

OFFENSE PLANNING IN BURGLARY: A COMPARISON OF DELIBERATE AND
IMPULSIVE BURGLARS

by

Amber Nicole Sanders

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Criminal Justice

Charlotte

2015

Approved by:

Dr. Joe Kuhns

Dr. M. Lyn Exum

Dr. Shannon Reid

ABSTRACT

AMBER NICOLE SANDERS. Offense planning in burglary: A comparison of deliberate and impulsive burglars. (Under the direction of Dr. JOE KUHNS)

While certain burglars are more opportunistic than others who may engage in more planning, comparison between the two distinct patterns of offense planning has not been explored. As different types of offenders may have unique offending patterns, such research yields importance for crime prevention. The present study captures the decision making process of over 400 incarcerated male and female burglars in three states. We explore motivations, target selection strategies, factors that deter, techniques and tools used during burglary, and responses to prevention measures for two groups of burglars, who vary in their levels of deliberation and planning. Overall, burglars are motivated by a need for cash, select targets based on visual cues surrounding the target, may have intricate techniques for committing a burglary and are typically deterred by prevention measures. More specifically, we find that deliberate burglars are more likely to be younger, male, less motivated by drugs, more proactive and thoughtful when selecting a target and more likely to use burglary tools while offending. These findings imply that situational crime prevention actions and measures may be more effective for impulsive burglars, but that deliberate burglars still consider such measures when selecting a target and carrying out their burglary. We also find that motivations differ for deliberate and impulsive burglars. This suggests that treatment services rendered to burglars may need to vary based on unique motivation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY	14
RESULTS	18
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	30
REFERENCES	33
APPENDIX: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	37

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Demographic characteristics of 376 burglars	23
TABLE 2: Motivation comparisons for deliberate and impulsive burglars	24
TABLE 3: Target selection and deterrence comparisons for deliberate and impulsive burglars	25
TABLE 4a: Technique comparisons for deliberate and impulsive burglars: items	26
TABLE 4b: Technique comparisons for deliberate and impulsive burglars: tools and methods	27
TABLE 5: Response to prevention comparisons for deliberate and impulsive burglars	28
TABLE 6: Logistic regressions predicting deliberate burglars	29

INTRODUCTION

Decades of research attempting to understand the decision making processes among burglars has revealed many characteristics of burglary such as common motivations, factors in selecting a target, factors that deter offending and techniques used during the commission of a burglary. In an attempt to understand such themes, studies turn to the offender him/herself to construct the offender perspective. Research has revealed that burglars operate under a rational decision making process that guides them through the process of deciding whether or not to commit their crime. Such knowledge and an understanding of burglars have paved the way for narrowly targeted efforts, such as situational crime prevention, which attempt to reduce criminal opportunities.

While the decision making process and characteristics of burglars and burglary have been explored in general, what have yet to be explored are the what characteristics and behaviors that are common among different types of offenders. Despite differences in offender characteristics, there has been little in depth comparison among distinct types. This study adopts a typology of burglar decision making in an effort to understand the differences among various types of offenders and their subsequent burglaries. The present study compares offender motivations, target selection processes, techniques and tools used during commission of an offense and the effectiveness of target hardening measures for deliberate burglars, who plan carefully rather than acting impetuously, as opposed to impulsive burglars who may be more opportunistic.

Offender Decision Making

Theory and Rational Choice

Researchers have explored the decision making among criminals in an attempt to understand what influences the planning of a crime. The prevailing theory is that criminals operate under a rational model, which stems from Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham's concept of rational choice that individuals willingly act in a way to maximize their pleasure and minimize any consequences (Beccaria, 1963; Bentham, 1962). In this sense, criminals must determine that their actions outweigh the risks associated with their proposed crime.

Modern rational choice perspective asserts that criminal behavior is purposive, rational and crime-specific. Under this perspective, criminal actions, while intended toward a particular crime, may not be purely rational, but more so limited or bounded by time or ability (Clarke and Cornish, 1986). Clarke and Cornish (1986) introduced the idea of "the reasoning criminal," or one that operates under a heightened rational choice approach. Under this notion, criminals act, through a process of decisions and choices, in ways that primarily benefit them. Clarke and Cornish (1986) developed a framework that emphasizes the need to understand the offender, not only the crime, and takes in account situational variables at play during the decision making process. Under Clarke and Cornish's (1986) decision making model, the rational choice perspective emphasizes decisions in an offender's career as opposed to concentrating on factors that may predispose an individual to crime. This model also recognizes and emphasizes the importance of situational factors in decision making and also the role of learning and incentives.

As initially proposed by Clarke and Cornish (1986), the rational choice perspective has been extended to specific types of criminals and crimes. Of those who initially utilized rational choice to understand the decision making of burglars, many suggested a sort of limited rationality (Scarr, Pinsky and Wyatt, 1973; Repetto, 1974; Walsh, 1980; Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985). Such reports claimed that burglary was the result of mere opportunity rather than rational planning. This gave rise to the notion that many burglars are generally impulsive and typically act on presented opportunities. Later works reveal a much different type of burglar, one which is highly rational and methodical, yet the image of the impulsive and opportunistic burglar often remains (Bennett and Wright, 1984; Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985; Wright and Decker, 1994; Nee and Meengaghan, 2006).

Understanding Burglary from the Offender Perspective

David Matza (1970) observed that the obvious answer in understanding criminality is to look directly at the source, or the offender. Researching the offender's perspective is extremely important as it allows an authentic look at an offender's criminal activity (Nee, 2004). Offenders are able to provide researchers with accounts of their unique histories, lifestyles and offense patterns (Copes and Hochstetler, 1996). Furthermore, offenders can describe their unique motivations to commit a crime, their thought processes in determining whether to engage in a crime, and their views with respect to deterrence measures (Miethe, McCorkle and Listwan, 2001). While there may be concerns with whether incarcerated offender accounts can be taken as factual, self-reported criminal activity is typically a valid and reliable measure as supported by

comparisons of offender's self-reported crimes with official records (for a review see Junger-Tas and Marshall, 1999; Krohn, Thornberry, Gibson and Baldwin, 2004).

In the 1980s research on burglary from the offender's perspective spread both in the United States and the United Kingdom. Researchers not only interviewed active and convicted burglars, but utilized innovative methods in obtaining the offender's perspective on their offending. Maguire and Bennett's (1982) seminal study involved interviews of burglars and victims, and analyzed police data, to develop the first empirical characterization of burglars taken from a burglar and/or victim's point of view. Bennett and Wright (1984) furthered our knowledge of the offender by showing videos and photographs to offenders to help facilitate their accounts of burglaries. The nature of such interviews allowed burglars to relax and speak freely and at length to the researchers in order to capture the often lengthy and complex nature of their crimes. In determining the accuracy of burglar's accounts, other researchers have incorporated simulations and participant observations in order to get a more ethnographic glimpse at offender's actual behavior (Cromwell, Olsen and Avary, 1991; Wright and Decker, 1994; Nee and Taylor, 1988). Such studies consistently demonstrate a pattern of decision making among burglars, further our knowledge of what burglars do on scene, and support much of the prison-based findings of previous works (Shover, 1973; Waller and Okihiro 1978; Bennett and Wright, 1984).

Offense Planning

In their preliminary work on burglary, Bennett and Wright (1984) developed a three pronged typology of burglaries: the opportunistic offense, the search offense, and the planned offense. Each typology is characterized by a burglar's pattern of offense

planning, which reveals how flexible burglars are in their target selection and in when they commit their offense. Each typology is differentiated from the others based on whether a time gap exists between when the decision to offend is reached, when a target is selected, and when the offense is carried out.

The opportunistic offense is defined by virtually no time gap between the decision to offend, target selection and offense. These burglaries are not planned but rather occur “there and then.” Surprisingly, Bennett and Wright (1984) found that less than seven percent of burglars that they studied committed burglaries in this way. This finding is particularly unexpected due to the common impression that many burglars act on opportunity. These burglars may be less flexible in their target choice as they will only act upon a presented opportunity and therefore those who experience a low level of opportunity may result in a lower level of burglary activity. On the other hand, opportunistic burglars may be more flexible in their target selection in that they can wait until an ample opportunity is presented to them (Bennett and Wright, 1984).

The search offense is represented by a time gap between the decision to offend and target selection, but no time gap between the target selection and the offense. After making the decision to commit a burglary, these burglars search for a suitable target and commit their crime immediately upon locating a suitable target. Forty-seven percent of Bennett and Wright’s (1984) burglars reported engaging in this type of offense style. Many searchers were typically selective in their searching grounds and conducted their search in a nicer neighborhood or a place believed to have desirable targets. Fewer searchers were less discriminating and searched whatever area they happened to be in. As

a whole, searchers were argued to be the most flexible in their target selection and decision making.

The planned offense is divided into two subcategories: one without a time gap between the decision to offend and target selection (the *opportunistic-planned offense* [17.1% of overall offenses]) and one with a time gap between the decision to offend and target selection (the *sought-planned offense* [41.9% of overall offenses]). Both subcategories have a time gap between the target selection and the offense and both types of planned offenses indicate forethought regarding the burglary as a whole. Fifty-nine percent of Bennett and Wright's (1984) burglars reported engaging in a planned offense and additionally over half of the planning burglars reported visiting their intended target beforehand. Of those indicating that they visited a location in advance, over half described paying careful attention during their visit to a potential target. The *opportunistic planner* is described as more inflexible in target selection than the *sought planner*. Both are said to be inflexible when it comes to the timing of offense, as supposedly a burglar with a specific plan may be unwilling to abandon their plan to burglarize.

Subsequent studies have similarly reported offense planning patterns as those described by Bennett and Wright (1984). Wright and Decker (1994) reported that nine in ten burglars had a specific target in mind that they would gather knowledge about before committing the burglary. Wright and Decker (1994) also observed that even when the decision to commit a burglary arose, many burglars would not commit a burglary in a hasty manner, but rather wait until they had more reliable information on the target. Nee and Meengaghan (2006) found that seventy-five percent of their sample of fifty burglars

made the decision to commit a burglary, and then searched for an appropriate target before carrying out their offense. On the contrary, Cromwell, Olson and Avary (1991) found that burglars tended to be opportunistic and easily deterred from one target to another, but nevertheless engaged in a careful decision making process. Additional studies focus on the timing of the decision to offend, target selection, and offense commission in exploring the features of burglaries (Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985; Nee and Taylor, 1988; Taylor and Nee, 1988; Wright, Logie, and Decker, 1995; Snook, Dhami, and Kavanagh, 2011; Palmer, Holmes and Hollin, 2002).

Features of a Burglary

Motivation

Studies suggest that the main motivating factor in deciding to commit a burglary is to meet some type of need, most often the need for cash (Scarr, 1973; Reppetto, 1974; Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985; Wright and Decker, 1994; Cromwell, Olson and Avary, 1991; Bennett and Wright, 1984; Palmer, Holmes and Hollin, 2002). What varies more widely is what motivates an offender to need such cash. While many claimed they burglarize to meet basic, everyday financial needs, many more claim the money would be used for substance use, gambling and entertainment (Scarr, 1973; Bennett and Wright, 1984). Likewise, Wright and Decker (1994) found that seventy-five percent of burglars spent their take to support a partying lifestyle that included illicit drugs. It is important to note that many burglars also decide to commit a burglary while under the influence of drugs or alcohol, often in an effort to continue their substance use (Hochstetler and Copes, 2006; Forrester, Chatterton, Pease, and Britain, 1988; Nee and Meengaghan, 2006). Wright and Decker (1994) also found that almost half of their burglars used their

money for “keeping up appearances” or on status items to project a specific image.

Although some offenders burglarize and use the money solely for subsistence and daily expenses, most are motivated by superficial factors (Wright and Decker 1994, Shover and Honaker, 1992). Some burglars even report psychological motivations such as revenge or excitement (Reppetto, 1974; Walsh, 1980; Cromwell, Olson and Avary, 1991).

Target Selection and Deterrents

Once a burglar has the motivation to commit a burglary he/she must then decide on a target. Some burglars rely on personal knowledge when selecting a target, choosing to burglarize friends, acquaintances or people they meet specifically to burglarize (Wright and Decker, 1994). Burglars may rely on receiving information on potential targets from others in the form of tips (Wright and Decker, 1994). A common method in selecting a target is to personally watch their potential target. Wright and Decker (1994) found that six in ten burglars reported this method of target selection. Still, some burglars act on opportunity and will respond to a presented target rather than seeking them out (Rengert & Wasilchick, 2000; Cromwell, Olson and Avary, 1991).

In searching for an optimal target, burglars must make certain determinations regarding their selected target’s probable reward, potential risk, and ease of access (Wright & Decker, 1994; Bennett and Wright, 1984). This calculated process is facilitated by environmental and situational cues that assist the burglar in making an assessment of the attractiveness of the anticipated target. In determining the potential for reward associated with a specific target, the most common cue considered by burglars tends to be perceived affluence. Such cues indicating affluence may include size of the property, condition of the property, and the types of vehicles present (Bernasco & Luykx,

2003; Nee and Meengaghan, 2006; Hakim & Blackstone, 1997; Rengert & Wasilchick, 2000; Hakim, Rengert and Shachmurove, 2001; Wright & Decker, 1994; Wright, Logie, and Decker, 1995; Walsh, 1980). In assessing risk and ease of access, many burglars consider cues regarding a target's vulnerability such as its visibility and "surveillability" (Cromwell, Olson and Avary, 1991). Burglars prefer targets that allow them to remain unseen, such as locations with fences or natural covers that block entryways and buildings with fewer nearby neighbors (Palmer, Holmes and Hollin, 2002; Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985; Cromwell, Olson and Avary, 1991; Bennett and Wright, 1984; Coupe and Blake, 2006; Hakim & Blackstone, 1997; Bernasco & Luykx, 2003; Bernasco 2006; Walsh, 1980). Such cues indicate a higher level of accessibility for the burglar to enter and exit a target undetected.

Techniques and Deterrents

A majority of residential burglars will commit their crime close to their own residence and during the day, as occupants are expected to not be present (Rengert and Wasilchick, 2000; Coupe and Blake, 2006; Cromwell, Olson and Avary, 1991; Goodwill & Alison, 2006; Hakim & Blackstone, 1997; Bernasco & Luykx, 2003; Bernasco, 2006). Sometimes burglars work with others, commonly friends, significant others or family (Hochstetler, 2001; Bernasco, 2006; Nee and Meengaghan, 2006; Wright and Decker, 1994; Rengert & Wasilchick, 2000; Bernasco, 2006). Burglars may approach a target in a disguise, such as a painter or other service worker, which may allow them to remain unnoticed (Wright and Decker, 1994). Many burglars enter their target either through an open or insecure window, door or garage (Cromwell, Olson and Avary, 1991; Hakim and Blackstone, 1997; Maguire & Bennett, 1982; Wright, Logie and Decker, 1995; Nee and

Meengaghan, 2006). Burglars may use screwdrivers, crowbars or other tools to assist in entering a location (Wright and Decker, 1994; Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985).

As target occupancy is a primary concern for burglars, many burglars will probe occupants to reassure that the home or business is unoccupied before entering by methods such as looking for uncollected mail, ringing the doorbell or calling the residence (Cromwell, Olson and Avary, 1991; Rengert & Wasilchick, 2000; Wright & Decker, 1994; Nee and Meengaghan, 2006; Hakim, Rengert and Shachmurove, 2001; Wright, Logie, and Decker, 1995; Palmer, Holmes and Hollin, 2002). Potential targets that do not exhibit optimal characteristics, such as lack of occupancy, may rather exhibit certain undesirable characteristics that act as deterrents. Burglars tend to be deterred by intentional security measures such as alarms and dogs (Garcia-Retamero and Dhami, 2009; Hakim, Rengert, and Shachmurove, 2001; Lee, 2008; Cromwell, Olson and Avary, 1991; Wright and Decker, 1994). Such factors increase risk to the burglar and can potentially deter a burglar away from a target.

Upon gaining entry into a target, a burglar must then decide what to take. While most burglars will immediately take cash, burglars will also take items that can quickly be exchanged for cash such as electronics or jewelry (Nee and Meengaghan, 2006; Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985; Schneider, 2005; Palmer, Holmes and Hollin, 2002). Most burglars will quickly dispose of stolen items in an effort to avoid being traced and to make quick money (Wright and Decker, 1994; Rengert and Wasilchick, 1985; Cromwell, Olson and Avary, 1991; Stevenson, Forsythe, and Weatherburn, 2001). Burglars most often dispose of stolen items by selling them to professional fences, friends or drug dealers; burglars may also sell items to pawnshops, legitimate businesses, strangers or

trade directly for other goods (most often drugs) (Stevenson, Forsythe, and Weatherburn, 2001; Schneider, 2005; Wright and Decker, 1994; Cromwell, Olson and Avary, 1991).

Burglary Prevention

As a result of an increased understanding of burglar motivations, methods of target selection and techniques, subsequent prevention efforts have emerged that are narrowly tailored to prevent and reduce burglary. Such efforts, referred to as situational crime prevention, are aimed at reducing criminal opportunities by increasing the perceived risk and difficulty of a burglary, while decreasing the promise of reward (Clarke, 1995). Situational crime prevention developed out of two earlier methods of prevention: defensible space and crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) (Clarke, 1983; 1995). Defensible space sought to prevent burglary through reducing anonymity, increasing surveillance of an area and reducing escape routes for burglars (Newman, 1972). CPTED expanded on defensible space theory by applying such concepts to school and commercial locations, and by also incorporating the physical environment (Jeffery, 1977).

Situational crime prevention aims to reduce crimes, including burglary, by intervening in a way that alters a setting by increasing surveillance, removing targets through environmental management and, most commonly, employing target hardening measures (Clarke, 1983). Increasing surveillance allows an added level of visibility, as neighbors can become familiar with one another, making it easier to distinguish when something or someone is out of place (Clarke, 1983; Jacobs, 1961). This familiarity can also take place as part of neighborhood watch programs (Bennett, Holloway and Farrington, 2006; Rosenbaum, 1988). Surveillance can also be increased with better

lighting of streets and homes, and by removing obstructions caused by natural coverings, such as trees (Clarke, 1995; Tien, O'Donnell, Bamett and Mirchandani, 1979; Ramsay and Newton 1991). By increasing surveillance, a burglar is more exposed and a burglary is perceived as more risky. By using environmental management to remove potential targets from sight, the opportunity for a burglary can be significantly reduced (Clarke, 1983). This can especially prevent opportunities arising from those in legitimate services (maids, gardeners etc.) who have access to a residence, but may tip off potential burglars (Wright and Decker, 1994). Lastly, target hardening reduces burglary by blocking prospective opportunities for burglary through physical barriers (Clarke, 1983; 1995; 1997). This includes increasing physical security, such as reinforced materials including locks, bolts, screens and safes (Clarke, 1983; 1995). Such measures easily create more obstacles for burglars, which in turn lead to an increased risk for the burglar or a reduced likelihood of the event occurring at all.

Summary of Past Research and Focus of the Current Study

Through decades of research from the offender's perspective, we have an idea of the decision making process many burglars use when planning and carrying out their offenses. Some burglars are much more rational than initially believed and, while some are opportunistic, many display higher levels of offense planning. Offender perspective research has also revealed common motivations, identified factors in selecting a target, specifying what measures deter burglars from specific targets, and the range of techniques used during the commission of a burglary. Such knowledge has paved way for burglary prevention efforts known as situational crime prevention, which has, in turn,

helped to increase the perceived risk and effort while decreasing the perceived reward from a burglary.

While it is understood that certain burglars are more opportunistic than others who may engage in more planning, comparison between the two distinct patterns of offense planning has not been explored. The present study captures the decision making process of over 400 incarcerated male and female burglars in three states. The current study also describes the descriptive features of their burglaries including motivations, target selection processes, the impact of deterrence measures, techniques used during the burglary events and responses to target hardening prevention efforts. Such data allows for a comparative look at similar offenders (i.e., burglars) with varying levels of planning commitment in an effort to understand the differences among those who typically plan an offense (*deliberate burglars*) versus those who report seldom planning an offense (*impulsive burglars*). This study will test the following hypotheses:

H₁: Deliberate burglars will differ in their motivations than impulsive burglars

H₂: Deliberate burglars will differ in their target selection than impulsive burglars

H₃: Deliberate burglars will differ in their offending techniques than impulsive burglars

H₄: Deliberate burglars will differ in their responses to prevention and target hardening measures than impulsive burglars

METHODOLOGY

Data and Procedure

Data for this study were collected by administering a print survey to incarcerated burglars in ten prisons in North Carolina, four prisons in Ohio and four prisons in Kentucky. Of the 2,709 incarcerated burglars in the three states at the time of data collection, 1,513 were invited to participate in the study (1140 males and 373 females). Those invited represent a mix of inmates from minimum, medium and maximum security facilities. Males were randomly selected in all three states. Females were randomly selected in Ohio, but all females were invited in North Carolina and Kentucky due to fewer than 150 incarcerated burglars in each state. For a full description of the sampling frame and processes please refer to Blevins et al. (2012).

As requested by the Department of Corrections in Ohio and Kentucky, researchers distributed and collected the surveys on-site in those eight facilities. Invited participants met with researchers to learn more about the study and discuss the informed consent. For those who were interested were able to sit and complete the survey, 236 surveys were returned in Ohio and 90 surveys were returned in Kentucky. In North Carolina, researchers were asked to utilize mail surveys in lieu of an on-site data collection process. Invited participants were mailed a package containing an informed consent form, instructions for completing and returning the survey, a copy of the survey instrument, and a pre-addressed business reply envelope. Ninety surveys were returned from North Carolina facilities.

Of the 1,513 incarcerated burglars invited to participate in this study, 422 completed the survey yielding a 28% response rate. Six of the returned surveys were not

suitable for analyses giving us a final sample of 416, which represents 15.9% of the total population of incarcerated burglars in the three states at the time of data collection.

Response rates varied across prison systems due to variability in inmate access, institutional cooperation, data collection procedural requirements, and data collection protocols. A complete description of the project and data collection methodology can be found in Blevins et al. (2012).

Measures

Offense Planning

Offense planning was measured by the question, “Do you typically plan a burglary ahead of time or is it spur of the moment?” Participants chose one of three answers: I plan the burglary, it is spur of the moment, or it varies. For this study, those answering “I plan the burglary” are classified as deliberate burglars (51). Participants who indicated “it is spur of the moment” are classified as impulsive burglars (172). Those who answered “it varies” were divided based on their answer to a follow up question that asked “if you plan a burglary, about how much time is there between selecting the target and the actual burglary?” Participants chose one of seven answers: it happened immediately (within 24 hours), 1 to 3 days, 2-7 days, about 2 weeks, about a month, more than a month, and other. Those who selected “other” were allowed to write in a time frame. Participants who selected “it happened immediately” were classified as impulsive burglars (85) and all others were classified as deliberate burglars (68) (the complete survey protocol is included as Appendix A).

In order to establish measurement validity, we utilized an additional question to assess whether a participant’s response to the primary planning question was consistent

with other responses that assessed extent of planning. The additional question asked “thinking back to your most recent burglary (current offense), did you collect information about the place before deciding whether to burglarize it?” Participants answered yes or no. Reliability between the primary planning variable and this additional planning variable was examined and tested to ensure that our two groups (deliberate versus impulsive burglars) are accurately distinguished from one another.

Motivation

Motivation for burglary was assessed by asking “what is your top reason for engaging in burglaries?” Participants were able to write in their answer and those narrative answers were then systematically coded into broader categories.

Target Selection

A series of ten questions (items 19-21, 24-25 and 36-40) were asked regarding what aspects are appealing in selecting a burglary target as well as what factors act as deterrents. Items assessing target selection included questions on types of places burglarized and burglar views on suitability of a target such as location, visible security, and occupancy. The survey also asked which factors would be specific deterrents in determining a target such as presence of an alarm or dog, lights on, or neighborhood watch signs.

Offender Techniques

A series of twenty-six questions (items 18, 41, 45-65, and 67-69) were asked regarding what techniques are used by burglars in planning and preparing for a burglary, items preferred by burglars and stolen property disposal strategies. Items assessing entry planning and preparation techniques included questions about use of a vehicle, co-

offending, preferred entry methods, preferred time of day to commit a burglary and use of tools. Questions assessing item preference included inquiries about preferences for cash, jewelry, electronics, clothes, drugs or other. Those who selected “other” were allowed to write in their preferred items to take during a burglary. Items assessing disposal strategies included a series of questions about whether a burglar disposes of their stolen items right away or not, where they store their items or where they sell their items to. For a full list of items see Appendix A.

Responses to Prevention Efforts

A series of eight questions (items 28-35) were asked regarding particular views on common prevention and target hardening measures. Items assessing responses to prevention efforts included questions on how the burglar handles encountering locks and alarms. Participants were also able to write in how they attempted to disable a lock or alarm. For a full list of items see Appendix A.

Analytic Strategy

We first determine how many and which offenders can be categorized as deliberate or impulsive burglars, as well as assess reliability and validity among offense planning responses. We then explore demographic characteristics for the two types of burglars. Next, we first utilize chi-square cross-tabulations and t-tests to compare group differences related to burglary motivation, target selection, offender techniques and responses to prevention efforts. Lastly, we utilize logistic regression to test the stability of bivariate findings and to examine what factors can be used to predict whether an offender will be a deliberate or impulsive burglar.

RESULTS

Our recoded sample yielded a total of 376 burglars: 119 (32%) deliberate and 257 impulsive (68%). Forty participants did not answer one or both of the original offense planning questions and therefore could not be recoded. Those in each profile generally answered the question about collecting information as would be expected (i.e. deliberate burglars collected information prior to engaging in a burglary), thus ensuring consistent and reliable groups. Almost seventy-one percent of deliberate burglars indicated that they collected information before committing a burglary whereas only 25.6% of impulsive burglars indicated doing so. Descriptive statistics and criminal histories for the two groups are displayed in Table 1.

Demographically the two groups of burglars were very similar in terms of race and marital status. Although most burglars overall were impulsive, females were significantly more likely to be impulsive (81.2%) than were males (61.3%). Deliberate burglars tended to be slightly younger ($M=30.4$, $SD=9.2$) than impulsive burglars ($M=33.7$, $SD=9.4$). Criminal histories were very comparable across the two burglar groups and among both groups. Over half of the participants reported burglary/breaking and entering as the most serious crime they had committed to date. Lastly, both burglar groups reported similar levels of substance use, however, crack cocaine use was more frequent among impulsive burglars than deliberate burglars (58.4% and 45.8%; $X^2(1, N=373) = 5.2, p<.05$).

Motivation

When asked “what is your top reason for engaging in burglary,” deliberate burglars were significantly more motivated by money, whereas impulsive burglars were

more motivated by drugs, both drugs and money and for other reasons. Results are displayed in Table 2.

Target Selection and Deterrence

While most burglars overall preferred to burglarize homes or other places where people lived, deliberate burglars were significantly more likely to indicate attempting to burglarize both stores/businesses and government buildings. When asked to select from a list of 24 situational and environmental factors to consider (i.e. presence of a car, lights on) when deciding to burglarize a specific place, there was a significant difference in the number of items selected by deliberate burglars ($M=11.0$, $SD=6.5$) versus impulsive burglars ($M=8.0$, $SD=6.5$). Also, deliberate burglars were more concerned with the likelihood of being caught while committing a burglary, more so than impulsive burglars. Results are displayed in Table 3.

Techniques

Results in Table 4a display technique comparisons regarding preferred items and item disposal. When asked “how do you spend income generated from burglaries,” deliberate burglars were more likely to spend the money on living expenses/bills than were impulsive burglars. Also, deliberate burglars were significantly more likely to spend the money on clothes/shoes. After committing a burglary, impulsive burglars were significantly more likely to dispose/sell stolen items immediately, while deliberate burglars were significantly more likely to hold onto the items until a good profit can be made. When not disposing of stolen items immediately, impulsive burglars were significantly more likely to store them at a friend’s house. Deliberate burglars were

significantly more likely to keep the items for themselves, sell the items at a market or garage sale, and/or sell the items online.

Results in Table 4b display technique comparisons regarding use of burglary tools and various intrusion methods. While most burglars will never attempt to cut telephone or alarm wires, deliberate burglars are significantly more likely to either sometimes or always attempt to do so. Deliberate burglars are significantly more likely to use a range of burglary tools such a mask/disguise, a bump key, a lock picking kit, a window punch, a bag or other container to carry items, and other items to assist in disabling alarms. When coming into contact with another person while committing a burglary, deliberate burglars were also significantly more likely to have a prepared, prefabricated story ready (e.g., pretend to be a delivery person, a maintenance worker or an employee).

Responses to Prevention Efforts

Deliberate burglars were significantly more likely to report attempting to pick a lock. In choosing a target, the presence of an alarm makes more of a difference for impulsive burglars than deliberate burglars, indicating that impulsive burglars are more likely to abstain from burglarizing a place when an alarm is present. Also, in deciding to burglarize a place and then learning of the presence of an alarm, significantly more impulsive burglars will never attempt the burglary. If a burglar learns that there is an alarm on a building, while the majority of both impulsive and deliberate burglars will never attempt to disable it, more deliberate burglars will sometimes or always attempt to disable the alarm. While the majority of both impulsive and deliberate burglars are not usually effective at disabling alarms, more deliberate burglars indicated that they were

effective at disabling alarms both before and after they are activated. Results are displayed in Table 5.

Multivariate Analyses

We next tested the stability of the bivariate relationships using logistic regression. Our dependent variable is type of burglar (0=impulsive or 1=deliberate) and we included age and gender as control variables (Table 6). First, when individually examining drug, financial or other motivations, drug motivation is the only motive for committing a burglary that remains slightly significant, indicating that impulsive burglars are more motivated by drugs. However, in each motivation model, age and gender were highly significant predictors of being a deliberate burglar (deliberate burglars are likely to be younger and male). Second, target selection remained highly significant, as did age and gender (younger and male). For this model, target selection was measured as a scale that summed the total number of situational and environmental factors considered when deciding to burglarize a place. Third, the use of burglary tools remained highly significant, as did age and gender (again younger and male). For this model we created a scale of the number of tools reportedly used in a typical burglary. Lastly, responses to prevention did not remain significant despite, again, age and gender (younger and male) being a highly significant predictor in being a deliberate burglar. For this model, we created a scale of being deterred by preventative measures (indicating that a lock or alarm makes a difference when choosing a target).

Considered collectively, it appears that deliberate burglars were more likely to be younger, male, less likely to be motivated by drugs, more proactive and thoughtful when selecting a target and more likely to use burglary tools while offending. Other

demographic factors such as race and marital status were not significant in any of the multivariate models and were therefore not included in the tables.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of 376 burglars

Variables	Deliberate Burglars (n=119)	Impulsive Burglars (n=257)	X ²	Significance Level
Survey State				
Ohio	35.8% (73)	64.2% (131)		
North Carolina	23.9% (21)	76.1% (67)		
Kentucky	29.8% (25)	70.2% (59)	4.217	.121
Gender				
Male	38.7% (94)	61.3% (149)		
Female	18.8% (25)	81.2% (108)	15.713	.000***
Race				
Caucasian	32.3% (84)	67.7% (176)		
African American	28.4% (25)	71.6% (63)		
Hispanic	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)		
Native American	0.0% (0)	100.0% (5)		
Other	44.4% (8)	66.6% (10)	4.469	.346
Marital Status				
Single	33.3% (77)	67.7% (154)	.927	.324
Separated	20.7% (2)	79.3% (23)	1.693	.193
Married	31.6% (12)	68.4% (26)	.000	.978
Divorced	27.5% (14)	72.5% (37)	.441	.506
Widowed	0.0% (0)	100.0% (3)	1.389	.239
Other	7.6% (9)	6.2% (18)	.246	.620
Most Serious Crime Charged with				
Burglary/B&E	34.3% (71)	65.7% (136)		
Robbery	22.2% (10)	77.8% (35)		
Assault	45.8% (11)	54.2% (13)		
Homicide/Attempted /Manslaughter	23.3% (7)	76.7% (23)		
Sexual Assault/Rape	37.5% (3)	62.5% (5)		
Kidnapping	15.4% (2)	84.6% (11)		
Larceny	16.7% (1)	83.3% (5)		
Drug Offense	16.7% (1)	83.3% (5)		
Motor Vehicle Theft	100.0% (1)	0.0% (0)		
Arson	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)		
Other	37.5% (9)	62.5% (15)	11.446	.324
Mean Age	30.4	33.7	t= -3.120	.005**

Table displays row percentages.

*p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

Table 2: Motivation comparisons for deliberate and impulsive burglars

Variables	Deliberate Burglars	Impulsive Burglars	X ²	Significance Level
What is your top reason for engaging in burglary?				
Drugs	24.1% (28)	36.0% (86)		
Money	51.7% (60)	31.4% (75)		
Both Drugs and Money	16.4% (19)	20.5% (49)		
Other	7.8% (9)	12.1% (29)	14.001	.003**

Percentages represent proportion of burglars who indicate each individual motivation.

*p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

Table 3: Target selection and deterrence comparisons for deliberate and impulsive burglars

Variables	Deliberate Burglars	Impulsive Burglars	X ²	Significance Level
Types of places burglarized or attempted to burglarize				
Homes/places where someone lived	84.0% (100)	88.2% (224)	1.226	.268
Stores or other businesses	54.6% (65)	41.7% (106)	5.423	.020*
Government buildings	15.1% (18)	6.3% (16)	7.621	.006**
Schools	16.0% (19)	11.0% (28)	1.798	.180
Churches	10.1% (12)	9.1% (23)	.101	.751
Other	7.6% (9)	11.8% (30)	1.562	.211
Mean number of factors considered when deciding to burglarize a place	11.0 (SD= 6.5) †	8.0 (SD= 4.1) †		
When planning a burglary, do you think about how likely you are to get caught?	57.8% (26)	47.9% (56)	1.278	.258
Do you think about the likelihood of getting caught <i>while</i> you are committing the burglary?	60.7% (71)	49.2% (122)	4.212	.040*
Do you think about the likelihood of getting caught <i>after</i> you commit the burglary?	56.9% (66)	61.0% (152)	.566	.452
If you feel that there is a good chance of getting caught during or after the burglary, are you less likely to commit the burglary?	61.7% (71)	55.4% (133)	1.271	.259

Percentages represent proportion of burglars who indicate yes for each item.

*p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

† p < 0.05, t = 4.0

Table 4a: Technique comparisons for deliberate and impulsive burglars: items

Variables	Deliberate Burglars	Impulsive Burglars	X ²	Significance Level
How do you spend income generated from burglaries?				
Living Expenses/Bills	66.9% (79)	49.0% (119)	10.349	.001**
Clothes/Shoes	47.5% (56)	29.5% (71)	11.223	.001**
Gambling	6.8% (8)	5.0% (12)	.488	.485
Drugs	68.6% (81)	75.9% (183)	2.163	.141
Partying	39.0% (46)	40.7% (98)	.093	.760
Gifts	22.9% (27)	18.3% (44)	1.068	.301
Other	4.7% (17)	6.4% (23)	1.892	.169
After you commit a burglary, what do you typically do with the items				
Get rid of them immediately	52.6% (61)	68.8% (154)	8.589	.003**
Hold onto the items until a good profit can be made	24.1% (28)	9.8% (22)	12.488	.000***
Get rid of some items and hold some items	35.3% (41)	33.9% (76)	.068	.794
If you do not get rid of items immediately, where/how do you store the stolen items				
In my home	30.2% (13)	32.7% (33)	.083	.774
In a family member's home	0% (0)	7.9% (8)	3.606	.058
At a friend's house	14.0% (6)	31.7% (32)	4.881	.027*
Stashed somewhere else (e.g. bushes)	30.2% (13)	28.7% (29)	.034	.854
In a storage facility	16.3% (7)	12.9% (13)	.293	.558
In an empty home or building	18.6% (8)	7.9% (8)	3.486	.062
Other	23.3% (10)	13.9% (14)	1.916	.116
What do you usually do with the stolen items?				
Keep the items for myself	35.3% (41)	22.4% (51)	6.608	.010*
Sell to a family member	15.5% (18)	11.8% (27)	.913	.339
Sell to a friend	38.8% (45)	39.0% (89)	.002	.956
Sell to a stranger	58.6% (58)	48.2% (110)	3.314	.069
Sell at a market or garage	22.4% (26)	9.6% (22)	10.434	.001**
Sell online	15.5% (18)	7.9% (18)	4.768	.029*
Sell at an auction	6.0% (7)	3.9% (9)	.755	.358
Sell to a pawn shop or second hand dealer	44.0% (51)	50.0% (114)	1.122	.290
Trade the items for other items	29.3% (34)	38.6% (88)	2.897	.089
Other	13.8% (160)	16.2% (37)	.350	.554

Percentages represent proportion of burglars who indicated "yes" for each item.

*p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

Table 4b: Technique comparisons for deliberate and impulsive burglars: tools and methods

Variables	Deliberate Burglars	Impulsive Burglars	X ²	Significance Level
Do you cut telephone wires?				
Never	70.1% (82)	86.3% (201)		
Sometimes	21.4% (25)	9.9% (23)		
Always	8.5% (10)	3.9% (23)	13.176	.001**
Do you cut alarm wires?				
Never	63.5% (73)	87.5% (203)		
Sometimes	27.8% (32)	10.8% (25)		
Always	8.7% (10)	1.7% (4)	28.448	.000***
What tools do you typically take?				
Crow bar	40.4% (46)	33.6% (73)	1.461	.227
Screw driver	48.2% (55)	46.1% (100)	.140	.708
Mask/disguise	39.5% (45)	24.0% (52)	8.679	.003**
Bump key	13.2% (15)	6.5% (14)	4.205	.040*
Lock picking kit	27.2% (31)	11.5% (25)	13.060	.000***
Window punch	18.4% (21)	8.8% (19)	6.572	.010**
Hammer	21.9% (25)	14.3% (31)	3.107	.078
Bag/containers to carry items	47.4% (54)	29.0% (63)	10.995	.001**
Electric tool to assist in disabling alarm	10.5% (12)	5.1% (11)	3.442	.064
Other tool(s) to assist in disabling alarm	11.4% (13)	5.1% (11)	4.459	.035*
Other	36.8% (42)	36.4% (79)	.006	.938
If you come in contact with another person during the commission of the burglary, do you:				
Pretend to be a delivery person	9.6% (11)	4.1% (9)	4.212	.040*
Pretend to be a maintenance worker	14.9% (17)	4.1% (9)	12.439	.000***
Pretend to be a neighbor	23.7% (27)	17.6% (39)	1.785	.181
Pretend to be an employee	12.3% (14)	5.9% (13)	4.207	.040*
Run away	47.4% (54)	57.2% (127)	2.934	.087
Other	36.0% (410)	31.5% (70)	.669	.413

Percentages represent proportion of burglars who indicate yes for each item.

*p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

Table 5: Response to prevention comparisons for deliberate and impulsive burglars

Variables	Deliberate Burglars	Impulsive Burglars	X ²	Significance Level
Do heavy-duty locks on windows and doors make a difference?				
Yes	28.4% (33)	34.4% (76)		
No	71.6% (830)	65.5% (145)	1.227	.268
How do you deal with locks?				
I try to avoid dealing with them	46.2% (55)	43.4% (102)	.253	.615
I smash them	36.1% (43)	32.3% (76)	.510	.475
I try to pick them	28.6% (34)	13.6% (32)	11.647	.001**
Do alarms in buildings make a difference when choosing a target?				
Yes	65.0% (76)	77.3% (174)		
No	35.0% (41)	22.7% (51)	5.996	.014*
How often can you determine there is an alarm in the building before attempting to burglarize it?				
Never	12.0% (14)	17.9% (41)		
Sometimes	53.8% (63)	48.5% (111)		
Always	34.2% (40)	33.6% (77)	2.170	.338
If you decide to burglarize a place and then learn that there is an alarm in the building will you:				
Never attempt the burglary	36.1% (43)	55.7% (127)		
Sometimes attempt the burglary	47.9% (57)	32.5% (74)		
Always attempt the burglary	16.0% (19)	11.8% (27)	12.053	.002**
If there was an alarm on the building, did you attempt to disable it?				
Never	69.4% (77)	85.3% (191)		
Sometimes	18.0% (20)	8.9% (20)		
Always	12.6% (14)	5.8% (13)	11.750	.003**
Are you usually effective at disabling alarms?				
Yes, before they are activated	21.7% (23)	9.9% (20)		
Yes, after they are activated	9.4% (10)	5.0% (10)		
No	68.9% (73)	85.1% (172)	11.399	.003**

Percentages represent proportion of burglars who indicate yes for each item.

*p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

Table 6: Logistic regressions predicting deliberate burglars

Variable	Unstand. Coefficient	OR	Standard Error	Wald
Age	-.036	.965	.013	7.637**
Gender (male)	.902	2.464	.272	10.951***
Drug Motivation	-.425	.654	.244	3.026*
(Constant)	.015	1.015	.497	.001
Age	-.032	.969	.013	5.813**
Gender (male)	.949	2.584	.275	11.888***
Money Motivation	.630	1.878	.258	5.961**
(Constant)	.764	.466	.512	2.233
Age	-.035	.965	.013	7.343**
Gender (male)	1.029	2.797	.264	15.151***
Other Motivation	-.623	.536	.429	2.113
(Constant)	-.236	.790	.470	.252
Age	-.039	.962	.012	9.036**
Gender (male)	.915	2.497	.266	11.849***
Target Selection	.064	1.066	.018	13.330***
(Constant)	-.776	.460	.481	2.603
Age	-.035	.996	.013	7.086**
Gender (male)	.836	2.307	.269	9.674**
Use of Tools	.291	1.338	.064	20.783***
(Constant)	-.928	.395	.492	3.563
Age	-.038	.963	.013	8.585**
Gender (male)	.941	2.564	.263	12.830***
Prevention	-.080	.923	.078	1.038
(Constant)	-.022	.978	.522	.002

*p < 0.05 ** p < 0.01 *** p < 0.001

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to compare burglars' varying levels of deliberation and planning in order to understand the differences among burglars who typically plan an offense, referred to as *deliberate burglars*, versus those who report seldom planning an offense, referred to as *impulsive burglars*. More specifically, we compared the motivations, target selection strategies, factors that deter, techniques and tools used during burglary, and responses to prevention measures among a sample of 422 randomly selected incarcerated burglars in three states.

Overall, our findings yield further support for prior studies of burglars. Burglars are motivated by a need for cash, select targets based on visual cues surrounding the target, may have intricate techniques for committing a burglary and are typically deterred by some crime prevention measures. Although the prevalence of high and low levels of offense planning seems to vary by study (Bennett and Wright, 1984; Cromwell, Olsen and Avary, 1991; Wright and Decker, 1994; and Nee and Meenaghan, 2006), we found that about a third of our sample of incarcerated burglars indicated some level of planning prior to engaging in burglary. Unlike prior studies that merely note the prevalence of deliberate, impulsive, or even search burglars, we examined common elements of a burglary for two distinct burglar types.

Our findings extend what we have learned from prior studies and reveal that motivations differ for deliberate and impulsive burglars. Deliberate burglars are much more likely to be motivated to obtain cash in order to pay living expenses or items such as clothes and shoes, while impulsive burglars are more motivated by drug use habits. While this finding has less utility for preventative measures, it reveals that treatment

services rendered by the criminal justice system could vary by individual burglar.

Deliberate burglars may benefit more from vocational training and skill-building training while impulsive burglars may first need to receive substance use treatment.

The remaining facets of a burglary - target selection, factors that deter, techniques used, and responses to prevention efforts - reveal that burglars actively consider how many physical and crime preventive obstacles they may have to overcome in order to succeed in their burglary. Just as Clarke and Cornish (1984) stated when describing “the reasoning criminal,” burglars, even impulsive ones, operate under some level of rational choice. Impulsive burglars are much more easily dissuaded from a target when multiple obstacles are present. While deliberate burglars are likely to consider more aspects of a target during selection, they still report being deterred by details that would make the burglary riskier, such as presence of a lock or alarm and whether it seems like the target is occupied. While deliberate burglars are more likely to engage in creative techniques and use tools during their burglary, they are still, more often than not, going to avoid unnecessary risks and attempt to locate a target with fewer obstacles to overcome. This implies that elements as outlined within situational crime prevention, such as target hardening, increasing surveillance, and removing targets through environmental management, are effective in deterring burglars from a potential target (Bennett and Wright, 1984; Clarke, 1983; 1995). Such measures work best against the impulsive burglar, but still are effective deterrents for the deliberate burglar as well.

This study presents a few limitations. As this study describes information collected from incarcerated burglars only, burglars who are not incarcerated may be different. Hence, more ethnographic based studies, such as those conducted by Cromwell,

Olsen and Avary (1991), Wright and Decker (1994) and Nee and Taylor (1988), may reveal additional differences amongst burglars with varying levels of offense planning. Also, although offender's self-reported crimes are typically accurate (see Junger-Tas and Marshall, 1999; Krohn, Thornberry, Gibson and Baldwin, 2004), the account of their specific decisions making processes while committing a crime may be less accurate and cannot be verified with official data.

Directions for future research would include examining gender differences among burglars. We found that females are much more likely to be impulsive. Further research should examine what about female burglary is a mostly impulsive domain. Also, as we found that planning commitment and subsequent motivations can vary by burglar, such differences may also be present for other types of crime. Future research should explore these possible differences for a variety of crimes and offenders.

REFERENCES

- Beccaria, C. (1963). *On Crimes and Punishments*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Bennett, T., & Wright, R. (1984). *Burglars on burglary: Prevention and the offender*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Bennett, T., Holloway, K., & Farrington, D. P. (2006). Does neighborhood watch reduce crime? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 2(4), 437-458.
- Bentham, J. (1962). *The Works of Jeremy Bentham. Vol. 1*. New York: Russell and Russell.
- Bernasco, W. (2006). Co-offending and the choice of target areas in burglary. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*, 3(3), 139-155.
- Bernasco, W., & Luykx, F. (2003). Effects on attractiveness, opportunity and accessibility to burglars on residential burglary rates of urban neighborhoods. *Criminology*, 41(3), 981-1002.
- Blevins, K. R., Kuhns, J. B. and Lee, S. Z. (2012). *Understanding decisions to burglarize from the offender's perspective*. Charlotte, NC: The University of North Carolina at Charlotte Department of Criminal Justice & Criminology.
- Clarke, R. V. (1983). Situational crime prevention: Its theoretical basis and practical scope. *Crime and Justice*, 225-256.
- Clarke, R. V. (1995). Situational crime prevention. *Crime and Justice*, 91-150.
- Clarke, R. V., & Cornish, D. (1986). *The reasoning criminal*. NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Clarke, R.V.G. (Ed.). (1997). *Situational crime prevention*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American sociological review*, 44(4), 588-608.
- Copes, H, and Hochstetler, A. (1996). Consenting to talk: Why inmates participate in prison research. In P. Cromwell and M. L. Birzer's (eds.) *In Their Own Words: Criminals on Crime: An Anthology* (pp. 19-31). Oxford: University Press.
- Coupe, T., & Blake, L. (2006). Daylight and darkness targeting strategies and the risks of being seen at residential burglaries. *Criminology*, 44(2), 431-464.

- Cromwell, P. F., Olson, J. N., & Wester Avary, D. (1991). *Breaking and entering: An ethnographic analysis of burglary*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Forrester, D., Chatterton, M., & Pease, K. (1988). *The Kirkholt burglary prevention project, Rochdale*. London: Home Office.
- Garcia-Retamero, R., & Dhami, M. K. (2009). Take-the-best in expert-novice decision strategies for residential burglary. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 16, 163-169.
- Goodwill, A.M., & Alison, L.J. (2006). The development of a filter model for prioritizing suspects in burglary offences. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 12(4), 395-416
- Hakim, S., & Blackstone, E.A. (1997). *Securing home and business: A guide to the electronic security industry*. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Hakim, S., Rengert, G. F., & Shachmurove, Y. (2001). Target search of burglars: A revised economic model. *Papers in Regional Science*, 80, 121-137.
- Hochstetler, A. (2001). Opportunities and decisions: Interactional dynamics in robbery and burglary groups*. *Criminology*, 39(3), 737-764.
- Hochstetler, A., & Copes, H. (2006). Managing fear to commit felony theft. In P. Cromwell (Ed.), *In their own words: Criminals on Crime* (4th ed.). (pp. 102-112). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The death and life of great American cities*. Random House LLC.
- Jeffery, C. R. (1977). *Crime prevention through environmental design*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Junger-Tas, J., & Marshall, I. H. (1999). The self-report methodology in crime research. *Crime and Justice*, 25, 291-367.
- Krohn, M. D., Thornberry, T. P., Gibson, C. L., & Baldwin, J. M. (2010). The development and impact of self-report measures of crime and delinquency. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 26(4), 509-525.
- Lee, S. (2008). *The impact of home burglar alarm systems on residential burglaries*. Ann Arbor: ProQuest.
- Maguire, M., & Bennett, T. (1982). *Burglary in a dwelling: The offence, the offender, and the victim*. London: Heinemann.
- Matza, D. (1970). Rebellious Youth: 1969. *Youth and Society*, 1(4), 455-472.

- Miethe, T. D., McCorkle, R. C., & Listwan, S. J. (2001). *Crime profiles: The anatomy of dangerous persons, places, and situations*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Co.
- Nee, C. (2004). The offender's perspective on crime: Methods and principles in data collection. *Applying psychology to forensic practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Nee, C., & Meenaghan, A. (2006). Expert decision making in burglars. *British Journal of Criminology*, 46(5), 935-949.
- Nee, C., & Taylor, M. (1988). Residential burglary in the Republic of Ireland: A situational perspective. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(2), 105-116.
- Newman, O. (1972). *Defensible space*. New York: Macmillan.
- Palmer, E. J., Holmes, A., & Hollin, C. R. (2002). Investigating burglars' decisions: factors influencing target choice, method of entry, reasons for offending, repeat victimisation of a property and victim awareness. *Security Journal*, 15(1), 7-18.
- Ramsay, M., & Newton, R. (1991). The effect of better street lighting on crime and fear: A review. Crime Prevention Unit Paper No. 29. London: Home Office
- Rengert, G. F., & Wasilchick, J. (1985). *Suburban burglary: A time and a place for everything*. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C Thomas.
- Reppetto, T. A. (1974). *Residential crime*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Rosenbaum, D. P. (1988). Community crime prevention: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Justice Quarterly*, 5(3), 323-395.
- Scarr, H. A., Pinsky, J. L., & Wyatt, D. S. (1972). *Patterns of burglary* (No. 10). National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.
- Schneider, J. L. (2005). Stolen-Goods Markets Methods of Disposal. *British Journal of Criminology*, 45(2), 129-140.
- Shover, N. (1973). The social organization of burglary. *Social Problems*, 499-514.
- Shover, N., & Honaker, D. (1992). The socially bounded decision making of persistent property offenders. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(4), 276-293.
- Snook, B., Dhami, M. K., & Kavanagh, J. M. (2011). Simply criminal: Predicting burglars' occupancy decisions with a simple heuristic. *Law and human behavior*, 35(4), 316.

- Stevenson, R. J., Forsythe, L. M., & Weatherburn, D. (2001). The Stolen Goods Market in New South Wales, Australia An Analysis of Disposal Avenues and Tactics. *British Journal of Criminology*, 41(1), 101-118.
- Taylor, M., & Nee, C. (1988). Role of Cues in Simulated Residential Burglary-A Preliminary Investigation. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 28, 396.
- Tien, J. M., O'Donnell, V. F., Barnett, A., & Mirchandani, P. B. (1979). Street Lighting Projects National Evaluation Program: Phase 1 Report. *Washington, DC, US Department of Justice*.
- Waller, I., & Okihiro, N. R. (1978). *Burglary: The victim and the public*. Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto by University of Toronto Press.
- Walsh, D. (1980). *Break-ins: Burglary from private houses*. London: Constable.
- Wright, R., Logie, R. H., & Decker, S. H. (1995). Criminal expertise and offender decision making: An experimental study of the target selection process in residential burglary. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 32(1), 39-53.
- Wright, R.T., & Decker, S.H. (1994). *Burglars on the job: Streetlife and residential break-ins*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

APPENDIX: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Official Information

1. How old are you? _____
2. What is your gender?
 - ☐ Male
 - ☐ Female
3. What is your race?
 - ☐ Caucasian
 - ☐ African American
 - ☐ Hispanic
 - ☐ Asian
 - ☐ Native American
 - ☐ Other (please specify) _____
4. How many times in your life have you been arrested? _____
5. How many times in your life have you been convicted? _____
6. How many times in your life have you been arrested for burglary or breaking and entering? _____
7. How many times in your life have you been convicted for burglary or breaking and entering? _____
8. What is the most serious crime you have ever been charged with?

9. For which offense(s) are you currently serving time?

10. What is your most serious current offense?

11. How old were you the first time you were arrested for burglary? _____

12. At the time you were arrested for your current offense, were you:

- ☐ Single (never married)
- ☐ Separated (married but not living together)
- ☐ Married (and living together)
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Widowed
- ☐ Other (please explain) _____

13. How old were you the first time you committed a burglary? _____

14. Please circle any of the items below that you have *ever* used:

Alcohol
 Marijuana or hashish
 Powder cocaine
 Crack cocaine
 Amphetamines or other stimulants
 Heroin
 Methamphetamine
 Non-prescription methadone
 Barbiturates
 Tranquilizers
 PCP
 Hallucinogens or other psychedelic drugs
 Glue, paint thinner, or other inhalants
 Other non-prescription drugs (please explain)

14a. Think about the six months before you were arrested for your current offense. In the list below, please check how often you used each of the drugs listed during these six months.

Substance	Never	Less than 4 times	About 1 time per	About 2 to 6	About 1 time per	About 2 to 3	4 or more
-----------	-------	----------------------	---------------------	-----------------	---------------------	-----------------	--------------

	Used	per month	week	times per week	day	times per day	times per day
Alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Marijuana or hashish	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Powder Cocaine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Crack Cocaine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Amphetamines or Other Stimulants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heroin	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Methamphetamine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Never Used	Less than 4 times per month	About 1 time per week	About 2 to 6 times per week	About 1 time per day	About 2 to 3 times per day	4 or more times per day
Non-prescription Methadone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Barbiturates	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tranquilizers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PCP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hallucinogens or Other Psychedelic Drugs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Glue, paint thinner, or other inhalants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other drugs for which you did not have a prescription (please list drug(s)):							
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. Have you ever used drugs or alcohol when you committed a burglary?

☐ No

- ☐ Yes, Which drug(s) were you using?

—

16. Over the past year, how many times did you break into a house, apartment, mobile home, or other place where someone lived? _____

17. Commercial establishments include places like businesses, churches, schools, and government buildings. How many commercial burglaries would you say you committed in the 12 months before your arrest? _____

18. In previous burglaries, did you use a car?

- ☐ No
☐ Yes (*complete 19a and 19b*)

18a. If you used a car, was it your own vehicle, a family member's vehicle, a friend's vehicle, or a stolen vehicle?

- ☐ Own vehicle
☐ Family member's vehicle
☐ Friend's vehicle
☐ Stolen vehicle
☐ Other, please explain _____

18b. How far did you drive to commit the burglary? _____

19. Which types of places have your burglarized or attempted to burglarize? (please check all that apply)

- ☐ Homes or other places where someone lived
☐ Stores or other businesses
☐ Government buildings
☐ Schools
☐ Churches
☐ Other (please explain) _____

20. Which types of places have your burglarized or attempted to burglarize most often? (please check all that apply)

- ☐ Homes or other places where someone lived
☐ Stores or other businesses
☐ Government buildings
☐ Schools

- ☐ Churches
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

21. Which type of place do you prefer to burglarize (please check choose your favorite target)?

- ☐ I prefer to burglarize a house or other place where someone lives
Why? _____
- ☐ I prefer to burglarize a store or other business
Why? _____
- ☐ I prefer to burglarize government buildings
Why? _____
- ☐ I prefer to burglarize schools
Why? _____
- ☐ I prefer to burglarize churches
Why? _____
- ☐ I prefer to burglarize some other type of building
Please explain what type of building
_____ Why? _____
- ☐ I do not have a preference

22. Do you typically plan a burglary ahead of time or is it spur of the moment?

- ☐ I plan the burglary
- ☐ It is spur of the moment
- ☐ It varies

23. If you plan a burglary, about much time is there between selecting the target and the actual burglary?

- ☐ It happens immediately (within 24 hours)
- ☐ 1 to 3 days
- ☐ 4-7 days
- ☐ About 2 weeks
- ☐ About a month
- ☐ More than a month
- ☐ Other (please explain) _____

24. What types of things do you think about when deciding whether to burglarize a place (please check all that you consider)?

- ☐ Whether there is a dog
- ☐ Whether there are cars in the driveway or parking lot
- ☐ Whether there is a security sign
- ☐ Whether there are outdoor cameras or surveillance equipment
- ☐ Whether there is a beware of dog sign
- ☐ Whether there is outdoor lighting
- ☐ Whether indoor lights are on
- ☐ Whether I can see people in the house
- ☐ How close the neighbors are
- ☐ Whether there is an alarm
- ☐ Whether there is a place to hide (e.g., bushes) where I will enter the house (e.g., doors or windows)
- ☐ How far the target is from other houses or businesses
- ☐ Whether I have several possible escape routes
- ☐ Whether there is a police officer parked nearby
- ☐ Whether there are neighborhood watch signs
- ☐ The amount of traffic in the area
- ☐ Whether there are newspapers piled up in the yard
- ☐ If the mailbox full of mail
- ☐ Amount of people walking in the area
- ☐ The types of doors and/or windows
- ☐ The distance from major road
- ☐ Whether there are steel bars over windows or doors
- ☐ Whether there are no trespassing signs
- ☐ Other (please explain) _____

25. Do any of the following cause you not to burglarize a particular place (please check all that apply):

- ☐ An alarm
- ☐ A dog
- ☐ Cars in the driveway or parking lot
- ☐ A security sign
- ☐ Outdoor cameras or surveillance equipment
- ☐ A beware of dog sign
- ☐ Outdoor lighting
- ☐ Indoor lights are on
- ☐ Noise coming from the house
- ☐ Seeing people in the house
- ☐ Seeing neighbors

- ☐ No cover (e.g., bushes) at the place you will enter the building
- ☐ Police officer parked nearby
- ☐ Neighborhood watch signs
- ☐ Steel bars over the windows or doors
- ☐ No trespassing signs
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

26. Thinking back to your most recent burglary (current offense), did you collect information about the place before deciding whether to burglarize it?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

27. If you collected information about your most recent burglary, where did you get the information?

- ☐ I went there and watched
- ☐ I saw or heard advertisements about the place
- ☐ An inside person or informant gave me information
- ☐ I got information from friends
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

28. Do heavy-duty locks on windows and doors make a difference when deciding whether or not to burglarize a place?

- ☐ Yes – I prefer not to burglarize a place with heavy-duty locks
- ☐ No – I will go ahead and burglarize a place with heavy-duty locks

29. During a burglary, how do you deal with locks?

- ☐ I try to avoid dealing with them
- ☐ I smash them
- ☐ I try to pick them
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

30. Do alarms in buildings make a difference when choosing a target?

- ☐ Yes – I prefer not to burglarize a place with an alarm
- ☐ No – I will go ahead and burglarize a place with an alarm

31. How often can you determine there is an alarm in the building before attempting to burglarize it?

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Never

32. If you decide to burglarize a place and then learn that there is an alarm in the building, will you:

- ☐ always attempt the burglary
- ☐ sometimes attempt the burglary
- ☐ never attempt the burglary

33. How many of the buildings you have attempted to burglarize have alarms?

- ☐ None of them
- ☐ A few of them
- ☐ Half of them
- ☐ More than half of them but not all of them
- ☐ All of them

34. If there was an alarm on the building, did you attempt to disable it?

- ☐ Always

How did you attempt to disable it?

- ☐ Sometimes

How did you attempt to disable it?

- ☐ Never

34a. Are you usually effective at disabling alarms?

- ☐ Yes, I can disable them before they are activated
- ☐ Yes, I can disable them after they are activated
- ☐ No

35. Do you consider whether police or security guards will respond if the alarm is activated?

- ☐ Yes

☐ No

35a. Are you more concerned with getting apprehended by private security guards or police?

☐ Private Security Guards

☐ Police

35b. Are you aware that some police departments will not respond to alarms unless the call is verified?

☐ Yes, and I consider this when deciding whether or not to burglarize a place

☐ Yes, but I do not consider this when deciding whether or not to burglarize a place

☐ No

36. When planning a burglary, do you think about how likely you are to get caught?

☐ Yes

☐ No

37. Do you think about the likelihood of getting caught *while* you are committing the burglary?

☐ Yes

☐ No

38. Do you think about the likelihood of getting caught *after* you commit the burglary?

☐ Yes

☐ No

39. If you feel that there is a good chance of getting caught during or after the burglary, are you less likely to commit the burglary?

☐ Yes

☐ No

40. When you first attempted to commit a burglary, what punishment did you think you would receive if you were caught?

☐ Prison

☐ Some local jail time

☐ Probation

☐ I did not even consider what the punishment would be

☐ Other (please specify) _____

41. How do you spend the income generated from burglaries (please check all that apply)?

- ☐ Living Expenses/Bills
- ☐ Clothes/Shoes
- ☐ Drugs
- ☐ Gambling
- ☐ Partying
- ☐ Gifts
- ☐ Other (Please explain) _____

42. How much profit do you usually make from an average burglary of a house or other place where people live?

43. How much profit do you usually make from an average burglary of a store or other business?

44. About how much of a profit do you think you have you made from all of your burglaries combined?

45. After you commit a burglary, what do you typically do with the items?

- ☐ Get rid of the items immediately
- ☐ Hold on to the items until a good profit can be made
- ☐ Get rid of some items and hold some items

46. If you do not get rid of items immediately, where/how do you store the stolen items?

- ☐ In my home
- ☐ In a family member's home
- ☐ At a friend's home
- ☐ Stashed somewhere outside (e.g., bushes)
- ☐ In a storage facility
- ☐ In an empty home or building
- ☐ Other (please explain) _____

47. What do you usually do with the stolen items?

- ☐ Keep the items for myself (do not sell/trade them)
- ☐ Sell to a family member

- ☐ Sell to a friend
- ☐ Sell to a stranger
- ☐ Sell at a market or garage sale
- ☐ Sell online
- ☐ Sell at an auction
- ☐ Sell to a pawn shop or second-hand dealer
- ☐ Trade the items for other items
- ☐ Other (please explain) _____

48. Of the burglaries you have committed, how many of them do you commit alone?

- ☐ None of them
- ☐ A few of them
- ☐ Half of them
- ☐ Most of them
- ☐ All of them (skip to Q52)

49. When you worked with others, how many other people helped you commit the burglaries?

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5
- ☐ More than 5

50. If you work with others, who are these individuals?

- ☐ Spouse/Significant Other
- ☐ Family Members
- ☐ Friends
- ☐ Colleagues
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

51. Would you rather burglarize places that are empty or that have people in them?

- ☐ I prefer to burglarize places that are empty
- ☐ I prefer to burglarize places that have people in them

52. How do you identify the places you want to burglarize?

- ☐ Other burglaries were committed at the same place
- ☐ I check for signs of an alarm

- ☐ I check for signs of a dog
- ☐ I check for locks
- ☐ I check for any signs of someone being in the place (e.g., lights on, car parked)
- ☐ I check to see how many cars are in the street and people are on the sidewalk
- ☐ A friend tells me about it
- ☐ I check for signs that no one has been around (e.g., newspapers in driveway, solicitations on door, unmowed/untidy lawn)
- ☐ Other, please specify _____

53. If you see a sign of the grounds of a building that an alarm system exists, do you attempt to burglarize the place?

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Never

54. If you see alarm equipment on the outside of a building, do you attempt to burglarize the place?

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Never

55. How do you typically get to the place you want to burglarize?

- ☐ I walk
- ☐ I ride a bike
- ☐ I drive
- ☐ Other (please explain) _____

56. If you come in contact with another person during the commission of the burglary, do you:

- ☐ Pretend to be a delivery person
- ☐ Pretend to be a maintenance worker
- ☐ Pretend to be a neighbor
- ☐ Pretend to be an employee
- ☐ Run away
- ☐ Other (please explain) _____

57. When you were burglarizing a home or other place where people live, how did you get in (please check all that apply)?

- ☐ I broke a window
- ☐ I used an opened window
- ☐ I forced a window open
- ☐ I used an unlocked front door
- ☐ I used an unlocked back door
- ☐ I picked the lock on the front door
- ☐ I picked the lock on the back door
- ☐ I forced the front door open
- ☐ I forced the back door open
- ☐ I got a key to the building
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

58. When you were burglarizing a store or other business, how did you get in (please check all that apply)?

- ☐ I broke a window
- ☐ I used an opened window
- ☐ I forced a window open
- ☐ I used an unlocked front door
- ☐ I used an unlocked back door
- ☐ I picked the lock on the front door
- ☐ I picked the lock on the back door
- ☐ I forced the front door open
- ☐ I forced the back door open
- ☐ I got a key to the building
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

59. Prior to breaking in to a place, do you cut telephone wires?

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Never

60. Prior to breaking in to a place, do you cut alarm wires?

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Never

61. When you are looking for a place to burglarize, what type of place are you looking for?

62. What type of neighborhood do you look for when deciding on a place to burglarize?

63. What items do you prefer to take during a burglary (please check all that apply)?

- ☐ Electronics
- ☐ Jewelry
- ☐ Cash
- ☐ Clothing/Shoes
- ☐ Prescription Medication
- ☐ Illegal Drugs
- ☐ Other (Please Specify) _____

64. What tools do you typically take with you when you burglarize a place (please check all that apply)?

- ☐ Crow Bar
- ☐ Screw Driver
- ☐ Mask/Disguise
- ☐ Bump Key
- ☐ Lock Picking Kit
- ☐ Window Punch
- ☐ Hammer
- ☐ Bag/containers in which to carry the items you obtain
- ☐ Electronic tool to assist in disabling an alarm
- ☐ Other tool(s) to assist in disabling an alarm
- ☐ Other(s) (please specify) _____

65. Think about the amount of time that passes from the time you enter a building for a burglary until the time you leave the building. How long does it usually take you to commit a burglary?

- ☐ Less than 5 minutes
- ☐ 5 to 10 minutes
- ☐ 11 to 15 minutes
- ☐ 16 to 20 minutes
- ☐ 21 to 30 minutes
- ☐ 31 minutes to one hour
- ☐ More than one hour

66. What is your top reason for committing burglaries?

67. How often have you committed more than one burglary in a single night or day?

- ☐ Always
- ☐ Often
- ☐ Sometimes
- ☐ Never

68. Do you prefer to commit burglaries at night (when it is dark), in the day time, or both?

- ☐ At night
- ☐ During the day
- ☐ Both

69. What time of day or night did you most often attempt to commit burglaries?

- ☐ Morning
- ☐ Afternoon
- ☐ Evening
- ☐ Late at night

70. What programs or services would be effective in preventing you from further criminal activity upon release from prison?

- ☐ Educational program (get GED)
- ☐ Vocational program (to help develop skills and get a job)
- ☐ Life skills program (to help develop skills such as financial management and communication)
- ☐ Participation in faith-based groups/religious programming
- ☐ Anger management
- ☐ Substance abuse treatment
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

71. How has your incarceration in prison changed your thoughts about whether you will commit burglaries after you are released?

- ☐ I will never commit another burglary
- ☐ I will think twice before committing another burglary
- ☐ I will continue to commit burglaries because I have learned from other inmates how to not get caught the next time
- ☐ I will still commit burglaries as I did before coming to prison because I will need to in order to support myself

72. If your thoughts about committing burglaries have changed, how has being caught and sent to prison impacted this change (please check all that apply)?

- ☐ I do not want to come back to prison because it is terrible being incarcerated
- ☐ I know I will get a much longer sentence to prison if I am convicted again
- ☐ I have received programming in prison that has changed me as a person (please explain) _____