of age. One respondent had completed year 12, at age 21, while in prison. For the 50 respondents the age at which they committed their first B&E ranged from 11 to 26 years, with a mean of 20 years. The number of estimated B&Es by the respondents ranged from 20 to 3,000. The mean estimated number of B&Es was 1,230. The number of B&Es for which respondents had been convicted ranged from none to approximately 50.

MATERIALS

For Study One each subject took part in a semi-structured interview (a copy of the interview questions are at Appendix 6). During interview, each subject was asked their process for selecting a target and gaining entry, their template of operation. The interview covered all aspects of target selection, attractiveness and risk assessment. The semi-structured interviews were conducted to establish the basic parameters for Study Two and to test the applicability of relevant overseas research findings. The data gained from Study One was used to construct the cues in Study Two.

Subjects were asked open ended questions in regards to both conspicuous and almost indiscernible cues regarding target selection, risks and rewards. Among other things, subjects were asked some of the following questions.

- How did they determine occupancy?
- What was their method of entry?
- What was the searching procedure?
- What was the effect of different divisions of labour (if more than one)?
- What was their method of escape?
- How was stolen property converted to cash or drugs?
- What were the proceeds of crime spent on?

A tape recorder was used to record the entire interview. The tapes were transcribed at a later date.
PROCEDURE

When a subject attended the methadone clinic for an appointment to participate in the study the clinic usually provided a private room. On a few occasions, due to a lack of free space, an interview was conducted outside in a park or at a beach (as one of the clinics is situated adjacent to a beach). Interviewing methadone using respondents who admit to having committed B&Es was a tremendous learning experience. To conduct 50 interviews of 1-2 hours, 136 appointments were made. Often up to four appointments were made with the one client until it was kept. Listening to many of their life experience stories one could all too readily understand why appointments were not kept. One can not expect respondents in a study to operate around a researcher’s schedule. It is the researcher who must operate around theirs. Approaching interview number thirty it was noticed that a state of critical mass was being reached. New information on target selection was becoming rare. However, each respondent’s life history and experiences were always fascinating. This inertia concerning new information resulted in a cessation of the interviews when 50 had been conducted.

The researcher read a standard opening address (Appendix 7) to each subject. It gave an explanation of what would take place during the interview. Each subject was then asked if they wished to take part in an interview. If a subject wished to participate they selected a pseudonym from a list and signed a consent form (Appendix 8). The interview was then conducted. At the end of the interview the subject was given twenty dollars (AUD) in cash. The subject had to sign a ledger that recorded the date on which the money was received (copy of one page at Appendix 9). However, to further ensure confidentiality subjects signed the receipt form with their pseudonym.
CHAPTER 5: STUDY ONE RESULTS

Chapter Five starts with the backgrounds of the 50 interviewees. It then outlines the main factors the interviewees utilised to select a target, such as the cues used by subjects to assess the vulnerability of a potential target. Next the actual B&E process is presented. Finally, the methods used by the subjects to dispose of stolen property are discussed. The comments of the subjects were tape-recorded and what is transcribed in this chapter is verbatim. Absolutely no editing has taken place.

BACKGROUND OF THE INTERVIEWEES

All 50 subjects in Study One were clients of methadone clinics. The first question asked of the subjects was, “How did you end up where you are now. On a methadone maintenance program?” Most of the sentiments expressed by the respondents were similar to those of Claire, a 28 year old who had committed about 30 B&Es over a 12-month period.

Claire:
I stopped doing B&Es because I had a scare. My mother got really sick and I just felt that my luck was running out, and I had gone from being just a person buying drugs to have a good time, to you know. I just felt like I was going to end up a dirty old junkie robbing all the time and I didn’t want to be like that. Believe it or not but my husband is really focussed and really straight, I do not know why he is still with me. He has nearly left me so many times, he would give me a really hard time, not about the drugs but about the stealing. I just, I didn’t want my mother dying. Well my mother and I are very close, she has actually died now, I didn’t want her to die thinking that I would end up, I can’t think of any other word but, fucked, and I know that is what she thought. I basically did it for those reasons and I am glad now, because when she passed away she was happy with me, things improved between us, and I have improved myself.

The respondents told very similar stories regarding the process that ended with a heroin abuse and treatment. Early experimentation with alcohol and marijuana
usually led to a first encounter with heroin. Respondents often stated that the use of heroin was very enjoyable in the early stages. Then over time, it became a hard addiction that they could not tame. Following are some subjects’ descriptions of the process:

Mick:
I started on heroin big when I was 20, after about one year I had a real habit.

Vikki:
I started smoking when I was 14. The next drug was marijuana, actually I started smoking marijuana before I started smoking cigarettes. I started smoking marijuana a lot. I don’t think it’s a progression from marijuana to hard drugs it was just me experimenting. Somebody asked me if I wanted some and it just went from there. I liked it so it became regular. I didn’t seek it out at first it was just a drug I liked, if it was there I didn’t knock it back. Then after a while I did start going to look for it. This whole process took months. I had my first shot when I was about 15. It wasn’t till I was about 18, I was actively going out to get it. It took about three years.

Nick:
The people I was living with were using and selling heroin so it was just there constantly. They gave it to me for free. I thought this was great cause I didn’t have to pay. Then they did turn around and say, “Hey you know you are going to start paying for this.” So I started doing burgs to pay. My habit cost, see by then I had a five weight a day habit. It happened so quick.

Claire:
Drugs in some things they have been good, and in other bad, because they are illegal that is what has caused the bad things. I don’t know I have always had an interest in different things. I think I used to think it was groovy to try everything at least once. The reason I took heroin so late was because I was really into cocaine for a long time and I started using heroin as a leveller to bring me down because I would be wired. In the end one habit got changed for another habit.

Kevin:
It was a gradual process to heavier drugs, the first time I had any amphetamines I was at the age of 19. A couple of friends and myself were going to the Royal Show in Adelaide and they got a gram for forty dollars back then. They chopped it up on a mirror and gave me two lines. I snorted it and sort of stayed up all night thinking
this is pretty good. I started buying it myself and using needles. The first use of heroin was after a big insurance pay out through a motor vehicle accident. I bought a gram with a couple of friends who were addicts that were in the know. I had it once and I liked it too much, so I had it again and again. I liked it, I enjoyed it.

Some respondents talked about the process of becoming a heavy user of heroin in very regretful tones:

Robert:
I took drugs at the beginning it was just a recreational thing, just for fun. A bit of peer pressure, my mates were doing it, so to be in with them, but it was definitely just fun. I used to enjoy it, I used to get a high out of it, but eventually it became from a recreational thing to a medicinal type thing. Like you know, once I was addicted to heroin I had to have it. The fun was gone out of it, then it was no fun any more.

Barry:
I only started smoking pot at first. Then a friend of mine overdosed and another friend of mine was actually killed by police in Wollongong. He was actually 14 at the time. I don’t know, oh it was through depression and all that I started trying it. It was all right so I kept going. Drugs have totally stuffed me, totally. I wish I could go back and do it all again, but I would do it through school, I would do it in a way that people wouldn’t even think it was me. I wouldn’t commit any crimes. I would just go to school, get all that education shit, cause everyone I know is just sitting back at my age with money and cars and everything and I have got jack shit. I have had it all. I have, in a way, done a lot more than what they have done. I have had more money than they have had, but at the moment, now, I have nothing.

Steven:
Drugs really change you, but at the time you don’t listen and you don’t see it. It is so slow. Like now I see ex-girlfriends, they used to be beautiful young girls, now they are old ugly prostitutes, just fucken sluts working Kings Cross.

Many respondents would try many times to rid themselves of their heroin addiction. This would usually follow a tragic episode such as a friend overdosing or a conviction which led to serving time in prison. The attempt to beat their heroin addiction was usually only successful for a short time.
Gerry:
I would get caught and go to gaol. I would always say to myself, like, “I will do the
right thing when I get out,” and then I think after a while, especially after I got out, I
would think, “Who am I kidding?”.

Jeff:
I have had lots of friend OD on drugs. My best friend, this mate of mine I found a
few days after he died. I found him, I had to break into his house. I thought it was
the garbage that was smelling. He had his head between his knees. I lifted him up
and he was all stiff. It was terrible. I couldn’t handle it. I had to take his ashes up
to Bathurst, so I stayed there with an uncle and aunty. I was really spun out. I went
cold for like five months. When I started mixing with old friends, it would start
again.

The respondents estimated that they spent from $800-00 to $3,500-00 each week,
predominantly on heroin. The mean cost was $1,350-00. This amount was difficult
to determine as some of the respondents were dealers and could support their habit
for very little cost, while some respondents paid a very high amount for heroin.
Those respondents that purchased heroin on the streets for the going rate spent
between $1,500-00 and $3,500-00 each week. This cost estimate was what
respondents would spend in an average week. Many respondents stated that their
spending on heroin and other drugs was dependent on their income from crime.
Most respondents (n=42) stated that they would spend more or less money on drugs
depending on how much money they made. Craig, a 37 year old who has committed
over 1,000 B&Es explains how the pattern would go:

You go and get on, you buy, up your arm. Straight away you spend a couple of
hundred, bang. Then you pay your rent. That takes out another hundred, bang, bang. If you have money, the next day you have to get on again. So $1,000,
sometimes it would be gone in two days, fair dinkum. You pay your rent, get on,
then the next day you have to get on, again. The more money you have in your
pocket, the bigger you get. If you have a little money you get enough to get by.

To gain some idea of the way respondents would spend the proceeds from a
successful B&E they were asked what they would do if they committed a B&E and
they found $1,000 in cash. The results were similar to those of Bennett and Wright (1984). There were predominantly two types of answers given in response to this question. The first was that the whole $1,000 would be spent on drugs. The second was that after a debt was paid, rent or food was bought, the rest (around $700-00 to $800-00) would be spent on drugs. The answers that typified the first group were similar to Barry a 23 year old:

If I made $1,000 it would be all gone on heroin for sure. The whole thousand easy.
See, I would shout so many people, it is the way I am. I am generous with what I have got.

The latter group were typified by the following responses:

Derrick:
If I made $1,000 from a break and enter I would spend it nearly always on drugs unless, like, I had a pressing debt. Then all on drugs.

Mick:
If I broke in and got $1,000 cash, the majority, if I did not spend it all on drugs, on heroin. I would spend $800 of it on heroin. The other $200 would just be spent on food. Maybe a weeks rent and maybe buy a pair of jeans. More than likely I would spend the entire lot on heroin.

Kevin:
I would go out and buy two ounces of marijuana and maybe a weight, one gram of heroin. That would leave about $200 I would blow that on take away food and petrol and stuff.

A very small minority (n=4) of respondents stated they would take care of bills, rent and food first. Then, whatever was left, would be spent on drugs:

Steven:
I would buy food and pay rent to get through about a week, then the rest on heroin and marijuana, about $700.
Vikki:
I would spend it on rent and whatever else needs paid. Like basically bills, and what
was left on dope, I mean smack.

BREAK AND ENTER

One respondent who had committed over 2,500 B&Es had only one conviction for
B&E.

Claire:
I have done about, I started doing break and enters when I was 11 or 12 and I have
not stopped. I am still going. 16 years. I have averaged 2 to 3 a week. That is
about 150 a year, (“about 2,500 in total” – interviewer). Yeah, that’s right. It has
always been constant, the lowest like. I have always done at least one a week. I
have never been caught for committing a break and enter, oh actually one. When I
was 16 I got done for one house, because that was where I used to live. The lady
still owed me money so I took it out of there like, so they classed it as break and
enter. I have been caught for one out of 2,500. That’s a pretty good average, yes it
is.

Only one respondent had hardly any contact with police. Fifteen respondents had not
been as far as prison (excluding remand or watch-house time). However they had
received fines, good behaviour bonds and been subject to community service orders.
Thirty-four respondents had been sentenced to prison in the past. The cumulative
time spent in prison ranged from four weeks to seventeen years, with a mean of 6.4
years.

All respondents were heavily addicted heroin users. Six respondents were employed
till their early twenties, then experienced chronic unemployment. The remainder
have been unemployed since leaving school.

Fifteen of the respondents predominantly committed their B&Es in daylight hours,
while the remainder expressed a preference for the early evening. No respondent
preferred late at night.
Respondents varied from those who committed the occasional B&E as a sideline to their main source of income to those who earned their income almost exclusively from B&E. Craig generated most of his income from armed hold-ups. B&Es filled in the gaps.

I have been doing B&Es since I was 13, but the level of how many B&Es varies, especially since I started armed hold-ups. See I do an armed hold-up and if I get say $15,000 at one hold-up I, there would be no need to go out and do break and enters. Then the money runs out and it might be a week or two before you can line up another armed robbery. So you do one or two break and enters to see you through.

Ted was another respondent who committed B&Es as a sideline. He principally earned his income from committing assault and robbery in company.

I commit break and enters, residential, but I mainly beat up guys picking up prostitutes and rob them. My usual way is this, we would follow them back to a flat. They would go in and shut the blinds. We storm in, they would have their pants round their ankles and we rob them that way. That is in partnership with the prostitute. We are not armed. Most hand it over, a couple put up a fight. It is good because they couldn’t go to the police and say “Well I picked up this prostitute down the road and her friends robbed me.” Sometimes I go where male prostitutes hang out. Pick up guys and give them an elbow in the head and then rob them. Assault and robberies mostly for me. No armed hold ups or anything like that. I do those more than burglaries because it was more cash in hand. You can do five or six in one night without any problems. See there is no problems with them telling. One flat we were using the cops did end up doing a raid on the flat. The neighbours maybe dobbed us in I think. They didn’t get us for anything though.

Thirty-two respondents committed B&Es while committing other income generating crimes. This varied on a continuum, from B&E being the main source of income to B&E being a sideline. Eighteen respondents nearly exclusively committed B&Es. Thirty-one of the respondents worked exclusively alone. The remainder were split between those (n=14) that sometimes worked alone and with others, and those who only worked as part of a team (n=5). Working with others was a method that was
like a *double-edged sword*. Respondents stated that there were three main positives when working with others:

1. one can work faster and steal more property;
2. one can have a lookout; and,
3. if trouble does occur one has someone to provide back-up.

The respondents also stated that there were two main negatives when working with others. A partner:

1. could steal from you, for example, by saying they found nothing in a bedroom, when they actually found $100 in cash; and,
2. may inform on you if they were arrested to make an arrangement with police.

Following are some of the respondents' statements about working alone or with others.

Craig:
I like working with someone but it is hard to find people you can trust. I had a good run with a bloke for nearly 2½ years. I have had friends throughout the years, but then I would move interstate or lose touch or something. When you find a good bloke to work with that is the best. It is good, when you can trust someone to look after you, look after your back. If a situation arises where you are confronted by someone, it's no problem. For example, I had a good mate, we used to work together for years and then one time he got charged with one offence regarding stealing a safe. We were in gaol together, for him to get off, he told the police about an armed robbery I had committed. So therefore, he was no longer my mate any more. I was on my own. Like you have acquaintances, I fucking wouldn't do robberies with them or anything, you need a close friend. See that guy for a while he was a good friend, a good back up, then one day he just changed. Bang, he started, he told the police about an armed hold up I had done. So he was off my list, but I would find someone else to work with. It is hard to find good trustworthy people. It is good for the crime, but then you have the risk that they will turn on you and they know everything about you.
Bill:
I have mostly worked with one other person. Just me and a friend. With another
person can help, but by yourself is good too. They both have their ups and downs.
Another pair of eyes and ears is good. They might dob you in, and they might go in
the bedroom and saying they didn't find anything and they got like money.

Kevin:
Most of the time it was by myself. If you operate by yourself and you get caught
you have only got yourself to blame, but if you do it with a friend the friend could
go off spouting his mouth off, you have got no control over what they say to other
people.

Nearly all of the respondents (n=47) stated that they operated within five to ten
kilometres of their own abode. The sentiments of the sample are summed up by
Nick.

Nick:
Well I would get the shits with this chick I used to live with like she would do the
next door neighbour. That wasn't on I would say "Uh! Uh!". I would not do that,
well, I have done, but not all the time. I would do my suburb and the two or three
surrounding suburbs. There is no reason to go too far if you can just go round the
corner.

**IMPROVEMENT THROUGH PRACTICE**

Respondents were asked if they felt they had improved at B&E. All of the 50
respondents stated that they believed they had improved. The most common area of
improvement was speed. Forty-three respondents stated the one way they had
definitely improved was speed. As well as stealing more quickly a further 38 stated
that they made much less noise. There were three more ways respondents felt they
had improved. Eighteen stated that they now drew less attention to themselves by
being quieter, looking the part and selecting better targets with more cover. Twelve
stated that when they were younger they would often leave fingerprints, but they
would never do that now, they would always carry gloves. If they did forget their
gloves they would pull their sleeves over their hands. Eleven respondents stated that
they had improved their efficiency in regards to the goods they stole. They could now differentiate better between goods with a low monetary yield or demand and goods that yielded good returns and were always in demand. Following are some typical responses from interviewees about how they have improved.

Christopher:
I improved from a kid to older, oh shit yeah. Like not leaving any finger prints.
When I first started it could take me anything up to twenty minutes, now I am done in one or two and I get more valuable stuff.

Tim:
I got better at it over time, when I started I would, like, make noise or I would break windows or whatever getting in, or sometimes I couldn’t get in to some places. After a while you learn the quickest ways to open certain types of windows and you learn the places to look like on top of the fridge. In cookie jars and stuff. That would all save time because you don’t want to be in there for long. Like I would like to be in, get a minimum of $100 worth and out within one minute or two and gone.

Steven:
I found I was always trying to get better and smarter with my offending. See the police, courts and prison they think you are gonna stop. What all that makes you do is you realise you don’t want to get caught again, so you try to get better.

Peter:
I got better, more professional, anything you do more of, you get better at. I was just quicker, I could calculate the value of goods quicker, early you steal shit, like, oh, what’s that worth? and what’s this worth? If a kid breaks into a house they don’t know what’s what. They are going to take shit. No matter what crime you do, the more you do, your knowledge of what it is. Like if someone has coins you have to know what coins are any good, also what you are going to get for them, whether it is worth taking the whole lot. So when you get in the house you just get the good stuff, not the whole lot, otherwise you have got too much stuff, too much chance of being spotted or getting caught.

Vikki:
All those times in court I kept thinking, “How stupid, how stupid, how stupid.”
Like you would break into a place, like a house right? It would have a certain door
knob that you could use multi grips on, to unscrew the door. Well every place you’ve done that to they match the print on the multi grips to the door, so you would be pinched for all the ones that matched your multi grips, that happened to me. So, say you break into a block of flats and you do every place in the block, they count the garage and the house as two different places. So in a block of eight flats that’s sixteen charges. What I learned was to throw the multi grips away as soon as you use them. You learn to get smarter.

TARGET SELECTION

The overall selection of a target is beautifully encapsulated in the words of Edward who stated that:

First you steal a car, then you drive around then it is just by chance, you pick one. See a house gives itself away. Depending on where it is situated will depend whether it is going to get burgled or not. Depending on what you get done to your house will depend whether you get burgled or not.

“A house gives itself away.” Edward eloquently captures the entire process through which a target is selected. All of the individual factors that result in a target being classed as favourable, culminate with the house signalling to the burglar to come and have a closer look.

Respondents were asked to nominate cues that they used to determine if a target is suitable or not. When a subject nominated a cue they were asked to give it a rating from ‘1’ (poor deterrent) to ‘10’ (an excellent deterrent). Table 1 displays the mean numerical value given to the cues nominated by subjects. The means give an overall rating but the variance in answers was quite marked for some cues. In the following sections the respondents’ remarks for each of the cues will be presented. The cues that have a deterrent effect are presented first and are followed by the cues that attract burglars.
Table 1: Deterrents to Selection of Target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cues</th>
<th>$x$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children in the street</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults in the street</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog (barking)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cul-de-sac (no back lane)</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High fence - locked</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarms</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights on inside</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car in drive</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio or television noise inside</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really good locks</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security screens</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High fence (unlocked)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

('1' = no deterrent - '10' = excellent deterrent)

Table 1 lists the twelve cues that respondents self nominated as good or poor deterrents. The best deterrents were children or adults in the street, a dog barking, a cul-de-sac or a high fence with a locked gate. Cues that were of little deterrence value were the quality of the locks on the doors, common security screens or a high fence if the gate was unlocked.

PEOPLE AT HOME

The two studies in this thesis concentrate on subjects intending to select an unoccupied house and breaking in with the intention to steal. During the interviews subjects were asked if they had ever chosen what they believed was an unoccupied house, but then when they broke in they discovered people were home. Subjects were also asked if they had ever broken into a house knowing people were home. The single biggest deterrent to non-selection was if people were actually home and the respondent was aware of this, however even this formidable deterrent was qualified by some respondents.

Hennessey:

Lights on inside I would scope it out, walk around the house. Cause see when the lights are on inside and it is night they can’t see out if they are inside. They might
be all sitting down watching television at the front of the house, so I might be in their bedroom at the back or whatever. If there is a window open or the back door is open I would go in, but like if it is all locked up I would have to make noise to get in. So I would move on.

Tim:
Even if they are home, you have just got to sus it out, they could be home, they could be asleep, even if they are asleep, you see if you can get into the garage, or into the car or even steal the car.

Darlene:
I have broken in when people was at home, they was asleep, I didn’t know they were in. It scares the life out of you. I walked in the bedroom and they were there. After a while I got quieter, at night, a couple of times I have got in and they didn’t wake up so you be quiet and sneak around, you grab what you can and get out really quick. Just grab their handbag or the video or something.

Bill:
Sometimes I have done it when they are home, when I was younger. Women hanging out washing. See you look over the fence at the back and you see a woman hanging out the clothes. You check the basket to see if she still has lots to hang out, if she has, you race round the front. See women can leave the whole house unlocked, windows open, yet they are out the back. You check no-one else is home, then rush in grab a purse or a bag, maybe a video or something then run out, you have to be quick and quiet.

CHILDREN IN THE STREET

This was a very strong deterrent with most respondents (n=44). It scored a slightly stronger rating than adult neighbours in the street. Many expressed the view that adults in the street could be deceived if you were outwardly confident and looked the part, but with children it is a different matter as they are often very curious. Adults seem to be slightly easier to deceive than children.
Barry:
Kids are more of a deterrent than adults. They can be trouble, they are the worst ones.

Mick:
Kids, I would avoid the house in case they remembered me.

Shirley:
Kids would be a deterrent.

Ian:
Any kids and I would give it a miss.

ADULTS IN THE STREET

Adults or neighbours in the street of a possible target were a very good deterrent. The majority of respondents (n=42) believed that anyone in a street was a total deterrent. Typical answers were:

Richard:
I don't like neighbours out, I would move on even if it looked like a good score.

Jill:
People in the street would deter me.

Steven:
I don't like people in the street, like a guy out mowing his lawn that would shit me off, definitely.

Derrick:
I don't like people in the street.

Kerry:
If there were people around, like neighbours, I would give it a miss.

Dan:
If there were lots of neighbours I would walk on.
Some respondents (n=8) did argue that neighbours could be deceived depending on how you acted.

Jack:
Neighbours are not a great deterrent, if you play your part. If I had stolen a $40,000 dollar car, I would not worry about neighbours. I would go home and get a good pair of pants on and a shirt. Then go out to do some breaks. If you look the part no-one notices.

Claire:
People in the street, yeah, that has happened with me. Most of the time I would go to another street but sometimes you like a place and there is a neighbour there, well you just act like you belong there.

Vikki:
If there were people in the street I will slow down and see if they are were walking through, if they are, not a problem.

Matthew:
People in the street doesn’t bother me unless they were right next to the place you were going to do.

DOGS

Overall dogs were a strong deterrent to a B&E taking place. However, there was a varied mix of responses to how good a deterrent dogs were. The responses could be grouped into three categories from dogs being a total deterrent, to dogs being a partial deterrent, through to a dog being no trouble.

Respondents (n=12) who believed dogs were a total deterrent are typified by the following responses:
Mick:
Dogs are a real deterrent, even if I had picked a place and I am all set and a dog came up, that’s it I’m gone. That is probably the biggest deterrent of all. Even a little dog because they all bark and they could attract attention.

Jill:
A large dog would deter me more than a small dog, but then if it is barking all the time that can be enough. I have never really burgled a place with a dog, because lots of people just don’t have them.

Amanda:
I do not go near places with dogs, even if it is the neighbour’s dog barking next door. I do not go near any dog, because they make noise.

Craig:
Big dogs, big dogs scare me, large, big attack dogs, trained dogs roaming around the perimeter scare me. I worked with one guy once and he said we’ll shoot the dog. I got in and I said “No, no we will look for another job”. I couldn’t live with killing a poor dog. Even though its a guard dog and it’s not like your dog, even though my friend wanted to I said “No we don’t do it”.

The second category of respondents (n=32) had a mixed response to dogs. Some stated that even a place with a dog at least required some further investigation and maybe an attempt. The respondents in this group still rated dogs as a fair deterrent. Typical responses were:

Carol:
Dogs, it depends what type of dog, if it starts barking straight away, no. Do not worry. If it is yappy, no. If it is quiet you give it a pat and keep going. I have done that.

Bill:
If you want to occupy a big dog you just chuck over a female dog on heat or visa-versa, or don’t worry about it, just move on. Dogs are still a bloody big deterrent. I mean if the dog is inside the house I usually didn’t break in, but if the dog is outside sometimes you can get in. We have taken care of dogs.