 2000). Originally situational crime prevention did concentrate on street crime, but as its successes grew, it found its way into white-collar crime (Homel, Clarke and Macintyre, 1995; 1996) and even domestic violence (Hanmer, Griffiths and Jerwood, 1999; King, 1999; Plotnikoff and Woolfson, 1998). Many researchers (Farrell, 1992; Farrell, Buck and Pease, 1993; Farrell, Clarke and Pease, 1993; Farrell and Pease, 1993) have conducted successful work on the temporal patterns of repeat domestic violence victimisation.

Karman (1984) argued that situational crime prevention initiatives often focus on the behaviour of the victim. This blames the victim for his or her own victimisation. Some critics believe situational crime prevention is a social control strategy (O’Malley, 1994a). Sutton (1994) argued that “organising social initiatives around crime prevention themes may detract attention from underlying structural issues”, and a reliance on situational crime prevention techniques “will extend social control” (p. 5).

This argument is countered by Felson and Clarke (1994) who state that modern criminology is not even as developed as folk medicine because

"not only does it not solve crime problems, it does not even try to. Most crime theories are so remote from real life that such evasion is built into their very structure. For example, strain theory’s policy would be a complete restructuring of society not likely to occur anywhere in reality” (p. 10).
Social prevention is aimed at reducing the proportion of people who start committing crime. Situational crime prevention can also stop new crimes occurring and it can dissuade those who have started from continuing. The two approaches should be viewed as complementary, not opposing.

Sutton (1994) contended that much of pre- and post-war liberal and critical criminology has argued that the criminal justice system only works downstream from the criminal act and that the new rhetoric should be to focus an effort upstream before the criminal act occurs. To take Sutton’s metaphor a little further, an upstream focus would be high in the mountains where the river begins. Crime prevention should focus on pro-active action in areas such as parenting, schools and health.

Situational crime prevention also places its focus upstream from the criminal act. However, it has its effect only a short distance upstream, just before the criminal act occurs. The counter argument to Sutton is that if an offender is too far downstream, an initiative aimed at the source will not achieve anything in regards to such an offender, but situational crime prevention could. Sutton (1994) and others (Chan, 1994; Dull and Giacopassi, 1987; Blau and Blau, 1982; Toffler and Toffler, 1990) claim that propinquity to the criminal act is the weakness of situational crime prevention. It can only ever be no more than a temporary spot weld, that at best, “keeps youngsters busy and diverted” (Sutton, 1994, p. 6). However, Ekblom (1999) argues that many criminality prevention initiatives are based on very tenuous links. A parable by Cohen (1985) gives the best counter argument to Sutton’s river metaphor. An angler is standing alongside a river when a body floats past. The angler dives in, rescues the drowning body and then resuscitates the body. A few minutes later another body comes floating along, but this time the angler ignores the drowning body and starts running upstream. An observer asks “Why are you not trying to rescue this drowning body?” “This time,” replies the angler “I’m going upstream to find out who is pushing these poor folks into the water” (p. 238). The message is that if you do nothing about original causes you will just be busy
continually pulling bodies out of the water. The paradox is, while one is busy running *upstream* who is going to save the drowning bodies? The drowning bodies would be reduced by situational crime prevention. Cohen puts this dilemma succinctly; “While sociology draws me upstream ... my pragmatism directs me to the drowning bodies” (p. 238).

There are many *drowning* people in society that could be assisted. The fact is humans have been practicing crime prevention for many years (Rosenbaum, 1988; Van-Kesterten, Mayhew and Nieuwbeerta, 2000). Research into the criminal event will better arm citizens so they can prevent their own victimisation (Garofalo, 1977; Mendelssohn, O’Keefe and Liu, 1981). The more research that is theoretical and radical, and the more that it concentrates on just making a difference to the way the world is interpreted, the more indifferent and distant it becomes to reality. As James states, “a difference that makes no difference is no difference” (cited in Cohen 1985, p. 237).

One cannot investigate the assets and liabilities of crime prevention through opportunity reduction or through breaking convergence patterns without considering the concept of displacement as a potential liability (Sherman, Gartin and Buerger, 1989). When crime is simply moved in its existing form to another location this is straightforward displacement. Displaced criminals may also change their selected criminal offence. When displacement transforms into another crime, the new offence can be less serious, (benign) or more seriousness (malign).

Many works have examined and confirmed the occurrence of straightforward displacement (Cook, 1983; Grandjean, 1990; Laycock, 1984; Litton, 1990; Lowman, 1986; Luxenburg and Klien, 1984; Maguire and Bennett, 1982; Mayhew, Clarke and Elliot, 1989; Poyner and Webb, 1987; 1992; Sviridoff, Sadd, Curtis and Grinc, 1992). For example, Press (1971) showed that a police crackdown on outdoor felonies resulted in straightforward geographical movement. Chaiken, Lawless and Stephenson (1974; 1978) revealed that when police cracked down on mugging on trains, the amount of mugging on buses went up.
Other works have confirmed the existence of malign displacement (Atkins, Husain and Storey, 1991; Buerger, 1992; Katz, 1991; Neave, 1988; Ramsay and Newton, 1991; Walsh, 1986). Austin (1988) found that when building societies installed alarms, cameras, bullet proof screens and time delay safes there was a reduction in robberies. However, there was a corresponding increase in armed robberies from cash in transit and smaller branches with a greater prevalence of hostage taking.

Some works have identified examples of benign displacement (Allat, 1984a; 1984b, Zimring, 1972). Brantingham (1986) found that when a massive crime prevention effort was made in the north east of British Columbia serious crimes fell dramatically and were replaced by a few minor offences such as vandalism.

In contrast to some studies that reveal displacement there are studies that show a reduction in a particular crime with no evidence of major displacement (Barnes, 1995; Bouloukos and Farrell, 1997; Burrows, 1991; Challinger, 1992; Clarke, 1990; Clarke, Field and McGrath, 1991; Crowe, 1991; Eck and Spelman, 1987; Ekblom, 1986; 1987; 1988; Forrester, Chatterton, Pease and Brown, 1988; Forrester, Chatterton and Pease, 1988; Forrester, Frenz, O'Connell and Pease, 1990). These act as a counter to the previous types of findings (straightforward, benign and malign). All of the following studies took varying steps to detect displacement and found none. Clarke and Mayhew (1985) found that when natural gas was phased in slowly over the United Kingdom there was a reduction in suicides using gas ovens. Clarke, Cody and Natarajan (1994) found that when simple changes were made to the ticketing machines on the London Underground System there was a reduction in counterfeit coins (slugs). A book edited by Clarke (1992) lists nine case studies where a reduction in deviance occurred with no measurable displacement. Many studies (Gabor, 1990; Grant, 1990; Heal and Laycock, 1987; Laycock, 1985; 1992; Mathews, 1990; McKnight and Kretzman, 1992; Miethe, 1991; Pease, 1991a; 1991b; Poyner, 1988; 1991; Webb and Laycock, 1992) have found no evidence of displacement.
Clarke (1992; 1997) argued that a researcher can often show a reduction in a particular crime rate but it is often difficult to quantify that displacement occurred in the form of malign or benign crime. Many prevention programs may achieve some, but not all of their goals. Therefore, the evaluation of a prevention initiative should be based on a wider set of criteria. Any measures that could be implemented in regards to B&E prevention should be evaluated on numerous criteria, not just one end goal. For example, a prevention initiative may not lower overall B&E rates, but there could be gains made in respect to other criteria. Residents may feel safer, or their overall attitude to their suburb may have improved. These results would be a beneficial result even if displacement did occur. As the outcomes of more prevention studies are reported this will better inform all prospective prevention initiatives so that, over time, a critical mass of studies will develop that will inform prevention planners on the successful and the less successful strategies, which will allow more effective and efficient prevention of crime based on the rational choice perspective and routine activity theory.

CONCLUSION

The rational choice perspective is based on Simon's (1983) concept of bounded rationality and has become synonymous with situational crime prevention. According to the rational choice perspective an offender’s behaviour is purposive. Offenders endeavour to advance themselves by criminal pursuits. To achieve this offenders make decisions based on perceptions. Offenders weigh up risk versus gain when making a decision. A burglar's decision making can be constrained and influenced by their intellectual abilities and their general disposition. Four other mechanisms can influence offender decision making on a more amorphous level – the stage they are at in their criminal career, drug use, the built environment creating cohesive societies and physical design creating territorial attachments to communal space.
Many researchers argue that any decision making research which does not take into account the stages of a criminal career will be deficient. Many researchers argue that offenders become more skilful at any crime, if they commit a number. Researchers also argue that all decision making becomes more considered with maturity, even offender decision making. Drugs can influence everyday decision making. The level of drug use by offenders is high therefore drug use is a probable and active influence on offender decision making. The interaction between environment and behaviour is devoted to studying how humans interact with the built environment. The influence of the built environment can be very subtle and difficult to evaluate. One of the main discussions within this field is whether homogeneity or heterogeneity best minimise crime. Researchers believe design that encourages homogeneity will prevent crime best because homogeneity increases social interaction and a better bonded society will be a stronger barrier to crime. Crime prevention through environmental design is an area of environment and behaviour research that is dedicated to the study of how alterations to the built environment can affect social interaction to subsequently reduce crime. Crime prevention through environmental design is based on the concept of group and personal territoriality. Proponents of crime prevention through environmental design argue that the environment has to be designed so that group and personal territoriality are heightened, as this will maximise informal surveillance and protection. Crime prevention through environmental design initiatives could intentionally or unintentionally influence the decision making of burglars.

Routine activity theory argues that for a crime to be committed we need the convergence of the three minimal elements: a suitable target, a likely offender and an amenable place. Their controllers (guardian, handler and manager) can significantly minimise the chances of convergence. Certain spatial designs and traffic flows facilitate the engagement of these factors. Routine activity theory and the rational choice perspective have many contrasts and similarities. The common bond is that they are both allied with situational crime prevention. It is the contention of this thesis that the assessment of the deterrent capabilities of the guardian and place manager in routine activity theory is within the ambit of the decision maker.
Regardless of what a guardian or place manager actually constitute it is the decision maker who decides whether it is capable or not.

No discussion of any theory would be complete without an examination of the criticisms. Two assets of situational crime prevention over and above any reduction in crime are increased social interaction and diffusion of benefit. The main criticisms of situational crime prevention based on the rational choice perspective and routine activity theory are based on moral, philosophical and practical grounds. The practical criticism levelled at situational crime prevention is displacement.

The next chapter examines the prevalence of B&E and how it has become a troublesome and disquieting crime for police and the public. The crime of B&E is crime that generates massive workloads for police and stress for victims. The inability of a traditional police response to make significant in-roads into the prevention of B&E has become a cause for concern.
CHAPTER 3: BREAK AND ENTER

INTRODUCTION

Chapter Two detailed the theories that this thesis investigates. A general overview of B&E is now required. This chapter will establish a need for research with an objective of prevention. The chapter presents a synopsis of B&E; it provides information on the frequency of B&E, the impact on victims and attempts by the police and other authorities to try other methods of prevention. It is made readily apparent that B&E is a very common crime. Drugs and crime have a highly interactive relationship and the economic cost of purchasing drugs is a common justification for the commission of income producing crime. An examination is also made of the detrimental impact B&E can have on victims. The chapter also outlines research that shows that B&E had become a problem for police and in response they are making attempts to prevent B&E using non-traditional policing methods.

At this point of the thesis the main theories have been introduced and B&E has been thoroughly detailed. This leads into a discussion of B&E research that supports the rational choice perspective and routine activity theory. This is followed by a summary of the main cues discussed in the literature. Chapter Three concludes with a summary of the weaknesses in past B&E research. These weaknesses are addressed by the method and analyses utilised in this thesis.

BREAK AND ENTER PREVELANCE

This section presents research that measures the occurrence of B&E in Australia and other western countries. This leads into the next section, which presents research that has investigated the extent of drug use by offenders.

B&E has a very prominent and infamous place in modern western society. The Crime and Safety Victimisation Study (ABS, 1993) for Queensland, based on a
sample of 52,300 people, revealed that the B&E rate had increased approximately 76% over ten years. In total numbers, this is an increase from 46,800 in 1983 to 82,200 in 1993. The ABS study found that in Australia between 1983 and 1993 the rate of B&E for every 100,000 people per annum went from 46.8 in 1983 to 82.2 in 1993 (ABS, 1993). These rises are in contrast to officially reported B&E, which varied from 64,587 for the financial year 1991-1992, to 64,922 in 1995-1996 (QPS, 2000). In 1999/2000 total reported unlawful entry stood at 75,988, while unlawful entry to a dwelling was at 46,021 (QPS, 2000). Burglary of commercial premises continues to rise (Roddis, 2000). Grabosky (1996) also found that in 1994 around 380,00 B&Es and attempted B&Es had occurred in Australia with just as many unreported. B&E continues at a high level and it is a substantial problem in Queensland (CJC, 1997), Western Australia (Morgan, 2001), New South Wales (Doak, 2000) and Australia (Prenzler and Townsley, 1998). In 1997 total unlawful entry in Australia (officially reported) with goods stolen was 322,913 in 1997, 339,512 in 1998 and 322,913 in 1999 (ABS, 2000). This continued level of B&E could be responsible for much of the fear surrounding crime in our community. The increase in B&E and its psychological impact on the community means that research into B&E is imperative in Australia. Research may benefit society through the prevention of B&E.

Figure 4 depicts the Australian trend in B&E from 1973 to 1996. From 1973 to 1996, there was a steady increase in officially reported B&E of a dwelling on a national level. Similarly in the United Kingdom reported domestic burglaries increased 135% from 214,200 in 1974 to 504,000 in 1986 (Williams, 1987). Correspondingly, Mayhew (1987a; 1987b) found that between the years 1972 and 1983 B&E rates doubled in the United Kingdom. In the Netherlands between 1980 and 1988 B&E increased by 111% (Essers and Eijken, 1990). Mukherjee (1986), in a synopsis of victimisation studies between 1964 and 1982 in Canada, New Zealand, United Kingdom, West Germany and Australia, found that B&E was even more frequent than indicated by official statistics.
Figure 4: Rate of break and enters reported to police, per year (dwelling and other) for the years 1973 to 1996 in Australia.

Graph constructed using data from Walker, Mukherjee and Dagger (1994) and Mukherjee, Carcach and Higgins (1997).

Offences against property account for most of the crime reported in Queensland each year (QPS, 1993) and B&E accounts for 28% of all property offences. Barlow (1986) found clearance rates in Queensland for the years 1981 to 1984 ranged from 16% to 18%. In New South Wales the B&E clear-up rate has remained around 6% for a number of years (Chilvers, 1998). The continued high level of B&E has prompted the following statement “residential burglary is one of the most common crimes in Australia and is an issue of major concern of the Australian public” (Prenzler and Townsley, 1998).

B&E is a common crime in many countries, including Canada (Chaiken, 2000), and the United States, where an officially reported B&E occurs every eight seconds (Theerathorn, 1988; Walsh, 1982). According to Walsh (1982) unreported burglaries at least equal to official burglaries, but probably exceed them. That equates to at
least one B&E every four seconds. However, in recent years the United States has started to experience a decline in the rate of burglary, which has not been echoed in Canada, England or Wales (CCD, 1999; Chaiken, 2000; Leena, 1999).

Walsh’s (1982) finding that only half of all burglaries are officially reported differs from that of Blumstein, Cohen and Rosenfeld (1991). They found a strong consistency for B&E between official crime rates and victimisation rates. Cohen, Kaufman and Gottfredson (1985) also supported the argument that B&E has a very high official reporting rate. However, a high reporting rate has to be tempered by the fact that staged burglaries to enable a fraudulent insurance claim are becoming more common (Albrecht, 2000; Cox, 2000).

The 2000 international crime victims study (Van-Kesterten, Mayhew and Mieubeerta, 2000) compared the victimisation rates across seventeen industrialised countries. Australia was in the highest band on the proneness to crime measure that gives an overall indicator of prevalence. One of the main reasons for Australia’s inclusion in the highest band is burglary. The proportion of households who had experienced a completed or attempted burglary was highest in Australia. Since the international crime victims study began in 1993 in all countries the burglary rate has fallen except for Australia and Switzerland. Surprisingly, according to the findings Australia is in the highest grouping for household burglar alarms and special door locks. Van Kesterten, Mayhew and Nieuwbeerta (2000) found the reporting rate for burglary in Australia has varied between 81% and 88% from 1989 to 2000.

**BREAK AND ENTER AND DRUGS**

Studies in Australia have tried to determine the extent of overall drug use. The Australian Institute of Criminology (2000) reports usage (ever used) rates between 1988 and 1998 have increased for illicit drugs – marijuana, 27.5% to 39.1%; heroin, 0.9% to 2.2%, cocaine, 2.4% to 4.3% and ecstasy, 1.3% to 4.8%. Others have found similar results (Commonwealth Department of Human Services and Health, 1994a; 1994b; Hando, Hall, Rutter and Dolan, 1998; Makkai, 1994; Miller and Draper,
2001). Similar rates of heroin prevalence occur in the United Kingdom and Europe (EMCDDA, 2000; Johns and Gossop, 1990; Home Office, 1988a; 1988b; Ramsay and Partridge, 1999), Canada (Adlaf and Ialomiteanu, 2001), New Zealand (Fergusson, Lynskey and Horwood, 1993a; 1993b) and the United States (Adams et al, 2001). Clearly, legal and illegal drug use is very prevalent in society. Drug use is even more prevalent amongst criminal offenders.

Many studies (Elliot, Huizinga and Menard, 1989; Fergusson, Horwood and Lynskey, 1993; Fergusson, Lynskey and Horwood, 1994a; 1994b; Inciardi and Pottieger, 1991; Shewan, Reid, Macpherson, Davies and Greenwood, 2001; White, 1991; White, Pandina and Labouvie, 1985) clearly show that many drug users are involved in crime. Leukfield and Timms (1992) stated that “the criminal justice system is awash with drug users” (p. 279). The connection between drugs and crime is not that straightforward. There is a correlation between drug use and crime, but one can not go as far as to say there is a causal relationship occurring.

Over a number of years research into the relationship between drugs and crime finds that drugs and income producing crime are strongly related (Best, Sidwell, Gossop, Harris and Strang, 2001; Johnson, Goldstein, Preble, Lipton, Spunt and Miller, 1985; McBride and McCoy, 1982; National Institute of Justice, 1989a; 1989b; 1990; 1991; 1992; Nucro, Ball, Shaffer and Hanlon, 1985; Nucro, Kinlock and Hanlon, 1990; Nucro, Kinlock, Hanlon and Duszinsky, 1988; Stewart, Gossop, Marsden and Rolfe, 2000). Early studies (ABA and AMA, 1916; Ausebel, 1958; Chein, 1964; Kolb 1925; MCB, 1922; Finestone, 1957; Lindesmith, 1957) supported the economic necessity hypothesis, however later studies (Gandossey, Williams and Harwood, 1989; Glaser, 1972; Goldstein, 1979; Kozel and Dupont, 1977; Kraus, 1981; McCord, 1981; Nucro, Cisin, and Balter, 1981; Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985; 1989) are less supportive.

Heroin and income producing crime, especially property crime have the strongest relationship of any drug and crime (Anglin and Speckhart, 1988; Carlyon, 1999; Dobinson and Ward, 1986; Fischer, Medved, Kirst, Rehm and Gliksman, 2001;
Patterson, Lennings and Darey, 2000; Stevens, 1998). Of all property crimes B&E is the most prevalent amongst heroin users (Akestrom, 1983; Brown and Silverman, 1974; Dobinson and Ward, 1986; Farabee, Vandana and Anglin, 2001; Reppetto, 1974; Rosenthal, Young, Wallace, Koppel and Gaddis, 1973; Silverman and Spruill, 1977; Spiotto, 1973). A pertinent example of the relationship is highlighted in the work of Stevenson, Forsythe and Weatherburn (2001) who found that the most common method for adult burglars to dispose of stolen goods was by directly exchanging them for heroin.

From reviewing the published research, it is clear that B&E is a very prevalent crime and drug use and criminal involvement are highly interrelated. Heroin and B&E have a unique relationship that is unlike any other drug and crime. The matter addressed by the next section is the effect of break and enter on victims.

**VICTIMS OF BREAK AND ENTER**

The following is an outline of research that has investigated the adverse impact of B&E on victims. B&E is a very common crime that can have far reaching effects on victims and society (Kearon and Leach, 2000). Even in the 1960’s, the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration (1967) affirmed that B&E is a significant reason for America’s alarm about crime. In the 1970’s Conklin and Bittner (1973) argued that break and enter is responsible for much of the public resentment of traditional crime control methods.

Many studies have investigated the trauma suffered by victims and they confirm that victims of B&E can experience painful, negative reactions that persist for a long period of time (Bourque, Brumback, Krug and Richardson, 1978; Waller and Okihiro, 1978; Wirtz and Harrell, 1987) and repeat burglary victims can experience more acute trauma (Dugan, 1999). Even though the economic loss from burglary can be less than other types of property crimes (Chambers and Tombs, 1984) the trauma is greater (Cook, Smith and Harrell, 1987) and can manifest itself in fear, anxiety and mood swings (Burgess and Homstrum, 1974a; 1974b; Harrell Smith and Cook, 1985;