Figure 16: Decision tree for all occasions when cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first.
The description will now continue on the left-hand side of Figure 16 concerning the 419 occasions when cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first and subjects received the positive alternative. After receiving this information and giving a mean rating of 83.84, selections were spread across five different choices. Circle 7 shows that on 136 occasions no more information was required after choosing cue 16 (inside information) and getting a positive response. When subjects did this, during early testing, they were often asked, “Why did you select only one cue?” Their response was generally the following; “If I know, from a reliable source, a house has a large amount of cash inside I don’t care about any of the other information. I will find a way to get in and steal the money.” They also stated that often a house with a large amount of cash would very likely be a drug dealer’s house, so the prospect of drugs on the premises made the house an even more attractive target. Subjects would also state that in the past where they have received good information that a house may have a large amount of money or drugs inside, this counteracted nearly every deterrent cue that could exist, such as dogs, alarms and so forth. Whenever they chose cue 16 (inside information) and received the positive alternative, that was all the information they required. They would say that when they have reliable inside information they would break in no matter what. They would take greater risks and increase their effort because the extra reward would more than compensate.

Boxes 3, 4, 5 and 6 show that on 283 occasions subjects made a second choice after choosing cue 16 (inside information) and receiving the positive alternative. Boxes 8 to 15 show the influence of each alternative for each of the four cues chosen. Box 3 shows that in 25 occasions cue 1 (dog) was chosen after the selection of cue 16 (inside information) when a positive alternative was received. Of those 25 times cue 1 (dog) was chosen, on 12 occasions (Box 8) the deterrent alternative (dog barking loudly) was received. On 13 occasions (Box 9) the attractive alternative (no dog) was received. Box 8 shows that for the 12 occasions when the deterrent alternative was received it lowered the mean rating from 95.00 to 80.83. The ‘1-’ in the square brackets ‘[ ]’ in Box 8 denotes the mean for these 12 instances after the positive alternative for cue 16 (inside information) was received. Box 9 shows that on the 13 occasions when the positive alternative was received there was no change in the
mean rating. It remained at 97.69, the same as it was after the positive alternative was received for the first choice, which was cue 16 (inside information). These two groups (Boxes 8 and 9) are not analysed any further.

At this point, the description of Figure 16 will proceed to Box 5. Box 4 will be discussed later. Of the 419 occasions when cue 16 (inside information) was chosen and the positive alternative received, on 21 occasions cue 6 (affluence) was then selected. Box 13 shows that of these 21 selections, none received the neutral alternative (house is run down). Box 12 shows that in all 21 cases subjects received the attractive alternative (house looks expensive). It can be seen that for these 21 selections this information caused a slight increase in the likelihood of this house being burgled. For these 21 selections, the mean was 96.67 after they received the attractive alternative for cue 16 (inside information). This increased slightly to 97.14 after the attractive alternative for cue 6 (affluence) was received. Figure 16 does not break these two groups (Boxes 12 and 13) down any further.

Box 6 shows that on 12 occasions cue 13 (people in the street) was selected after cue 16 (inside information) was chosen. Box 14 shows that none of these 12 selections received the deterrent alternative (the street has many neighbours out washing cars, mowing lawns etc). Box 15 shows that after all 12 selections the attractive alternative (street is very quiet, no-one is around) was received. For the 12 selections, the mean rating did not change after receiving this new information. The mean after receiving the attractive alternative for cue 16 (inside information) was 98.33. It remained at 98.33 after the attractive alternative for cue 13 (people in the street) was received. Figure 16 does not break these two groups (Boxes 14 and 15) down any further.

On 419 occasions when cue 16 was chosen first (inside information) the attractive alternative was received. On 225 occasions the most selected second choice was (Box 4) was cue 3 (alarm). Of these 225 selections, on 143 (Box 10) occasions the deterrent alternative was received, while in 82 (Box 11) instances the attractive alternative was received. Box 10 shows that on the 143 occasions when the deterrent
alternative for cue 3 (alarm) was received, the mean rating lowered substantially from 74.27 to 55.45. Box 11 shows that for the 82 times when the attractive alternative for cue 3 (alarm) was received there was a slight increase in the mean rating from 73.66 to 77.20. An interesting point is the difference in initial ratings for the four sub-groups. Boxes 8, 9, 12, and 15 show initial ratings in the mid to high 90's, whereas Boxes 10 and 11 show initial ratings of 74.27 and 73.66. For those in Boxes 10 and 11, the initial influence of the attractive alternative of cue 16 (inside information) was lower.

Figure 16 breaks down Boxes 10 and 11 to one more level. Of the 143 (Box 10) instances when the attractive alternative for cue 16 (inside information) was received, but then the deterrent alternative for cue 3 (alarm) was received, subjects either made no more choices (Circle 16, n=13), or they chose cue 1 (dog, Box 17, n=81), cue 10 (fence, Box 18, n=12), or cue 13 (people in the street, Box 19, n=37).

Figure 16 displays the effects of the alternatives for Box 17. These are presented in Boxes 26 and 27. Box 26 shows that on 33 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen. The attractive alternative was received and the mean rating was 56.67. Then cue 3 (alarm) was chosen and the deterrent alternative was received. The mean dropped to 46.06. Then cue 1 (dog) was chosen and again and the deterrent alternative was received. This caused the mean rating to fall again to 30.61. Box 27 shows that on 48 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen. The attractive alternative was received and the mean rating was 61.67. Then cue 3 (alarm) was chosen and the deterrent alternative was received. The mean rating dropped to 47.50. At this point, the means are very similar to Box 26. Then cue 1 (dog) was chosen and the attractive alternative was received and the mean did not change, but remained at 47.50.

This description will follow the choices made after Box 11 when on 82 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received. Then cue 3 (alarm) was chosen. Again, the attractive alternative was received. After these 82 second choices either no more choices were made (Circle 25, n=2), or
further selections were made from five cues – cue 1 (dog, \( n=50 \), Box 20), cue 4 (occupancy -lights/tv/radio, \( n=21 \), Box 21), cue 7 (doors and windows, \( n=1 \), Box 2), cue 8 (locks, \( n=8 \), Box 23) or cue 13 (people in the street, \( n=2 \), Box 24).

Figure 16 displays the alternatives for Box 20. Box 28 shows that on 36 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received. The mean rating was 68.06. Cue 3 (alarm) was chosen second and the attractive alternative was received. The mean rating rose to 73.89. Cue 1 (dog) was third and the deterrent alternative was received. This caused the mean rating to fall back to 69.31. Box 29 shows that on 14 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received. The mean rating was 56.43. Then cue 3 (alarm) was chosen second and the attractive alternative was received. The mean rating increased to 62.14. Then cue 1 (dog) was chosen third and the attractive alternative was received. The mean rating increased to 64.29. Of note is that the mean rating after choice three for Box 28 is 69.31. This is after receiving alternatives that were attractive-attractive-deterrent. This is slightly higher than the mean rating after choice three in Box 29 (64.29). This was after receiving alternatives that were attractive-attractive-attractive.

The description will now continue with the right-hand side of Figure 16. It shows that on 275 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first and the neutral alternative (you have no inside information) was received. The mean rating was 58.45 (Box 30). Circle 40 shows that on two occasions no more information was required. The remaining second choices were spread across nine cues – cue 1 (dog, \( n=1 \), Box 31), cue 3 (alarm, \( n=120 \), Box 32), cue 5 (occupancy - car in drive, \( n=6 \), Box 33), cue 6 (affluence, \( n=106 \), Box 34), cue 7 (doors/windows, \( n=1 \), Box 35), cue 12 (location, \( n=10 \), Box 36), cue 13 (people in the street, \( n=17 \), Box 37), cue 14 (neighbourhood watch, \( n=11 \), Box 38) and cue 17 (street type, \( n=1 \), Box 39). Figure 16 only continues describing the second choices of cue 3 (alarm, Box 32) and cue 6 (affluence, Box 34), because they have high numbers of selections to enable interpretation.
Boxes 41 and 42 display the effects of the two alternatives for those who chose cue 3 (alarm). Box 41 shows that for the 59 times cue 16 (inside information) was chosen and the neutral alternative was received (no inside information) the mean rating was 58.73. Then cue 3 (alarm) was chosen, and the negative alternative was received (house has a good alarm). The mean rating fell to 43.39. Box 42 shows that on 61 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen and the neutral alternative was received. The mean rating was 44.10. Then cue 3 (alarm) was chosen and the attractive alternative was received. The mean rating rose to 98.33.

Figure 16 shows that for the 61 second choices in Box 42 on two occasions no further choices were made (Circle 54). The remaining third choices were spread across seven cues – cue 8 (locks, n=10, Box 49), cue 1 (dog, n=3, Box 50), cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio, n=20, Box 51), cue 6 (affluence, n=10, Box 52), cue 7 (doors/windows, n=2, Box 53), cue 17 (street type, n=1, Box 56) and cue 13 (people in the street, n=13, Box 55). None of these third choices is further described in Figure 16.

Figure 16 shows on 59 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen and the neutral alternative was received, then cue 3 (alarm) was selected and the negative alternative was received. On two occasions no more third choices were made (Circle 48). The remaining third choices were spread between three cues – cue 1 (dog, n=44, Box 45), cue 7 (doors/windows, n=10, Box 46) and cue 13 (people in the street, n=3, Box 47). Figure 16 continues with a description of the effect of the deterrent (Box 57) and attractive (Box 58) alternatives for the third choices of cue 1 (dog, Box 45).

Box 57 shows that on 32 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first and the neutral alternative was received. The mean rating was 62.19. Then cue 3 (alarm) was chosen second and the negative alternative was received. The mean rating fell to 46.88. Then cue 1 (dog) was chosen and the negative alternative was received (dog barking loudly). The mean rating fell further to 42.81. Box 58 shows that on 12 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen and the neutral alternative was received. The mean rating was 24.58. Then cue 3 (alarm) was chosen and the
negative alternative was received. The mean rating fell to 10.00. Then cue 1 (dog) was chosen and the attractive alternative was received (no dog) and the mean rating rose to 20.00. Of note in Boxes 57 and 58 is the difference in the mean ratings for the two groups at their second choice. After they received the neutral alternative when they chose cue 16 (inside information) the ratings were 62.19 and 24.58. Then when they chose cue 3 (alarm) and received the negative alternative the means were 46.88 and 10.00. The cues chosen and the alternatives were identical, but the mean ratings were quite different.

Figure 16 describes in further detail the 106 second choices of cue 6 (affluence) after the neutral alternative was received for a first choice of cue 16 (inside information). Cue 3 (alarm) was chosen highly on both sides of Figure 16, but cue 6 (affluence) was only chosen highly on the right side. Theorising about this leads to a possible conclusion. After the 694 first selections of cue 16 (inside information) on 419 occasions the attractive alternative (from a reliable source you are told there could be a large amount of cash kept in the house) was received. However, on 275 occasions the neutral alternative (you have no inside information) was received. Subsequently, 106 second choices were cue 6 (affluence). What subjects are trying to do is deduce some inside information for themselves. On 275 occasions when cue 16 (inside information) was selected first and it was neutral, subjects further tried to determine the presence or absence of a honey pot when they had no inside information.

Boxes 43 and 44 display the effect of the two alternatives for the 106 occasions when cue 6 (affluence) was chosen second and the neutral alternative was received. Box 43 shows that on 32 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first and the neutral alternative was received. A mean rating of 49.38 resulted. Cue 6 (affluence) was then chosen second and the attractive alternative was received (house looks expensive). The mean remained similar at 49.69. Box 44 shows that on 74 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first and the neutral alternative was received and the mean rating was 67.43. Cue 6 (affluence) was then chosen second and the neutral alternative was received (house is run down) and the mean fell to 48.51.
Figure 16 describes the decision path after Boxes 43 and 44 to one more level. On 32 occasions a second choice of cue 6 (affluence) in which the attractive alternative was received (Box 43) resulted in a third choice spread between two cues – cue 3 (alarm, n=1, Box 59) and cue 5 (occupancy - car in drive, n=31, Box 31). Figure 16 proceeds to display the effects of the two alternatives for the 31 times cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway) was chosen. Box 66 shows that on 11 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first and the neutral alternative was received. The mean rating was 50.00. Then cue 6 (affluence) was chosen second and the attractive alternative was received, with the mean rating remaining at 50.00. Then cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway) was chosen third and the deterrent alternative was received. The mean rating fell slightly to 49.09. Box 67 shows very similar results to Box 66. First cue 16 (inside information) was chosen and the neutral alternative was received resulting in a mean of 49.00 (Box 66, 50.00). Then cue 6 (affluence) was chosen second and the neutral alternative was received producing a mean of 49.50 (Box 66, 50.00). Then cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway) was chosen third and the attractive alternative was received resulting in a mean of 49.00 (Box 66, 49.09). Figure 16 does not break these two groups (Boxes 66 and 67) down any further.

On 74 occasions cue 6 (affluence) was a second choice and the alternative received was neutral (house is run down, Box 44). After this information was received 74 third choices were made and these were spread between five cues – cue 1 (dog, n=13, Box 61), cue 3 (alarm, n=4, Box 62), cue 5 (occupancy - car in drive, n=29, Box 63), cue 10 (fence, n=3, Box 64) and cue 13 (people in the street, n=7, Box 65).

Figure 16 displays the effect of the negative and neutral alternatives for cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway, Boxes 68 and 69). Box 68 shows that on one occasion cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first and the neutral alternative was received. The mean was 60.00. Then cue 6 (affluence) was chosen second and the neutral alternative was received. The mean fell to 20.00. Then cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway) was chosen third and the deterrent alternative (car in driveway) was received. The mean remained at 20.00. Box 69 shows that on 28 occasions cue 16
(inside information) was chosen first and the neutral alternative was received resulting in a mean rating of 51.79. Then cue 6 (affluence) was chosen second and the neutral alternative was received causing the mean to fall slightly to 49.29. Then cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway) was chosen and the attractive alternative was received and the mean rose slightly to 50.00. Figure 16 does not break these two groups (Boxes 68 and 69) down any further.

SUMMARY

The decision tree for all occasions when cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first revealed some interesting findings. The first was the number of instances when subjects terminated a case study after one cue selection. Of the 694 occasions when cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first subjects received the attractive alternative on 419 occasions. On 136 occasions a case study was terminated after this one piece of information. On 275 occasions cue 16 (inside information) was chosen first and the neutral alternative was received. On receiving this information on a further 106 occasions cue 6 (affluence) was chosen second. Subjects seem to be trying to deduce some inside information for themselves. Clearly the cue selections are very considered and the rational choice perspective is a suitable method for analysing burglar decision making.

DECISION TREE FOR ALL OCCASIONS WHEN CUE 3 (ALARM) WAS CHOSEN FIRST

The three decision trees that are described in Figures 17, 18, and 19, all begin with occasions where the first cue chosen – cue 3 (alarm), cue 1 (dog) and cue 13 (people in the street) – is directly associated with determining level of risk. On the other hand for Figure 16 on 694 occasions the most common first choice was cue 16 (inside information). Cue 16 (inside information) is directly associated with reward or gain. This raises an important point. In Figure 16 cue 16 (inside information) is chosen first, then if the alternative received is neutral many proceeded to cue 6 (affluence, n=106). All of the first choices and many second choices are concerned
with the reward and gain side of the risk versus gain equation. Figures 17, 18 and 19 depict those who weigh up the risk side first. On some occasions when weighing up risk versus gain subjects chose to weigh up the level of risk initially, while others weighed up reward and gain initially. This raises two questions. First, does a subject reach a different conclusion if they start with cues related to gain, compared to a subject that starts with risk related cues? The second question raised is whether some subjects weigh up one side of the risk versus gain process first and if they do what factors pre-dispose them to or contribute to this occurring?

Before examining Figure 17 on the following page it is of interest to compare its overall shape to Figure 16. On the left side the numbers drop very quickly, whereas on the right side the numbers fall away at a slower rate. This shows the effect of the deterrent alternative (good alarm on house) of cue 3 (alarm), and it corresponds to the findings presented earlier in Figure 15 (p. 167), where fewer cues were chosen when a case study presented a greater level of deterrence. Box 2 shows that on 191 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen and the deterrent alternative was received (good alarm on house). Circle 8 shows that this information alone caused termination on a majority of occasions (n=129, 67.5%). In these instances, the reasoning is simple and straightforward – in reality many homes do not have alarms, so if a good alarm is present, the decision is made to simply move on.

Figure 17 shows the effect of the two alternatives for all second choices when cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the deterrent alternative was received (good alarm on house). Figure 17 does not expand these further as the numbers become too small. After the first choice of cue 3 (alarm) resulted in the deterrent alternative being received on 129 occasions, no more cues were chosen (Circle 8). The remaining second choices were spread between five cues – cue 1 (dog, n=10, Box 3), cue 5 (occupancy - car in drive, n=26, Box 4), cue 8 (locks, n=8, Box 5), cue 13 (people in the street, n=2, Box 13) and cue 14 (neighbourhood watch, n=12, Box 7).
LEGEND
[1-...]: previous means for this sub-sample only, after first selection.
[2-...]: previous means for this sub-sample only, after second selection.
[3-...]: previous means for this sub-sample only, after third selection.
General stopping rule-splitting stops, if a subsequent split leaves a sub-sample
with an 'n' of less than 30.
Figure 17: Decision tree for all occasions when cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first.
The numbers are already small, so only the effect of the two alternatives for each of the five cues is displayed. No third choices are displayed in Figure 17 when the deterrent alternative was received after the first choice.

Box 9 shows that the deterrent alternative for cue 1 (dog) was not received after the deterrent alternative for cue 3 (alarm) was initially received. Box 10 shows that on 10 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first (deterrent alternative) and the mean rating was 47.00. Then cue 1 (dog) was chosen and the attractive alternative was received (no dog). The mean rose to 52.00. Box 11 shows that on 12 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the deterrent alternative was received resulting in a mean of 50.00. Then cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway) was chosen and again a deterrent alternative was received causing the mean to fall to 40.00. Box 12 shows on 14 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen and the deterrent alternative was received producing a mean rating of 29.29. Then the second choice was cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway) and the attractive alternative was received causing the mean to rise to 48.57. Of note in Boxes 11 and 12 is the difference in the mean ratings after the initial deterrent alternative for cue 3 (alarm) is received. Although the identical information is received after the first choice the means are quite different (50.00 and 29.29).

Box 14 shows that no-one received the attractive alternative for cue 8 (locks) as a second choice after choosing cue 3 (alarm) first and receiving the deterrent alternative. Box 13 shows that on 12 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the deterrent alternative was received resulting in a mean final rating of 50.00. Then cue 8 (locks) was the second choice and again the deterrent alternative (all doors and windows have the best locks available) was received, which caused the mean to fall slightly to 46.67.

Cue 13 (people in the street, Box 6) was chosen twice after the initial choice of cue 3 (alarm) and the deterrent alternative was received. Box 16 shows that no-one received the attractive alternative for cue 13 (people in the street). Box 15 shows that on two occasions after receiving the deterrent alternative for cue 3 (alarm) the mean
rating given was 30.00. Then cue 13 (people in the street) was chosen and again the deterrent alternative was received causing the mean rating to fall to zero.

Box 17 shows that no one received the deterrent alternative when they selected cue 14 (neighbourhood watch) after initially receiving the deterrent alternative when they chose cue 3 (alarm). Box 18 shows that on 12 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the deterrent alternative was received resulting in a mean rating of 50.00. Then cue 14 (neighbourhood watch) was chosen and the attractive alternative was received, which caused the mean to rise to 60.00.

Boxes 19 to 62 in Figure 17 show some of the main paths for the 268 times that cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the attractive alternative (no alarm) was received. Circle 31 shows that on 12 occasions no more information was requested after the attractive alternative for cue 3 (alarm) was received. The remaining second choices were spread across 11 cues – cue 1 (dog, n=132, Box 20), cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio, n=25, Box 21), cue 5 (occupancy - car in drive, n=13, Box 22), cue 6 (affluence, n=1, Box 23), cue 7 (doors/windows, n=12, Box 24), cue 8 (locks, n=2, Box 25), cue 9 (garage, n=12, Box 26), cue 10 (fence, n=11, Box 27), cue 12 (location, n=22, Box 28), cue 13 (people in the street, n=11, Box 29) and cue 17 (street type, n=15, Box 30). Figure 17 displays the effects of the two alternatives for three – cue 1 (dog, Boxes 32 and 33), cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio, Boxes 34 and 35) and cue 12 (location, Boxes 36 and 37) – of the eleven second choices.

Box 32 shows that on 73 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received producing a mean rating of 92.60. Then cue 1 (dog) was chosen second and the deterrent alternative was received causing the rating to fall to 56.16. Box 33 shows that on 59 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received, which resulted in a mean rating of 84.24. Then cue 1 (dog) was selected next and the attractive alternative was received. The mean rating rose to 86.10. Boxes 38 to 62 in Figure 17 present further decision paths that follow Boxes 32 and 33. Discussion of them continues after the next two paragraphs that present and analyse Boxes 34 to 37.
Box 34 shows that on 14 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was selected first and the attractive alternative was received resulting in a mean rating of 90.36. Cue 4 (occupancy-lights/tv/radio) was then selected next and the deterrent alternative was received, which caused the mean to decrease to 47.14. Box 35 shows that on eleven occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received, which generated a mean rating of 63.64. Cue 4 (occupancy-lights/tv/radio) was then chosen and the attractive alternative was received (no light/tv/radio on inside house). This caused no change to the mean rating and it remained at 63.64. The comparison of Boxes 34 and 35 shows that the 14 selections in Box 34 received an attractive alternative, then a deterrent alternative and the mean rating went from 90.36 to 47.14. On the other hand, the 11 selections in Box 35 received the same initial attractive alternative, then a further attractive alternative, but their mean rating started at 63.64 and remained unchanged. The 11 selections and ratings in Box 35 show less volatility than the 14 selections and ratings in Box 34.

Box 36 shows that on ten occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received resulting in a mean rating of 68.00. When a second choice of cue 12 (location) was made and the attractive alternative (house is on a corner block) was received it caused the mean rating to fall slightly to 67.00. Box 37 shows that on 12 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received and it resulted in a mean rating of 30.00. When cue 12 (location) was selected as a second choice and the neutral alternative (house is located in the middle of the street) was received it caused the mean rating to fall to 20.00. The interesting point to be made from Box 37 is the low mean rating after receiving the attractive alternative for cue 3 (alarm, 30.00) compared to the other first ratings presented (Boxes 32 to 36). The mean ratings ranged from 92.60 to 63.64.

Box 32 displays the instances where cue 1 (dog) was a second choice after initial receipt of the attractive alternative for cue 3 (alarm). Of the 73 occasions in Box 32 where cue 1 (dog) was chosen and the deterrent alternative was received after receiving the attractive alternative for cue 3 (alarm) on one occasion it was decided that no more information was needed (Circle 43). The remaining third choices were
spread across five cues – cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio, n=54, Box 38), cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway, n=1, Box 39), cue 6 (affluence, n=1, Box 40), cue 13 (people in the street, n=14, Box 41) and cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio, n=2, Box 42). Figure 17 only displays the effect of the two alternatives for the 54 occasions when cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio, Boxes 48 and 49) was a third choice.

Box 48 shows that on 12 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and when the attractive alternative was received the mean was 98.33. Then cue 1 (dog) was the second choice and the deterrent alternative was received causing the mean to fall to 71.67. Then cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio) was chosen and the deterrent alternative was received and this caused the mean rating to fall further to 43.33. Box 49 shows the same first two steps as Box 48, but the other alternative for the third step. The first choice was cue 3 (alarm) and the attractive alternative was received resulting in a mean rating of 90.71. Then cue 1 (dog) was the second choice and the deterrent alternative was received causing a decline in the mean rating to 54.05. Then cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio) was selected as a third choice and the attractive alternative was received causing the mean to rise to 72.26.

Of the 42 selections depicted in Box 49 on five occasions no more information was needed (Circle 55). The remaining fourth choices were spread across three cues – cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway, n=26, Box 52), cue 13 (people in the street, n=14, Box 53) and cue 17 (street type, n=1, Box 54). Figure 17 displays the effect of the two alternatives for the 26 occasions when cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway) was the fourth choice (Boxes 59 and 60).

Box 59 shows that on 19 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received resulting in a mean rating of 96.84. Then cue 1 (dog) was the second choice and the deterrent alternative was received causing the mean to fall to 59.47. Then the third choice was cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio) and the attractive alternative was received, which made the mean rise to 84.21. Then the fourth choice was cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway) and the deterrent alternative was received. This caused the mean rating to decline to 52.00. Box 60 shows the
identical first three steps as Box 59, but the alternative at the fourth step is different. Cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received, which resulted in a mean of 95.71. Cue 1 (dog) was the second choice and the deterrent alternative was received, which caused the mean rating to fall to 70.00. The third choice was cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio). When the attractive alternative was received the mean rating remained unchanged at 70.00. The fourth choice was cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway). When the attractive alternative was received it caused the mean rating to rise to 80.00.

This discussion of Figure 17 now finishes with a description of the 59 occasions Box 33) when cue 3 (alarm) was selected first and the attractive alternative was received. Then a second choice of cue 1 (dog) was made and the attractive alternative was received. Of the 59 second choices on one occasion no more information was required (Circle 47). The remaining third choices were spread between three cues – cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio, n=46, Box 44), cue 5 (occupancy - car in driveway, n=11, Box 45) and cue 8 (locks, n=1, Box 46).

Figure 17 displays the effect of the two alternatives for the 46 occasions when cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio) was chosen third (Boxes 50 and 51). Box 50 shows that on 34 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received, which resulted in a mean rating of 88.53. Then cue 1 (dog) was the second choice and the attractive alternative was received, resulting in a mean rating of 88.24. Then cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio) was the third choice and the deterrent alternative was received, causing the mean to lower to 56.47. Box 51 shows the same first two alternatives as Box 50, but the alternative for the third cue is different. First cue 3 (alarm) was selected and the attractive alternative was received, resulting in a mean rating of 97.50. The second choice was cue 1 (dog) and the attractive alternative was received, resulting in no change to the mean rating (97.50). Then the third choice was cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio) and the attractive alternative was received and the mean rating remains unchanged on 97.50.
Of the 34 selections in Box 50 who chose cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio) and received the deterrent alternative there were two who decided they did not require any more information (Circle 58). The remaining selections were divided between two cues – cue 13 (people in the street, n=29, Box 56) and cue 17 (street type, n=2, Box 57). Boxes 61 and 62 show the effects of the two alternatives for the 29 occasions that cue 13 (people in the street) was selected for a fourth choice.

Box 61 shows that on nine occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was received, resulting in a mean rating of 70.00. Then cue 1 (dog) was chosen second and the attractive alternative received. The mean rating remained at 70.00. Then cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio) was chosen next and the deterrent alternative was revealed. This caused the mean rating to fall to 31.67. Then cue 13 (people in the street) was chosen and again a deterrent alternative was revealed, which caused the mean rating to decline to 10.56.

Box 62 shows the same first three steps as Box 61, but the fourth step has a different alternative. On 20 occasions cue 3 (alarm) was chosen first and the attractive alternative was revealed, resulting in a mean rating of 97.50. Then cue 1 (dog) was chosen next and the attractive alternative received, which left the mean rating unchanged at 97.50. Then cue 4 (occupancy - lights/tv/radio) was chosen and the deterrent alternative was revealed, causing the mean rating to fall to 70.50. The fourth choice was cue 13 (people in the street) and the attractive alternative was revealed, which caused the mean rating to climb to 88.50.

SUMMARY

Figure 17 illustrates the flow on effect of initial deterrent or attractive information. On the left-hand side of the decision tree the numbers of choices decline dramatically compared to the right-hand side of the decision tree. The left-hand side were instances where the deterrent alternative for cue 3 (alarm) was received first, whereas the right-hand side were instances where the attractive alternative for cue 3 (alarm) was received first. On the left-hand side further choices are minimal and when they